

Public Hearing for Sagarra (H-2022-0027) by Accomplice, located at south side of W. Orchard Park Dr., west of N. Fox Run Way and east of N. Linder Rd.

A. Request: Planned Unit Development for a residential community containing a mix of single-family detached, single-family attached, townhome and multifamily units with a reduction to the setback requirements in UDC Table 11-2A6; and two private streets.

B. Request: Preliminary Plat consisting of 114 building lots and 16 common lots (including 3 private street lots) on 17.49 acres in the R-8 and C-C zoning districts .

Simison: All right. Council, we will go ahead and come back. It's 8:01 and we will proceed to Item 5, which is a public hearing for Sagarra, H-2022-0027. We will open the public hearing with staff comments.

Allen: Thank you, Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council. Let me get the presentation up here. The next item before you tonight is a request for a preliminary plat and a planned unit development. This site consists of 17.49 acres of land. It's zoned R-8 and C-C. It's located on the south side of West Orchard Park Drive, west of North Fox Run Way and east of North Linder Road. This property was annexed in 2019 with the requirement of a development agreement, which was later modified in 2021. Most of the property is designated on the future land use map as medium density residential, with some mixed-use community on the west end. That brown area here on the -- the left map. A preliminary plat is proposed consisting of 114 building lots and 16 common lots, including three private street lots on 17.49 acres of land in the R-8 and C-C zoning districts to develop in two phases. A planned unit development is proposed for a 146 unit residential community, containing a mix of single family residential detached homes. There is 32 of them. Single family residential attached homes. There is 38 of those. And 38 townhomes. And multi-family units, 38 of those, at a gross density of 8.35 units per acre, consistent with the medium density residential and mixed-use community designated areas and with the development agreement. A reduction to the setback requirements listed in UDC Table 11-2A6 is requested with the planned unit development. Access is proposed via the extension of two existing local public streets, North Arliss Avenue and West Director Street, and the existing North Bergman Avenue. One local public street access, North Arctic Fox Way, is proposed via West Orchard Park, a collector street. Private streets are planned for internal access off the public streets and will be requested with the final plat application. A revised common open space exhibit was submitted as shown that depicts a total of 3.43 acres of qualified open space, which exceeds the minimum standard by .69 of an acre. Amenities consist of a 12 foot wide multi-use pathway along the south and east boundaries of the site, a swimming pool with changing rooms and restrooms, to a library, community workshop, dog washing stations, outdoor activity complex, fire pits, barbecue area with tables and shade structures. All units are required to provide 80 square feet of private open space. The uses within the planned development are proposed to be interconnected through a system of local and private streets and pedestrian pathways. A revised off-street parking exhibit was submitted as shown that demonstrates compliance with UDC standards and exceeds the minimum standards by 16 spaces. An additional 122 on- street parking spaces are also available.

Conceptual building elevations were submitted for the proposed residential structures as shown. A mix of one, two and three story structures are proposed in a variety of construction materials and styles. Final design of the structures must adhere to the design standards in the architectural standards manual. The Commission recommended approval of this application and I will go through the summary of the Commission public hearing. Michael Slavin and Tony Tseng testified in favor. No one testified in opposition. There were several folks that commented on the application, some of which may have leaned towards the opposition side. Doug Jones, Chris Eastman, Sally Reynolds, Julie Duran, Shane Nye and Jennifer Card, Lisa Metcalf, Kelly Carpenter and Justin Carpenter. Written testimony was received from Michael and Linda Arnold, Leah Balecha, Daniel Briggs, Julie Duran, Matt Mueller, Scott Fuller and Jane and Julia Duty. Key issues of discussion were as follows: Request for denial of the project is currently submitted due to the following reasons: Project isn't consistent with the medium density residential future land use map designation and would be more appropriate in the medium high density residential designation. The proposed parking isn't sufficient for the proposed development and will result in substantial on-street parking that will contribute to congestion and make traveling through the community difficult. The proposed contemporary modern design of the single family homes are not harmonious with the design of the existing single family homes in the adjacent Paramount Subdivision. On-street parking along Bergman should not be allowed due to the curvature of the street, which will not allow two vehicles traveling in opposite directions to easily pass one another if there are cars parked on either side of the road on the curve. And belief that too many residential units are proposed in this area, which will not complement existing neighborhood and will negatively impact the community's livability. And increased traffic, density and on-street parking on North Bergman Avenue. Key issues of discussion by the Commission were as follows: They wanted the -- the parking plan updated to ensure the project is adequate -- adequately parked per UDC standards, which the applicant has done. They wanted the open space exhibit updated to ensure the project meets the open space standards, which it does and exceeds the minimum standards as noted and code compliant fencing along the south and east boundaries of the proposed development. The Commission made the following changes to the staff recommendation. They required pedestrian lighting to be installed along the pathway along the south and east perimeter boundaries of the subdivision. They directed the applicant to coordinate with ACHD on installing no parking signs on the public streets where the S or the 90 degree curves are located on Bergman, Arctic Fox, and Arliss. And they directed the applicant to continue working with abutting neighbors on repairing the existing fence that was damaged during tiling of the North Slough. There are no outstanding issues for Council tonight. There was some written testimony submitted since the Commission hearing from Lorraine Howe, Jennifer Card, Jennifer Lytle and Sally Reynolds. Staff will stand for any questions. The applicant is here to present tonight.

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

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Apologies, Councilman Borton. Didn't mean to talk over you there. A couple questions. Can you walk us through the density for the R-8 zoning district? And, then, could you also clarify -- I believe there is a different application with a large apartment complex coming in the future -- what the timing and status of that is and that that is separate from this application, because I saw some public testimony that seemed a little confused about that and can you walk us through the setbacks that are allowed under code?

Allen. Yes, Mr. Mayor and Council Woman Strader, Council. It's -- they are proposing an overall gross density of 8.35 units per acre, as I mentioned, which is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. The -- I don't have the -- I have the -- excuse me -- the setbacks they are requesting right here. That does not include what the required ones are for the district.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Where is that coming from? Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Apologies. And maybe the applicant could do that comparison, but I really wanted to understand, you know, under code what the setback requirements were and, then, really understand the -- the proposal. So, if -- if you can't answer that question right off the top of your head, the applicant would need to address that.

Allen: Yeah. I could certainly -- certainly bring it up, but, you know, the -- the applicant is here to speak tonight, so they may answer a lot of your questions, if you guys want to maybe wait until they have spoken and, then, if there isn't -- if there are some items that they haven't addressed we can certainly address those then.

Strader: Okay. I have two more, Mr. Mayor.

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: When was the revised open space exhibit posted or provided? You could come back to it. And, then, finally, the timing and status of any other applications for residential development in Orchard Park. Specifically there are several letters of testimony about a very large multi-family building. I just want to establish that that -- the -- the timing and status of that.

Allen: I'm looking for that information, Council Woman Strader. Maybe the Clerk could find this quicker than I can on the open space exhibit. She's wanting to know when that was submitted. And I'm looking as well, but --

Simison: So, while they are looking at that, Councilman Borton.

Borton: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Sonya, this other question highlights this application is very unique in Meridian and it's a PUD, which -- which impacts a lot of the issues that Council Woman Strader is referencing and so will you -- will you give us the -- kind of the -- the one minute snapshot and there is references also -- I think Ms. Reynolds referenced it in her letter, among others, how the PUD application was considered the best fit for what the applicant was trying to do. So, a snapshot of what a PUD is designed to do in this context and why it made sense to encourage that application here.

Allen: Mr. Mayor, Council, and so back to Council Woman Strader's question. The revised open space exhibit was submitted on December 22nd. There is an application that's in process that is not -- I don't believe it's been -- excuse me just a second. Let me look for that. I don't believe that -- it has not been submitted yet to the city. We have met with the applicant, but it has not been submitted yet. Oh. Excuse me. It has been. The DA modification has been submitted. It has not been accepted yet or scheduled it for hearing. So, the -- Council -- Councilman Borton, -- this -- as -- as you are aware, planned development applications are for unique developments that offer a little more amenities and -- and housing types and -- and opportunities and they do allow for reductions to our -- to our minimum standards. The applicant and -- and staff felt that this fell in those categories for the request for PUD. Is there any other questions that I missed of yours, Council Woman Strader?

Simison: Councilman Borton, any follow up?

Borton: No. That's -- no.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Yeah. I think what would be helpful -- and it's okay if it comes later in the hearing, but I think what's important is to establish because it's a PUD specifically what standards have been modified in terms of, you know, both setbacks, establishing if there has been any kind of density bonuses or anything through using the PUD process. I just -- I -- I just want to get really clear, because I -- I think Councilman Borton's point it's I think a point of confusion and I -- I just want to be really clear on exactly what, you know, those exceptions are.

Allen: Mr. Mayor, Council, all of this information is contained in the staff report. It's -- it's pretty lengthy and all that information is addressed in the staff report if you have read it.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Allen: The density is consistent with the densities desired in the comp plan for these designated areas, for the MUC and the medium density residential.

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Just to be super clear -- so, I have read the staff report, but I think it's important to outline -- and for me what I would prefer to see, I think, is like a side by side comparison of each aspect and how it's different. So, if it's here are the normal setbacks under code, because we have a PUD application, here are the setbacks, for example, I just think for ease of review, for communication with the public, I think it's important to put that in a way that's more clear.

Allen: I will note it for future reference.

Strader: Okay.

Allen: I apologize that was not done, but there are links in the staff report right by the -- the proposed -- the proposed setbacks for reference. But, yes, nothing side by side.

Simison: Council, any additional questions for the -- for staff?

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Thank you to my fellow Council for asking those questions, because I had the same -- so, just a couple of quick questions for Sonya. One, in the staff report there were numerous statements that the applicant needed to provide certain pieces of updates or information before this hearing. I think there was at least five -- four or five. Did they do that on every one of those counts?

Allen: Council Woman Perreault, yes, they have. To my knowledge. I'm going to go back and just double check, but, yes, to my knowledge they did address everything that was outstanding.

Perreault: Thank you. And I have one more question, Mr. Mayor.

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Allen: I believe that was in the staff report as well. But, yes, I will double check here.

Perreault: Going on seven years of seeing these applications, it's been a long time since I have done a PUD, so thank you for the refresh on that. I don't know that I have ever seen an application that had a density -- a gross density -- excuse me -- a net density that was almost double the gross density. So, I assume that that is because of the PUD allowances that we wouldn't otherwise see. I mean the -- I understand that the gross density is -- you know, fits fairly closely into medium density, but the net density is really high in comparison to what we typically see. So, I -- I guess I want to get understanding on why in this situation that's the case. Is it because there is more open space? Is it because we have -- you know, because we are allowing additional units in a smaller

amount of space than we normally would, because the setbacks are less? All of the above?

Allen: All the above. Yes.

Simison: All right.

Allen: Yeah. And to answer your question, Council Woman Perreault, if you look at Section 8-A in the staff report that -- that listed those outstanding items, that staff response is there they are stricken and the response is included how they comply with those recommendations. So, that has been addressed.

Simison: Any further questions for staff? Then I will ask the applicant to, please, come forward. Good evening.

Slavin: Good evening, Councilman -- Council. Thank you for hearing us this evening. My name is Michael Slavin. I'm with the Orchard Park development team. I primarily focus on design, as well as financial feasibility for projects. I am accompanied with a handful of associates and design professionals. If the right questions arise or specificity of questions arise that needs their help, I just want to let you know that they are at our disposal. I live in Garden City, Idaho. 424 East Thurman Mill Street. So, I would just stand for any questions you have and then -- there you go. And I guess I have a presentation first; right? And I think Sonya is bringing it up. Cool. Thank you. So, what you see here -- I think first it's fun to just introduce the project and why the name Sagarra. It's a Basque name for Apple. We did go through a rebranding effort a number of years ago -- was then called Linder Village during the development agreement and we wanted to really reshape the development in the spirit of a mixed-use atmosphere. So, you do see, of course, in buildings on the highway they are more of a classic shopping center, but as we are moving to the center, which is mainly the impetus for the development modification that we presented before Council here very soon is we want to create a walkable, mixed-use environment and be more within the spirit of the walk -- a mixed-use walkable environment. And in just a little bit what I would like to do in this presentation, because Sonya's done such a great job of presenting the technical aspects and, of course, we are happy to answer anymore questions you have as they arise. We just want to give you insight into our design process and -- and how we arrived at the design we did. And so what we did is we took an integrated approach of -- of reviewing the development agreement, what standards have been put in place and in really respecting what comments were made through that process, both, you know, from the Council, the hearing process and planning staff and we also looked very closely at zoning and use to make sure that uses are appropriate and we -- we really looked at the Comprehensive Plan. We know that's a large concerted effort the cities go through that seek a lot of public comment and we really respect that process in any city that gives the community a voice to voice any -- any visioning or concerns they have for future use of land in their community. So, looking at the site and, of course, this is the Orchard Park development. It's around 80 acres. What we are addressing this evening is the MDR R-8 zoned area. It's -- it was a pretty interesting project to look at from simple fact that -- that, you know,

