

Public Hearing for Alden Ridge Subdivision (H-2022-0059) by Dave Yorgason, Tall Timber Consulting, located at 6870 N. Pollard Lane and three (3) parcels to the north and east, directly east of State Highway 16 and south of the Phyllis Canal at the northern edge of the Meridian Area City Impact

A. Request: Annexation and Zoning of approximately 24.8 acres of land with a request for the R-4 (20.35 acres) and R-8 (4.45 acres) zoning districts.

B. Request: Preliminary Plat consisting of 65 building lots and 10 common lots on approximately 21.7 acres of land in the requested zoning district

Seal: Okay. At this time I would like to open public hearing for file number H-2022-0059, Alden Ridge Subdivision, and we will begin with the staff report.

Dodson: Thank you, Mr. Chair. My second and final one tonight. The site consists of 21.7 acres of land, zoned RUT and R-1, located at the northern edge of Meridian's area of city impacts. So, complete opposite end of the previous one. It is directly south of the Phyllis Canal, which, essentially, is our north boundary of our area of impact and directly east of State Highway 16. It is designated as low density residential on our future land use map. The applications before you tonight are for annexation and zoning of approximately 24.8 acres of land, with a request for the R-4 district and the R-8 district and a preliminary plat consisting of 65 building lots and ten common lots on approximately 21.7 acres. The applicant has also requested alternative compliance to the required landscape buffer adjacent to State Highway 16, which has been approved because it's an administrative application. I will get into more of that later. The subject 22 acres is located at the northern edge of the area of impact as noted and includes four county parcels that contain three rural county homes. The largest home located at the very northeast corner. That is incorrect. At the very northwest corner of the property is proposed to remain, while the other two homes are shown to be removed upon development of the site. As noted, the subject site does abut State Highway 16 on a portion of its west boundary and the Phyllis Canal runs along the entire north boundary, which limits any connectivity to the north or the west. To the east two county residential parcels exist and will remain with their new access being to the south through an approved development Pollard Subdivision. It will be -- their new permanent access will be to the south. The temporary access will be through this subdivision. South of the subject development is the aforementioned Pollard Subdivision, which is zoned R-8 and C-G south of it. This development was approved as a mixed-use development consisting of residential and flex space and commercial uses. The applicant is proposing 65 building lots on approximately 21.7 acres, which constitutes the gross density just under three units to the acre, 2.97, which is near the maximum allowed within the LDR, but overall very low for the City of Meridian. The applicant is proposing two zoning districts within the development to better transition from the existing R-8 to the south. So, they are doing R-8 along the south boundary, just these two blocks of homes, and the remaining area is proposed as R-4. To further help transition to the south, the applicant is also proposing a 30 foot wide buffer with linear open space and a walking path along the entire south boundary. Staff finds that the buffer and the proposed zoning is an adequate transition

