

Meridian Planning and Zoning Meeting

October 21, 2021.

Meeting of the Meridian Planning and Zoning Commission of October 21, 2021, was called to order at 6:02 p.m. by Commissioner Andrew Seal.

Members Present: Commissioner Andrew Seal, Commissioner Nick Grove, Commissioner Steven Yearsley, and Commissioner Nate Wheeler.

Members Absent: Chairman Rhonda McCarvel, Commissioner Bill Cassinelli and Commissioner Maria Lorcher.

Others Present: Adrienne Weatherly, Kurt Starman, Bill Parsons, Joe Dodson, Alan Tiefenbach, Caleb Hood, Brian McClure and Dean Willis.

ROLL-CALL ATTENDANCE

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Nate Wheeler	<input type="checkbox"/> Maria Lorcher
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Andrew Seal	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Nick Grove
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Steven Yearsley	<input type="checkbox"/> Bill Cassinelli
<input type="checkbox"/> Rhonda McCarvel - Chairman	

Seal: Good evening. Welcome to Planning and Zoning Commission meeting for October 21st, 2021. At this time I would like to call the meeting to order. The Commissioners who are present for this evening's meeting are at City Hall and on Zoom. We also have staff from the City Attorney and Clerk's office, as well as the City Planning Department. If you are joining us on Zoom this evening we can see that you are here. You may observe the meeting. However, your ability to be seen on screen and talk will be muted. During the public testimony portion of the meeting you will be unmuted and, then, be able to comment. Please note that we cannot take questions until the public testimony portion. If you have a process question during the meeting, please, e-mail cityclerk@meridiancity.org and they will reply as quickly as possible. If you simply want to watch the meeting we encourage you to go to watch this -- watch this streaming on the city's YouTube channel. You can access that at meridiancity.org/live. With that let's begin with the roll call.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Seal: All right. Thank you. So, the first item on the agenda is the adoption of the agenda. Let me see. I don't think there is any amendments to the agenda. Okay. Can I get a motion to adopt the agenda?

Grove: So moved.

Wheeler: Second.

Seal: It's been moved and seconded to adopt the agenda. All in favor say aye. Any opposed? All right. Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. THREE ABSENT.

CONSENT AGENDA [Action Item]

- 1. Approve Minutes of the October 7, 2021 Planning and Zoning Commission Regular Meeting**
- 2. Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law for Burger King Drive-Through (H-2021-0051) by Legend Engineering, Located at 6211 N. Ten Mile Rd.**
- 3. Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law for Southridge Apartments Phase 3 (H-2021-0055) by The Land Group, Inc., Generally Located South of W. Overland Rd. and East of S. Ten Mile Rd.**
- 4. Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law for TM Creek Storage (H-2021-0054) by Brighton Development, Inc., Generally Located South of W. Franklin Rd., Midway Between S. Linder Rd. and S. Ten Mile Rd.**

Seal: For the Consent Agenda we have four items on the Consent Agenda. The approval of the minutes of the October 7, 2021, Planning and Zoning Commission meeting. Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law for Burger King Drive-Through, H-2021-0051. Findings of Facts, Conclusions of Law for Southridge Apartments Phase Three, H-2021-0055. Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law for TM Creek Storage, H-2021-0054. Can I get a motion to accept the Consent -- Consent Agenda as presented?

Grove: So moved.

Wheeler: Second.

Seal: It's been moved and seconded to adopt the Consent Agenda. All in favor say aye. Any opposed? All right. Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. THREE ABSENT.

ITEMS MOVED FROM THE CONSENT AGENDA [Action Item]

Seal: So, at this time I would like to briefly explain the public hearing process. We will open each item individually and begin with the staff report. Staff will report their findings on how the item adheres to our Comprehensive Plan and Unified Development Code. After staff has made their presentation the applicant will come forward to present their case and respond to staff comments. They will have 15 minutes to do so. After the applicant has finished we will open the floor to public testimony. Each person will be called on once and only once during the public testimony. The Clerk will call the names

individually of those who signed up on our website in advance to testify. You will, then, be unmuted in Zoom or you can come to the microphones here in chambers. You will need to state your name and address for the record and you will have three minutes to address the Commission. If you have previously sent pictures or a presentation for the meeting it will be displayed on the screen and our Clerk will run the presentation. If you have established that you are speaking on behalf of a larger group, like an HOA, where others from that group will allow you to speak on their behalf conceding their time, you will have up to ten minutes. After all those who have signed up in advance have spoken we will invite any others who may wish to testify. If you wish to speak on the topic you may come forward in chambers or if on Zoom press the raise hand button in the Zoom app. Or if you are only listening on -- on the phone, please, press star nine and wait for your name to be called. If you are listening on multiple devices, a computer and a phone, for example, please, sure -- please be sure to mute the extra devices, so we do not experience feedback and we can hear you clearly. When you are finished if the Commission does not have questions for you you will return to your seat in Chambers or be muted on Zoom and no longer have the ability to speak. And, please, remember we will not call on you a second time. After all testimony has been heard by the applicant will be given another -- the applicant will be given another ten minutes to come back and respond. When the applicant has finished responding to questions and concerns, we will close the public hearing and the Commissioners will have the opportunity to discuss and, hopefully, be able to make final decisions or recommend -- recommendations to City Council as needed.

ACTION ITEMS

- 5. Public Hearing Continued from August 12, 2021 for Centerville Subdivision (H2021-0046) by Engineering Solutions, LLP, Located at 4111 E. Amity Rd. (Including the Outparcel to the South) and 5200 S. Hillsdale Ave., at the Southeast Corner of S. Hillsdale and E. Amity Rd.**
 - A. Request: Annexation and Zoning of 40.49 acres of land from RUT to the R-8 (13.35 acres) and R-15 (27.14) zoning districts.
 - B. Request: A Preliminary Plat consisting of 190 total lots (124 single-family residential lots, 35 townhome lots, 2 multi-family lots, 1 commercial lot, 1 clubhouse house, and 27 common lots) on 38.95 acres of land.

Seal: Okay. At this time I would like to open the public hearing for Item No. H-2021-0046, Centerville Subdivision, which was continued from 8/12/2021. We will begin with the staff report.

Dodson: Thank you, Mr. Chair. You stole some of my thunder there, the continuance, but thank you. Jump into this here. As noted this is for Centerville Subdivision. On the screen here we have the view of the land use maps associated with the site. Because it's been almost two months I will go briefly over the entire project and, then, I will come

back and hit on what has been revised since the last Commission hearing. In general, the site consists of 40 and a half acres of land, currently zoned RUT, near the intersection of Eagle and Amity, about a half mile to the east. It includes three existing parcels, as you can see by the three different shapes. I will just wait there. There is no history with the City of Meridian with this site, so no zoning history or anything like that. It is -- has two future land use designations on the site, mixed use neighborhood and medium density residential, with medium density residential being the vast majority, about 31 acres, versus eight acres on the site. The original request was for annexation and zoning of all 40 and a half acres from RUT to the R-8 zoning district, the R-15 -- and the R-15 zoning district. It showed 159 single family units and 168 multi-family units with a plat consisting of 190 total lots, which included 124 single family lots, 35 townhome lots, two multi-family lots, one commercial and one clubhouse a lot, with 27 common lots. There was no CUP and still is no CUP, which is a conditional use permit, proposed for any multi-family. The project is still proposed in four phases. I have not been told otherwise. With a majority of the detached single family in the first and second phases. The access is to Hillsdale and Amity and the large center open space is proposed with the first phase of development. Again, that has not changed from my understanding. Let me just -- access to the site -- I will go to this one here. Access to the site has not changed either. The main access point is from South Hillsdale, which is here, and to East Amity up here. The applicant is also extending two local stub streets from the southeast, one from the south, one from the east, with a pedestrian connection in between. There was a TIS required with this, because it has more than a hundred units, with -- well, not to spoil it, but the applicant has reduced the number of units, so the anticipated trips will be reduced as well. Originally it estimated to be about 2,600 additional vehicle trips per day and the TIS recommended some requirements. Those are still being recommended from both city and ACHD. Those improvements are to include an interim signal at the Hillsdale and Amity Road intersection, which is planned for a future roundabout at some point and where the Amity Road entrance is to what is shown Amorita Avenue. ACHD is requiring a dedicated eastbound right-turn lane and a dedicated westbound left-turn lane. Staff is recommending that both of these, the interim signal as well as the turn lanes, be constructed with the first phase, which is consistent with ACHD's recommendation. In addition, safe access to Hillsdale Elementary is imperative. ACHD recommends and the applicant has agreed to install a rapid rectangular flashing beacon, which most people just say RFB beacon or RFB crossing at the Hillsdale and Hill Park Street intersection. There is an existing RFB beacon, in my understanding, further south directly in front of the school. The school district, the city, and ACHD believe that this is the best location for an additional one, especially with the addition of more units -- more homes in the area. The project area as noted does have two different land use designations on the site. The relatively small area of mixed use neighborhood allows six to 12 units per acre and medium density residential allows three to eight dwelling units per acre. The mixed use neighborhood area is part of a larger area that encompasses most of the area to the west, as you can see here. So, it's about eight acres of -- more than 70 acres of mixed use neighborhood. Approximately half of this area is already residential -- was already approved for residential development, which is the Hill Century Farms North. The remaining area is comprised of commercial zoning that includes self storage, an urgent care, medical and dental offices, assisted living facility and some vacant commercial lots.

Within the overall site -- and this has not changed with any revisions. The applicant is proposing transition a lot sizes and density within the project. This is done by -- around the perimeter and matches the lot sizes to the existing development of the east and the south and it has the higher density along Amity and further to the west, further away from the existing development. Staff does find that the proposed project is compatible with the surrounding uses because of this transitional density. Now, for the changes that have occurred since the Commission hearing, this is probably the best way to see it. On the left is the original plan that shows the apartment units. On the right is their new revised rendering. They have removed all of the apartment units and included more of these attached townhomes, which is about three-plexus here. The only multi-family remaining are four four-plex buildings here, which are new to the site -- a new use to the site. In addition, the applicant has added three additional commercial lots to basically comply with some of the mixed use neighborhood regulations. This is still proposed to be a daycare and these propose to be flex space lots. Flex space can have a number of uses, but there are certain specific use requirements that would be -- have to be complied with in the future as those sites develop. This has required the applicant request some commercial zoning, which was not previously requested. The applicant did provide revised legals with that and that was in the record. Overall, as I noted, all the apartments were removed. The total unit count is now 219, which is down from originally 327. So, it's a loss of 108 units. The only remaining portion of the site, as I noted, is multi-family and will require a future CUP for those four-plex units along Amity. This is specifically placed along Amity near the commercial, because of the higher density. That is -- that's Planning 101. So, staff does support the location of the proposed flex -- or both the proposed flex space and the four-plexes. The multi-family was replaced by more townhomes as noted and all of those previous drive aisles, which are all these, were replaced by 28 foot wide private streets, that, essentially, function as alleys for the townhome units. The applicant is required to submit for private streets -- for these private streets prior to the City Council meeting, which, to be clear, private street application is an administrative level only. There is no need for Commission or Council to act on that. They did add three additional commercial lots and removed two and a half acres of the existing residential zoning because of that new commercial zoning as I noted. Therefore, the overall area of the residential portion is now 36 and a half acres, give or take. The gross density is now six dwelling units per acre, which -- and originally it was 8.4. So, again, that's about two and a half units per acre difference that they have done. Because of this -- and they have lost, again, 108 units, staff does find that the applicant has made significant adjustments to the site to mitigate the Commission's concerns over the density and that general impact to the schools, as well as the transportation element. For the additional commercial properties, the applicant did also include and is proposing a right-in, right-out access to Hillsdale, which would be this access here, that was not previously proposed. That would be a new access. It is directly across from the existing access on the west side and ACHD has approved this with their latest revision to their staff report. The applicant also moved the pool amenity, which was previously here, to the central open space, which was also discussed at the previous Commission hearing as wanting to provide equal access for everybody in the development and have that centralized in the site. The initial review of the landscape plan does show continued compliance with all open space requirements. I would like to note that there has been new additions of

linear open space for these townhome units to front on, which staff does appreciate, which is these -- this large area here, as well as this open space here and the -- it is, essentially, a parkway, but a larger width area than just a parkway along here and the previously proposed parkway here is also remaining. Since the Commission hearing there were -- at least as of about 3:00 o'clock this afternoon there were eight pieces of testimony since the previous Commission hearing. They noted the same issues as before, which was a discussion of traffic, school impact, and overall density. Staff does recommend approval of the subject applications, especially with the revisions that have been in place and I have noted that in a memo dated last week at some point -- I don't remember. I apologize. The specific provisions that I'm recommending to be changed. So, if you do make any motion tonight you could just say per the memo -- or the staff memo. After that I will stand for any questions.

Seal: All right. Thank you very much. Would the applicant like to come forward? Name and address and away we go.