part of the development agreement we required to actually construct Orchard Park Drive, which is a collector road and the impetus for that at the time was to really create a buffer for any through traffic that might be present from Rocky Mount High School coming from the south through the development and so we were happy to provide that and specifically for this conversation we want to talk about the R-8 project. That having been said is that, you know, some of the requirements within the development agreement where they -- the City Council, as well as the planning staff, wanted us to create a feathering effect. So, I will get into that here in a minute of how we go from single family homes on the periphery, which is part of the development agreement, into higher density and so reviewing the DA Comprehensive Plan signed into law in 2019 -- and we have, of course, a couple items here from the Comprehensive Plan, as well as notes from the staff and one thing we really took to heart was supporting a variety of residential categories and what we wanted to do is, of course, you know, there are a lot of beautiful homes in Meridian, but a lot of those homes are very large. There is a large consumer group that might be a downsizer young professional single that there aren't a lot of options for that category for sale homes. So, that was really important, that was really insightful to, you know, have the community asked for a variety of residential categories. And this is a continuance of the Comprehensive Plan analysis per the development agreement. And another one is this provides housing options close to employment and shopping centers and so what we really love about this project is we are creating this walkable environment and listening so much tonight about cars and human safety and we also believe that where we love the fact that people can actually get up, you know, meet friends, go to a meal and walk home without getting in a car and we think that that's really powerful. You know, I say amenity and lifestyle for humans today, a lot of people get tired of driving in this traffic and incentivizing the valley. Our ultimate goal is to keep more people out of cars more often and the third point of the Comprehensive Plan review that we thought was really interesting is -- is protect residential properties from incompatible land use development of adjacent parcels and as you saw it was presented that 32 of the single family homes on the periphery are honoring that wish and this one I don't know why the size is a little bit off. Can change it. And here is just another view from the Uniform Development Code, but somewhat redundant that the wish, of course, is to provide a variety of residential types within a development. That's what you are seeing in our provided site plan. So, next where I jump into is just, you know, the guidelines we put together from this analysis. R-8 zoning, you know, we wanted to stay within that bound, which we have. Comprehensive Plan. Of course, we want to support a variety of residential categories, which you will see here in a minute. Housing close to employment, which we are providing with the mixed-use zone to the north and provide a buffer and transition to commercial and that's the big design challenge here is that you have single family homes, but this was stipulated in development agreement is to provide this transition and so single family homes right next to a large shopping center isn't very congruous and so that's why you will see a lot of the design that we put together was honoring that wish. And so looking here we start -- we have kind of -- I would say five taxonomies of homes, the first set being the single family homes you see delineated in blue and we have a 40 foot walkway or pathway that also serves a buffer in between us and the Paramount Subdivision to the south. These would be -- is -- is the design examples showed for the application. Hopefully you reviewed. These would be high end homes. Probably a little

bit smaller in size. Just going to offer a different product, other than what's available in the current area. Second, moving to the north, creating the transition or feathering, if you want to call it that. You will start to see townhomes. A lot of these will use classic materials, brick and otherwise. These will definitely be, you know, nice, timeless structures that it also speak -- in our mind really provide a transition from the -- the classic single family homes to the south and transition to more of a commercial use to the north as per the stipulation of the development agreement. And moving further to the north you will see these -- these ribbon townhomes and these get to be a little bit more commercial in appearance. We were pretty excited about how the design is turning out. Again these will be high end finishes on the exterior and be in full compliance with the design standards in place. Next you have a series of -- of multi-family homes. These are -- what we wanted to create here is almost like a village green type atmosphere. We have a large park that these homes are surrounded by. This is really stepping into what the PUD was for is it -- you know, we -- we -- we designed -- I think we put a lot of effort in design to satisfy the requirements of a PUD and what that means is -- is what Council Person Perreault said -- or asked was what it allows us to do is provide a lot more open area than typical -- typical. So, a lot of what happens in -- in subdivisions is every home is kind of a standard lot size. There is not a lot of great common area, other than a couple common areas, and this is a more integrated setting and we found there is a consumer base that likes this style. They might lock and leave and go south for the winter. You know, they have a lot more flexible lifestyle and travel more and when they are home they like that a lot of amenities that they are not running a lawnmower or scheduling maintenance et cetera and that we just found that's a great living style for a certain amount of people in the community. And, then, the next -- we do have a couple small condo buildings on the property, again, offering more of that variety. These are one and two -- two-bedroom units. We only have a handful of them on the entire site. Of course, they are overparked on site, so we feel really comfortable with our planning here. We wanted to touch on a point -- which we are happy to get into more detail. One -- one question was brought up about zero lot lines. To be really clear on this topic is that where this was raised that we are in absolute compliance with R-8 provisions. What R-8 calls for is uniform setback separating us from other properties and where you do see zero lot lines, which is allowed, we are only doing it in a couple spots. I mean we could go to the full extent of the code. You see these little red dots. But we didn't push the buildings all the way to the zero lot line. The reason why we did this is we wanted to create a lot of articulation. So, as you are driving up and down Orchard Park Drive you see a lot of movement in the buildings and you don't see buildings along lines. So, when you see that written it's, you know, just in isolated cases, which we put little red dots. And so, in summary, you would say we worked really hard to present what we think is a really thoughtful package to Council, as well as Planning and Zoning, that it complies with zoning, the UDC, and Comprehensive Plan. It fits better the development agreement. That was definitely a high bar to reach, especially creating that feathering aspect. Exceeds open space requirements -- thanks to the PUD -- distribute that to a certain degree to the off-street parking requirements, as well as exceeds the community amenity requirements, which we are pretty excited about. Again, it creates a really livable community for a certain amount of people that like living that way. And so with that I will open it up for any questions.

Simison: Thank you.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Let me be the first to start off. Michael, I don't know if this question will be for you or for another member that you brought with you, but in reviewing all of the citizens' concerns and how they were addressed in two different P&Z meetings, I kept noticing that when you were talking about the parking and all of the parking slots that you provided in this development and -- and, Sonya, I don't know if you can pull that up. The major complaint had to do with the narrowness of Bergman Avenue and how there were quite a few parking stalls allowed on the S curves going through there and it was very very narrow and when I look at that and I realize that we are talking about a road that can connect some of our youngest and newest drivers from Rocky Mountain High School to Winco and the library and you are going to have drivers driving through -- not just in the morning, but at noon and after school, I know it was addressed by you and I heard what I thought was very good faith understanding that probably those parking spots -- all the pink parking spots on Bergman, as it goes through the curves all the way into the development, should go away. Every time I would see this slide it was never updated and they are still here and I'm having a heck of a time trying to decide how I would approve something when you say that, you know, you don't need to have those, but they are still here and can you explain to me why the -- the map hasn't been updated and those parking spots on Bergman Avenue have not been taken off of your parking map?

Slavin: Councilman Overton, thank you for bringing that up. There was a lot of discussion about this in two hearings and -- and so this is where the dissonance exists in between Meridian and ACHD. ACHD controls the roadways. So, you know, you as the city don't have any say over -- unfortunately. And we as a developer don't. And it's a separate process to go through ACHD. We actually in the discussion with Planning and Zoning were -- I think we addressed the Council and -- and it's tough to make any conditions of approval in an area that's not in -- in Meridian's purview -- a limitation of -- of our development. All that having been said, that's kind of the technical answer, but behind the scenes is -- is -- you know, we stand with the community, like we are happy to get rid of these parking spaces and go the hard yards it takes and that could take quite a bit of time. I believe that there is an instance within the Paramount Development that maybe took three years of concerted effort with the community to get rid of some parking that they didn't want with ACHD. So, we are happy to stand there in solidarity. But it's just one of those things that ACHD moves at their own pace. We all know that. That's a frustration definitely of ours and I'm sure of the planning staff as well as we are trying to get projects through. But there is -- it's absolutely out of our locus of control.

Overton: Mr. Mayor, follow up.

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: I understand, Michael. But do you not agree that a form of showing solidarity with the homeowners from Paramount would be to just simply eliminate those from the map, so it doesn't look like us as sitting City Council members are patently agreeing that those are good parking places, when I'm telling you right now I disagree with those. I think that's a really good turning area for even traffic calming, but a terrible location for parking. That's a -- I think they said it was a 33 feet wide section of street that you could not get two cars in between two other cars parked, but your solidarity is falling hollow with me when it's still on that map. I'm simply asking if you have the solidarity when you agree with the homeowners in Paramount that are bringing this forward, at least make the good faith effort to take it off the map, even if it takes a long time to make it official with signage.

Slavin: Mr. Overton, we would love to do that. Sadly enough I don't think we have that visual exhibit. We did that analysis just to make sure, you know, how many spaces would be left if we not only removed the curves here, but we would love to remove the curves - - what is off of our list? So, this is west most corner. We feel the same problems going to exist there. That -- that road hasn't connected yet, but that's going to be the same exact condition and so we would love to go further and remove that parking as well. Again, our project from a code requirement perspective for parking off-street wouldn't be affected, we would be happy to do it.

Nary: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Mr. Nary.

Nary: Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, I mean as an -- in addition, if the Council is in agreement with that, as Council Member was saying, that can be a condition of approval as well. So, that ACHD is well aware that this Council also would not like to have those parking spaces there. So, even though they may not have the ultimate authority to eliminate them, definitely will send the message to the highway district that the Council doesn't want to see those there, you don't want to see them there, your neighbors don't want to see them there. They may move at their own pace, but at least they are getting the same message from everyone.

Slavin: Sure. I think that's a great suggestion. One -- is it okay if I ask you a question for clarification?

Nary: Sure.

Slavin: So, if that's a condition of approval is that a requirement we need to satisfy with ACHD before we can record a plat map or how would that work technically?

Nary: Well, it's going to be part of -- it would be part of the findings. Ultimately, then, that would be part of the development agreement. So, that is a condition that's going to have to be finalized probably before final plat, so --

Slavin: Okay. Thank you for the clarification.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Thank you. Along those same lines, these internal streets are private; correct?

Slavin: May I respond? A couple of them are, yes. So, not the -- the primary access road that moves east to west. That would be an ACHD road. But the interior circulation streets will be private, yes.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: So, the primary streets that have the on-street parking, all of those are going to be a width of 33 feet with parking on either side. So, essentially, they are going to be how wide for the -- the drive lanes. Is it to ACHD standard or is it going to be more narrow?

Slavin: It -- it will be to ACHD standard. And, fortunately, we have had this on other sites around the valley where they see it as a form of a traffic calming and not justifying it and I think the best place to go is somewhere like the North End where it's really frustrating - like one car can only get through at a time and it doesn't work very well and that's the standard they impose on us for this particular type of street.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: So, I have some questions about the parking with the setbacks. We -- we regularly see issues when there is a ten foot driveway or a five foot driveway. Mostly see them in alley loads. But this is not -- you know. But this is going to create the same -- same situation we see, which is that those spaces are often used by residents to park in or they want to use them to park in, because they have storage in their garages. So, whether we like it or whether we don't, that's the reality of it. I'm curious as to how this actually meets parking standards for -- so, for the townhomes, for example, I think the three bedroom townhomes have a parking requirement of four spots. So, if -- if you have two spots inside the building and you don't have a 20 foot driveway, where are the other vehicles parking? Off street? On-street parking?

Slavin: That -- that's a great question and maybe I have the luxury that the numbers are really small on this table and you will see that we have broken it down by actual townhome and how many bed counts are inside of the townhomes. So -- so, we have analyzed this very very closely and, essentially, satisfy on-site parking requirement standards for -- for both what the residence requires, as well as guest parking on -- on site or off-street, however you want to look at it.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: If other Council Members have other questions -- I have a series of questions. So, if you guys are okay -- unless somebody has a quick question, I'm going to -- if it's okay with you, Mr. Mayor.

Simison: I think it's -- all questions will be answered and move on, no matter how we do it.

Strader: I appreciate that. Thanks for being patient. Okay. So, I have the R-8 standards in our code opened up in front of me. So, the minimum property size in square feet is 4,000 square feet. So, I -- I want to go through each one of these standards -- or if you can just tell me which standards do you deviate from?

Slavin: Sure. I wouldn't have -- I don't have the code in front of me.

Strader: I know.

Strader: We sat down with our design professionals and we made sure that we complied with all the requirements. In summation -- excuse me. That's why we -- it wasn't the reason why we employed a PUD, but certainly we could go back and, you know, do these lots in a singular fashion. Take away a lot more open space. Reduce the parking that we are exceeding and end up with a different site plan. But in light of the fact of the development agreement and the standards that were put in place to create a natural transition and a variety of housing types, we felt that this was the most appropriate application and so we need those standards that -- you know, the PUD addresses those standards.

Strader: I'm not sure you do. That -- that -- that's what I'm confused about and so -- like what I really wanted to understand were the setbacks, because I think -- and frankly -- and the other thing I should warn you what I want to do is I want to go through all the elevations that you guys submitted. I have them on my computer --

Slavin: Uh-huh.

Strader: -- some of them, if that's helpful, but, you know, I'm looking at a couple of these elevations -- one of them I think may have been in your presentation, if you can find it. It almost looks like warehouses. Do you know what I'm talking about? If you could find that slide. If you have your presentation open.