from the south to the north. Minimum building lot size is proposed as 5,500 square feet, which does exceed the minimum lot size for the R-8 district of 4,000 square feet. Within the R-4 area the minimum building lot size is approximately 8,000 square feet. A number of the perimeter lots are much larger than the minimum lot size of 8,000 square feet within the R-8 zoning -- or R-4 zoning district. Staff finds that the proposed development complies with all UDC dimensional standards and is generally consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. Further, the applicant is providing excess open space, 3.1 acres versus 2.77 acres required, and providing excess amenities, a picnic area worth two points, pathways worth two points, two dog waste stations worth one point total and a swimming pool with changing facilities worth four amenity points. Access to the site is a main point of discussion and analysis within this project. Sorry. Main point of discussion of analysis within this project, as well as with the timing of the development as it's integral to its success, because there are no public streets currently constructed to the subject development. There is existing right of way from the subject site to Chinden, but no physical road within the right of way. This will persist until Brighton constructs Waverton east-west through their site and connects to Pollard Lane at the west boundary. According to the applicant Alden Ridge will connect to Pollard Lane with Brighton's first phase of development for its required public street access. Because of this ACHD has stated on their staff report that they will not approve any final plat for Alden Ridge until the required public street access is constructed. This same issue does persist for city sewer service, as the adjacent developer to the south also needs to extend sewer services and construct a lift station in their northwest corner in order to provide service to this entire area. Public Works has approved the lift station at this time, but construction of Pollard Subdivision No. 1 has not yet commenced. So, to help people understand the exhibit here, the pink area is the right of way. Pollard Lane, as you can tell here, Asphalt Gray is not part of that right of way, at least not all of it. A portion of it is. Because of that ACHD is saying that there is no public road connection. There is a gap here. Pollard Subdivision No. 1 is approved. It will construct West Waverton all along here. Obviously, they will need to dedicate additional right of way here, but they will construct that and because Pollard Lane exists here, it will be reconstructed as a full public street and, then, Alden Ridge will have their public street access. A portion of the west boundary abuts the ITD right of way for State Highway 16 and requires a 35 foot landscape buffer per the UDC for the R-4 zoning district, because it is an entryway corridor. The applicant is showing a common lot along the west boundary that is 20 feet in width, which does not comply with the required width of 35 feet. To the existing location of the home and mature trees, the required easement by the water company along the rear of those building lots and the relative limited number of homes along the highway, the applicant has requested alternative compliance to the location of the buffer and it's required width on the subject property. To be clear, the applicant is not requesting to reduce the actual buffer width, but to shift it over west of the property line, so that 20 feet is on the site and 20 feet is within ITD right of way. According to the applicant ITD has approved the inclusion of this landscaping within the right of way, as they have excess area that will not be used for future road widening. Staff is supportive of this request because the actual buffer width will be five feet wider than the minimum. It will allow for the existing mature vegetation to remain and will also allow for a wider and more dense berm and landscaping to be placed

along this frontage. As with the previous project, there was no written testimony. Staff has recommended approval with conditions and I will stand for any questions.

Seal: Thank you very much. Would the applicant like to come forward? Good evening, sir. I need your name and address for the record and the floor is yours.

Yorgason: Good evening. I think Joe's going to pull my presentation for me. Perfect. Thanks, Joe. Good evening, Commissioners. My name is Dave Yorgason. Address 14254 West Battenburg Drive, Boise, and I'm here as part of the development team for Alden Ridge Subdivision. Also in the group is Kyle Enzler with me, which I think I can answer all the questions you may have today, but if not he is also part of our group here. He is also planning on being the builder for all or almost all the homes. His home building company has built quite a few here in the City of Meridian and just great to be part of his team for this development moving forward. In my presentation I will just highlight a few points. I will introduce the site. The staff's done a great job kind of going over several items. Talk over the application details and review the staff report with you. As staff has identified, the site is located at the northeast corner of Highway 16 and Chinden, Highway 20-26. Approximately 22 acres in size and it is the north border of the city's area of impact. In fact, you can see to the northwest of the site city of Star has now annexed property and more or less contiguous to this site, which is interesting how the two are growing together. In our annexation and zoning request we are contiguous to the city limits, as has been stated by staff. The Comprehensive Plan future land use map calls for this site to be low residential -- low density residential and our request for a mix of zoning of R-4 and R-8, still less than the three dwelling units per acre. As staff had mentioned, we really had had a lot of good discussion with the surrounding adjacent neighbors specifically to the south. I have had a lot of discussion in the history of working in the City of Meridian and recognize the importance of transition of lot sizes to future and/or existing developments in the area, of which we are doing this here, too. And so our request is not to really change the density, but to have similar lot sizes adjacent to similar lot sizes and that's where our plan is along the south border only. The rest of which is the R-4 size lots throughout the rest of the development. So, our total density still stays within the range as required or suggested by the future land use map and as I mentioned also we are adjacent to Brighton's development that's soon to be under construction. I will talk about that here in a minute. And staff is supportive of this annexation and zone request. The Alden Ridge Subdivision -- the summary for it is 65 total residential units, all single family detached homes, to be developed in two phases. We will start in the southern area first, south and west and, then, the second phase will be in the northeast area. As I mentioned, we are considering the design for the transitional lot sizes to the south. But also importantly this is not just jam in density, but we also think it's important to have high quality amenities and additional open space, which we are providing in this site. We are providing just over three -- about 3.1 acres of total open space, which is 14.4 percent of the total size qualified, which exceeds the required amount for this development. As noted, only four points is what's required in the amenity table that the city would require. We are actually proposing more than double of that. We have nine total amenity points for this community, including a swimming pool, picnic area, pathway network through and without the development, path -- sorry. The dog waste stations and also the usable park,