McKay: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission. I'm Becky McKay with Engineering Solutions. Business address 1029 North Rosario in Meridian. I'm representing Challenger Development on this particular application. Just to kind of give the Commissioners kind of a brief summary of where we left off in our August hearing, we appreciate the Commission provided us the opportunity to go back and rework our plan, rethink it, work with the staff and come up with some new ideas and I just kind of wanted to go through the instructions that the Commission provided us. One, we were asked to eliminate the high density apartments that they were -- that you were convinced that this area was not appropriate for like three story apartments and based on the impact on traffic and schools, that you wanted to see an incorporation of more townhomes and that providing a larger commercial component would be preferred, so that we could meet the mixed use integrity that's talked about in the Comprehensive Plan. One of the other statements was -- you just need to reduce the overall density of the development. One of the other comments was the primary amenity should be centrally located and available to all residents and not located kind of in the south sector of the multi-family area and that we should limit all residential structures to more than -- no more than two stories. We also talked about transitioning from the commercial component to the townhomes and providing a more blended and integrated site plan, which better fits the definition of a true mixed use development and to improve the diversity of the residential uses with less impact on the adjoining neighborhood, the schools, and the transportation network and so what -- what we brought before you today we believe meets those -- those requirements that you -- or that guidance that you gave us to go back to the drawing board. So, I will skip that and go to the preliminary plat. So, we revised our preliminary plat. As -- as Joseph indicated we incorporated a community business district and added that C-C zone -- is this going to work for me? Joe, is it not working? Oh, there it is. I think. Maybe the battery's dead. It should work? Is it me? Okay. Moving on. Here we go. So, this is -- this is the new colored site plan as you can see. So, one of the things that we did is we have a C-C area over there in that -- at the intersection of the collector Hillsdale and Amity Road. As Joseph indicated, we are proposing a C-C zone within that quadrant and, then, we transition from some four-plexes that back up to Amity Road,

which is an arterial and, then, we transition into a townhome product and, then, into our single family residential. The single family residential portion that was proposed on the eastern side of the project has not changed. Those lot sizes have not been modified and we -- we have those two mixed designations in your comp plan that mixed use neighborhood allows us six to 12 dwelling units per acre. The medium density residential allows us three to eight. As Joseph indicated, we are asking for R-8, C-C and R-15. Our overall residential density is 6.01 dwelling units per acre and that calculation does exclude the commercial. So, it's not skewed by the commercial, it is a net density. We have in the R-8 zone -- thank you. Is it working now? A dead mouse. A dead mouse. There we go. Oh, that's you. Okay. Go ahead. I thought it was me. Within the R-8 zone, which is on primarily the eastern side of the project, our density is still 3.45 dwelling units per acre. Within the western portion of the residential where we have the four four-plexes on the north side and the townhomes, our density is at 7.44 within the R-15 zoning designation. So, the lot sizes on the single family, we have a variety of lot sizes just as we initially proposed, ranging from 36 feet in width, all the way up to 90 feet in width, 95 feet in depth, to 123 feet in depth. We incorporated the townhomes. The average townhome is about 3,104 square feet, whereas the average single family lot is about 5,550 square feet and I want to mention from the last hearing our largest lots are all on the periphery next to Rockhampton and, then, next to the Howry Lane Subdivision No. 2. The development -- we propose both rear and front load townhomes to provide variety. So, 71 percent of the townhomes that we have will be rear loaded and only 29 percent will be front loaded. Obviously, this gives a better curb appeal where we are actually loading them and, then, it provides us the ability to have a MEW on the north portion of the -- of the project. You guys working over there or -- there you go. So, on the north -- on the north portion we still have our collector roadway with our -- with our landscaped entrance, detached walks, and -- go to the west. Sorry. And, then, what we have is -- we have what we call a MEW there that the -- the lots -- the front of the lots we have sidewalks coming out of the townhomes and, then, connecting to a sidewalk that goes both north and south. Along the south portion we ended up with a linear open space. We have a playground in there. We have pathways. We have interconnectivity to those townhomes and all the townhomes south of our entrance collector are on open space. They back up to open space, either in the linear open space or to the south where we will be piping the Cunningham Lateral and grassing and creating a little nature path that goes on out and, then, our collector buffer. As far as the -- the commercial component, we are at a little over four percent in our commercial component. We kind of racked our brains. We don't want to compete with Hill Century Farms commercial. So, one of the things -- the daycare was integral, because that's an essential service that will, obviously, benefit this neighborhood and -- and this project. But the flex space was one thing that we came up with as a great alternative to trying to compete with the -- the commercial that's to the west of us. So the flex space would be small business development and it would be -- there would be no exterior materials, everything being closed. Obviously, would have to comply with your design guidelines for the commercial. There will be no outdoor storage. And, then, on the -- the townhomes we have almost an acre that -- that is in that linear open space. We have approximately a half acre that is the transition from the commercial to the townhomes. That ranges in width from -- I think 35 to about 55 feet. We will have pathways. We will have picnic areas. But when you come into the development the first

thing you are going to see is our primary amenity and that primary amenity is significant in size. I think it's -- hold on. Got to get to my amenities. It is 1.93 acres. So, just a little bit shy of two acres. We will have a pool facility. We will also have a pickleball court. We have play -- a central playground for the kids and, then, we have pathways that link out through our pedestrian pathways for the project portion that is to the east. We have retained our pocket park to the north. I'm not doing that. We are having a great time tonight, aren't we? So, this -- this shows you what our qualified open space is. So, we have six acres of qualified open space. That's 15.4 percent. Previously we were at about 4.48 percent. Our central amenity with 1.93 acres. We are going to have a plaza, swimming pool, community playground, pickleball court, pathways, off-street parallel parking. We are proposing a ten foot sidewalk along Amity with micro path connections to our commercial component and our pocket park. Our entrance at Amity will have public art, a little plaza area, and, then, our MEW, like I said, is just a little less than half acre with two covered sitting areas and pathways and, then, our linear open space, another tot lot, gazebo, and, then, our micro path and a natural pathway. This was kind of a blow up of the landscape plan. We did submit a revised landscape plan that shows you what -- what we are proposing here. So, we are going to have a significant amount of open space in this project. Far more than was required. When we submitted the application the requirement was ten percent and, as I indicated, we are at 15.4 in our qualified open space. We have done a great job of -- of really spending a lot of time reworking this and working on elevations. These are our farmhouse elevations. This shows you the alley load townhomes. You see every elevation. You can see that there is articulation in the roof lines. Different materials. Different -- different angles to, obviously, provide a visual interest. Oops. This shows you our front load townhomes. They are more of a modern style. But we are still going to have them mesh in with -- with the architectural styles that we will have with our traditional craftsman, modern, and farmhouse styles. Here is the four-plexes. We only have four of those. So, there is 16 units. They back up to Amity. You know, that's going to be a -- that's a major intersection. It's going to be signalized. As you recall, we have to signalize that at there -- our 61st lot. So, basically, you know, we can get one phase in and, then, we have got to put the light in. So, it's almost like we need to go into design on that with the first phase, so that -- that's in there. As you can see with the four-plexes, there is, you know, roof articulation. They don't look like your standard four-plexes. There is a lot of variety. We only have four of those. Our sample elevations for the homes -- and you can see we will have a combination a two story, three car garage. Single story, three car garage. And, then, on the smaller 64 foot lots will have two story with a two car garage. Single story, two car garage. And, then, on the 36 foot wide lots -- this is a new product. So, they have kind of farmhouse styles. They have craftsman. They have modern. So, there is a variety of styles that fit on those lots to, obviously, meet the diversity that we need, especially in today's marketplace where everybody is struggling to meet that affordability that our community desires desperately in these times. I saw the other day the average price of a home in Meridian now is, what, 555,000, which is just like -- it blows my mind. I remember, you know, when -- when you struggled to get a 227,000 dollar house and the hoops you had to jump through. So, this -- this particular project I think hits the mark. It meets the -- the mixed use as far as an anchor on that corner, providing some type of employment opportunity. Maybe someone that lives in here will be able to put up their business there. Walk to work. Bike to work.

The townhomes will all be on separate lots, so they can be sold and, like I said, we have a combination of front load and alley load to meet different -- different tastes, different lifestyles. Smaller lots. Larger lots. This is a great project and with an overall gross density of just 6.01 we have reduced the -- the impact on the schools, the impact on the transportation system significantly and I ask the Commission to support it. Thank you. Any questions?

Seal: Do we have any questions for the applicant or staff? Commissioner Wheeler, go ahead.

Wheeler: Can you -- staff, can you tell us just one more time what the net gain or net loss on the total number of units is again?

Dodson: Yes. Commissioner Wheeler, that would be a total loss of 108 units. Three hundred and twenty-seven is what was approved before and now there are 219.

Wheeler: Thank you.

Dodson: If that math is right.

Wheeler: Okay. Thank you.

Seal: Quick question of staff or the applicant can answer. The -- I'm interested in the parking for the multi-family. I think we have to have at least a minimum of 24 parking spots here. How many are available?

McKay: Yes. For the four-plexes we are required to have 30 spaces. Of those 16 will be covered. For the commercial flex space we have 42 spaces. For the daycare we have seven. And, then, staff asked us to include parallel parking along our MEW area that's on the west side of the townhomes north of our collector and we have 12 parallel parking spaces there. Each townhome will have a two car garage, plus a 20 by 20 parking pad in front and, then, we also have guest parking on the south end. There are nine spaces for guest parking and, then, we also have four parallel spaces along our central amenity feature that's outside the right of way. And, then, the townhomes that front on the public street we will have detached sidewalks and the ones -- or excuse me. The ones that have the alley load they will be parking on the public street north of the collector roadway.

Seal: Okay. Thank you.

Dodson: Mr. Chair?

Seal: Go ahead, Joe.

Dodson: I would like to just add to that as well, just to visually show the -- all of this -- this right here, because -- oh, should say, actually, this north portion here, that's a public road. This entire length on both sides can have parallel parking. Can have on-street parking

because there are no driveways. So, that's in excess of code requirement. In addition, they are -- all the private streets they are proposing, especially here, as long as they are wide enough, which I believe it needs to be 29 feet wide, they can accommodate the parallel parking on that as well. So, again, this would all be in excess of code for the off-street parking. So, I did not mention that, because they are exceeding all of the parking requirements.

Seal: Thank you. Commissioner Grove.

Grove: Mr. Chair. Joe, could you remind us -- just kind of give us an overview of what was continued and kind of if there is any parameters on the discussion tonight?

Dodson: Commissioner Grove, Becky actually outlined that way better than I did, admittedly, about why we were continued. The majority of it was as discussed, the overall density, including more commercial and, frankly, removing all the apartments -- or some and per some of my recommendations and analysis in my staff report. Those are the -- really the main issues. I guess a secondary one is just overall compatibility with the adjacent neighborhoods, but that was based largely in the inclusion of apartments versus townhomes or single family. From my perspective they have responded to each of the comments that were in that previous hearing and have answered -- well, I do not have anymore concerns based upon my previous analysis.

Grove: I guess my question is -- I know when we do some continuances we will have, you know, pretty limited discussion points that we are actually bringing forward to discuss. I didn't know if there was anything that we are, you know, asking the public testimony to focus on as -- as we have a fairly full house. So --

Dodson: Right.

Grove: Just trying to make sure that we are all on the same page before we get started.

Dodson: That's a great question, Commissioner Grove. It was my understanding because of some of the major revisions that are going to occur, it was not limited. That the overall project was going to be basically still open for public testimony. That was my understanding. I hope -- the residency -- the work the applicant and staff have done.

Seal: All right. If there is no more questions, we will go ahead and open this up to public testimony. Do we have anybody signed up? A rhetorical question, more or less, but --

Weatherly: Mr. Chair, we do. Online the first to sign up was Rebecca Prestwich, representing Hillsdale Creek.

Seal: Good evening. Just to set -- right. Just -- just to set this up, we have had several public hearings where people come forward to represent a larger group and nobody yields any time to it. So, that is one of the requirements that you are speaking for a larger group and the people that you are representing are yielding their time to you. So, who in the

audience will be yielding their time? Okay. If you would state your name and address for the record.

Prestwich: Can you hear me?

Seal: Yes, ma'am.

Prestwich: All right. Thank you. I don't know who to address, because Madam Chair is not present, so to --

Seal: Chairman.

Prestwich: Mr. Chairman, I'm Rebecca Prestwich. I live in the Hillsdale Creek Subdivision on South Bleachfield Way and I am representing the HOA for this meeting. There is a couple of things that I wanted to point out is that I'm an ordinary citizen, I don't have 25 years of planning experience, as Ms. Becky does, and I haven't been before the Commission -- only once before and that was in the last meeting. However, my observation in this meeting and in the last is that the developer's representative tends to embellish her opinions of her own -- of their own presented plan and the community's response to them and so that is something that I would like you to keep in mind as you hear all the members of the community give their testimonies today. The request from Madam Chair as I remember was to the developer to reduce the overall density of the overall proposal, quote, end quote, and that didn't really say we were particularly happy with one plan or one piece of the plan or the other, we were unhappy with the entire proposal and we did want the density reduced and that's why we are here today to see that -- that can be further addressed. Now, with the FLUM, which has been referred to, we understand that the City of Meridian has invested thousands upon thousands of dollars engaged in the research of feasibility studies and engineering towards the Comprehensive Plan and the citizens have invested their hours and time in participating in this planning development process and the citizens feel vested in doing that and, quite frankly, we had ownership in that plan and we endorsed that plan as it exists in the written FLUM and it was an eye opener to me to come to the meeting last time and to have the feeling -- and I was really grateful to Madam Chair for voicing it -- that our voice wasn't being heard and she did say, yes, your voice is being heard and she handed it back to the committee to -- I mean to the developer to further reduce the density and that doesn't mean by a small percentage, it meant to us by a significant percentage that actually represented what we understand the -- the acreage to be developed -- you know, to be designated as in the FLUM. So, I want to discuss what that is. The subject property area presently -- presently consists of two future land use designations. The mixed use neighborhood consists of 9.97 acres, according to the county assessor parcel -- and I won't list that out. It's written out and approved in the land use. Medium density residential, R-8, consisting of two parcels totaling a total of 28.98 acres. That's 12 acres for one parcel and 16.98 acres for the other. That's 75 percent of the comprehensive FLUM land use proposal. Now, the Planning and Zoning -- in Idaho Code 67-6115, Subsection A, states: Planning and Zoning Commission shall evaluate the request to determine the extent and nature of the amendment. Particularly they shall consider the