Slavin: I think Sonya had the elevations. I just had the bubble diagram.

Strader: Yeah. Here. So, this is where I'm really wanting to -- to get clear a couple things. So, just some feedback. I mean this is incredibly inconsistent with the Paramount neighborhood as it exists today. It's completely different. What are -- like, for example, if I'm looking at these -- if I'm -- the picture here in front of us on the left, if I'm -- if I'm looking at this picture, what is this setback -- does this meet the setback for the R-8 zone? Because it's really close.

Slavin: These are conceptual renderings with -- with all due respect. So, you are not going to get down to actual dimensions. These are -- these are ideas; right.

Strader: Yeah.

Slavin: And that's -- that's what's required for this particular portion of the application and to the design -- I don't want to be condescending, but through the design process, you know, design review that's when we address those issues. These are -- these are purely conceptual.

Strader: Yeah. So, I just want to give you some feedback. So, like an example I would point to -- you know, we recently approved a development off of Ustick and McDermott, I believe, that had some deviations from our standard dimensions and even from our setbacks and there were good reasons at that site that were geographic in nature that had to do with a lateral, with like some serious site constraints and that was kind of the bar we set for deviating from some of our standards. But I would point to like that -- that particular development is a good example of like attached townhomes in terms of style and -- and kind of how -- how things would blend with the neighborhood. You know, I'm looking at -- and I'm -- I normally don't get into design stuff. That's not something that I normally care that much about. But I'm looking at something like this -- this is totally inconsistent. I mean even the library, you know, is kind of like a modern farmhouse vibe. But I'm -- I'm like looking at these renderings and there are even hardly any windows facing the street. I mean it's -- it's just -- it's just a totally different type of design and I'm -- I'm just trying to understand like were these design choices driven by trying to get an exception to our setbacks and that's kind of what's going on or help me understand why stylistically like this was the choice.

Slavin: Yeah. That -- that's a great question and thank you for your comments. And to assure you, we won't build exactly what you see here. These are just examples of what we are looking at for design inspiration and I'm happy you are raising the points you are. Is it -- we will be building something different I assure you. I mean it will be similar in nature; right? And one of the challenges we had, again, is that, you know, in the development agreement, you know, it was somewhat of a staff comment to provide a natural transition. So, what we are working really hard to do is have these single family homes that transition into more of a commercial look and so on and so forth until we get into the mixed-use development and so we are trying to strike that balance to make everybody happy. But at the end of the day, you know, for us it's interesting to present a different product, because different humans have different tastes and we get excited to offer something different.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Time is yours.

Strader: Yeah. So, I understand that, but part of our Comprehensive Plan really speaks to, you know, trying to make sure there is adequate transition, but trying to have kind of consistency with surrounding neighborhoods and I agree with the principle that you are trying to follow, which is you are starting with single family, then you are getting denser as you get closer to the commercial. That's beautiful. I don't have any issue with that. But I think where I'm -- I'm getting like a lot of heartburn personally, besides I thought Councilman Overton's excellent points about safety and Bergman and all that stuff, is I'm looking at some of these elevations and -- I mean I -- I'm just -- I'm not on board with them, frankly. This wasn't the only example. I mean I went through every single one and there were just -- it -- it just was completely a departure from the existing neighborhood and it's kind of hard to hear -- trust me this isn't what we are going to do. I'm just -- I'm a little worried. I feel like there are some concerns and it's better to, you know, come back with something that's flushed out, that's going to mesh with the neighborhood, and you have worked with the neighborhood really well -- since you have had a couple meetings. I just think it's important to flush out that harm -- something more harmonious with the surrounding neighborhood. So, that's one point I would make. The townhome elevations, same issue. And, then, as well, you know, I'm concerned I'm -- I'm -- I have got -- maybe you could go back to the slide where you had the little plus signs of where you are at a net zero lot line. Yeah.

Slavin: Is that -- I know it's on my presentation. I think there is one on yours is there? Yours is much bigger, but I think it might be there. But while Sonya is looking for that, we are definitely open to design and if there is a way to, you know, implement that we are more than open. And I caveat that with we definitely want to -- we take the financial risk on building something that's sellable and so, you know, at the end of the day we would like -- we would love to strike a balance.

Strader: Sure. Mr. Mayor. Yeah. I -- I think that, you know -- sure, that makes sense. I -- all I can tell you are examples of projects where I have seen townhomes and density that looked like it would be very successful with this type of a surrounding neighborhood. Like that's one example I can think of off the top of my head, but I'm not going to design it for you, you know. So -- yeah. If we could -- we are in the right presentation. I think we are getting there. Go ahead.

Slavin: Thank you, Sonya, very much. My apologies. At least I think I drive -- am I able to drive on the -- there we go. Thank you so much. At least the mouse was working for a second. And -- thank you. So, let me grab that again. Bear with me for a moment, please. I will just flip -- I believe it's the last in this series. Yeah. Here we go.

Strader: Yeah. Okay. So, here clearly -- this is a deviation from our setbacks; right? From our standards.

Slavin: Yeah.

Strader: And so explain to me why it's not.

Slavin: Yeah. What -- what you will see here -- great -- great question. Is that you are -- we have a periphery buffer that's required under a PUD zoning. So, we can only be within so many feet of -- of neighboring properties and what you are seeing here -- we just wanted to point out the fact is that, you know, it's allowed to do zero lot line, but on the --

Strader: In a PUD.

Slavin: Yes.

Strader: Right. That -- that's where the disconnect is -- is -- is I'm really trying to establish -- if you didn't do a PUD what would the standard be and -- and what exceptions are we making to traditional R-8 standards, because we are giving you an opportunity to use a PUD process. So, I'm going to keep asking that question.

Slavin: Yeah.

Strader: You and -- and Sonya, unfortunately for everyone -- but that -- that's what I need to understand, because it -- to me it feels like -- okay. I understand granting exceptions for an urban feel, but I need to understand what the exact rationale is and what those exceptions are. Like what specifically do you need an exception from traditional R-8 zoning that you couldn't do here if you didn't use a PUD? That's what I'm trying to understand.

Slavin: Sure. They -- they would all be very traditional homes, which we don't feel is in compliance with the Comprehensive Plan to provide -- to provide a variety of homes. And I think you made an excellent point about another project, about a challenging site, and so what happened was when the collector road was imposed upon us, which we agree with and we were happily built, was that it created a pretty awkward lot, especially when you deal with triangles. You know, it's really tough to deal with those and one option to us -- which -- which I don't think was appropriate was hardship and I think in the case you mentioned, when you have a precarious site -- it's pretty narrow on one side as you can see and, then, it has a triangle on the other side -- is that a PUD seemed like the best application. So, we looked closely at PUD requirements and satisfied those requirements.

Strader: Yeah. I mean just to give you some context for the example that I gave you, in that example, after purchasing their property there was a state highway that separated their property, in addition to a lateral. So, the -- the kind of conditions I'm talking about were really dramatic. Okay. Well, maybe this is as far as we can push this, but, anyway, it's a little bit of a point of frustration for me that I can't see somewhere on one piece of paper here is what -- even, for example, the -- you know, the setbacks, the total square

footage, all those things. I -- I would love it if I had every, you know, dimension of those things and why you exactly needed, because I -- I think I have seen others pretty successfully be able to work within it and we can give exceptions, but there needs to be I think more rationale. So, my comments are -- just to summarize and I think where I'm having some frustration -- for me personally I think more justification behind the PUD and why that's a justified approach. The elevations need work, in my opinion, to blend with the surrounding neighborhood and a lot more granularity I think on -- on why not traditional R-8 zoning and what -- you know. And part of it -- by the way I think when you have those elevations I think it explains itself; right? That -- that's what I saw with that other example. So, anyway, I will stop hogging the mic and pass it to others.

Simison: Thank you. Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. I agree with Council Woman Strader and I see exactly where she's going with this and I think what would help with clarification is that PUD is a tool that we permit applicants to use to try to work with a site that has much more significant constraints than this. We -- we see -- we see sites that are far more constrained than this site in -- with -- with -- with geographic problems, with lack of access, with -- so -- so, I don't -- I'm not a developer, but I have been looking at these land use applications for many years now and this doesn't strike me as a -- as a -- a site that is -- that has hardship. What it -- what I see the use of the PUD is -- in this situation is that there is a desire for greater density and that's what the PUD is being used for and -- and I don't -- I don't see that hardship. So, one thing I wanted to clarify, you -- you -- you keep going back to the Comprehensive Plan. We -- I appreciate that you, as the developer, have spent time looking at the Comprehensive Plan and trying to determine what the city desires. It's always -- always tough to kind of guess what it is that we desire. But the Comprehensive Plan and the sections that you are quoting are guides. They are not -- they are not requirements. They are what our city has said we desire. But they don't have to happen -- all of them don't have to happen on one property, especially not a property this small and -- and doing that doesn't necessarily make it more desirable to us as -- as a city, although we greatly appreciate when developers spend that time to try to figure out what it is that we need as a community. You don't have to have a PUD to meet all of those desires that are in the Comprehensive Plan. That's not what we necessarily have to have happen. The PUD also allows us to have more decision making ability when it comes to the entire development. So, if this wasn't in a PUD and -- because it's already annexed, then, this might be a different conversation. Because it's designed as a PUD, Council Woman Strader is correct, we have to justify why we are going to -- we are going to alter what our normal standards are in the R-8 to comply with your -- or to approve what it is that you are requesting. So, I think her requests for justification for what you are asking for is very fair. For us to go to our public and say, hey, we think this PUD is necessary here, because X, Y and Z. I don't yet see what that X Y and Z is. I don't -- I don't see what -- other than creating additional density, I don't see a necessity to have a PUD on this property with its specific given limitations. You could have all -- all of these buildings that -- all the elevations I have seen so far are all at least three stories. The townhomes, the -- maybe some of the single family are single -- are single level, but most of them probably two level -- two stories. Your ribbon townhomes are three stories. All

of those could be one story. It's not -- the -- the variety of housing doesn't have to pack in three story buildings everywhere. It could be single story townhomes. It could be single story ribbon townhomes. It could be single -- you know. So, I -- I don't see that that -- that there is any requirement that there has to be such -- you know. I -- so -- so, help us understand -- my question for you is help us understand are you creating this height and this density because it economically has to be -- you know, for you as the developer you have to do that to make a project work or are you doing this because you have done some sort of study that shows that there is a definite need for these. Because, you know, we -- we hear from our community and we hear from our applicants week in and week out about what the community needs --

Slavin: Yeah.

Perreault: -- and I have yet to have any group come and say we unequivocally need this -- you know, an 18 plus percent net density in a -- in a -- in what -- a medium density residential designation.

Slavin: And appreciate your comments and there is a couple -- hopefully I address all your questions. The nature of the PUD isn't -- isn't so much it's necessary -- it's satisfying the requirements in my understanding and what we wanted to do in -- in earnest -- it wasn't so much about density, it is about creating open spaces, walkability, fire pits, pools, dog wash stations, things that a certain amount of customers really like and they want that walkable environment and it's very different than a lot of what exists in Meridian. So, we are excited to offer a different living style and -- and especially given the fact it's right next to our mixed-use project. So, you know, for a certain amount of people -- not saying everybody -- it's really cool to get up and put your slippers on and take your dog and go get a coffee and, then, walk home, you know, and read the paper and we just -- we are really building to that lifestyle that gets us excited. From -- from an economic perspective I'm sure there is several ways to make it work, but, you know, this is -- I would say a preferred mode, because we wanted to offer a differentiated product and especially in the market where the median home price is so high and it's become less affordable for so many people that we did want to offer a variety of housing types and that doesn't mean, you know, I would say, you know, Section 8 homes, it means, you know, affordable for a lot of different people, from the aspiring, you know, young college person that just graduated getting their first place and a lot of other folks to open it up for more people to enjoy. As far as three stories, it's -- you know, we are definitely staying within the building envelopes. We are not trying to be cute. There are very large homes in Paramount that are very high. So, I don't think that that's, you know, out of character with the neighborhood.

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

Slavin: Thank you. Mr. Clerk, I will turn this over to you.

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, first is Sally Reynolds. Sally, Sonya is bringing up your presentation.