which I think is an important concept. Sometimes we just have open space and you say it's usable, but this really truly is a spot where you can throw your Frisbee or -- or your -- or your football or whatever in the area just around the -- the community pool. Here is some illustrations of some homes that are planned to be built for this site. Again, all single family detached homes. These are all renderings of homes that have or soon to be built by this builder in -- in the surrounding community and you can see a nice variety of quality custom homes, where they are modern styles -- or some Craftsman style, kind of a mix of -- of a variety of homes for this community. A single story, two story as well. As we go through the process of going through development, we know one thing is important is neighbor feedback. We actually had two on-site neighborhood meetings to meet with our adjacent neighbors and talk about the community. Also had several one-on-one discussions with the neighbors in the area. A lot of comments of support and neutral. A lot of the comments included appreciate the density, the transition that we are proposing, the quality of homes and the amenities for the community. Really only one comment or question was raised of concern -- I will call it a concern, but it's really timing. We are providing a well site to the water company and the developer -- well, the commercial builder -- developer, if you will, to our southwest is Franklin Sensors. They need additional water capacity to expand their commercial facilities and they are looking forward to this well site being provided, so they can have that extra fire flow for their community. So, we are really trying to work together with the community to try to meet those needs and that's what we are doing here, too. With regard to the staff report, oftentimes they come to the city and say, you know what, I really like these conditions, but can you change one or two? Not today. We are agreeing with all of the conditions as presented by staff. I do want to highlight, as mentioned by Joe, discussed the traffic access, the timing of Brighton's development, as well as the alternative compliance for the buffer. ACHD just, as we all know, provides the conditions of approval for traffic and we agreed to all the conditions of approval, just on the record no -- no change or conditions there also. With regard to Waverton -- in this illustration you see in the bottom right-hand corner of this image, this is actually from Brighton's engineer, KM Engineering. All the areas down at the bottom in the black and white is their first phase and the red lines running east-west would be their future phase two and so we are -- we are collaborating closely with them as to what that will all look like and -- and for the record tonight I have an e-mail statement from Jon Wardle of Brighton if you would like it, but we have worked very closely with them and what they have said is they are starting construction next month in December. They have -- staff has said they already have approval of the lift station for sewer. They are in their second phase of review of construction plans with ACHD. As soon as they have that in the next few weeks they will be under construction. So, the way we see it is their construction will be long complete before we will begin construction with our development. Knowing how long the process takes for not only this phase, but also designing construction plans, construction plan review and approval and, then, before we can finally get there. So, we really don't see a gap in -- in providing access to the development, because all these improvements will be in place. Additionally, secondary access -- if we have more than 30 lots secondary access is required. Brighton's given us permission to build that access. That's the north-south road. I will use -- I don't know if this mouse works. That's right, it doesn't. Anyway, there is -- one of the north-south roads would be where that access is and we have their permission to build that if it's even