given effects of any proposed zone changes upon the delivery of services by any political subdivision providing public services, including school districts within that jurisdiction. The existing conditions report of the City of Meridian Comprehensive Plan designated that parcel as mixed use neighborhood. That is not what the developer put forward. The developer put forward a much more dense plan than mixed use neighborhood. The intent of a mixed use neighborhood is predominantly single use developments and that means they are supportive of proportional public and quasi-public spaces, places such as parks, plazas, gathering areas, open space -- and I know Ms. Becky would argue -- argue with you that they have provided that in their plan, but if you take a look at that plan and the small spaces and the number of people that are going to live in that community, you will find that it is a relatively small number compared to all of the neighborhoods in the surrounding area. The land uses are supposed to be supporting nonresidential services. Nonresidential service -- excuse me -- services should blend in with the buildings and their uses to provide goods and services that people typically do not travel far for and some employment opportunities. The proposal had a daycare in it and now they have put other commercial proposals into it. Now, there are services, as she mentioned, on the other side. There is actually a pediatric doctor's office, a separate children's dental office, adult dental office and a separate orthodontic office and there are a few vacant commercial building spaces. Those are what the mixed use neighborhood should be consisting of. R-8 houses in the majority, the 28.98, and in that 9.68 a few commercially -- commercial opportunities for business -- businesses to establish. Now, the community does want further additional serving uses to be developed on that parcel, the 9.97 acres. What they would like to see is -- a daycare is a good idea. Possibly a preschool. It was also suggested that perhaps additional elementary school facilities that could be used by Hillsdale Creek to further support the community could be donated by the developer. A coffee shop. A sandwich shop, dog grooming, and service providers that they would visit typically once a month or less and frequent -- and frequent -- or even a less frequent basis. That's not the proposal the developer is putting forth at this moment. The community respectfully requests the Council to follow the Comprehensive Plan and to maintain the current mixed use neighborhood designation for the 9.97 acres of land. We request the City Council to deny the developer's application for 2.5 acres of C-C zoning. I don't believe that most people understood until we really read through this document that that meant that they could include one warehousing unit with -- building within this community and in a -- in a community that exists only of low density urban family housing and they are now trying to place this dense and -- and all the commercial on that place -- on that small 40 acre lot. Furthermore, the community requested -- uh, my mouth is drying out. The developer not -- not be allowed to calculate the common area -- and this is another problem I have is the common area, the buffers, the green space are all calculated into their gross density, which, then, lowers it below the six. But if you go back down to their report, the last page, you will see that they report the 6.1 gross density, but the actual net density is 9.1 and that's far beyond what the FLUM designates. Let me get to the other part and I will be done. So, now that -- that is addressing the 9.69 acres. The other 28 acres -- I think it's 20 point what? Six eight? If memory serves me right. Is -- according to the original staff report at maximum allowable density and all they did was add a little bit more -- just little few more strips of green space and, then, they calculated it gross and they came out with a 6.1 density and that is not a true number for what will

happen in that community. Can you imagine 214 households -- individual households on 40 acres? Two hundred and fourteen. That's -- that's -- in my opinion gross. It is just too dense and it doesn't pattern this community. And the other thing I want to address is that originally the developer representative suggested that we were just upset about how many households were going to be there and how much traffic there was going to be and all these things, when, in fact, that wasn't our original concern. Our original concern was the overall impact of a development that dense in a community that is already overburdened in all of the aspects that we were told we could not discuss today.

Seal: Ma'am, you will need to wrap up real quick.

Prestwich: I will. I'm just about there. So, with regards to the 28.9 acres, the community requests that the -- the developer not be allowed to calculate common area, buffers, green space, et cetera, to be calculated in their gross density calculation. I don't think that developers should be allowed to do that. They should base their calculations on net density and that's the actual house on the actual lot and how that affects the overall plan. The community would rather the developer be able to -- to calculate the net density. We believe that if you did that, the calculations would provide a greater possibility for proposed development to conform with the surrounding subdivisions. The community respectfully requests the City Council to return this proposal back to the developer to further reduce the density of the 29.8 acres parcel to R-8 calculated at the net density calculation and I appreciate the time that you have given me and I thank you.

Seal: Okay. Thank you.

Weatherly: Mr. Chair, next we have James Phillips signed in as a representative of the Southern Rim Coalition.

Seal: Okay. Thank you. Good evening. We need your name and address for the record, please.

Phillips: My name is James Phillips. I live at 4140 East Rockhampton Street, Meridian, Idaho. 83642. And like was mentioned, I'm representing the Meridian Southern Rim Coalition. Just as a quick preamble, I can appreciate the passion and motion shown already today. There has been a lot of public anxiety, frustration, and concern, not to mention loss of sleep that could have been avoided had the currently revised preliminary plat as we see today had been the version first proposed. I feel that the public is still smarting a bit from the original plan and it actually hurts the public's ability to see and appreciate the revised version. Today I will be focusing in on a number of public concerns where the revised plan continues to fall short of Meridian's vision. This was mentioned before, the importance of having a FLUM and it's super important to underline that. The FLUM is -- is what's used to set general public expectations and we trust P&Z and the City Council to enforce this vision. The FLUM also is used by public entities, like ACHD, West Ada, COMPASS, for planning roadwork, updating school boundaries, projecting community growth that inform city strategic planning. The FLUM also is used by developers for making decisions of whether they should buy a land for development. It

informs them of the zoning, dwelling units, property types constraints -- constraints that developers are to respect. As you can see there is a large latitude at which development can operate. You can see that swing in number of units in the MUN. The swing in the number of units that are okay for the MDR. This is where P&Z and the City Council come into play. They have the responsibility to be good stewards of public trust by reconciling developer plans with suburban-urban planning development best practices, the expectation and needs of the public and the expectation and needs of the city. Developers are free to accept or reject P&Z recommendations, but City Council has the final say, particularly in cases of annexation and rezoning. Developers take a calculated risk when they purchase the land knowing full well that getting annexation and rezoning of their ideal liking is not a foregone conclusion. So, what are these public expectations being set by this FLUM, this nine acres of MUN, this 30 acre of MDR? These are some of the areas where -- where we still see the revised -- even the revised version falling short. This slide was taken out of the original slide deck. A few things to note. A number of concerns that break public trust had been reduced enough to actually now enumerate them here and you can see I have got a few bullet points around that. I will go into detail about that. But also a number of major red flags found in the agency comments that had been addressed by removing the three story apartment buildings, adding more commercial, adding an entryway into the commercial area. Not to say that there are any additional red flags still, but these red flags will be raised -- we can raised at the city and not necessary here at P&Z. So, let's look at this. This is, again, just outstanding concerns that we have around the MUN component, that nine acres there. In the revised we can see there is three things, actually. The fact that commercial lots are not fronting that East Amity Road is a concern for a few different reasons. One, it's vital for businesses to have patrons come in and when it -- when they are not located off of main transportation corridors they get less patrons. The other thing to note here is when you have it -- that commercial tucked in a little bit things like the public really wants, like a restaurant and cafes, they are likely not to risk their business in putting it in there. Also there is a missed opportunity of increasing some more commercial, reduce what's really needed in South Meridian, which is our employment-to-resident ratio. It's super super low. If you look at the COMPASS reports it's terrible. Absolutely terrible. We are in a restaurant desert in south Meridian. The other thing to note is around adequate parking. For the workers and the patrons of the businesses, guests and visitors of the four-plex, guests and visitors of the 40 townhomes. Possible solution there would be to actually look at Lot No. 52 and make that into a mailbox with -- with additional parking there. A possible solution. The other concern that the public has is a little bit of nuance here, but the awkward traffic flow for those townhome residents that live just south of that -- that would come out of that private alley, that Redding Lane, they can only turn one way. So, if they want to go -- lug some equipment to the park in their car, they can't turn left, they have to do a U'ee or go around. Have to keep an eye on both screens I guess. See if I can coordinate this. So, this guy right here. So, again, removing one of the four -- four-plexes for more commercial off Amity. Removing one of the lots for parking. And, then, address the awkward traffic flow. This is pretty bad to navigate. Okay. I won't get into -- I will just kind of skip this slide. Just note that -- that the ideas that we will propose in the next slide are based off of coming off the Comprehensive Plan and that's where the slide come from. You can revisit it if you have any questions, but -- so, one of the -- let's start with the most glaring

issue that I see and that has to do with the 39 attached townhomes that continue to extend into the MDR designated area. We ask that we swap those -- those attached townhomes for single family residents, again, to meet that expectation of medium density residential area. Next glaring concern is actually more going further south, is that those -- again, those 11 townhomes just south of West Lachlan Lane. Taking a step back you can see a plan -- you can see how there is a natural east-to-west density being transitioning until it hits up against Rockhampton neighborhood, which is great to see that. We don't get the same thing going north to south going into the Rockhampton and while Becky paints a picture that there is no need for that transitional density there, that simply is not the case. There is two considerations that have to be -- have to be made. One, the extreme difference in density between the townhome lots and the neighboring single family lots, one of which my home is. The other one is -- actually has to do with elevation. You can't really make it out, but the elevation on those is -- it's higher there and so having those two story attached to townhomes tower over the homes that are just adjacent across the street and over the entry is not appropriate. It's not cohesive with the surrounding neighborhood. So, the proposed solution would be make those single family -- single story family lots. Now, kind of putting it all together, there is a few things I would want to highlight. One is on the red. I will just walk through the different colors. On the red ones here in the comp plan talks about density transitions and where they should take place. Over alleyways or roads. Here they are taking place across back fences. This is problematic. This is -- does not meet expectations. And so the red actually puts it into alignment with the Comprehensive Plan by adjusting the lots to be aligned and density with their back neighbors. The purple, like I mentioned in the slide before, addresses the neighborhood compatibility issue and the surrounding areas to the south. The orange, again, to meet MDR expectations set by the FLUM we ask that these townhomes be replaced with single family residents. Lots for the green. This is to address walkability within the neighborhood. There are some good things of walkability east to west, but not going north to south, particularly as it goes to those neighbors walking to the main park there. And, finally, the last thing I want to highlight is actually the entire areas of blue. Propose that this should be R-8 zoning. Right now the smaller single -- the smaller lots you see in that area they are on average 3,500 square feet. By having an R-8 zoning it would require that to be a minimum of 4,000 square feet. And why is that? Why does that matter, just 500 square feet? Well, a couple different things. First, when it comes to real estate, just remember what they say, location, location, location. It's not lot size. Price is impacted more by surrounding neighborhoods, amenities, build cost, quality than would be by 500 square feet of lot size. The economic factors out -- there is economic factors outside the control of one builder in one preliminary plat that's going on in Meridian right now. The existing surrounding neighborhood -- exuberant home values have bigger impact on the prices of these homes than the square lot. So, why -- what is that difference? What does that 500 square for --

Seal: Sir, you will need to wrap up quickly.

Phillips: That 500 square feet lot will allow individuals to have -- to make their house a home. Front porches for neighborhoods. Patios for family to gather in. Additional living space to watch Boise State games, areas for a family getting started. Additional storage

so they can actually park in their garage. And so that's why I request that that be made R-8 zoning. Thank you.

Seal: Thank you. Madam Clerk, do we have any -- who else do we have signed up?

Weatherly: Mr. Chair, we had several people sign up in house. Only one indicating a wish to testify and that's Thomas Dayley.

Seal: Good evening. Please state your name and address for the record and --

Dayley: Thank you. Thomas Dayley. 4892 South Willandra Way, Boise. 83709. I guess I would -- first of all, I would like to thank the Commission for extending their time for consideration. We appreciate the fact that you have done that. You asked them significant questions in the August meeting. Some of those were addressed and I would like to talk about some of those as well and appreciate the developer as well trying to accommodate some of the issues that were brought forward by the Commission, as well as the community. However, I don't think all of those were addressed and that's where I would like to get to. I am a very supporter of private property rights. I think the developer has his property and he has a right to develop it. That's not what we are talking about here. It's how it's developed. By the same token, the people who own the homes adjacent to that property also have property rights and they are going to be impacted negatively by the proposed -- proposal as it's being developed and I think that's part of what the Commission needs to be considering as well. Not only the developer's property rights, but the land -- other landowners' property rights as well and try to -- try to accommodate both of those. We have had significant questions asked here by the -- by the people that have been brought forward and I think -- one of the questions I would like to ask to the Commission is do you feel that all of the questions have been appropriately answered as you consider approving this or not? And another question is are there other alternatives that a developer could use to reduce the density and one of the options that I would like you to consider is -- in my previous work I worked with the National Resource Conservation Service, which has what they call an urban farming program and that dedicates places within an urban environment where a developer or a landowner can actually get an easement -- paid money for an easement. That easement, then, dedicates property for urban farming for plots for -- for gardens -- urban gardens. Education. You have a school right next to part of the -- the plan there, as well as it's an educational purpose for kids in a school where they can see farming, how it's done, et cetera. So, there are lots of options like that a developer could have, which will reduce the density and also provide a very good use. And the developer gets paid for this. There is an easement and they get paid current land values for that property and I know this developer has owned this property for a long period of time and is now finally getting to develop it. So, I understand that. But for the last 20 years that they have owned it and haven't been able to develop, it -- it's increased in value. They haven't lost value and that's what this urban farming program would do as well, it would allow a time period and at the end of the 20, 30 years for the easement, they can still come back and develop it and it would actually do more in keeping with the Comprehensive Plan of transitional. Twenty years from now that portion of the City of Meridian will be much more attuned to the

development of commercial and the other things and this developer would still have the ability to retain it -- retain their value and also be able to have a transitional development process and it would also reduce the impact at this point in time with the adjacent landowners. So, I think -- I guess my request to the Commission is to -- there has been significant questions asked here that I still don't think have been addressed. Like the parking. The traffic flow. The commercial development where there is a warehouse. A warehouse does not fit in this community. But that's part of their commercial -- commercial proposal.

Seal: Sir, you will need to wrap up here real quick.

Dayley: So, just to wrap up, the townhouses to single family homes. That's a significant impact that I think that the Commission should deal with. Request for zoning. Parking. When they said -- at least my understanding is 219 homes and nine guest parking. That's why I just -- and maybe I misunderstood what she said, but that is not sufficient. There is some quite -- there is still unanswered questions I think that the Commission should be asking of the developer that we should walk through. Thank you.

Seal: Thank you.

Weatherly: Mr. Chair, that's all we have signed in indicating a wish to testify and I don't see any raised hands online at this time.

Seal: Anybody in Chamber, if you would like to testify, please, raise your hand. Okay. If there is nobody else online, would the applicant like to --

Dodson: Mr. Chair?

Seal: Oh. Go ahead, Joe.