Reynolds: Thank you. Will I see it on the screen here? Oh, there we go. Okay. And I can move it through -- right here with the arrows? Okay. Great. Can you go into presentation mode? My cursor seems to be -- oh, it's your cursor. Thank you. All right. Good evening, Mr. Mayor, Members of City Council. My name is Sally Reynolds. I reside at 1166 West Bacall Street in Meridian. I'm going to kind of do away with the remarks that I had and I'm just going to go through some bullet points. So, first of all, I would like to thank the developer. He's been very good at communicating with the public and getting input from the public. I do like the feathering of density. I think that's very thoughtful planning. They have agreed to put lighting -- I'm sorry -- along that easement and that's by P&Z, so I would encourage that that stays as a condition and they have happily agreed to do that. This is the Bergman parking that Council Member Overton was addressing and there is an ACHD meeting tomorrow at 12:00 noon and I have already contacted a commissioner concerning this parking and I will be at that meeting to address that then and we can see where that goes from there. But this is how narrow the street is, just for reference. Finally, this is the fence. They have agreed to repair or replace it. How that's going to work I'm not really sure, but it was damaged when the canal was done and so that would be appreciated to be done. You can see the side yards are not compromised. It is an old fence, but the side yards are fine. It was the backside that was sliding down in. So, I agree with Council Member Strader, a comparison of the R-8 dimensional standard versus what the city code would be asking for in a PUD would be great to see. I'm not sure where in -- besides just those 0.6 setbacks where the other setbacks are and -- and so are being requested and how are they being used and I think that should be highlighted. One other point. In R-8 there is a variety of homes that are allowed, single family detached, single family attached, townhomes and duplexes, all of which we already have in this square mile with Linder -- Linder Springs townhome, the apartments at Prelude, more dense housing at Cadence at 55 and older. So, those can be done. And, you know, to their comment of why they are clustering them so close together is for open space -- well, the open space wasn't met until the irrigation company said that they could build -- or put plants along that easement. So, there isn't actually -- and I was on the open space committee for a year and a half and I understand that is great usable space and I would much rather have that easy be open space and count, but my point is throughout the rest of the neighborhood it's very very cramped. There is not enough open space there just for people to breathe due to the setbacks. And so the setbacks request -- this is in the staff report. It's really really hard to read even when I blew it up and I haven't gotten a chance to compare it, like Council Member Strader said. Finally, this is what I see a planned unit development as being and I don't see that it fits under any of those points. The -- it's for residential developments greater than eight units per acre. So, is this eight units per acre and is it MDR or is it actually greater and so you can't really have it both ways. Last, I would just say it's not the intent that the PUD process is used solely for the purposes of changing dimensional standards and that's exactly what this is. I will stand for any questions.

Simison: Thank you, Sally. Council, questions?

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Sally, thank you for presentation. Always appreciate your -- your involvement. Regarding Bergman and the other streets for parking, what are your thoughts if one side of the street is no parking and allowing parking on the other side? Does that give enough room for that or not?

Reynolds: It -- it would probably be enough for two cars to pass. I mean -- I mean looking at it really where Arliss comes around, where Bergman goes through and where Director comes in, those are going to be the major feeding roads and those are the ones that I don't think should have parking on either side. Now, the ones where -- if they need parking for guests and such, yeah, having all it on one side of the road that would probably be great and, really, unless high school students are going to take Arliss and, then, go down that road, it wouldn't be heavily trafficked and maybe having parking on one side of the road would have them come through Bergman and a safer road where there is not parking on either side. So, I'm only going to talk to ACHD concerning the curve on Arliss and Bergman and Director and I really think it's up to the future residents who live in those houses on if they want parking there or not.

Hoaglund: Yeah.

Reynolds: To me that's their choice.

Hoaglund: Okay. Thank you.

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: Sally, was there any part of your letter that you submitted to us that you wanted to provide comment on that you hadn't touched on yet?

Reynolds: The one -- I mean to Council Member Perreault's point, I have yet to see why the PUD is warranted, besides fitting in more units. So, residential rooftops in the square mile is not needed and the development could still have those unique amenities and innovative living spaces without violating that R-8 zoning. So, I can appreciate, after being on that committee, trying to balance regulating development, while encouraging for innovation and allowing flexibility and that's where PUDs should come in, to allow something truly unique when underlying zoning and circumstances or outside factors prohibit it and I don't think that those apply in this case.

Borton: Okay. Thank you.

Reynolds: Sure.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Sally, thank you for the relationship that you have built with us and we value your thoughts. You share them so well. If -- if -- looking at their application, what -- is the biggest concern the parking or is it -- is it density? Trying to think how I want to ask this. If there was one -- there is four types of housing in here. If there is one type of housing that you felt was the least beneficial to that area, given that there hardly is any multi-family in this area and there is a lot of service jobs in this area. So, we do need some housing that is going to accommodate those service jobs. Is there one particular type of housing that they have proposed that you don't think would be beneficial to the development for what you see on a daily basis --

Reynolds: Sure. Sure. Mr. Mayor, Council Member Perreault, I would say the condominiums, just because that is the one type of multi-family unit that is not allowed in R-8 and we have over 300 prelude apartments in the southeast corner -- in that same square mile that people could get here walking without crossing a major road. So, we have 300 apartments there that can serve it. Linder Spring townhomes is probably another 150. And, then, if that application that was referred to later on comes through there will be 540 apartments, which is huge multi-family in the upper right-hand corner. So, where it's right up abutting single family homes, I don't think there is a huge need for multi-family and I think it could be eliminated.

Simison: So, yeah, I was just sitting here saying don't say the condos. Don't say the condos. It's the first project I have ever -- I have seen that I can recall that we actually have condos and that -- that was my one redeeming quality that I could really point to in this is condos I think are a needed product in Meridian.

Reynolds: Let the apartment people know that, maybe they will change up there and put in some condos instead of apartments. That would be -- they would fit great up there. Mr. Mayor. Excuse me.

Simison: You are fine. Council, any additional questions? Okay. Thank you.

Reynolds: Thank you. And happy Valentine's Day.

Simison: Same to you.

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, next is Kelly Carpenter.

Carpenter: Good evening, Mr. Mayor and Council People. Forgive me. A little nervous. My name is Kelly Carpenter. My address is 5991 North Arliss Avenue in Meridian. Thank you so much for your time this evening and thank you so much for all of your comments and questions on this development, because those are all the things that I am personally

feeling. Two main things I would like to ask for or bring to your attention is that I believe that the density of this development does need to be reduced and, then, also the height of the units in the building should also be reduced as well. As the developer Michael did state, it is a very narrow piece of land. I live directly up against the fence where the park will be and it's literally a stone's throw before the condo buildings begin. I just don't think that it is cohesive to the neighborhood. I believe the heights -- they are just way too tall. The developer keeps talking about a two-story building when, in actuality, it's a three story building, because it's a two-story with a garage on the bottom. But I do agree with the feathering. I do agree that the work-live balance is a really cool concept. I just think that we need less of them. You know if they could eliminate one row of the condos and have the townhomes, I think that's fantastic. Single family homes. Absolutely. But with that many people it's going to put a strain on our schools, a strain on our roads. I can't tell you how many times a day I hear tires screeching and sirens going, because there is not many people on Linder and Chinden. Let's see. I think that's pretty much everything that I wanted to say. And, then, again, just thanks, Council Woman Strader, for all of your comments and concerns, because, again, those were all mine, as well as Council Woman Perreault. So, thank you. And if you have any questions --

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

Carpenter: Thank you so much.

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, next is Justin Carpenter.

J.Carpenter: Hello, Mayor, City Council Members. Justin Carpenter. 5991 North Arliss, Meridian. Thank you for your time today. You know, I'm -- I'm glad we are on this slide right here. You know, it's just -- I -- I think it was Council Woman Strader talked about this transition of elevation. It's just too -- too extreme and they are -- they are trying to pack too much into this -- this property. It sounds like you guys see it, too, which, you know, reassures me that you guys are seeing what we are seeing. It's just -- it's just too much density, especially with the five story apartment building that's on deck to come after this. You know, we just -- we just have concerns. I think the developer kind of spoke volumes there, because when he was -- talked about the density, he talked about pulling out the green space to maintain his -- all his units. You know, if this is truly that walkable, livable environment, why would you give up one of your greatest assets? The second thing I want to point out is I think it's being underestimated, the walkability that's coming from Paramount. We -- all of us in Paramount are -- are anxious for this development to come through. We want the restaurants. We want the pubs. We want the surf machine. You know, the library. You know, we are very anxious. We are a very walkable community and there is going to be a lot of that that's going to -- that's going to come to this development as it gets built out. So, it's not like we need to rely on these consumers of these residential units to support those businesses. And that's all I have.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: I'm kind of chuckling, because I was in the hearings when this came through and Paramount was not in favor of the Linder -- the Linder Park development. So, I'm glad to hear that they are --

J.Carpenter: We have also seen it come a long way from the original design.

Perreault: Yeah. I'm -- I'm glad to hear that. I -- yeah. I'm -- I'm happy to hear that.

Simison: Okay. All right. Thank you.

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, next is Chris Eastman.

Eastman: Is it this mic? Mr. Mayor and Council Members, Happy Valentine's Day. I actually would rather be home eating my Sa-Wa-Dee Thai, one of our favorite Meridian restaurants -- is waiting for me at home when I get done. The original -- I have been a -- I live on 1192 West Bacall Street. I have been there since 2007 and so I have been through many hearings on this development and I can't wait to have something behind our homes that we love and will continue to -- to go and visit. The original concept after lots of work showed a map with 120 units with one main road and single family homes on both sides and, then, it was to go and get more dense, different type of housing out from that. The property is zoned for R-8 residential. That's the eight residential units per acre and he is -- the submitting is 8.35 units per acre. At the Planning and Zoning meeting the Commissioner brought this up and said, you know, you are parsing it, because you are rounding down; right? So, he said to them to come back, you -- you know you are doing that, you are -- you are using the number, it's higher, round down. Unfortunately, nothing changed. The -- the developers have worked with us and talked with us, but nothing has changed from the original design. So, even with that comment from the Commissioner nothing has changed what was presented to you guys tonight. So, that was one request is to stick with the original zoning. They shouldn't have to be able to round down. Like really stick with what was meant to be behind our homes. They are also asking for the setbacks, which is a violation of city code, if you follow the R-8. So, I would ask for you guys to stick with the correct zoning behind our house and not allow a lot -- give them allowances. Paramount is a wonderful place to live. That is where I have raised my kids. It's where I plan on staying and I want it to continue to be a very walkable place. Unfortunately, that road that you guys keep talking about, I keep forgetting the name now, Bergman, when the -- when it was snowy I was going to work and I saw a teenager crash on the side, hit the fire hydrant. I saw multiple teenagers coming right after them about to hit that -- me and -- and the teenager pulled over. They come through our neighborhood, they also come through on to Linder Road to get to Rocky. This is a very dense -- it doesn't look as dense on paper. I'm glad you guys are seeing that. But it is going to be driven through by the teenagers, by us that live in Paramount, and I really would -- would hope that you would respect keeping it safe and making sure that the parking is not allowed on main roads and that they have enough parking for each unit to be safe. Thank you for your time.

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

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, Shane Nye.

Nye: Good evening, Mr. Mayor and Council Members. Appreciate you letting me come up here. My name is Shane Nye. I live at 858 West Bacall Street. I do appreciate the concept of this design. Again, the -- the feathering that's mentioned. But it seems like a lot of the concerns -- and I'm just kind of echoing some of these same things over again -- come from the stretching of some of these limits. At the last meeting I was at the Council Members noted that there was not much say they had with the roads and the parking, but sometimes the stretching of -- of these limits, the density, the setbacks, things like that to allow more housing, is what's creating the problem or worsening the problem and we do have a -- you do have a say over that. So, I would appreciate those being addressed as was previously said. It's also interesting to me that the developers -- this -- make this property so diverse they can kind of answer any question depending on which part they are talking about. For example, at the last meeting they were talking about million dollar homes, but at this meeting they are talking about affordability for any type of person, you know, and I -- I agree there is some lower income level homes that feather out, but they kind of play both sides of the coins very often on this issue. Again, I agree with the concept, I agree with the -- some of the ideas behind it, but just stretching the limits, forcing the density I think is what's creating some of the problems and the heartburns and so I would appreciate those being addressed as was previously spoken of. Thank you.

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

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, there are several other names. They didn't mark they wanted to speak, but, of course, they may wish to.

Simison: Is there anybody else that would like to come forward and provide testimony on this item? Go ahead and come on up. And if you are online and wish to testify, please, use the raise your hand feature.

Brownlee: Hi. I'm Tony Brownlee. I was on the -- the first list. I live at 797 Barrymore. Built my house there in 2005 and have been through several changes to that property behind there. One -- one thing that the developer said that it's neither -- it's not in your control and it's not in his control to change the width of that street. It's absolutely in your control. You can deny their project or they can change it. So, I think it was being disingenuous. One thing that -- that my neighbors didn't bring up was that there are no three story houses anywhere in Paramount. Not one. He said that there were. There is not. There is only two stories with a -- a garage underneath it either. However way you -- you look at that. They are not there. I think that the -- that the density there is way too high. I think that the street is too narrow. Councilman Hoaglund, you said do you -- do you think that if -- if they could park on one side. If it was my daughter, those along that street, no. Absolutely not. Not with -- not on days like today with adults driving, much less kids driving. I, you know, got a call from my better half to say, well, I made it. I saw a whole bunch of accidents on the way and that was after she got out of our -- of our

subdivision. I can't imagine on a road like that. And, again, I just think that the density is -- is much too high, that the buildings don't fit the character of Paramount. The -- the buildings that we have there, you know, what -- I built in 2005 what all my other neighbors built. I appreciate their -- their designs. But I think that the sole reason that they are asking for the PUD designation is to pump up the density. I think you all are calling it as it is and until they can show something different, I think that's what it is.