needed. So, again, closely working with them. Regarding the alternative compliance, I appreciate staff's comments and explanation of it. I will just highlight it quickly. There is a nice home on the north -- northwest corner of the development with large trees and some shops and some things and we really recognize the importance of maintaining existing buffer. Likewise, the commercial to the south of us, which is not that much of a gap in between, they really don't have any landscaping or very little and so we are really kind of tight as to what we can do and our goal is not to provide less, but do more with what we have and so we are going to be building a little bit wider landscape buffer. We have worked with ITD for their approval to just have it straddle a little bit right of way and also on our property. ITD is currently in the process of widening Chinden, Highway 16, and -- and the Highway 16 all the way to Ustick to the freeway and so based on those full build out plans, they still have additional right of way on that common border with us and so we have that arrangement with them and so we agree with -- appreciate staff's support and approval of that and we agree with their conditions. So, in conclusion, this is really a quality development, not high density, it's a lower density development. We are -- we are working closely with the neighbors and working together. We are enabling additional water for expansion for Franklin Sensors when it's needed for them. Closely collaborating with Brighton and with Franklin Sensors for the utilities and access. All the required improvements will be in place prior to our start of construction, as conditioned in this development, and we agree with all staff report conditions of approval. With that we request your approval tonight with the staff report conditions as stated and stand for any questions you may have.

Seal: Any questions for the applicant? All right. Thank you very much. Appreciate it.

Yorgason: You are welcome. Thank you.

Seal: Madam Clerk, do we have anybody signed up testify?

Hall: We do. We have Dustin Hadfield.

Seal: Signifying he would not like to testify. So, no one else? Anybody else want to -- sir, come on up. Good evening. I will need your name and address for the record. Please speak right into the microphone.

Peterson: All right. Thank you. My name is John Peterson and my address is 6786 North Pyra Avenue in Meridian, Idaho, and I live in a neighborhood that is adjacent to the proposed, you know, subdivision and I actually really like the way that they have laid it out. I feel like it's very congruent with the lot sizes that are -- you know, that are in that same area. I like how they are all single family lots and it is being built by a builder that builds really nice homes that are congruent with the area. And I think that pretty much everyone that I know would support this development going in because of how nice it is and the nice amenities that they have put in. They are putting in a pool, you know, so they are going above and beyond as far as what they really need to do to build out a neighborhood.

Seal: Okay. Thank you very much. Appreciate that. Anybody else would like to testify? All right. Would the applicant like to come back up? So, it -- it sounds like nothing really to address there, but I will -- the -- the -- the only question I have -- I have for you is as I'm looking at the layout of the -- the common open space where Lot 9 and Block 3 kind of juts down into -- seems like that squeezes that open space and reduces the ability to, you know, have that flow and be a little bit more opening -- open without that being constricted in there. Would you be amenable to squeezing -- you know, making Lot 9 a little bit smaller in order to open that up for --

Yorgason: Yes. Mr. Chairman, for the record Dave Yorgason. Got my friend Dean over here, so he knows who is talking. We actually already looked at that. We already did move it open. So, it's -- it's more than what might be sometimes somebody squeezes like ten foot wide and there is barely enough room for a five foot sidewalk and maybe a tree on one side, maybe it's because the open space is a little bit larger proportionally, but, again, these are a little bit larger lots, so we actually think it's okay as is. If you need us to maybe clip the back corner of Lot 9, we would look at that, but we really don't know that it's necessary. I have built personally in miles of pathways throughout the Treasure Valley, feel very confident with what's here, but if you feel like you need us to review it we will, but we have looked at it, we have already looked at it with staff -- actually more than once and we are -- we think it will work, but --

Seal: Okay.

Yorgason: -- that would be my response. But if there are other questions -- we appreciate the comments tonight. We -- we -- we are excited about this moving forward, but I don't know if that's a direct answer to your question, but we have looked at it and we think it's more than adequate, but if you want us to relook at it, well, we will.

Yearsley: Mr. Chair, just to follow up with that. Looking at it, I'm assuming that that pathway in between is a five foot pathway. So, more than likely you are, what, 20, 25 feet between properties back there?

Yorgason: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Yearsley, it's a minimum of 20 feet. It might be closer to 25 at a minimum.

Yearsley: Yeah. That's -- that's what I thought. It looked -- looked fairly wide, so --

Yorgason: And you are correct, it's a five foot sidewalk and that is to scale.

Seal: Yeah. On the map it's only this --

Yorgason: You are -- you are right, it is only that.

Lorcher: Mr. Chair?