Dodson: I would like to go first, if I don't -- if you don't mind. If the applicant doesn't mind. Just a couple things to clarify for the Commission. On the proposed flex space is not -- how do I put this? It cannot be all warehouse that's for sure. There are minimum requirements that are specific use standards that require a minimum of 30 percent office, no more than a certain amount of retail, but that does not mean that the remaining 70 percent is always warehouse. Largely these flex space units are a pretty even mix of kind of an office, warehouse type of deal that some small business uses to have a little bit of product, I guess, and, then, they have their offices there. I have seen this work really well throughout the city and throughout the valley. It's becoming more and more popular and they are generally low impact on both vehicle trips, as well as overall traffic. So, I do think that that's why the applicant chose that. If the Commission so desires additional -- like we discussed previously -- multi-tenant building for some kind of retail, commercial, restaurant, coffee shop kind of use, that will increase traffic compared to a flex space building for sure in the area. So, that kind of goes against some of the other issues that we have been discussing -- discussing. So, I do want to make that clear. And, then, the -- the density conversation has -- and the future land use map has come up repeatedly,

not just with this project. That's every project. I do want to be clear that the -- the area shown on the future land use map for the future land use designations is not parcel specific. So, it's very difficult to say that certain parcels should have certain future land use map on it or certain acreages and things like that. That's not how we do that. Secondly, to make this applicant utilize the net density versus gross density is completely against what we have in our Comprehensive Plan. Our Comprehensive Plan specifically designates that the density is based off of gross. That's every single project, including the existing that's already there. It's all based on gross density. This does happen to have a fair amount of area that's buffers and they have a large amount of open space. Regardless, they are absolutely meeting their density requirements. Commission and future hearings at the Council can disagree overall and that's fine, but minimally code and future land use they are complying with those density requirements. I just wanted to make that clear.

Seal: Okay. Thank you. Would the applicant like to come back up. Or did Joe steal all your thunder? I stole some of his tonight, so I'm feeling bad about that.

McKay: Thank you, Mr. Chair, Members of the Commission. Becky McKay. Engineering Solutions. As far as the density of this plan -- I mean we -- when -- after we heard the Commission's comments and the neighbors comments -- none of the comments were ignored. I mean we sat down and we spent a couple hours basically going through my detailed notes of not only your comments, but the neighboring comments. We reduced our density by 108 units. We have dropped our density 33 percent. At the same time we have increased our open space significantly and I'm not even counting the eight foot landscape buffer that's on my detached walks along my local streets, which you are allowed to count. I have excluded that. There was a comment about -- that we are embellishing our plan. I mean we have been working really really hard over the past couple months on this plan. We even sent some drafts to the staff to get feedback. We have provided 104 parking spaces. Staff said, hey, we want some parallel parking spaces. So, we -- we have them inset. They are not on the private drive or the alley, they are inset to the landscaping to give that more traditional neighborhood look, that more integrated look. The FLUM was brought up. The FLUM, the UDC, every other municipality in this state looks at density from a gross density standpoint. We provide the gross density calculation. We also provide the net density calculation. That R-8 zone allows three to eight dwelling units per acre or 3.45. The R-15 allows 15 dwelling units per acre and we are 7.44 and our overall density, excluding the commercial area -- so, all we are talking about is the residential zoned area, we are at 6.01 gross density, which is within that medium density designation. There was comments made about mixed use. Mixed use doesn't mean commercial. Mixed use doesn't mean townhomes. If you look at your Comprehensive Plan, your definitions within your ordinance, mixed use talks about townhomes. It talks about -- it talks about four-plexes. Detached single family dwellings. Attached single family dwellings. Neighborhood commercial. Flex space. Flex space is not warehouse. A flex -- I -- there is property on the northwest corner of Hill Road and Highway 55 that has sat vacant for -- it's pushing probably 15 years. Finally a use went on it and it's a mixture of some flex space, where it's a business, but they have -- they have material storage in their -- in their building and, then, next door to them is a

coffee shop. So, it's kind of integrated and I thought, you know, that's -- that's unique and the -- the elevations of the building meet all of the design guidelines for commercial. I mean we are trying to figure out -- one of the comments was the transportation. The lowest traffic generator is something like a combination flex space, maybe a little retail component and a daycare, so that we are not generating so much traffic. Absolute retail generates a significant amount of traffic. A comment was made why don't you have an approach out to Amity Road? Amity Road is a major artery -- or minor arterial. ACHD will not allow us to have any access to Amity. We did add another access to Hillsdale Avenue, which is a collector, to make our commercial component more viable and if you look at that site plan -- if Joe could bring it up -- you can see that it has -- the commercial node has its own access and that will be a full access. We only asked for a right-in, right-out. ACHD came back and said, no, that will be a full access, because it's a full access that you are aligning with on the west side at the Hillsdale commercial. So, you can see that we have added another access to make that commercial component viable and allow it to have transfer -- or access outside of the neighborhood and within the neighborhood. It was mentioned this plan falls short of the vision. This is a priority growth area that the city has spent a significant amount of money for the regional park. They wanted the South Meridian YMCA, elementary school. West Ada School District owns additional property north of Amity. There is a charter school that's going to come online next fall that will also serve the same area as Hillsdale Elementary and at the same time that we are being bashed, we are also going to have to install the signal at Hillsdale Avenue and Amity, which is going to benefit not only us, but everyone in this community and allow them to make left-hand turns more easily. We are also going to be widening all of our frontage along Amity. We are going to have a turn lane. We are not solely depending on Hillsdale Avenue, an intrusion into this neighborhood, and it's not intrusion, because that is a mid mile collector that was intended to handle a significant amount of traffic. But we also have our Amity Road approach. So, that gives us an opportunity for our residents to go eastbound and make a right-hand turn on Amity. We have connected to the stub streets. I have nine and ten thousand square foot lots all around my perimeter, matching them lot line for lot line. And, then, transitioning the lots across from those lots, so that we have different variety of lots. That is the whole objective of mixed use, that we provide a variety of home products, a variety of mixed uses. The traffic that we were initially going to generate was 2,600 vehicles per day. I have got that traffic down to about 2,025. That's at build out. That's over four phases, which will probably be built over a four year period. So, this -- this project will come online incrementally. My overall landscaping is seven acres and that seven acres -- I mean you got to remember the size of the property is 38 and I have 7.19 acres of common area. That's 18 and a half percent of this property is in landscapable area, with pathways and significant amenities for these residents and we -- we have done -- we have -- we have put plazas in. We have art. We have pickleball courts. We have a swimming pool. We have -- we have pathways. Picnic shelters. Multi-use pathways. Nature pathways. I mean for a piece of property that's this size, we have really worked to make sure that it incorporates the vision that's in your comp plan and we missed the mark with the first version. The density was too great. The three story was not appropriate. And I believe the Commission made the right decision to say, hey, Becky, take another look at this. Go back to your client, see what you can do. Come back with a good -- a better plan. A better plan that fits this area. This plan fits this area.

This plan complies with your Comprehensive Plan and to just say, hey, we got to all be single family, that -- that defeats the whole purpose of the land use map and what we are trying to create in Meridian in this particular area and if you can't get density, how do you build the signals? How do you afford to build all the amenities? How do you afford to put in the pedestrian signal to improve the safer route to schools? I mean we are doing everything -- everything we can to not only make our development the best it can be, but to improve this overall neighborhood and make it safer for everyone and I ask the Commission to support it and recognize the effort and the time that's been put into it and the recommendation of your staff. Thank you.

Seal: Thank you. Any final questions? If not I will ask that I get a motion to close the public hearing for Item No. H-2021-0046.

Grove: So moved.

Wheeler: Second.

Seal: Okay. It's been moved and seconded to close the public hearing on Item No. H-2021-0046. All those in favor say aye. Opposed? So, motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. THREE ABSENT.

Seal: All right, Commissioners, who wants to go first?

Grove: Mr. Chair?

Seal: Commissioner Grove, go ahead.

Grove: Where to start? The -- the applicant did make some significant improvements and the reduction -- I mean that's one of the biggest reductions that I have seen on a project this size for a continuance. Just kind of throwing that out there. So, the two years I have been here I haven't seen that big a reduction on a continuance before. So, kudos to your team for -- for doing that. I definitely see and have read and can feel the palpable emotions of the audience and the residents on this. So, I definitely understand, you know, what is being said and why it's being said. I -- I have some things that I like about it. I have some things that I don't like. I would say the likes that I have on this, with this revision, the second edition connection to Hillsdale to get that commercial, that definitely increases that -- the value for everybody just in terms of reducing traffic and making the commercial more accessible. I like that you have included the commercial. I think that having a better narrative on what that is in terms of -- I don't think most people will understand what flex space is, so as you go forward and making sure that that is better communicated as to the intentions, so that the current residents understand a little bit more of your intentions with that space, so that there isn't hesitancy and confusion and misunderstanding. I think anytime that misunderstandings can be cleared up it works in everybody's favor. This is not a process where we are going to get everything that everybody wants. It's a compromise and just because there is pieces that the developer

likes and the residents don't and vice-versa doesn't mean that the process is wrong. It means that it's a compromise. I like that you have improved the entrance. The amenities look great. I think that there is room for improvement on some of the -- as -- I think -- let me see if I had it right here. James mentioned some of the north-south connections. I don't know if there is any ability to squeeze those in to get additional north-south passages, but well -- well made point and think that's where I'm at for right now. But I'm sure I will come back on in a minute.

Seal: All right. Commissioner Wheeler, go ahead.

Wheeler: Thank you, Chairman. I'm -- I am, too, with Commissioner Grove on this, that -- that to go ahead and reduce your -- when a developer comes out to go ahead and purchase a piece of property, obviously, he is doing his proforma and he is trying to figure out, okay, how much can I make per acre and to go ahead and reduce that size -- or that amount by a third, that's -- that's significant and still want to move forward with the project. That's -- that's significant. I'm also seeing that a lot of the stuff that we talked about and suggested the developer did put into practice or into this -- into this plan here in order to -- so, it seems like he was responsive and wanting to listen to what was being shared from the Commission. The -- the flex spaces -- yeah, I -- as I look at this you are -- you are next to a daycare, you are going to be next to a school, you are next to the Y. There is no doubt in my mind there is going to be a coffee shop here. It just seems like this is just a perfect little spot for it, somewhere in here on this flex space. One of the things I was looking at, too, was just the traffic pattern, but -- and this is maybe where this might have some jurisdiction over on ACHD side of things, but coming in most likely they will be coming in off a Hillsdale, turning left into the full access that's at the most north -- yeah. Northwestern part of the project and, then, turning right. You got a daycare there. Right again. Right again. And a back. And that landscape buffer that comes in off of Park prohibits people from coming into the daycare with a left-hand turn, going ahead and jamming up traffic within the interior drive aisles and so there seems to have been some good thought on that, on even just the traffic flow pattern on that, so -- and the reduction in the height coming down from three stories down to two, it seems to have accommodated some of the concerns of the neighbors on this. I'm -- I like the adjustments that were done here. I like the way that there was a lot of thought put back into what was said from both the Commission and also written testimony. A lot of open space, comparatively speaking, to other projects of the same size and at the same time I'm with Commissioner Grove on this. There is some things maybe I would do different, but all in all all of this has been put together pretty well with a lot of willingness to listen to the input that was given.

Seal: All right. Commissioner Yearsley, you want to jump in on this?

Yearsley: Thank you very much. I might be the only one in the room, per se, saying I think Becky did a great job. This looks so much better than it did before. It just -- you know, to come in with that much of a reduction in home -- units is -- is amazing and I think she did a very good job laying it all out and making it look good. So, like I said, I think it looks good. I am one in full favor of property rights and -- and having the developer

develop as they would like within reasonable limits, with -- as set by the city and I think they have done that and I am in full support of this project.

Seal: Okay. Thank you. I'm kind of with Commissioner Yearsley, I think they have done a good job of listening to the concerns, reducing things overall. Like -- like Commissioner Grove said, this is one of the largest reductions I have seen. So, hopefully, a third is -- is enough. I mean if any one of you were asked to give up a third of anything that you have with potential, it's probably a hard pill to swallow. So, they have swallowed it and acted on it. So, if anybody has questions on flex space and what that might mean, you might want to stick around for the Red Aspen presentation we have next -- coming next as far as what a commercial space can do. Flex space can do. It will be enlightening for you. So, they are -- they are good for our communities. I guess one of the things I'm -- I still get a little discouraged about is there is a lot of talk about how, you know, everybody's -- nobody's against development, but they just don't want it in their area, so -- I mean, unfortunately, Meridian is -- it's a big area and it's growing. I mean we are the fastest growing city in the United States. So, it's -- it's coming, it's here, and we do have to manage it well. I applaud the applicant for listening and doing what was asked. I think to ask for more at this point in time is not appropriate, to be perfectly honest. So, with that I will -- oh, go ahead, Commissioner Wheeler.

Wheeler: I would like to go ahead make a motion.

Seal: Absolutely. Motions are always -- always admired here.

Wheeler: After considering all staff, applicant -- staff, applicant, and public testimony, I move that we recommend approval to the City Council of file number H-2021-0046, as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of October 21, 2021, with the --

Grove: With the -- with the changes in the staff memo; right?

Wheeler: Do we need to put that in there, too? Okay. And also with the changes per the staff memo.

Seal: Okay.

Yearsley: I will second that.

Seal: Do I have a second? Oh. Commissioner Yearsley, thank you. It's been moved and seconded to approve Item No. H-2021-0046 with -- with the modifications in the staff memo. All those in favor say aye. No opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. THREE ABSENT.

6. Public Hearing for Elsinore Daycare Facility (H-2021-0061) by 814 Development, LLC, Located at 4818 and 4858 N. Elsinore Ave.

- A. Request: Conditional Use Permit request to construct a new 13,535 square foot, single-story daycare facility on approximately 1.3 acres of land on Lots 12 and 13 of the Paramount Square Subdivision in the C-G zoning district.

Seal: All right. Thank you everyone. With that we will move to open public hearing for Elsinore Daycare Facility, H-2021-0061.

Dodson: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Seal: We will go ahead and give everybody a minute to clear out here. Sorry about that.

Dodson: No problem.

Seal: All right, Joe. Go ahead.