Simison: Thank you. Council, questions?

Brownlee: Thank you.

Simison: Thank you. Is there anybody else that would like to provide testimony on this item? Okay. Then I would invite the developer to come up and close. Or the applicant. I should say the applicant. I apologize.

Tseng: Mayor Simison, Members of the Council, my name is Tony Tseng. 6518 North Fairborn Avenue, part of the development team for Sagarra. Sonya, if you want to -- Sonya, if you can please bring up Michael's presentation. I'm going to use some slides from there. A lot of things to unpack here. Obviously there is a lot of issues, a lot of questions and, hopefully, I had the -- I had Ross over there, our engineer, to be able to ask some questions. So, I can hopefully ask -- answer some of your open questions. I think Council -- Council Person Strader -- great questions and that's really what I was trying to work hard on and you are -- you are right, you know, because the PUD allows for so many different things and what are we slipping in because we are using this designation. Totally understand that concept and so kind of did a download with our landscape architect, our engineer, wanted to make sure we tried to capture everything there is and I'm going to step right into them. So, I want to address those first, because I think that's a big issue and it's a big question, you know, what's going on and hopefully, Sonya and I can address all of them, but I'm pretty sure this is all of them. The zero lot line thing is number one and I want to make sure that when we talk about zero lot lines it's articulated to exactly what we are trying to do and we -- I addressed this at P&Z. The zero lot line issue isn't -- we are not using that so we can have zero lot lines and push all the buildings to -- to the -- to the edge of the street. If you look at where we are really using this it's on this Orchard Park Drive. We have a 20 foot buffer along Orchard Park Drive to -- to the north and if you see the points, it's so we can articulate the buildings and when I was talking to P&Z I literally said, look, if we have to, we will straighten those buildings out and not violate -- violate those zero lot lines. But they came back and said, no, we actually like it -- to see the articulation, so when you are driving down Orchard Park Drive it doesn't look like a big apartment building or big mass, it gives it some -- some -- like it gives them more feel -- architectural feel. It's -- it's not this big massing. If you -- I know that the graphic or exhibit is really small, but it's on those points and if that's an issue and you say, guys, the zero lot line thing, we just can't handle, we can probably go back and just straighten the buildings out and, then, we will have the same -- again, we will talk about density later, but it will -- if we can -- we could easily address the zero lot line issue just by straightening them out. We felt -- and maybe Council does or doesn't -- it just makes it look better. Again, we can straighten them out and solve issues. Second

issue we have -- the reason why the PUD is in -- in place is smaller lot sizes. And that was addressed earlier I think by Sally and she's awesome and she knows all her code and it is because that the minimum lot size is 4,000 square feet. Now, one thing I want to point out that is kind of unique to this and we will look at this calculation. Now, if this was a normal application for a plat and for a subdivision, you buy a piece of land and you have so many acres to work with. The reason why this piece of land and -- and its development is so unique is because this thing -- this entire development probably started in 2004. A lot of things were happening 2007, but a lot of stuff with Winco. Obviously, the neighbors -- I wasn't around for that -- that version of the development -- it was pre -- before I joined the development team. But I know that the neighborhood didn't like Winco and rightfully so at the time. I think it's turned out to be an okay addition to the park and there is a lot of neighbors that use it. But because of that there is a two acre -- two plus acre park that is adjacent to the Sagarra Subdivision that we have not used as part of our open space calculations or our density. If you look at the -- let's see. I can give you a graphic. But adjacent to -- directly east of the Sagarra community, right behind the couple on Arliss house. So, that two acres -- which, again, if you look here we did not use for any reason and, yes, technically can't be used -- is part of that community. It's going to be -- we have a survey that we sent to the community. We had 78 respondents. Because we -- you know, originally, Sally and I talked about what the park should be. Her and I thought a dog park. Yea. I have a dog. She has a dog. We did a survey. We had 78 respondents. We were very wrong. Really nobody wants a dog park. It came in last. Number one represents -- I really don't want it. Number five represents I really do want it. So, we had 78 respondents and this is the breakdown. We offered a dog park, a fitness park, just plain open space, a normal neighborhood park and my favorite was a pickleball court. But that -- that technically won, if you want to look at the data, but it -- it's average score was similar to the neighborhood park, but it had more people that didn't like it as much. If you see there is 16 people that said one to a neighborhood park -- I mean a pickleball court and 34 people loved the pickleball court, number five. But if you go to the neighborhood park there are less people in opposition to a neighborhood park. So, I guess my point is part of the discussion is the -- the space; right? Not only are we not using that two acres, which, by the way, we can get a -- we can get an agreement with the owner of those two acres, which is part of the Orchard Park, to do a cross -- cross-use agreement -- whatever agreement we want it's going to be part of it. We are going to treat it as part of Sagarra. You know, we are going to put some sign -- we are going to use whatever the code allows us to use, whether it's signage, develop a great park, because it's an entrance to our community. The second piece is the road. So, if you look here -- and I'm sure you can't see it, but the collector road represents another -- give or take one acre. So, again, brand new subdivision. If we went out and purchased 17 acres, we would have 17 acres to do our calculations against. However, because of the development that we -- we -- the -- the Orchard Park built that road earlier than you would do in a normal subdivision. So, that acre got sucked away from us. Now, again, we are not using it -- we are not using it towards our calculations for density or anything, but that's another acre of land that in a normal situation we get to add that back into our calculations and the last piece that's here, we call it the remnant parcel. Part of the development we were -- I wouldn't say forced, but Brighton had us buy another piece that's about 3.7 acres that we wanted to include our open space, but we are told -- and

rightfully so he said -- they said, look, it's really not part of your open space, it's -- it's -- it's attached. We wanted to put a fitness track that went through it, but after discussion with Sonya, we agreed with her, it's really not part of it, but that is part of the development that is land owned by us that is part of Sagarra -- again these red numbers are just not being used. So, I get on paper the density looks tight, because it is pretty tight and I -- I -- I -- I agree with Mayor Simison that we need some multi-family. Now, that's another reason that the PUD is being used. Regular R-8 does not allow multi-family. We really did want to offer every product type and I'm kind of afraid to admit it, but I have moved here from California, but ten years ago, so I'm not the local -- the recent, you know, migration. So -- but ten years ago I moved here. A lot of home -- and, by the way, I love Meridian. Beautiful. Have moved ten families here from California because they come visit and they love it. But the product type is pretty homogeneous, which is beautiful, too, but there is a lot of new people coming to town, younger people -- in fact, we have a family friend who is 30, who is living with us, looking for employment, looking to live here and I just don't feel like there is enough product mix. Now, I know this is not California, I'm not trying to make it California. Trust me. I moved here for a reason. But having multi-family. Having a little more dense area. Having attached to this -- really proud of Orchard, what we are trying to do there. A lot of walkable food -- a lot of walkable spaces. I personally feel the library is beautiful, but if you are not as modern I get it. You might think it's ugly. But I think that product mix is really really important to Meridian. You know, there is a lot of big houses -- I mean big -- I'm from California. Like a 3,000 square foot house would have been -- where I came from, used to feel pretty big. But it seems like every house here is like two to four thousand square feet. But to address your question about the PUD, zero lot lines, we talked about smaller lot sizes, the multi-family component, and the final component is the -- so, if you look at this map right here -- and I'm going to highlight -- if I can get the mouse to work. Where is the mouse? Oh, here we go. This townhome coming right here -- this private driveway here is 30 feet from home to home. So, it's a 20 foot street with two five foot -- five -- there is five feet between the street and the -- from the garage. The reason we needed the PUD is because in speaking to the city -- the planners. Not -- I don't think it's planners. I take it back. I think it was -- I think it was the fire department. Regardless. But we don't want people to park in that street and part of the PUD is allowing for -- what we are asking for is that this is made to be a townhome with a 20 -- a five foot setback -- five foot buffer, 20 foot street, another five foot buffer -- if you live here you park your cars in your garage and, then, no -- it's no parking on the street. So, that's the idea for -- and -- and, then, there will be no parking allowed, by the way. Signed no parking. Unlike Bergman. And that's the next thing I want to address is Bergman. I have reached out to -- I was able to get through -- contact -- reach out to Steve Price, head of ACHD, had an appointment set that had to get broken. But I know it's a big issue. If we could change it we would. We don't need the parking. I don't -- there is no reason we want those parking spaces there and I think one of the Council Members said, well, show -- in solidarity show it off the graphic. I will delete it right now. I have my computer. Oh, sorry. Oh, wow, I talk way too much. So, we don't want that street -- to have parking on the street or less -- we -- we agree with them. I don't -- I -- I agree -- I -- I get the fact that people don't like the design and feel again. We want to build something that's sellable and the last thing is Sa-Wa-Dee is probably

coming. I'm meeting with her on Wednesday. So, for the neighbor toffee and fawn. They are looking becomes Orchard Park. So, I stand for any questions.

Simison: Thank you, Tony. And just for the record, I didn't say we need multi-family, said we need vertically integrated home ownership opportunities and condominiums.

Tseng: I'm sorry.

Simison: Just so we are clear on what I am referring to.

Tseng: Pretend like I said that.

Simison: Okay. Council, questions?

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Thank you for clarifying that, because you can have multi-family that don't have the structures this close together and still accomplish the same amount of housing. So, what we regularly see is not just parking issues when you have five foot -- five foot setback, a 20 foot street, and a five foot setback. We see moving trucks. We see HVAC trucks. We see garbage cans. We see all kinds of problems with this that is not just about parking their vehicle and whether you like it or not, people are not going to always park in their garage -- that we have fought this forever; right? And -- and I'm not -- again, it's -- I'm not saying that it should be done that way. That's just what's going to happen and so our job is to make sure that it's safe for folks; right? And that people can get from their home on this 20 foot drive to -- you know, to work or wherever they are going. I do appreciate that there is two accesses on either side. So, if somebody has a vehicle that comes through that's blocking their access to their drive -- to their garage, they -- they can back out and get on to the street. But this isn't just a parking problem. This -- this is -- I mean I live in a neighborhood with a regular street width and I -- every single day there are Amazon drivers, HVAC, moving trucks, tile trucks, contractors and I have -- and -- on either side of the road and I live in -- and I have a regular street width. So, that's -- that's really the concern and -- and I get it -- I get it from a developer standpoint, it's like, okay, well, then, why don't you change code. I understand that. I understand where you are coming from. A lot has changed with that, though, because once upon a time there weren't four vehicles per home that had two teenagers, but that's just kind of how it is now; right? So, that -- that in and of itself is not its own challenge, it's that combined with the other setbacks, combined with the building closeness, combined with -- it's just kind of like stacked on top of one another that it will cause folks to not have places to go or -- you know, it's just going to create a cluster of challenges.

Tseng: And -- and all great points. Honestly. To address some of them, you know, some of them are just facts, but to address a lot of them is -- I know we are saying no parking and we are going to have it posted no parking and that the kind of luxury we have -- and

I have talked to Sally and the neighbors -- is that we are -- we are associated in helping develop Orchard Park also and the one thing that has -- this is a kind of a different subject, but we talked about security and part of our plans at Orchard Park -- and it's going to be in our cams -- is 24 hour security. Some of the shops that we have in the middle of Orchard Park is away from the street and we want to protect some of the unique design and the higher end design, so we have 24 security, which is going to encompass -- you know -- Sally and I talked about this -- encompassing not only Sagarra, but making sure that there is less crime. I know -- I know there is a concern regarding the 40 foot walkway. So, we addressed it with, hey, what do you want to see? Lighting? Great. Let's -- because we want lighting. But, then, we have to get the neighbors to agree whether it's uplighting or downlighting. You know, we just want lighting. And making sure that that doesn't become something that's not a positive; right? Making -- we -- it's our responsibility as part of Orchard Park. I know that once the homes are built and sold a lot of developers are, hey, it's not my problem anymore. You know, if that turns into a crack alley -- I sold the houses. We care, because that alley is part of our park and to address the parking with the townhomes -- most of those townhomes are two bedrooms. If -- the product I know is not normal to Meridian. I get it. It's different. Design looks funky. You know, it's too modern. I have heard it -- and I -- I -- I get a taste, you know. At first I looked at like them and I'm like -- I'm a little -- my wife is a modern farmhouse lady and I guess I have to agree with her, that that's what I like, but we -- we want to build these for a slightly different demographic. You know, a demographic we think is there. We hope it's there. You know, there is -- how many people want a two-bedroom townhome? We think there is a lot of people. How many people want to live in a condo or a multi-family or a condo community in a residential community? I know a lot of my friends do that are moving here. Unfortunately, because of a divorce or situations where they are really downsizing or a single -- single father, single mother. We believe there is a need. We believe in it so much that we are going to spend quite a bit of money to develop something and build it and we hope they will come. We think they will; right? And so a lot of these issues I totally agree with you. You know, we don't want -- but it's going to be no parking. We are going to enforce it. The neighbors are going to enforce it. There is so much extra street parking is what I really want to emphasize and we keep talking about parking. Trust me, if we needed Arliss, if we needed Bergman, we would be -- we will be self-serving. We say, nope, ACHD says we can have it. So, therefore, that counts for our parking count. It's easy -- I know it's easy for us to say we stand with neighbors, because we don't need them and -- and -- and, I agree, they shouldn't be there. But we -- if you look at the exhibit for parking, we are overparked by -- I think we have it -- it's in Sonya's display. But, Sonya, can you pull up yours? Because I don't remember. It's a large number with the on-street parking. Sorry. I won't touch it. No. I'm sorry. Okay. Yeah. So, it looks like -- can't read this, so -- we have 132 on-street parking and I can't -- we have extra parking. Even if we take it all out. I can't -- I can't read it. But, again, I get parking is a big issue, because we are dealing with that at the center, too; right? Dealing with how much parking we have, making sure we can park it, et cetera, et cetera. So, hopefully, that answers most of your questions. I know that probably not satisfactory all your questions, but it is a concern. It's not something we brushed over, you know, it -- and I get that we are doing something pretty different that's not normal -- I mean the library is not normal. Compare the library to any other libraries