Yorgason: I promise the sidewalk won't be that big, though.

Seal: Commissioner Lorcher, go ahead.

Lorcher: For the lots that are on the -- the open space, the backyards are facing it. Are you going to have open fencing or are they private vinyl fencing?

Yorgason: Mr. Chairman and Commissioner Lorcher, great question. There is actually a conditioning here that requires us to meet the open fencing standard, which is -- sorry, that's solid part way and open part way. We will meet the open space standard requirements for the City of Meridian.

Lorcher: Okay. I think it's just the drawing that's kind of throwing you; right?

Seal: Yeah. A little bit. Just, you know, to see that space in there just squeezed a little bit where -- you know, I mean as you are saying throw a football, throw a frisbee and things like that, I mean it's a huge area. So, I don't think anybody's going to really have any problems and I mean, to be honest, if you closed it off the other part would have its own function for sure. So, I mean the only other question I have is that Block 1, Lot 22, that seems out of place, I guess, but I understand it, so -- I mean I don't know if I have a question on that, it just seems out of place in the whole thing. I mean I understand where the residence is going to remain, but --

Yearsley: I actually think it fits, because you have the two estate lots on either side and I'm guaranteeing you someone will want that. That's a desired lot.

Seal: Well, I -- I want that.

Yorgason: Maybe we will visit afterwards, Commissioner, but I can't say that on the mic, but --

Seal: I love that lot.

Yorgason: We -- we -- we might already know who is headed that direction, but it's nothing official, of course, until -- but we -- we recognize these would be nice premium view lots all the way through there and it's right up on the rim. It's pretty -- pretty nice up there.

Seal: Yeah.

Yorgason: Thank you.

Seal: Absolutely.

Yorgason: Appreciate that.

Parsons: Mr. Chair, Members of the Commission, if I could just ask Dave maybe another professional opinion on opening that area up a little bit. Just like to give a little commentary on that as well. Are you amenable to maybe just shifting Lots 10, 11 and 12

all the way to the backage of the sidewalk? And it kind of opens that up a little bit more and lose some of that open space along the street there and add it to the other side. Yeah. Shift those lots to the east.

Yorgason: Mr. Chairman and staff, I'm not even going to look over here who was going to help make the decision, I'm going to say, actually, I think that would be less desirable, because north facing backyards are more desirable lots and they back up to open space. So, I would say to the design of this plat, I would prefer what we are presenting tonight. But thanks for asking.

Seal: Okay. Anymore questions, comments? No? All right. Thank you very much.

Yorgason: You are welcome again. Thanks for your comments and your time tonight.

Seal: Thank you.

Yorgason: You are welcome.

Seal: Okay. Can I have a motion to close the public hearing for file number H-2022-0059?

Lorcher: So moved.

Yearsley: Second.

Seal: It's been moved -- excuse me. It's been moved and seconded to close the public hearing for file number H-2022-0059. All in favor, please, say aye. No opposed. The public hearing is closed.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Yearsley: Mr. Chair?

Seal: Commissioner Yearsley.

Yearsley: So, I guess besides having a -- a really good design and layout, timing is always a benefit to you as well, going from an application that's really really dense to one that's really big. Also provides -- you know, this -- this is really nice. Sorry for that. But I -- I like it. I -- anytime I can get an R-4 I'm -- I'm happy. I -- I -- I apologize, but I'm tired of seeing subdivisions that can try to pack as many homes in as they can. I understand that this is a desirable area and you want the bigger lots and -- and it makes sense to have -- to meet that -- that criteria and I -- I can't say more that I'm -- I'm in very much support of this project.

Lorcher: Mr. Chair?

Seal: Go right ahead.

Lorcher: After considering all staff, applicant, and public testimony, I move to approve to City Council file number H-2022-0059 as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of November 3rd, 2022, with no modifications.

Stoddard: Second.

Seal: Thank you. Okay. It's been moved and seconded to approve file number H-2022-0059 with no modifications. All those in favor say aye. None opposed. Motion carries. Thank you very much.