Dodson: Thank you, Mr. Seal. Onto the next one. And I have the one after this, so, sorry, you got to hear me more. The application before you tonight, Item No. 6, Elsinore Daycare Facility, which is for a conditional use permit. The site consists of 1.38 -- sorry -- 1.3 acres of land, currently zoned C-G, located at 4018 and 4858 North Elsinore. So, they are currently two properties. They have tentative approval for a property boundary adjustment to combine the properties into one for the proposed use. Brief overlay of what is surrounding this development. To the north is C-G zoning, with some commercial, which also does include an existing daycare, which is about two lots -- it's on this lot -- where is it? This lot right here. To the east is C-G zoning and some undeveloped commercial, as well as existing commercial. To the south is McMillan Road. South of that, obviously, is some medium density residential. To the west is R-40 and as you can see on the aerial -- so, higher density. Multi-family residential. The proposed use of a daycare, which has more than 12 children, daycare center, is a community serving commercial use that fits within the future land use designation of commercial. The proposed location is at the western edge of a commercial subdivision and directly across the street for multi-family residential, which functionally creates a mixed use development. The daycare use is needed -- is a needed use throughout the entire city and providing it at nearby higher density meets many of the city's desired outcomes for commercial development. A daycare center, again, which is more than 12 children, is listed in the UDC as a conditional use within the C-G zoning district. It is also subject to specific use standards. Discussions with the applicant have yielded that 165 children are proposed to be served by this daycare center, with approximately 10 to 12 staff members. The number of staff members will be determined by state required student-staff ratios. Staff has recommended a conditional use permit to limit the child capacity to 165 children. When a commercial district, as is the case here, directly abuts a residential zoning, which, again, is to the west, the C-G zoning district limits the hours of operation from 6:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m. The applicant has stated that their intended hours of operation actually is 6:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., which is within this range. Staff did not specifically limit the hours of operation to the 6:00 to 6:00 as was proposed specifically, because we wanted to give them flexibility if they happened to want to do additional later hours, you know, 7:00, 8:00

for some of those workforce housing people who may not get off at 5:00 p.m. Direct lot access is proposed along the west boundary via a driveway connection to Elsinore, which is the public road here, and loops around to the north and east. An additional driveway connection is proposed to the north property boundary as shown. So, you have one access here, another access here. Because this is to a public road that has to meet offset requirements per ACHD, this is a shared drive aisle, so there are no such offset requirements. The shared drive aisle along the north is existing and goes through the entire commercial development. This creates cross-access and is already existing as noted. So, the entire commercial subdivision provides multiple points of access to Meridian Road and McMillan. As part of this application the applicant was required to perform a turn lane analysis by ACHD for the Elsinore and McMillan intersection, which would be right here. Sorry. I wanted to do this to obtain data on the existing traffic movements at this intersection and what the proposed use would incur to this intersection. ACHD reviewed this and staff agrees with its findings as well. The requirements are to construct a dedicated westbound right-turn lane. I said that wrong. A dedicated westbound left-turn lane from McMillan onto Elsinore and, then, eastbound -- I completely messed that up -- and eastbound right-turn lane from McMillan onto Elsinore. Staff is not sure if the right-turn lane will affect any dimensional aspect of the site, but anticipates that it will not. My only concern there is where the existing right of way is and, then, the existing landscape buffers. It's my understanding that the landscape buffer was already measured from the ultimate right of way and anticipated a right-hand turn lane, but per the submitted plans that has not been shown. That is the Joe's 90 percent probable on that one. The specific use standards require that onsite vehicle pick up or parking and turnaround area shall be provided to ensure safe discharge and pick up of clients -- or children in this case. Access to the building, again, is shown with a two way 25 foot wide driveway along the west side of the building, with parking on both sides that equals 36 total spaces. Code requires a minimum of 27 per the one per 500 ratio. There is not a specific additional ratio for daycares. The proposed building size is 13,500, which is how you get 27 spaces. The site plan does not show any dedicated pick up or drop-off location like a turnout or something like that, which is fairly common in other daycares, but not always a requirement. Staff has concerns that the proposed parking and drive aisle as noted could be overrun in the morning and afternoon peak hours with the current site design. Staff does recommend a reduction in the building size in order to scoot everything south -- everything by play area south and create additional parking as noted here. Basically, emulate this and put it here and you have at least approximately ten additional parking spaces that can be added in total 46 for the site would help with the concerns regarding any backing up of parents dropping and picking up their children. Staff -- with these changes staff does not anticipate reduction in the play area, but just the building. I do want to make that clear. I don't want to lose the outdoor play area for the children at this location. That was really the only issue that staff found, to be honest, and that's -- other than that I will say that the -- there is no written testimony and staff does recommend approval of the subject CUP, but with the conditions that are outline in the report, one of which being add this additional parking. I will stand for any questions.

Seal: At this time would the applicant like to come forward? Is the applicant online?

Kozlowski: I am here. Good evening. My name is Samantha Kozlowski. I'm here on behalf of 814 Development. We are a development company located at 1695 12 Mile Road, Suite 100, in Berkley, Michigan. 48072. Thank you, Joe, for taking the time to go through that presentation. I think that you have painted a really good picture of the development and what we are trying to accomplish here and all of the benefits that we will bring to the City of Meridian. I know in the staff report there were a couple of items that, unfortunately, we will not be able to abide by. The major one being the reduction in the building size that you had requested. We are working with a specific childcare tenant. This building, the 13,535 square feet, is their prototypical building that they use and they need it to operate functionally with the number of students, being the 165 students maximum, with the ten to 12 staff members. So, operationally, that is the building size that they have used in the past and that would be the prototype that they would be most comfortable moving forward with. A couple of other concerns. I know that you had recommended adding some additional parking. We see currently that we are meeting the parking requirements and, actually, exceeding the parking requirements with the 36 spaces, where the 27 are actually required by the zoning ordinance. We are -- we think that with the two drive aisles that there shouldn't be an issue with parking or any increase to traffic from this development. That just -- the reason why we think that goes along with the actual operation of the daycare facility -- so, parents or guardians actually are required to park and, then, drop off -- or, I'm sorry, to park and walk in the student to the school and actually sign them in at a front desk. So, we don't have your typical pick up, drop off area where the students can be waiting outside. The garden -- the guardian is actually going to have to escort them into the building and, then, when they want to pick them up at the end of the day they will have to go inside the building to retrieve the student as well. So, we kind of see that as mitigating some of the traffic concerns and just to go along that note, we are working with ACHD right now on a proposed plan for the turn lanes onto North Elsinore Road. So, we also think that if that development plan were to move forward and we are working on developing the plans right now, that that would help mitigate any traffic concerns as well and those really are the major things that I just kind of wanted to explain and give you a little bit more color into why they may not work for the tenant and just kind of wanted to give you their overall needs and wants for this project and just kind of explain that operationally a smaller building will not work for them. So, we would like to move forward with the 13,535 square foot building and maintain the existing parking layout that's shown on our concept plan, since it already meets the parking requirements in the zoning ordinance. We do feel that this is a need that is desired by the City of Meridian. We think that it would add a lot of benefit to the community, not only providing a place for parents and guardians to have their children in daycare, but also to provide a number of jobs to the local community as well. So, we know that Joe has expressed that this is an inherent need within the City of Meridian and we ask that the City of Meridian support our project going with our existing concept plan.

Seal: Is that everything?

Kozlowski: That is all I have at this time. If you have any other questions I'm more than happy to address them at this point.

Seal: Okay. Thank you very much. From our Commissioners are there any questions of staff or the applicant?

Grove: Mr. Chair?

Seal: Mr. Grove, go ahead.

Grove: Joe, real quick. You said there was another childcare facility fairly close. Is your parking concern based on concerns that we have had with that facility and do we have any numbers on what the parking is at that facility? I mean I know it might not match square footage wise, but it might give us some -- something to go off of. I have my own personal experience with it, so I have some thoughts on that later, but just wanted to know if there was any information that I'm not seeing.

Dodson: Commissioner Grove, great question. I do not know the specific counts for those. They have a different site design where they kind of put the building in the corner and, then, they have a one way drive aisle and angled parking and, then, a specific drop off location as well, so that -- that creates in and out very smoothly. This has a two way traffic, which with the multiple avenues in and out with the -- with the shared drive aisle, I did note that in my staff report. Some of those concerns are mitigated because of that. If we didn't have a shared drive aisle through the subdivision, the commercial subdivision, this would be a complete disaster. So, thankfully that's there. You and Mr. -- Commissioner Seal are on the same page there with having had other issues with this with daycares. It is my understanding that specifically we have not. We have had a lot more issues with drive-throughs, specifically coffee shops that shall remain unnamed, but not so much with daycares. The issue largely comes up when Fire and Police get involved and there are -- there are general life and safety concerns about just kids running across parking lots, the parking area is now becoming the drop off area, other than just a park and walk kind of thing. There is just kind of those concerns that we have. So, anytime we can add some additional parking to help mitigate some of those concerns staff is going to ask for that. I will say regarding the overall size of the building, it is unfortunate to hear that reducing the size might kill the overall project just -- just because the Commission has approved more children in a building less than half the size of this. So, that's not really saying business wise that makes sense, but it is possible to have this is -- this is literally twice as big as another CUP that we did for a daycare that had 20 additional children. So, there -- there is precedent here that a 13,500 square foot building is rather large for a daycare, especially for this number of children. That is also why we capped it at 165, with the understanding that if we don't there could be a potential to have vastly more children, which would be more cars and more traffic and further exacerbate the issue. Long winded. I apologize.

Seal: Joe, quick question. Is there parking allowed on Elsinore or on the street to the north?

Dodson: Commissioner Seal, I believe Elsinore is a local -- it is a local road. So, technically, yes, you could park -- as long as it's wide enough, which it's a public road, so

it's going to be wide enough to have parallel parking on both sides where there aren't any driveways. The shared drive aisle, no. That's just a drive aisle. Except for, as I have noted, where you put parking like this. But this is wide enough to have on-street parking.

Seal: Okay. Thank you.

Dodson: You are welcome.

Seal: Any other questions at this time? All right. At this time we will take public testimony. Madam Clerk, is there anyone signed up?

Weatherly: Mr. Chair, there is not.

Seal: All right. Anyone raising their hand online? Anybody in Chamber would like to testify? Just raise your hand. Okay. Seeing none --

Grove: Mr. Chair?

Seal: Oh. Commissioner Grove, go ahead.

Grove: Just say I move to close public testimony on File No. H --

Seal: We are close. You are ahead a little bit. Would the applicant like to come back? Is there -- is there anything that the applicant would like to add at this time before we do close the public hearing?

Kozlowski: This is Samantha with 814 Development. Again the applicant. Thank you again for your concerns and all the comments. I do understand the concern with the building size. However, as stated, this is the tenant's proposed and prototypical building type that they are used to using. So, I think that they favor a smaller number of children in classrooms, so that each child can get enough attention and time from the team members that are working within the facility. So, I think that that is really important to the tenant and, then, just, again, wanted to stress that there is no drop off and pick up area, so all the parents and guardians are actually going to be parked. So, there shouldn't really be an influx of a bunch of cars all at one time. There aren't any specified pick up and drop off times either, so parents and guardians are kind of coming throughout the morning. There are peak hours, but they aren't all flooding in at the exact same time. So, just wanted to stress that and, obviously, we are working with ACHD to try to mitigate any further traffic concerns and, again, we hope that you are in support of the project as the current site plan stands and thank you again for your time this evening.

Seal: Okay. Thank you. At this time can I get a motion to close public hearing?

Wheeler: So moved.

Grove: So moved.

Seal: It's been moved and seconded to close the public hearing on Item No. H-2021-0061 for Elsinore Daycare Facility. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? All right. Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. THREE ABSENT.

Seal: Okay. Who wants to jump in first?

Grove: Mr. Chair?

Seal: Commissioner Grove.

Grove: All right. Back to the parking piece. Having to go to a childcare facility multiple times a week and do pick up, drop off, I'm very familiar with the in and out setup versus a drop off setup. I had an experience with that at another facility. But the in and out I think you are looking at -- let's say 12 staff. You have 36 parking spots. That means you have 24 spots for parents. Without specified pick up and drop off times at a childcare facility like this I don't see this being an issue. I have never seen 24 people come in to pick up and drop off. The only time this is going to be an issue is when the facility decides to have an event to have all of the parents come in at once for holiday singing or Father's Day, Mother's Day, those types of things. That is when that is going to be an issue and I think that having a good relationship with the surrounding businesses is going to be a key element for those times and that the applicant needs to take that into consideration. But for day-to-day operations I don't see the 36 parking spots being an issue. With that I would be in favor of not requiring additional parking and I think, you know, anything we can do to get more childcare facilities in I think we got to really push that. It's -- it's pretty tough out there.

Seal: Joe, just real quick, what -- what is the specific requirement number that's in the staff report for the parking?

Dodson: Commissioner Seal, do you mean the minimum code requirement?

Seal: No. Just the -- what number is it in the staff report?

Dodson: Oh. Condition you are talking about.

Seal: Condition. Sorry.

Dodson: I do not have that up. In a motion, if you guys want to remove my recommendations, I think there is multiple, so that I think a general motion of saying approve without staff's recommended conditions of site modification I can go through and handle that. That's specific enough for me.

Seal: Just in case. I want you to be ready. Mr. Wheeler? Mr. Yearsley? Either one.

Yearsley: You know, I will defer to Commissioner Grove on daycare. I have not had to take my kids to daycare, fortunately enough. But I like it. I think it's a good -- you know, it's a good facility. Looks -- in a good location and I would stand in support of it and also not requiring the additional parking.

Seal: Okay. I have got a little bit of mixed feelings on this. I do think the parking is adequate and when I say adequate I think it's just adequate at this point in time, so it does exceed the minimum parking requirements for a facility like -- or, sorry, I should say a building like this. That said, it's -- with the drop off and pick up, I have had experience where it can get crowded, it can be a problem, depending on how traffic does actually flow through there. So, I think the way that it's laid out and the way that traffic can flow through that it mitigates some of those issues. The fact that there can be on-street parking to handle the events, like Commissioner Grove talked about, because that was one of the things in my mind is you have the Christmas program and all the parents show up and, you know, grandparents and aunts and uncles and everything, then, it gets really crowded really fast and those -- those become an issue, so -- but I like the idea of this. I think it's a -- it's a good area to put it. I think, you know, they -- it looks like they have kind of a cookie cutter approach to it, so they know what they are doing as far as laying it out. That seems to work for their business. I could essentially go either way, basically, on the parking recommendation at this point. So, I think it's -- but I do think it's a good -- good proposal. Would be good for the area.