in Idaho. Some people like it. And I have told -- I have been told some people don't like it. I get it. I personally like it, but I don't -- I don't expect everyone to like it. And the collective is going to be very unique and the barn is going to be very unique and we want that neighborhood to reflect that. As the property owner, which I'm not, I represent him, he could sell that land -- land off to a Corey or to a home builder and they can build whatever they want. R-8. Here is your lot size. They build homes. A mishmash of types and elevations, which usually are nice, but for us the reason we want to do it is because we want to make it cohesive. We want to make that entire neighborhood look like it was master planned. It matches -- good or bad, but matches. It plays into how Orchard Park is going to be seen and that's -- that's our motivation. Now, if this is going through I get it. The plan might be okay, just sell off to a master home builder, let them figure it out, they will build what they want. But that's not -- we don't want that. You know, we want to do what the neighbors want also and, by the way, working neighbors they have all -- they have all been really cool to me. They have been really nice. And -- and we want to work with them. I get the density thing and I remember asking Sally -- I said, well, how many less do you want? What if I told you we are going to do 180, if you -- then I said 140, would you get happy? And -- no, I'm not trying to say anything negative, Sally. But that was a conversation we had. I said if I said 140 -- if I said 120, would you be happy. At what point -- I mean how much are you just trying to extract from us just to get a win; right? I -- I guess there is a number, but because of the open space and the extra space we have, I feel like the community, the way we designed it, it's nice. But that's up to interpretation.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Cancel Woman Perreault.

Perreault: So, I didn't ask any questions about parking numbers.

Tseng: Sorry.

Perreault: I was asking about functionality of the spaces. The streets. Access. Not parking numbers. Not parking spaces. It's access issues that I was referring to. And we -- we love new concepts and ideas. That's not -- we are not -- we are not saying go do what is just like Meridian everywhere else. None -- none of us have said that this evening. What we have said is we need to understand how what you are doing justifies a PUD within our code that would require you to go to higher than eight and, obviously, a huge difference up to net density that is necessary in this area. We are trying to understand the necessity of the PUD in this area. We -- we understand -- and what I have heard from you is that it's not a necessity, it is something that we think is really cool to bring to the city that's -- that's design elements. That's what we think is the -- the lifestyle that folks want. Those are subjective, intangible things; right? We are not talking about the subjective, intangible, we are talking about the -- how this will physically be built within dimensions and within access and within functionality. So, I think that's where there is this disconnect between what questions we are asking and the responses we are getting.

Tseng: I'm sorry.

Perreault: Let me -- let me finish. So, at least that's for me the disconnect I'm seeing and the questions I'm asking and -- and what we are seeing -- or what -- the responses that we are getting. When I look at this type of community, when we talk about walkability and open space and creating more open space by having denser units, I don't look at this and go, yeah, I'm going to go take my dog for a walk and get a coffee by Winco. Like I -- I see doing that if you are in a Bown Crossing, I see doing that if you are in, you know, a Harris Ranch. I see doing that if you are in somewhere where you have this little shopping community feel, because you are the closest store is two miles away. But I don't see that lifestyle in what you have portrayed and what Orchard Park is being -- is -- is building currently. I -- I don't -- I'm not connecting the dots. I'm a professional single in this city, there are areas that I would live in a two bedroom like this, but not in this location, because I don't -- I don't look at what's being built in Orchard Park and go, oh, yeah, I totally want to walk around that. I go to that Winco frequently. I want to get in my car as fast as I can, because I'm uncomfortable walking in that area and you can show me all of the pedestrian mapping that you have, it still doesn't give me a feeling that that's where I want to go walk as a leisurely casual part of my afternoon. I'm just being really honest with you. So, if you are -- if you are attempting to convince us that this is a PUD for lifestyle purposes, I haven't caught the vision yet.

Tseng: Sure. And that's part of the -- so, we have submitted a lot of this stuff to the city and we have a thousand page plan that we have -- are going through the city for what's being built. So, I get it. Right now, if you look at Orchard Park, you have quick retailing outside, a lot of national chains. The Olive Gardens of the world and Jacksons of the world and we have Winco, which is as big of a big box as it gets. What's not being addressed -- and maybe you -- you haven't had an opportunity to see it, because 80,000 it is an 80,000 square foot glass bar and that is -- finalizing our construction drawings is another walkable village that leads up to a library, with another 40,000 square foot retail that are bringing a lot of really different restaurants, some from downtown, but out-of-state restaurants and the Wilder is coming. I don't know if you guys like the Wilder, but they are -- I think they are great. So, my point is I get what -- how you feel. It's not walkable right now, because I -- I drive by it and I go, man, I'm associates of Winco development and we want to make it so it's not the Winco development, it's the collective and the barn. And, granted, that -- that library is 15,000 square feet. It's a pretty big structure. The barn is going to be 80,000 square feet. So, I -- I wish it was built so you can see it. I would be happy to share with you the thousands -- literally thousand page plan of how that's going to get built. We have spent a year and a half designing it. It's going out on a limb to do something really different, even more innovative than The Village.

Simison: Council, any additional questions or other restaurants you want to find out that are coming to the area, because we are getting a really good preview on the public record. So, hopefully --

Tseng: I can get more.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: The last time that -- that you -- your team was before us I asked for them to update the website, because there was minimal information about -- the -- the -- the renderings of the barn was there and that was pretty much it and -- and it didn't even -- it's a cool idea, but it -- like it -- there wasn't even details about how it was going to -- like what its purpose -- the purpose served. I haven't looked at the website in a while, so I don't know if that's all been updated, but there is no way for me to know that.

Tseng: Yeah. No. I don't blame you and --

Perreault: There is -- I mean how am I supposed to know that if --

Tseng: He's the -- he's the website guy.

Perreault: Or how is our public supposed to know that and I asked for that probably a year ago and I haven't seen it done. So, if you are wanting us to catch a vision, again, it's not here yet.

Tseng: Is it okay if Michael comes up to answer that question?

Simison: Yeah.

Nary: Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, no, because it's -- that's a future pending application and it's not related to this one.

Tseng: Oh. the website --

Nary: The vision is fine. I mean for what you have talked about. But more than that is this is a future application that hasn't been in front of the Council.

Tseng: Okay. I was going to answer the question whether we have updated the website.

Nary: Oh. Okay.

Tseng: Yeah.

Nary: Please keep it really minimal.

Tseng: Okay. Sorry.

Nary: The project yourself.

Tseng: Yeah. Yeah. Okay.

Slavin: And, actually, thank you. You -- you gave me that. The most appropriate answer is we -- we wanted to get successfully through the development agreement modification to go ahead and roll out the new website. We are really excited about it. We are going to make a lot of commitments to the city with new structures that are coming and we are rolling out, you know, exciting restaurants as we sign leases, but it's really tied to -- to making sure we can do it. So, we don't want to get out over our skis, honestly. So, we are so excited. The website's awesome. I have been putting a lot of hours outside of our normal job and can't wait to share it with you and I think about you every time I'm working hard at nighttime and in the morning getting that website done, drinking my coffee, saying, yeah, got to get this done. I really do -- because that comment wasn't lost on us and we are not trying to hide anything, it's just we have to work with the community and -- and the Council to get things approved before we can make promises is all. And one last note. If you would like to see it offline, happy to show it.

Tseng: Okay. Sorry. Okay.

Simison: Council, any additional questions? Okay. Tony, I think you can take a seat.

Tseng: Thank you for your time.

Simison: Don't go very far. Council, do you want to take a break before we -- okay. All right.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I'm happy to kick off discussion. I don't think it will surprise people the opinion that I have, just based on my questions. I -- I feel strongly that this has not met the bar of a PUD application. You know, if -- if we deny it they are certainly welcome to come back with an R-8 application and that I think still allows for a variety of product types, including townhomes, et cetera. I think there is a lot within the R-8 standard to work with frankly. I wasn't on Council when the original Orchard Park Winco development and Linder Village at the time was approved, but it was very contentious and, you know, I'm sensitive to the fact that this was laid out as an R-8 and I -- I think there is an expectation there that things align with the way it was approved. I don't see a lot of hardship here. I don't view the park -- that's an existing condition. I don't view that as a -- a hardship. I don't view the collector road as a hardship. These are all existing conditions. Nothing has changed out of the ordinary in my opinion. I really appreciate the applicant walking through some of the standards. I appreciate you doing that. You know, talking about the -- the lot sizes, talking about the buffer. Obviously, the -- you know, there are some -- there -- there is a reason that they requested this. I just -- I don't see it as particularly meeting the bar. The -- the renderings and the elevations did not meet the bar for me -- the very high bar we should be setting. I think there is a way to do a modern feel that would be more consistent with the neighborhood and more consistent with the library. I think the library is beautiful. I don't have any issue with the library. I do have an issue

with something that looks like a windowless warehouse where we are going to store people. That -- that freaks me out. I'm sorry, I just -- I had kind of a visceral reaction to a couple of the renderings. But it just -- it -- I -- I think there -- there is a meeting point between modern and where Paramount's at that you can find. So, I -- I'm not on board with it tonight. I would love to see you come back with an R-8 and give it a crack and if there are a couple of exceptions or things that are a little different, you know, justifying those at that time -- but trying to move head on the standard of R-8 and if there is something particularly innovative let's talk about it, but, yeah, I mean that's -- that's just where I'm coming out on this. If the rest of Council, for whatever reason, decides to approve, I'm in strong agreement that we need to get this condition ironed out on -- on Bergman, Arliss, and Director. You know, as someone who drives through that road I could tell you for a fact it -- that the -- the curves in that road will not support parking. It's just a fact. So, I think that needs to be addressed. And, then, you know, I would just say, you know, the other thing, too, I -- again, just giving an example, but I did check and for reference I think it was December 13th -- could have been December 13th or the 15th, but that's when we had the application at Ustick and McDermott that was a PUD and, again, very different site conditions, but I thought that the renderings there of the townhomes and stuff were something that -- that you could look at as an example of something that's a little closer, but still very modern. Yeah. So, I'm -- I'm -- I'm just -- I'm not on board with this application tonight. Thanks.

Simison: Thank you.

Cavener: Oh, Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Sonya -- I don't know -- someone -- or maybe it was the camera person took down the exhibit from the screen. If they can put that back up I would sure appreciate it. And I'm -- I'm -- I'm happy to weigh in with a couple of thoughts, if that's okay, Mr. Mayor.

Simison: Yes, please, sir.