Dodson: Mr. Chair?

Seal: Joe, go ahead.

Dodson: Specifically the conditions that would be noted -- I do remember now that the applicant also wanted to strike an additional condition that she did not bring up, so I will do it for her. Regarding adding a pedestrian connection to McMillan. Their justification was they are proposing one here, which is fine. It was just me being picky. I'm okay with saying no or -- and striking that. So, it would be condition 6-A for the parking and 6-C for the sidewalk, if Commission is amenable to that.

Seal: Understood. And thank you for being picky. I, for one, appreciate that. With that if anybody has anymore to add or always looking for a motion.

Grove: Mr. Chair?

Seal: Commissioner Grove.

Grove: After considering all staff, applicant, and public testimony, I move to approve file number H-2021-0061 as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of October 21st, 2021, with the following modifications: That we strike conditions 6-A and 6-C.

Wheeler: Second.

Seal: It's been moved and seconded to approve Item No. H-2021-0061 for Elsinore Daycare Facility with the aforementioned modifications. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Okay. Motion carries. Thank you very much.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. THREE ABSENT.

**7. Public Hearing for Red Aspen (H-2021-0066) by KM Engineering, LLP,
Located at the southeast corner of S. Linder Rd. and W. Overland Rd.**

- A. Request: Annexation and Zoning of 2.99 acres of land with a request for the C-G zoning district for the purpose of constructing an approximate 30,000-square-foot flex space building on 2.19 acres of land.

Seal: All right. We are coming up on 8:00 o'clock. Would anybody like a quick bio break before we press on? Okay. It looks like we are pressing. So, at this time we would like to open the public hearing for Red Aspen, H-2021-0066 and we will begin with the staff report.

Dodson: Thank you, Mr. Chair. This is my last one for the night and, then, I won't bug you for two weeks. So, we will hammer through this. The application before you tonight is for annexation and zoning of 2.99 acres of land. It's currently zoned RUT and it's located at the southeast corner of Linder and Overland. To the north Overland Road. How about that? North of that you have I-L zoning with Camping World RV service, storage, and I don't know what else is there. Sales I believe as well. To the east is R-8 zoning and the -- Meridian's newest fire station. To the south is R-15 zoning and existing multi-family residential and to the west is Linder Road and, then, west of that would be C-C zoning and some -- I believe there is one existing building and the other -- some of the other properties are currently under development. There is no history of applications with the city. The property does have two future land use designations. You can't really see it on this map, because of the lines, but there is a sliver of medium density along the south boundary and the rest is commercial. The annexation and zoning request of the nearly three acres is a request for the C-G zoning district for the purpose of constructing an approximate 30,000 square foot flex space building on 2.19 acres. So, as you can tell there is about -- I can't do math -- eight-tenths of an acre of land that's purely in -- the zoning this goes to the centerline of the roads. Despite two future land use designations, the city does anticipate commercial uses on this corner property, especially because it is adjacent to two heavily trafficked arterial roadways and near the future planned, hopefully coming soon, Linder Road overpass directly to the north. The proposed use of flex space is subject to specific use standards 11-43-18 and is proposed to serve as the core office and warehouse of a local business Red Aspen. It is a social selling, which is online, beauty company that aims to utilize this site as their brand new main hub for their growing business. Flex space is a principally permitted use in the requested C-G zoning district. Access to the site is proposed to be one connection to Linder and one connection to Overland, with both accesses being restricted to right-in, right-out per ACHD. The access to Overland is existing, whereas the access to Linder Road is an existing 25 foot wide

access that is projected to be widened to 40 feet and be shared with the residential property. In my staff report I noted that no agreement had been provided. Since my staff report I have been given that agreement and it has -- it is in place. Both proposed access points are as far away from the Linder and Overland Road intersection as physically possible. So, again, they -- they really can't move them over anymore to the east or to the south. The applicants propose to place the building near the hard corner and pull it away from the existing multi-family residential to the south. It's approximately 119 feet from the loading docks -- or I should say really the building wall to the south property line. This area that's 119 feet does include the required 25 foot land use buffer here. No buffer is required adjacent to the fire station, because it is not a residential use. As proposed the required five feet of landscaping per the parking lot standards -- parking lot landscaping standards. The applicant is also showing the required landscape buffers to the adjacent arterial streets Linder and Overland. The buffer adjacent to Overland is shown wider than the required 25 feet. Due to required right of way dedication and the larger landscape buffer, the proposed building is shown approximately 42 feet behind the existing sidewalk -- attached sidewalk along Overland. The -- it has the building being further south than staff did originally anticipate. In order to help the site gain back some of this usable area and create more space between the building, the proposed use and the existing residential to the south, staff is recommending the applicant reduce the landscape buffer to Overland by going through the alternative compliance process with future applications, which for the record, tonight just annexation and zoning, because the use is principally permitted. In this -- in the requested zone of C-G their next step would be administrative approvals, which would be certificate of zoning compliance and design review. Staff finds that the revision to the site of moving it further north had two positive outcomes. The building can be moved further north towards Overland to create a better presence and streetscape along this corridor and, secondly, moving the building further north creates further separation from the existing residential to the south, while at the same time allowing more area for truck turnaround in the south area of the site. The applicant has stated that the hour -- the planned hours of operation are Monday through Friday, 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., with occasional Saturday hours during peak holiday season, which would be about this time of year, October through December. Most importantly, the applicant has stated that any freight deliveries will only occur during normal business hours. Due to the proposed hours of operation staff does believe the proposed development agreement provisions, the screening method -- and the screening methods will be sufficient in mitigating any negative consequences of the proposed use. Staff did not include any specific provisions to limit the hours operation, because, again, it is adjacent to the residential district, so they are limited by code from 6:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m. If Commission finds it needed to limit it further you have that purview. Designed floor plans do show compliance with all specific use standards for the proposed flex space as discussed with Centerville. That includes the percentage allowed to be warehouse and the percentage allowed to be office, retail -- well, office and, then, retail -- there is comments in there. The loading docks and -- oh, sorry. The applicant is proposing two loading docks and one roll-up door for the building. All three of those do face to the east and are located at the south end of the site. Code requires that they cannot face a residential use, so they are complying with that code section. In addition, I would like to note -- I did not put this in my outline, but the -- any kind of heavy truck traffic is not

anticipated. It is my understanding that they currently don't do business like that, but they are showing this for potential future growth. Most of their deliveries -- from what I heard 90 percent of them occur with the UPS, USPS kind of trucks. Smaller trucks that are not going to be nearly as loud as a 53 foot truck and trailer. Regardless, they are proposing loading docks for some future expansion or larger shipments that they may or may not have. Staff does recommend approval of the requested annexation and zoning due to the proposed use and site design. In addition, staff does find it very important to keep local businesses like Red Aspen within the city where they started. With that I will stand for any questions.

Seal: Turn on my mic now. Thank you. At this point would the applicant like come forward. State your name and address for the record and if anybody else wants to speak on behalf of this, please, have them do the same. Thank you.

Moore: Amanda Moore. 389 East Pisa Drive, Meridian. 83642.

Reese: Genie Reese. 1308 East Holly Street, Boise, Idaho. 83712.

McKinney: And Jesse McKinney and our business address here in Meridian is 989 South Industry Way, Unit 102, but we are very excited and hoping to be annexed in tonight.

Seal: Thank you. Go ahead.

McKinney: So, we are Red Aspen and we are a social selling beauty company based here in Meridian, Idaho. We just celebrated our fourth anniversary last week. Genie, Amanda and I founded Red Aspen. We -- we had just a little bit of money and we had a really big dream. We started out and we had pretty much nothing. We had barely two pennies to rub together and we are incredibly excited, because we are going to end the year at over 30 million dollars in revenue, which is really exciting for us. We support women. Our mission is to inspire women to stand up, stand out and stand together by uniting passion with purpose and we do that through our independent sales model where we utilize brand ambassadors, reps all over the country, of which we have about 10,000 nationwide to sell our beauty products, which Genie is going to talk just a little bit about right now.

Reese: Yes. So, we focus on what we like to call beauty solutions and I'm going to explain what that means to the lovely Planning and Zoning Committee here tonight. So, what is a beauty solution? It is a beauty product that saves time, it saves money, it's a salon replacement, so you don't have to go into the salon, you don't have to leave the house or get a babysitter. It's consumable and it's incredibly easy to demo on social media and online, where the majority of our sales reps, our brand ambassadors, do sell these products. So, we launched with six false lashes and since then we have expanded our product line to include pop-on nail dashes -- thank you, Amanda. At home tanning and clean color cosmetics. Today we have over 150 active views on our website and we custom formulation and development on every single one of these products, with some of our manufacturers even located here locally in Meridian, Idaho. So, our products are

small, but we have maxed out our current Meridian office space and we are excited about the potential to have space to grow.

Moore: So, Amanda, as our COO I am responsible for everything operations. I need to make sure we have a house for everything and that products get shipped out. We ship out roughly 3,000 orders a day from our Meridian warehouse here, but we are excited to have the opportunity to have everybody come together. We currently have two different addresses here in Meridian and we would love to combine into one. We were so happy and grateful for the growth that we have had and the fact that we could even have the possibility of staying in Meridian and not having to go outside is so exciting for us. We have over 60 people on staff right now all from throughout the valley and for us to keep a centralized location here in Meridian to support our team members that are in Boise, our team members that are in Nampa, we have so many jobs that we have been able to create to support even our local community here in Meridian, we are just so excited to be able to stay here with you guys. So, we hope you love our plan and our beautiful building and a little splash of pink out there.

Seal: All right. Thank you very much. Well, I was going to say at this point do you have any questions for the applicant or for staff? None? Commissioner Yearsley, anything? All right. So, at this time we will take public testimony and if anybody has signed up.

Weatherly: Mr. Chair, we have a few people signed up. I didn't catch everybody's name, so I want to make sure that I -- Amanda Moore. That was you; right? Genie Reese. Okay. And, then, Jesse McKinney. Okay. Perfect. Then Joshua Jantz.

Jantz: Good evening, Commissioners. My name is Josh Jantz with KM Engineering. Address 5725 North Discovery Way, Boise, Idaho. After the two pieces you have before you there is pretty much nothing else I can say. But I'm here to help answer any questions you have related to zoning or site plan specific. We also have Cornel, the architect, that helped out with the project here to answer any questions related to the building itself. Do you have any questions on it? Staff covered it pretty well, but --

Yearsley: Mr. Chair?

Seal: Commissioner Yearsley, go ahead.

Yearsley: I guess the one question that I have is are you in agreement with the staff report?

Jantz: Yes. Yes, we are in agreement with the staff report.

Yearsley: Thank you.

Seal: Okay. Thank you very much, sir. Appreciate it.

Dodson: Mr. Chair?

Seal: Joe, go ahead.

Dodson: Sorry? The -- before we close up their public hearing, the one thing I did notice doing my outline, I missed a condition I should have added and I request that the Commission add that and that is that the applicants obtain a property boundary adjustment prior to building permit. That the applicants provide a -- or obtain approval for a property boundary adjustment prior to building permit. That's because there is three existing parcels and to do what they are asking they can't do that. So, I'm just wanting to clear that out. Whether that means they combine them into -- three into one, I don't really care. Or if they move the lines in order to accommodate that, that's fine, because it can be underneath parking areas, but we can't have a building -- the property line underneath or going through a building. And I apologize to the applicants for missing that. Hopefully that's okay.

Seal: Okay. If there is no questions, does the applicant have anything left to say? Oh. Sir, go ahead. Come on up. Need your name and address and the floor is all yours.

Larson: Good evening, Mr. Chairman. My name is Cornel Larson. I'm the architect on this project. Larson Architects. Address 210 Murray Street, Garden City. Is that better? I thought I would explain to you a little bit on the building. We have -- we have a little bit of concern about shifting it up too far to the north, because our client really likes to have and would like to see a decent amount of land. So, that it could be beneficial. They planned on some logos that promote their company and things to be integrated into the landscape. We do want to move a certain amount up there, because we would like to have a little more turnaround room for the trucks on the south side. So, we will probably make a shift and we will work through that with staff if that's okay. The other thing -- there was a condition on page 16 under item eight that noted a 40 foot height limitation and, then, prior to that there was a condition that noted a 50 foot height limitation. We would -- in the C-C zone. We would like to stay with a 50 foot limitation. We are right at 38 right now. If we needed a mechanical unit or something up there and we want to make sure we can screen those, especially if they do extend the Linder overpass. So, if we could stay with the height limit in the C-C zone and if staff would agree with that we would like to do that. The other item we had that was a little bit of a concern was the uses are fairly limited on page 16 and if the building were to need to -- or if the Red Aspen folks would need to downsize in the future, if the economy changes -- or upsize, it would be really -- be really nice if we could add a clause or something that allowed us to add an additional use to that site, maybe through a conditional use or some other application, as long as that use was within the C-G zone or was permitted in that zone. And, again, I haven't talked to staff about that at all at this point in time. So, I apologize to them for that. And, then, we would also like to thank staff for helping us get to this point. We have been about three and a half, four months. The first time I met Amanda Moore she had jingle nails on, which if -- so, that was their Christmas promotion. It was nails and had little Christmas balls on the end of them and so they were planning ahead for Christmas at that point in time. So, they are looking ahead at staying in Meridian and enjoying Meridian. I also need to thank our neighbor to the south, Steve Smith, who is very willing to help us with a shared access to the site through his property and that helped solidify

the site, so that it worked for the Red Aspen folks and it would become usable for maneuvering back out onto Linder and being able to hit a stoplight and go two directions on Overland Road. Would be happy to answer any questions about the building or the site that you might have.

Seal: Joe, I will -- I will just ask you the question, so -- for the C-C zoning is the height restriction 40 feet or 50 feet?

Dodson: Mr. Chair, so the -- the requested C-G, which has a height limit of 65 feet.

Seal: Oh. Okay. Even better.

Dodson: I wanted to -- I wanted to limit that only because of the existing development in the area, including the residential to the south. Having a 60 foot or even a 50 foot building right there might be quite a lot considering even the other warehouses that are on the north side are not that large either. They are probably 30 feet, give or take. I understand the concern with any mechanical equipment. That wouldn't be part of the height limit. It would be any kind of buildable area, building area, and not necessarily the screening materials. The discrepancy of 50 and 40 feet is probably me not being smart enough to go through my analysis again and change that and, then, I did change a condition to say 40 feet. I'm amenable to 50 feet, which does correlate to the C-C zoning. So, that's why -- I know that's a lot here. That's why I messed it up. That -- that's -- I'm amenable to that. I think that's acceptable, in case they need something and they maybe want to add a second story of actual area and -- for additional office or something. I understand that. The other points were the --

Seal: Additional -- additional use, if they needed an additional use they would just have to file for a CUP and come back; correct?

Dodson: It depends on the use, I guess. I guess, Cornel, what would you guys need?

Larson: The thought was, you know, there is a list of approved uses in the C-G zone.

Dodson: Right.

Larson: But in the staff report you listed some very specific uses.

Dodson: Correct.

Larson: If we had a use that was in the C-G zone, not necessarily specific to your list, if we could process a conditional use application or something to allow the city to look at it, that might help us if in the future we need to change something on that site. Especially, if we are going to limit the site with a DA. We were just looking for a little more flexibility.

Dodson: Okay.

Parsons: Joe, if I may chime in. So, Mr. Chair, if I can elaborate where our thinking was on this particular restriction on the uses. This site's very challenged with access. I mean, you know, a future overpass is going to happen. It's imminent. At some point it's going to get built. We have planned for it. It's in our Comprehensive Plan. How that gets funded we don't know yet, but we are working on it. So, what we wanted to make sure we did -- what we set up this property to do is develop with the uses that, one, not only integrate it with the surrounding residential to the south, but also made sure that they could be successful there and, again, I applaud the applicant for wanting to be -- come up with creative ideas, but I don't think we have to. This is simply an annexation. If you guys feel that we don't need to restrict the types of uses that go on this property, you could simply just strike -- strike that from the record. A CUP just -- is not going to get you what you want, because they could either modify the DA, too, in the future. So, either way it's a public hearing, either before you or before City Council. So, again, I don't know what that gains us. If we want some assurances for us the assurances are the requirements in the development agreement and that can be changed as well. So, again, if you guys feel comfortable that Red Aspen will continue to grow and reach that 50 foot height limit, we are happy with that and you can certainly strike any of those use restrictions on the property and just allow the C-G zone to control.

Seal: Okay.

Starman: Mr. Chairman?

Seal: Yes, sir.

Starman: I echo what Mr. Parsons said in the last minutes or so on that is that -- that that condition that we are talking about will become a portion or section of the development agreement and so to give the applicant some comfort and the Commissioners, the applicant can always ask later for a modification to the development agreement and expand the uses at that point. So, there is a mechanism to accomplish that. So, that -- I think that may provide some comfort to the applicants here is that there is an opportunity to ask for additional uses respectively if the need occurs.

Seal: Understood. I mean -- I can't speak on behalf of the entire city, but I think supporting a growing business is going to be something that we would want to do as a city in order to keep that business here. So --

Larson: Thank you.

Seal: Thank you.

Larson: Questions?

Seal: No, sir.

Larson: Thank you.

Seal: Thank you. Appreciate it. All right. If the applicant has nothing further to add, then, I will take a motion to close the public hearing.

Wheeler: So moved.

Grove: Second.

Seal: It's been moved and seconded to close the public hearing for H-2021-0066, Red Aspen. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? All right. Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. THREE ABSENT.

Seal: All right. Commissioners, jump right in and let me know what you think.

Grove: Mr. Chair?

Seal: Mr. Grove, go right ahead.

Grove: I will just be first tonight.

Seal: Yeah.

Grove: Love that it's a Meridian company. Want to do whatever we can to get this forward. I like the project. It will be interesting to see how the overpass impacts this general area, but with this I think that that will be a good piece on that section. So, I'm in favor of this project.

Seal: Mr. Wheeler, go ahead.

Wheeler: Yes. Same here. I'm very much in favor of the project, especially since it's here in Meridian, wanting to stay in Meridian, want to help out with that. I felt like at your initial pitch I felt like I was on Shark Tank more than I was at, you know, the P&Z Commission here at Meridian. But I enjoyed the bravado and I enjoyed the enthusiasm. Just hopefully you can carry on and as you guys continue to grow and -- and expand. So thank you.

Seal: Commissioner Yearsley, you want to jump in?

Yearsley: I have nothing to add. I think it's a great project and I am glad that they are excited to stay in Meridian and we are glad to have them.

Seal: All right. I'm on the same line as that. It's nice to see a company grow and I have seen Ms. Moore in a previous life when we were both doing different things, so it's nice to see the success that's coming out of the company, both personally for people and for the company itself and the growth of Meridian. So, it's very nice to see that the need is there. With that, if anybody would like to take a crack at a motion, I am all ears.

Grove: Okay. Before I make a motion, Mr. Chair --

Seal: Go ahead.

Grove: Could I get some clarification on what we want to do with the -- that DA modification piece that you were talking about, Kurt?

Starman: It's the Commissioners' prerogative. If you want to eliminate that condition all together and rely upon the underlying -- or the zoning district itself, that's -- that's an option to you. I think my recommendation would be that -- there is some thought that went behind that condition, that my recommendation would be to include the condition, but with the understanding that things change, the applicant can come later to the City Council for a modification to the development agreement. I think the Council -- can't guarantee that, but I think it would be receptive to if the business is doing well and might need a modification, so -- but if you have any hesitancy about that I think you could eliminate the condition altogether and rely upon the zoning district to set the uses.

Grove: I got it.

Seal: You got it? Okay.

Wheeler: I did have a question of clarification if you are okay with that, Commissioner Grove. Joe, can you -- what were the limitations that were on that, if you can speak to those uses?

Dodson: Commissioner Wheeler, great question. Off the top of my head -- again I don't have my staff report in front of me. It was flex space, obviously. It was -- Bill is going to save my butt again. Thank you, sir.

Seal: Flex space we learned at the last one was just -- just a warehouse; right?

Dodson: Right.

Seal: Sorry. I couldn't resist. I just --

Dodson: I listed the -- allowed uses show flex space, a financial institution, healthcare, social services, information industry, personal and professional services, retail, including beer and wine sales. Restaurant. Research and development and vertically integrated residential. And I just noted that the applicant shall adhere to any applicable specific use standards for a future use for a proposed use. So, I thought that that was pretty exhaustive in the sense of what could potentially go here. The main point is a gas station would be a disaster. Restaurant probably wouldn't work financially anyways, because of the restricted access. Granted vertically integrated does allow that, but that's a whole separate discussion. And general warehouse, where it will be a hundred percent warehouse kind of thing, I believe that's already a conditional use within C-G anyways. So, we just wanted to eliminate that possibility, because we wouldn't just want a -- just a

warehouse here, you know, we would love the idea of -- of what they propose already with the flex space, with the office component for the business to continue growing there.

Wheeler: So, it would allow them to expand into more office space if need be, if they grow and hire and things of that nature.

Dodson: Absolutely. Absolutely.

Wheeler: That's my biggest concern on this one when they talked about some limitations, as Commissioner Grove.

Seal: And what was the condition for the 50 -- or the 40 foot height limitation? Do you know which one that was right off the top of your head?

Dodson: 8-A-B. Or 1-B. Sorry. 8-A-1B.

Seal: Okay. Just in case Mr. Grove wants to add that.

Grove: I wasn't planning on getting that specific, but -- after considering all staff, applicant, and public testimony I move to recommend approval to the City Council of file number H-2021-0066 as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of October 21, 2021, with the following modifications: That the applicant obtain property boundary adjustments prior to City Council and that the applicant works with staff to adjust the building location north to an agreed amount and that they address the height limit as presented in 8-A-1B.

Wheeler: Second.

Seal: Okay. It's been moved and seconded to approve Item No. H-2021-0066, Red Aspen, with aforementioned modifications. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? All right. Motion carries. Thank you.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. THREE ABSENT.

8. Public Hearing for Meridian South Fire Station & Police Substation (H-2021-0062) by City of Meridian, Located at 2385 E. Lake Hazel Rd.

- A. Request: Conditional Use Permit to develop the property with two (2) public/quasi-public uses to include an 11,650 square-foot fire station and an 11,550 square-foot police station on 4 acres of land in the R-8 zoning district.

Seal: All right. With that we will go ahead and move on to the public hearing for Item No. H-2021-0062, for the Meridian South Fire Station and Police Substation. That was a mouthful.

Tiefenbach: Alan Tiefenbach, associate planner with the City of Meridian. I was kind of hoping my project would be a warm fuzzy, too, but I'm not sure. Certainly one everybody will like. This is a conditional use permit to develop a roughly 11,000 square foot fire station, 11,000 square foot police substation, with some change on approximately four acres of land. Let's see. The site consists of four acres. It is now zoned R-8 in the city, located at 2385 East Lake Hazel. You probably will remember in April this property was annexed and zoned for the purpose of having a police station and the substation. There is an interagency cooperative agreement. So, we are going to look at -- on the left is what the site plan was that you saw when it was annexed. On the right is the site plan that is being presented now. So, it's very similar to what was approved. One of the requirements -- one of the conditions of approval is regarding having to build a collector road along the east. There is a cooperative development agreement with Brighton Corporation for that area. Brighton owns a piece of property to the east that went into effect when all this was annexed. Brighton would have to build that collector road. Fire -- or city knows that. They would have to build that collector road along the eastern property line down to a cul-de-sac at the southern property line. There would also -- they know they also have to build the pathways, which would be a ten foot wide pathway along the north and the ten foot pathway along the east. They are over their parking they are required. They have provided 32 parking spaces over what's required and three parking spaces for the fire engines. One I guess correction is -- I noted previously that there was a condition to make sure all existing residential structures be removed. Stacy with the city was kind enough to let me know they were already removed, so that condition -- you could keep it, but it is not necessary. Really, the only issue -- and I'm not even sure if I would call this an issue -- is that there has been some changes in the elevations from what they were to what they are now. If you look at this, this is what was presented with the annexation and you can see they had some -- the -- the building materials showed CMU and it had some texturing to it and there was that -- the sloped roof with the exposed timber frame and some different accents. Not sure if it's a cost issue or not, but we have gotten to a much -- more of a basic design. I'm just raising this to let you know that they are going to still have to work with us -- we are going to have to work with us, basically, to make sure that we meet all of the requirements of the architectural standards manual or there will have to be a design exception. Again, I don't really want to get into the weeds to this, I'm just for the record noting that this may not meet all the architectural standards requirements. With that if you have any questions I would be certainly happy to entertain them.

Seal: All right. Thank you, sir. At this point would the applicant like to come forward? Is our applicant online? I didn't see anybody walking up.

Schubert: Sorry. I was muted. I'm online. Can you hear me now?

Seal: I think I hear barely --

Schubert: Can you hear -- boy. Can you hear me now? Sorry. I'm trying to talk as loudly as I can. Am I being heard? Is that better?

Seal: That's -- that's a little better. If you can turn things up on your end that might help.

Schubert: That's about as high as I can go right there. Hopefully that will work. So, I'm Mike Schubert. I'm with Rice-Fergus-Miller Architects. Our address is 275 5th Street, Suite 100, Bremerton, Washington. 98337. So, we just saw this as a -- the police and fire station that is proposed for -- next to Discovery Park to help expand the emergency services to this part of the city, as it is growing rapidly in this area. At the current time we have been -- the city has decided to no longer pursue the police station at this time. It will be -- the site -- they do plan on building a police station in this area, but at this time they don't have the funds to go forward. But the fire station, as originally put in our proposal, will continue. So, one thing I want to bring up is that we are slightly shifting our generator location to a central location within the site that is closer to the fire station, but will still allow for the same development to occur for the police station parking area. But, essentially, the fence line that divided the two apart is, essentially, where the property will not be developed at this time and the interim -- during this time the area will be filled with sod and it will actually be grassed and maintained by parks at this time. So, we have seen the staff report and are in total agreement with it. The -- the comments about the elevations -- we do apologize for the noncolored elevations. The -- the texturing that was going on is still occurring in the building. The -- the knee braces of the roof have been removed, but looking at the flat elevations do not look like the -- the three dimensional views that we see before, so -- but the coloration is very similar to this. It's actually -- they have gone to -- the fire department decided what they want is more of a beige and brown combination of block, as opposed to the gray colors. So, the colors are a little bit different. But the -- we will still have wood soffits that are underneath the eaves of the roof and the mechanical screening areas and at the -- the lower -- it's kind of shown at the lower right side is there is an additional screen that will be in a metal panel that -- those are in a -- what's called a brownish gray color. But we will be working with -- with the CDC to make sure that we -- we get all of that approved appropriately.

Seal: Okay. Thank you very much. Is there more you wanted to add?

Schubert: I guess that's kind of it, unless you guys got questions about it.

Seal: All right. Any -- any questions here for the applicant or staff? Commissioner Yearsley?

Yearsley: I have none.

Seal: All right. Okay. With that -- is there anybody signed up to give public testimony?

Weatherly: Mr. Chair, there is not.

Seal: Excellent. Thank you. Anybody here would like to come and testify on behalf? Please raise your hand or approach to microphone. None? Okay. If the applicant has anything -- do you have anything more to add?

Schubert: No, I don't.

Seal: Okay. If there is no questions, I will take a motion to close the public hearing.

Wheeler: So moved.

Grove: Second.

Seal: It's been moved and seconded to close the public hearing for H-2021-0062, Meridian South Fire Station and Police Substation. All in favor say aye. Any opposed? Okay. Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. THREE ABSENT.

Seal: Okay. If you guys have anything more to add or I will take a motion at this point.

Wheeler: Take a motion. Yeah. You got the last one; right? Commissioner Grove. All right. I will take this one. Unless Commissioner Yearsley has anything to add.