Cavener: Thanks. I -- I think I have remained relatively quiet during this application, which is pretty off brand for me. I will just share kind of where I'm coming from on this. We don't get a lot of PUDs before us and so I have really tried to be two ears, one mouth on this particular one. Looking for what all -- what elevates to -- to necessitate an approval of a PUD and appreciate the -- the good questions of -- of my fellow Council Members on a host of different areas and kind of attacking those angles, so I didn't have to. For me I have struggled through this application, through the P&Z, through reading it, to see what our community gains by taking the PUD route. What -- well, how does Meridian win? The applicant I think heard some -- some feedback and testimony about the subjectivity about what people like and don't like. While, I don't particularly -- I didn't particularly care for any of the exhibits, I recognize the applicant's the one that's putting the financial risk and that they believe that those designs, you know, are attractive to a growing market. So, I have -- I have kind of put that piece on the shelf. To me Council Member Overton I think

really started things off correctly with the concern about the -- the transportation, the traffic safety piece, connecting that with Rocky Mountain I thought was really well thought out. Appreciate the applicant's quick response to that. So, the only piece that really is stuck with me on this is that what I see the PUD brings is the added density and I think Council Member Strader was -- was pretty direct in saying, you know, if this is headed towards denial, she would like to see an R-8. I appreciate the applicant saying that, you know, another home builder could come in here with an R-8 and do something like that and certainly the free market could support that. I think that we have always challenged the applicant team to be willing to hear from our neighbors, which I think that they have done, but also to be creative and this certainly does some of that, but I think that it could also be accomplished under the R-8 zoning. I think that the -- the -- the public hearing is still open. Perhaps maybe after Council's had some time to summarize some thoughts maybe we could invite the applicant team back up to maybe at least explain what -- what they think they are gaining in the PUD. I think Council Member Perreault asked that question specifically and I didn't get a direct answer. So, maybe giving them one more opportunity. I'm not completely sold on approving the PUD tonight. Just want to be clear on that. I still have too many questions that I feel haven't been answered.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Yeah. This -- this presents a lot of challenges from several different perspectives. You know, a PUD, if you look it up it talks about creative land development that preserves natural features. It allows for efficient provision of -- of services. It's not a traditional lot -- lot by lot development and we have had folks testify, well, this is a narrow strip of land and developers talked about the triangle. Okay. Does that make it unique enough to do a PUD? You know, maybe, maybe not. People talk about they like the fact that -- and -- and I like it as well -- you match single family to single family and, then, you move out -- you move out and, then, you have commercial after that and that's -- that's a good -- good following and if you look at our commercial areas that's what you have is a lot of the denser -- densities there next to commercial and -- and you have to realize if you don't have density next commercial centers, it's moving out. You are pushing people out and we talk about and complain about the traffic and people moving out. If we could stop development in Meridian, which we can't, there are state laws that keep us in a pretty narrow lane on that, there will be more traffic in Meridian, because everybody is going to be around us and we are right in the middle and it's going to be more traffic and we have no say over that. So, just one of those things. And I -- I -- I get the -- not liking the -- some of the elements of it. I -- I am not a fan of modern craftsman, Tony. I -- I -- I agree with you, it's just not my thing. But my tastes are not like everybody else's taste. I have to say I have got friends that live in Bridgetower. I love their house. They have a beautiful house. But, boy, the first time we went into Paramount -- I live in a little older subdivision -- a few years a little older. I look and I go you guys are so close together. Where is your side yards? This is terrible. So, you know, I won't have anything to do with Paramount. But no. But it -- but it's -- what I'm -- what I'm trying to point out is it's perspective. It's where we live compared to what's coming in and it's different and so we have to -- we

grapple with that. Well, that's not what I have and I don't like that. The situation it is -- it is different. Builders don't build things to not sell homes. They know what the market is. It has changed. It is different. Modern Craftsman is everywhere. But it is and that's what we have to deal with. There are height restrictions on homes, depending on, you know, what they are trying to do. So, it's not -- if it's three stories -- we have three stories in our subdivision, but there -- you really can't tell that they are any taller than a big two-story with -- with a roof. We also have to look at the variety of housing. The house that we live now -- and I look at you as a group, because I fit your demographic -- is probably not the house we are going to live in 20 years from now. My wife and I are talking about what happens when we are this age. Do we want this big of a yard? Are we going to mow this much? It's different. It changes. So, we need the different varieties of housing and the Council has probably heard me preach this before, but it's -- it's just the type of thing we have to prepare our community for, because we are going to see a lot more variety, because people are not wanting the same thing. They don't want to spend their time on yard work necessarily, they want a small yard and so we -- and when the time comes to sell and my wife and I decide to sell, it might be -- we might have a hard time selling our place, because we have a lot of yard and they are going to want something that is more of a townhome, a condo, some of those other concepts that -- that are being -- going to be offered in this. So, I -- I -- I -- I get that. So -- and you also have to think about this. You are going to fill in the blank here. If that land sells to this builder and you fill in the blank of who you think that is in your mind and they are going to build single family homes on that, will you like that? There is something to be said -- and we have had this happen before with neighborhoods that when you have someone who is invested in that property, not just to sell, to develop it and sell it and move on to the next piece of property and they are tied to that property, there are some good things to that and you have to realize that doesn't happen very often. So, just keep that in mind. But for the developer just a couple of things to note on your thing. Yeah. Fitness parks that's not going to work. It just reminds people what they are not doing. They feel guilty. So, you know, I would feel that. But also concept photos. I know they are concept. It's kind of like. Similar. But don't use one -- that one on the left -- that -- that's dog ugly. I would not want anything like that. Please. No. So -- so, how do we get from where we are to where we can have something that I think you would want to live next to and maybe not your style, but what is it that -- that we want. I think there needs to be more work to find that. Is it R-8 that we can do some things, because we like the diversity, we like that phasing, but maybe the density is not there and -- and I forgot to ask Sally at the time, but, you know, you had in your letter I think 146 down to 120 and I meant to ask you what did that entail, because -- okay. There is a number. I -- I think that you had talked about that -- Michael, that there is probably a number there that -- that they would be okay with. Now, what is that number? How can we make this work, because you also have to understand land prices have changed since our -- our developments were put into place and the land costs have skyrocketed and what they are dealing with today in dollars and cents -- and I believe in the American dream and I believe you take risks and you can -- you should be -- if you are successful with it you can make money. That's not a bad thing. But at the same time that means that has changed, what -- what they can do to make a decent margin. So, I - - and -- and I don't behoove them that, but we have to understand that, it's -- it has changed that way. It's not going to be necessarily 4,000 square feet. Maybe they need

those single family homes at 3,000, but it's also a market thing, because people don't want big yards. They want to do other things than spend time in their -- on their yard. They do want the open space. We know that from our surveys that we do for the city, because they -- they want to have that open space, but they want someone else to maintain it, whether it's the HOA or -- or the city, that sort of thing. So, anyway, I -- I don't think we are there with this particular one yet. I think there is a lot of good things that has been expressed, it's just a matter of now how do we -- how do we get there with these folks, because I think that's -- that's the issue you have to think about. What are you willing to say, okay, we can live with that to allow this and to make it a win-win in this situation. So, I hope that helps. But that's -- that's my perspective on it.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: You know, when I first looked at this I got to admit it hit a little too close to home. I looked at this and I felt like I was looking at something that was going in east of where I live currently and it reminded me of the fact that eventually we are going to have a development to the east of us and we want to try to make sure that we get the best one we can. It may not be the one we all want, but will it be the best one? Will it be built well? Is it going to stand the test of time? In the same manner of thinking, I listened to both days of testimony in P&Z and all of the neighbors' concerns and how things were addressed and I still have a tough time with this development. I'm not familiar with the PUD. This is the very first one I have ever seen and so far I don't like it. It's -- it's -- I -- I -- I like to see the open space in these developments. I like to see the place where people can get out and walk. I see you -- you got to have open space off to the side, but we really don't have anything in view and this main section of -- of housing it's -- it's just -- it's private roads. It's public roads. It's parking and it's housing. I think the density is -- is tough. I think there is too much parking on street for the type of uses that are going to be there. I think Council Woman Perreault put it so well on all the other vehicles we are not even thinking about that are going to be parking in front of these residences as we go forward. I really struggle with approving this, but I know there is a lot of thought that's gone into this and I think they are close. I just don't think -- and I know I echo some of these sentiments, I just don't think we are there yet, so --

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: I may be kind of a lone wolf. All in all I liked it. I like seeing the PUD come. This might not be the most classic example what the PUD provision is designed to provide for, but -- but I thought the application was really well designed, very creative, a good transition in a relatively difficult spot. I think the Main Street parking comments from Councilman Overton are spot on, but I thought the applicant -- the development team did a good job with this one in a creative way and -- and I would rather not see this spin off into just a regular R-8 kind of Plain Jane housing development that -- from somebody that

might not be invested in this -- this particular region. So, that was one of my main takeaways that I could have been supportive of this project.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Pearl.

Perreault: I'm just going to add a couple quick comments. So, I -- I know I have pointed out a lot of -- a lot of the concerns, but I want to say for the positives that I like the creativity of it. I like the uniqueness of it. I agree with Council Woman Strader that I am not a fan of the elevations -- of the designs. I think for me it was as much the -- the coloring and I -- they -- I know these are not going to be exact. It -- it could be that, you know, one very plain looking building that is brown on paper is going to be a beautifully articulated white building in -- in reality. But my main concern about this -- I don't know that I necessarily think we -- we have to keep it right at an R-8 -- with R-8 standards, but I -- I almost would -- I have concerns about the height of many of the buildings and I -- I do have concerns about the proximity of the buildings to one another. If you want to call that density I guess that's what you can call it. I don't think of density that way. I think of density more as the entire project -- you know, how -- how -- the space within the entire project. So, that being said I definitely think there is still some adjustments that need to be made. Agree with all of Council's thoughts on what's happening with the on-street parking, including I would like to see adjustments to on-street parking in all of the corners on the public streets, not just on the street that runs through the middle and -- but as Councilman Borton was saying, I -- I like the uniqueness of it. So, I don't want to take away from that. I just think it needs to be adjusted so that it is not so compact and if the intent of the developer was to have housing that's -- that is residential that's closer together, but, then, create these community spaces, I don't know that they accomplish that, because there really isn't that much diversity in -- in community spaces within the whole development. But there is one central space there on the east side and, then, there is the park that really is not connected and -- and, then, that's it. I don't see it spread out I guess within the development. I understand there is some constrictions, but I don't see it spread out within the development such that every property owner is really going to have great access and have great usability of the amenities that the developer is intending to create by doing the PUD. That's all.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor, I -- if Mr. Slavin would come up and I'm -- I'm just curious to get your opinion on -- you know, there is some things about a PUD that allows you creativity based on what you are hearing. So, is that something we delay and -- and you work with -- it sounds like you have a great relationship with the neighbors, which to your credit for your -- your outreach or is this something we just start over with? I mean what are -- what are your thoughts? What direction would you like to go on -- on something like this at this point in time? Yes. Yes. Please. We haven't closed the public hearing, so --

Slavin: I first want to thank you all so much for your attention and deliberation. It's -- it's really cool to see a city that cares so much and I really mean that. This is a big deal and we -- we don't take it lightly either. And I love all the comments that have been made tonight. I love the positive tension. That's when you know you are doing something right, because it should be a little bit on the edge, because you want to innovate. And -- and to Jessica's point, to address your question, is that we would love the opportunity for a continuance to come back and demonstrate how we are satisfying, at least in our view, the idea of a PUD. Because what -- and we did ourselves a big disservice. When you look at the little plan -- I think it's displayed now. You see hardscape areas and these little dots that represent fire pits and hangout areas and the community garden on the far left side next to the park and there is a big paved space that actually represents the pool house and there is a tool shed that everybody can come share tools and a bike -- like a bike shed, et cetera. So there is all these cool things that this -- this plan doesn't do justice because the scale so tiny and so we spent so much time on these little dots and so much passion on those dots and we would love to come back and expand these dots, so you can see a much more specific plan of how we feel we are meeting those requirements.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Yeah. Just -- I'm just going to push you a little bit, because I just want to understand. So, if -- if you get -- if you request a continuance, is your intention to come back and just further justify the exact same plan and why you feel you meet the PUD or are you guys open to making changes and we could expect to see something that maybe better fits with the neighborhood and addresses these concerns? I just want to make sure, because I think there is kind of a difference.

Slavin: Yeah. That -- that's a great question. Excuse me. I think in elevations, in all honesty -- and maybe we are terrible for doing this -- is the application wants to give examples. We -- we Googled examples of stuff and put it in the application. So, please, again, I think -- and we worked really hard and the really bad little brown renderings, those are actually brick buildings we put a lot of effort into and one thing financially we wanted to do with this is -- is why the density is higher, is that allows us to create more open space and a lot more amenities, as well as to put much better finishes on the outside of the homes. Because what you have seen in the valley in the last years -- year and a half, technically, construction costs have escalated by a hundred percent and so now what most developers do is they put up the cheapest materials absolutely possible that wiggle through the design standards to satisfy the design standards and we wanted to go the extra mile with our -- our finishes on this project to make it more timeless and so I think that we would be happy to just finish this one to address site amenities and really drill down on the open space, because even in the center of this triangle it looks like there is a lot there, but that's actually, you know, pool house, barbecues -- all sorts of cool stuff that people that live in communities like this really enjoy and in other seating areas

throughout the site. We would love the opportunity to I guess expand further. As far as, you know, moving density around we are running so razor thin offering all these amenities and high end finishes on homes, It's -- it's tough to -- to cut away, because once we start doing that finishes get to be less and community amenities get to be less.

Hoaglund: Michael? Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: And Michael. Just a question about Bergman. I know it's done for traffic calming situations, but I was just wondering -- you have buildings there, if there is a way to make it so it's just an S that meets that straight portion in the -- in -- in the curve there and make it so it does traffic calm, you can re -- reconfigure the open space and maybe the parking that goes into where that street was, just it -- it's just a -- such as there -- there -- there is a disconnect. You need parking. It's on-street parking. ACHD is going to require it. So, can we refigure that to make that work for everybody where, okay, you have traffic calming, but they don't have to park there. They can park off of Main Street, but you still can have the open space and access to the buildings and different things. To me that seems like one of the hang ups on -- on that, as well as parking on -- on the other -- other areas that come into the subdivision are -- are going to have to be looked at. But that -- that was one thing that kind of stood out to me. That seemed to be a point of contention with -- with folks. Yeah. Density. I -- I get why you -- you know, zigzagged those buildings, because we want that articulation. We don't want things to be uniform and straight down and so that was very innovative but -- you know. So, yeah, you could just pop them all out and put them to be a zero lot line, but are there things like that that you can do that keeps the uniqueness and the identity for the vision that you have for that whole development, because you do have that vision for that whole thing, not just, well, we are just going to build it this way and -- and move on. You guys are invested in that for the long term. So, is there a way to keep that, but -- the uniqueness, but yet still reconfigure things, make it so it doesn't look so dense -- and maybe it is partly how it's presented here. But what will that look like and -- but work with the neighbors, see if there are some things there that -- I -- I think they have an understanding, too. They -- we -- we get people all the time who come and they have really unreasonable requests. It's just not going to -- it's outside the realm of any possibility. I didn't -- I didn't see that tonight. I mean these are people who care about their neighborhood. They want a nice development. They see good things about this. And -- and there might be some things they are going to ask you, because we don't know your financials and those types of things -- and I don't want to know, but -- that you can't do. But is there some commonality that you could find some areas that people can accept? So, I think -- I'm willing to give you more time to do that and -- and to follow up, then, on that, Mr. Mayor, how much time do you think that would take? And I -- and I know time is money. I -- I get that.

Slavin: Yeah. Well, interesting enough -- and thank you. There is a couple questions there -- is one that we would, you know, happily look -- relook -- we look at this thing we called the turtle head. So, that's that squiggly road and -- and I -- as I understand it this is before our time on the project. That was a traffic calming measure that was a

misinterpretation by the development team at the time and not maybe necessary, but that is a quick trip to ACHD to see how we can enter the -- the collector road. Because what you see there just north of it there is actually the sewer easement that we can't build on, so we built that as an amenity park, too. So, it's an easy thing to do with the road. So, what you are -- are you suggesting just to run that thing directly north to the collector?

Hoaglund: Uh-huh.

Slavin: Okay. I mean that's something we can -- we can address that -- hopefully that answers the first question. Secondly, we can certainly look at the site plan again. Last thing I would like to call -- call attention to is with open spaces. When you look at the -- the townhomes just north of -- on the new drive that we -- we would be installing, just -- just north of single family homes, we did those in patches of two. So, each of those townhomes has three -- three sides of light, which is really big for townhomes, because we could stack them closer with our provisions, but the problem is they are not as nice to live -- any middle townhome is a gunshot and just kind of get light at the ends and they are just not nice and so we sacrificed in that since to open the space up more. Oops. Sorry. But those are the things we would be happy to look at. As far as time estimation, I would be somewhat confident we could do it in a month, but we have to, you know, talk to our design team and make sure they have time and allocation and -- and make sure they drink a lot of coffee and work really hard. But we might be able to do it in a month's time.

Hoaglund: And Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: I would envision another meeting with neighbors to get input and see what -- see what they can come up with. I think you got some committed neighbors to help you be successful, you know. So, I think that's a good thing.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Yeah. Just -- I just want to understand where you are coming from in terms of density and meeting with the neighbors. Are you just saying from this point forward -- like you will not adjust the density, you will refine your design more, et cetera, but that's totally off the table. Because I just need to know, because that -- that will influence how I vote.

Slavin: Sure. Yeah. With -- with that I'm not trying to be cute at all. It's just pushing the performance we did off recent construction numbers and having level finishes of brick and all the levels of amenities, it's really tough. Like every unit means a lot to us. It means a lot. I mean we could run them again, but --

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Yeah. That's tough. I understand. Believe me, the conditions right now in the -- in the market for development between the interest rate environment and construction costs and labor, it's crazy. I just -- I can't gear how I vote toward those market conditions, unfortunately. I just -- I have to just try to look kind of from a long-term perspective. But I appreciate you saying that. Thanks.

Slavin: Appreciate it.

Simison: And -- and just -- again I'm trying to listen to what I have heard from Council. I don't want to waste people's time. If we are just going to come back and see prettier pictures of more detail, I -- I'm not hearing that's where Council was lying in just more details personally based on what I have heard. So, if -- if -- I don't want to, again, waste your time and I don't want to waste Council's time and I don't want to waste the community's time if that's what the intention is is just to further define what you have on paper.

Slavin: May I respond really quick?

Simison: You are more than welcome. And I'm -- I'm just trying to interpret to save everyone time and energy and money.

Slavin: And I'm a little bit nervous about it without speaking to my -- my financial partners, because those are big decisions to make with cutting density. That's something I would hate to make a promise on by myself without talking to my partners. And so I mean if that's something everybody is willing to do on our team, then, that's something we would be happy to address.

Simison: Yeah. Come on up. Come on up, Tony.

Slavin: There you go.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Before -- no. Come on. Before -- to -- to throw this in, one -- one thing I wanted to say is the lighting that's going -- that you mentioned you would be willing to do, we have had folks in Paramount who have complained about the streetlights going straight into their windows and so just on -- I wanted to -- as part of your response, understand that these are not streetlights like we are thinking of. We are talking about like pathway lighting; right?

Tseng: Yes. Absolutely.

Perreault: Okay. Because street -- the streetlights are causing lots of issues from Orchard Park. As a matter of fact, they -- like it's been run through our -- our planning staff and building staff and they have answered a lot of questions from people about -- and they have directed them to the highway district who said there was a lighting study done and it's -- there is people that are investing in like serious blinds, changes, window changes darkening, windows because it's caused so many problems, so --

Tseng: I mean we would literally let the people who live on Bacall, Arliss, decide the lighting. I mean I have been talking to them, I have visited two or three of the neighbors regarding the fence. They let me in their homes. Looked at the fences. I'm getting to know that community pretty well. Really nice people. And if -- we will do another survey. No one's going to -- by the way, they are not all going to agree and we will have to probably do a majority, as some people will be upset. But we want lighting in there, as long as it's not like super -- you know, super super expensive. Normal lighting. We will let them decide. Yeah. We don't -- we have no preference; right? Because it's -- it's needed and whatever type they want we are happy to give. Oh. So -- so to answer your question. Sorry. The reason I walked up here. Is that, yes, look, it comes down to the -- and so the answer is yes, because I -- I -- I can feel the room. If the answer is no, it's not going to happen. So, the answer is tentatively yes and we might not show up at Council next time if the answer is no, which means get some pencil; right? So, I have to say yes to get an opportunity to speak with friends again and if we can't make it pencil, then, it's the same thing as a no. So, the answer is, yes, with an asterisk. I'm not going to -- if I don't show up, I -- I just don't want to break our promise.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Yeah. That's perfect. I just -- I just want to know that like part of what you are going to look at is actually making changes and not just like bringing beautiful --

Tseng: No.

Strader: -- photos and renderings that -- because that -- that's not fundamental -- at least for me. I don't speak for anybody else. That's not for me fundamentally what the issue was.

Tseng: Yeah.

Strader: So, if -- if you are going to take a hard look at it, I don't see the harm in giving you a continuance if there are positive changes that could bring you better into alignment with what we want to see.

Tseng: It seems like, you know, from the feedback, working with the neighbors is important to you guys and we will work with the neighbors. Density is important to you

guys. We are going to work on density. We -- we hear what you guys are saying. We are not -- we are not trying to sidestep any of the issues. You know, I really appreciate -- when Michael says that we appreciate feedback -- by the way all those elevations will be deleted. It really was one of the things I said, they just need some conceptals and I was on Google for like 17 minutes and that was my mistake. So, I apologize for that. Not him, it was me. I was the Googler that made the mistake.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Yeah. But bring something back that -- that does look good, that looks like it's a little bit better fit, please. Because --

Tseng: Yeah. Absolutely.

Strader: -- and there is a -- there is like also just, then, I had just seared into my mind what I have seen; right? So, that's -- that's a problem now you have to overcome, but --

Tseng: Yeah. The funny thing is that -- that white building you are talking about is a development in Phoenix. It's called Phoenix -- Karma Phoenix. Their layout is beautiful. Their exterior was horrible. But we loved their interior layout. But, again, that's on me.

Strader: We appreciate you saying that you will look at the density and look at making some changes and I think hopefully if you are able to make changes -- you know, I do agree it's -- it's better than what could end up happening. So, maybe there is a compromise here. I would -- I would love to see it given an opportunity if it can happen for sure.

Tseng: Okay. We appreciate the possible opportunity.

Simison: And leave the condos. I mean -- sorry about that. It was my -- I didn't really speak much on this. I'm a little bit more in Councilman Borton's camp in general. I -- I like the uniqueness of it. I -- you know, I think it is a standalone project that works really well. Maybe challenges as mentioned with the -- with the connection to others. But I think that this project could exist in Meridian. Here I don't know. Density I don't know. But as a general concept I didn't have as much -- the -- the white barn thing was no from that standpoint, But, anyways, just --

Tseng: Thank you. Yeah.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: We get -- we understand that -- that this isn't done until it goes through staff. You know, you -- you are going to -- you are going to do it in line with our code. You are going to review it with staff. However, we have a public that doesn't always completely understand how that process works. So, when they look -- when they get online and they look at that, they are, they are -- the question is like, oh, my goodness, this is what they are doing and we -- for -- for them we want to have clarification. For them we want them to be able to look at the -- at the file and be able to see what's really going to happen. So, that's part of the request to have more accurate renderings; right? We understand that you don't have to, but we just think it's fair to our public to have that happen. The other thing I would say is this is one of the hardest applications I have ever had to view on a computer. I really struggled. I was zooming in and I was zooming out and I was moving it around and it took a lot of time, because you -- you have a correct assessment that there were several things missing that would have been helpful. For example, if you had a -- an exhibit that showed exactly -- like here is the -- what they call ribbon townhomes, which is a word I have never heard before, but I figured out what they were, because they are -- you know, they are long and -- okay. Here is -- here is a map with the ribbon townhomes are green and the two -- you know, the two-story townhomes are red and -- like that -- like the type of unit, if we had a map that just showed these are the condos, these are the ribbon townhomes -- it kind of does on the parking a little bit, but it wasn't about -- it was -- that was about parking, It wasn't about the actual type and what -- how many stories they are going to be. So, that would be really helpful to just say, you know, the -- the single families were -- you know, I just kind of like here is what -- I kind of figured it out from the -- the lines, but like it took me a while just to figure out of the -- of the multi-family units -- okay. There is six that are three story and there is two that are two-story, but why? And, you know, what -- what -- like it just -- and then -- and, then, when you threw in the elevations there were like six or seven single family elevations. I'm like, okay, where is all the elevations for -- I think you will find those in the staff report. So, lots of problems just reading the application and helping it make sense for me on what it was that you were attempting to do. So, you were accurate in that there would be a lot more helpful to dial in to some micro areas of the development, so we can get a sense of what is intending to happen. Just -- just for some feedback.

Tseng: Thanks. Thank you. And we will definitely work hard on that.

Perreault: Yeah. Absolutely.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor, I move that we continue the public hearing for H-2022-0022 -- H-2022-0027 until March 21st.

Overton: Second.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Was that a second?

Strader: Second for discussion. Second for discussion.

Nary: So, Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, what I heard the developer say it would be about a month for them. But I wanted to make sure staff has time to analyze it as well and probably you want to make sure the public has an opportunity to see it on the record. So, I don't know if -- if it takes them a month and we submit it -- about a month from now, there is not a lot of time to review it before it has to be scheduled for Sonya to do an updated report. So, I just wanted to make sure there is enough time for everyone.

Slavin: I think that's a great comment. Sonya, how much lead time would you need to have new materials to prepare a report for Council, to see if we could back into that time frame.

Allen: Yes. Mr. Mayor, Council, applicant, our code requires that any revised plans be submitted at least 15 days prior to a hearing.

Slavin: Okay.

Allen: So -- and we -- we, quite frankly, are -- are very short staffed right now and this -- this staff member is pretty fried, so I apologize to all for my lack of better responses tonight. But, yeah, probably a little further out would probably -- I -- I -- I imagine it's going to take you guys some time to get things rounded up, too.

Slavin: Sure.

Allen: How long do you think it will take you to get revisions made?

Tseng: We will get it done in three weeks.

Slavin: Yeah. Lots of coffee. Emily, are you comfortable with three weeks?

Allen: Yeah. And they need time to meet with the neighbors and -- you know, I would say a minimum of six weeks out.

Tseng: I think we can get it done. I honestly do. I think the -- the change that we have to make I kind of can picture in my head. I mean I'm going to bug Sally until she meets with me anyways and whoever wants to show up and she's nice enough to not say no. So, we are going to -- I think we are making it happen. We have two weeks. I think we will make it happen. Three weeks.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor? I -- I think we have -- we have one hearing on the 28th. That's a big one. Is that right; Sonya? On the 28th?

Allen: We have two scheduled right now. This would be a third. One of my projects is probably going to have issues.

Simison: We can make it to the 21st. If we don't make it we could continue it for two weeks after that for that six week period and I think the community is here still, they have -- they have heard and I think there is good communication, but you could try to go that way.

Hoaglund: March 21st. Yes.

Simison: So, I have a motion and a second and we have had kind of discussion. Is there further discussion?

Strader: No. Just -- I'm -- I -- I will be here if I can be.

Simison: No guarantee.

Strader: No guarantee. I might Zoom in from an unexpected place.

Hoaglund: Keep your mic off.

Simison: All those in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it and the item is continued.