Yearsley: Who doesn't love a fire station. So, I'm on board.

Wheeler: Alrighty, then. Here we go. After considering all staff, applicant, and public testimony, I move to approve File No. H-2021-0062, as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of October 21st, 2021, without any modifications.

Seal: It's been moved and seconded -- oh, do I have a second.

Grove: Second.

Seal: Sorry. I got ahead of myself. It's been moved and seconded to approve Item H-2021-0062 with no modifications. All in favor say aye. No opposed. The motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. THREE ABSENT.

Seal: All right. Thank you, everyone, on that. Okay. Does anybody want a bio break before we go on to the next one? Yes. All right. We will take a five minute break and we will be right back.

(Recess: 8:36 p.m. to 8:43 p.m.)

9. Public Hearing for Village Apartments (MCU-2021-0008) by KM Engineering, LLP, Located at 2600 N. Eagle Rd.

- A. Request: Modification to the Previously Approved Conditional Use Permit (CUP-15-019) to update the conceptual development plan and elevations and eliminate the requirement for pedestrian and vehicular connectivity/crossaccess to be provided to the residential development to the north

Seal: All right. It sounds like we are ready. So, at this time we would like to open the public hearing for Village Apartments, MCU-2021-0008, and we will begin with the staff report.

Parsons: Thank you, Mr. Chair, Members of the Commission. I'm starting to get a complex. The room seems to clear out every time I have to present a project. I don't know if I should take that personally or not. But next application before you this evening is the Village Apartments. This is a conditional use modification. History on this property. It was before you in 2015 for a CUP for a multi-family development, consisting of 336 multi-family units contained within 11 structures and that was really probably -- this particular property that you see in front of you here. You can see the Comprehensive Plan has it as a mixed use regional. I would mention to the Commission that there is a commercial component that goes along with the multi-family, but it's not part of tonight's application. But it is tied to the overall project in a recorded development agreement that was approved in that same year. So, the site plan before you here is what was previously approved. As I mentioned, you can see how the -- the buildings were oriented on the site. Again, the applicant is here to discuss reorienting the site, changing the landscaping and open space and, then, also modifying conditions of approval that required cross-access -- pedestrian access and connect -- access to the property to the north here, which was the Veraso North project and because the way that site's designed out and there is an existing irrigation easement there, staff is amenable to removing that condition and not requiring any access with that northern piece. They do have access via Records Avenue through their own private street and, then, of course, with the commercial farther to the west, there is going to be cross-connection with that and, then, also with the multi-family development to the south they are tying into their parking lot as well. So, there is some additional accesses is being provided with the new site plan that I will show -- share with you shortly. So, here are the -- again, the -- the approved site plan and elevations. Typical garden style of what we see in Meridian. Again, mixed use regional designates 60 to -- six to 40 dwellings to the acre. So, the C-G zone requires a conditional use. So, they are just here, again, tonight to modify those items. So, here is the new plan that they are proposing. Now, you can see here they -- they maintain their existing access to Records Avenue and, then, you can see where they have oriented the buildings -- reduced the buildings, but increased the footprint. So, the unit count remains the same, but what's unique about the plan is they have more centralized open space. So, they have consolidated that. Provided more parking than what code requires. I would also mention to the Commission that this site is in close proximity to Kleiner. So, typically when we first analyzed this project back in 2015 we made the finding that it didn't necessarily need as much open space, because it had a regional park about 500 feet to its south. But the applicant, again, in this application, by reorienting the site and having larger buildings and a bigger footprint, has -- was able to get actually more open space than was previously approved. Again, staff is recommending approval of this site, because, one, it's oriented better and, two, it makes -- it's a higher quality development than the previous plan. I did receive written testimony from Derek, the applicant. He had some concerns about a condition of approval. If you can see my cursor here, around the -- the pool house are some covered structures and he was -- the way it's structured and the staff report Sonya had conditioned him to provide details for a gazebo. This isn't necessarily a gazebo, it's

just more of a covered shade structure. So, he's asked that we strike the word gazebo from condition 2-C. Staff is amenable to that as well. They will have to, obviously, go through certificate of zoning compliance and design review to work out those amenities as he goes through that staff level approval. In your hearing outline -- I'm not going to go through all of the amenities that the applicant is proposing, because it's in excess of UDC, but the code does allow you to determine whether or not they have adequate amenities for a development of this size. Again, as I mentioned to you, we have Kleiner Park directly to the south and, again, they are -- they are proposing a pretty great amenity package here, as you can see on the exhibit. So, with that one change that I just mentioned, staff is recommending approval and I will stand for any questions you may have.

Seal: All right. Thanks, Bill. Would the applicant might come forward. All right. Please state your name and address for the record and it's all yours.

Gasser: Good evening -- sorry. I will lean forward. Is that better?

Seal: That's -- that's perfect. Yes.

Gasser: Derek Gasser. 74 East 500 South, Suite 200, Bountiful, Utah. 84010. Good evening, Mr. Chairman and Commissioners. Thank you, Bill, for your presentation. We are here to request modification of the previously approved conditional use permit for the Village Apartments. As Bill mentioned in a little more detail on it, rather than doing 11 Garden style walk-up four story buildings, we would like to propose building six buildings, four story, with elevators. Those units would also have controlled access, which we feel is -- is a benefit. We feel this is a much nicer product. Like Bill mentioned with the location next to Kleiner, with what CenterCal has done with The Village, we feel like this type of product is -- it fits the land, the area or the location, better than your traditional garden style walk-up product. We -- Sonya put in -- or staff put in a condition for a play structure, a children's play structure, and we are -- we are agreeable to that. I think with that if -- if there is any questions we can answer.

Seal: Anybody have any questions for the applicant or staff?

Wheeler: I do.

Seal: Commissioner Wheeler, go ahead.

Wheeler: How many -- staff, how many -- or I guess the applicant can also answer this one, too. But has there been any increase or decrease with the number of units overall, even though that the buildings have changed? It's all the same?

Parsons: Yeah. Mr. Chair, Members of the Commission, unit count is exactly the same. 336-336. So, no change to that.

Wheeler: Okay.

Seal: Any other questions? Mr. Yearsley, do you have anything?

Yearsley: Not at this time.

Seal: Okay. Thank you. With that, if you want to take a seat or just see if we have anybody signed up for public testimony.

Yearsley: Sorry, Mr. Chair. We do not.

Seal: Okay. Anybody in the audience want to testify? You can raise your hand. All right. Seeing none, do you have anything else to add now would be the time.

Gasser: Mr. Chair, Commissioner, thank you for your time. We -- we do feel this is a superior product and we are excited to build it. Thank you.

Seal: Excellent. Thank you. We will take a motion to close the public hearing.

Wheeler: So moved.

Grove: Second.

Seal: It's been moved -- moved and seconded to close the public hearing for Village Apartments, MCU-2021-0008. And one point here is when you make your motion it is to approve or disapprove tonight, so -- or approve or deny. We are the deciding body, not the recommending body.

Wheeler: Mr. Chairman?

Seal: Go ahead.

Wheeler: For the commercial aspect; is that correct, staff? That -- aside from the commercial aspect? There is -- there is a commercial component that's not going to -- that we are not approving tonight; is that correct? As far as my understanding.

Parsons: Mr. Chair, Members of the Commission, that is -- that is correct. That -- my -- my point with the discussion tonight is this is a phased project and this is one part of that phase. So, the commercial -- the applicant's working with ITD and adjacent landowners for some cross-access and -- and doing their due diligence on that part. So, really, they want to get ahead and move forward on the residential portion of their property at this moment.

Seal: Mr. Grove? You were reaching for the mic.

Grove: I was just going to motion, unless anybody had anything that they wanted to interject.

Yearsley: Mr. Chair?

Seal: Commissioner Yearsley, go ahead.

Yearsley: Bill, what is to the east? Is there -- is that residential? On the east side of that property.

Seal: Records, I believe.

Yearsley: I know, but on the other side of Records is that residential?

Parsons: Yes. Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission, yes. That's -- I believe that's a county subdivision across the other side of Records.

Yearsley: Okay. And, then, nobody has -- you know, they have been noticed and nobody had issues with the -- the bigger block of apartments facing Records is my understanding.

Parsons: Yeah. Mr. Chair, Members of the Commission, I did look at the public record this evening and no other testimony has been provided on this application.

Yearsley: Okay. Then I'm good.

Seal: Yeah. The only thing I will add is that this is an interesting piece of land and the commercial development has other implications that are coming in the future, but I like the overall layout of this and the way that it was changed. I don't like that Records is -- it's my secret way to get into The Village and the secret is out, so -- but at this point I will entertain a motion if somebody wants to throw it out there.

Grove: All right. Mr. Chair, after considering all staff, applicant, and public testimony, I move to approve file number MCU-2021-0008 as presented in a staff report for the hearing date of October 21st, 2021, with the following modification: To strike the word gazebo from Condition 2-C.

Wheeler: I second.

Seal: It's been moved and seconded to approve Item No. MCU-2021-0008, for Village Apartments with the aforementioned modifications. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Okay. Motion carries. Thank you very much.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. THREE ABSENT.

10. Public Hearing for Aviator Springs (H-2021-0065) by The Land Group, Inc., Located at 3235 N. McDermott Rd.

- A. Request: Annexation of 40 acres of land with R-8 (31.59 acres), L-O (1.64 acres) and M-E (6.77 acres) zoning districts.

- B. Request: A Preliminary Plat containing a total of 112 lots consisting of (93) buildable lots and (13) common open space lots on 31.59 acres of land in the R-8 zoning district, (2) buildable lots on 1.64 acres of land in the L-O zoning district, (1) buildable lot on 6.77 acres of land in the M-E zoning district, and (3) future right-of-way lots on 40 acres of land.

Seal: With that we will open the public hearing for Item No. H-2021-0065, Aviator Springs, and we will begin with the staff report.

Parsons: Thank you, Mr. Chair, Members of the Commission. Next item is Aviator Springs. The application before you is an annexation and preliminary plat. The site consists of 40 acres of land, zoned RUT in Ada county and physical address is located at 3235 North McDermott Road. There has been no history on this particular property as far as city goes and the current Comprehensive -- Comprehensive Plan designation is mixed use neighborhood. If you looked at the planned development map here, you can see how many other additional residential developments have occurred in this particular area. So, the applicant is here tonight to discuss with you annexation of 40 acres, again, with R-8, and which is approximately 31 acres of land, an L-O zone of 1.6 acres of land and an ME zone, which is 6.7 acres of land. They are also requesting to develop the site with 93 residential detached homes at a gross density of three dwelling units to the acre. To help kind of clarify density, if -- if the Commission -- may understand this, but typically in a mixed use neighborhood designation we anticipate densities between six and 12. So, this particular project tonight is under -- quite a bit under what we anticipate in this area and rightfully so. If you have had a chance to -- this particular project we spent quite a bit of time trying to analyze this for you as far as being consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. It's unique. It's -- it's different, because of the fact you have a school bounded by -- on its west -- western boundary -- boundary. You have an R-8 development already to the north of it that's developing with an existing street segment. You have a state highway that's going to be extended in bifurcating the property, which doesn't allow the project to really integrate as much as we anticipate in a mixed use neighborhood and, then, we also have property to the south that is a different, more intense land use designation. Although mixed use that hasn't come in yet. And so I can tell you in working on this particular property and also with the developer of the property on the southern boundary of this site, we were hoping they would all come in together, so that we could work out a lot of those things and make sure that we had a little bit better integrated project. But we are here this evening talking about this one. So, you can see here -- here is the pre-plat that the applicant is proposing. It's -- it's the same -- it's two phases. The first phase is the western half and, then, the second phase is the opposite side on the McDermott Road side of things and that's -- that's why we tried to present it to you in the staff report that it is -- it won't be integrated, because it's -- it's impossible. What the applicant's tried to do -- and they have done a great job and -- what we told them to do in order for them to garner our support, they really needed to justify it in their narrative when they submitted their application and I think they are doing the best that they can with -- with the limitations that they have on this site. But they are proposing two office lots, which are located along the western boundary here. One will be a future home

of an LDS seminary to go along with a high school. That's pretty typical here in Meridian. And, then, the southern lot they are hoping to deed this -- or dedicate it to Boys and Girls Club to have that other civic use here and, then, again, most of the residential type in here -- all of the residential lots in here are single family detached homes. So, typically in our mixed use zones -- or even in our comprehensive plans, we try to encourage a mix of residential types at a minimum. We try to have walkability. We try to have detached sidewalks and parkways. Providing some of those pedestrian scale elements and that's what the applicant's done with this application. So, you can see the walking path that runs along future Highway 16 and, then, also some additional walking paths through this MEW that ties into the commercial and ultimately gets to the high school to the west. So, as far as interconnectivity and trying to link all the uses together on the west side, staff felt that they have done a pretty decent job of doing that. Now, we did pose to you -- we have not recommended that they provide any additional residential types. That's something that certainly is within your purview if you think additional density is desired in this area. But I can tell you looking at the ACHD staff report, there are some access challenges for the Ada County Highway District as well. Not so much for the city. So, as this body knows when -- with the fire department you can have no more than 30 homes on a single access. But if you have secondary access, then, it's not really an issue and so down here in the southwest quadrant of the development the applicant was able to work with the school district and secure a secondary emergency access to allow them to move forward with their 93 homes. But if you have had a chance to look at the ACHD staff report, they have reached out to the city and -- me in particular, because I'm taking -- I'm covering this for Sonya this evening. But they are concerned with the number of homes taking access off of one entrance -- one public street access. So, their current policies say no more than a thousand vehicle trips on a local street access and because we don't have the property to the south coming in with the application, we only have a stub street, this -- this entire development really is stuck with one public street access that comes in north, runs east-west along the school site and, then, ties into this development and so they -- they have placed a condition on this development that they either can't develop anymore than 96 residential homes, which, again, this plat is 93, so I don't know where that 96 came from. Or they would not allow development on the Boys and Girls lot and develop -- or they restricted development to the Boys and Girls lot and, then, only allow up to 84 homes to be developed. So, I think this body -- at least the Commission should ask the applicant if they are amenable to ACHD's condition as one and, two, what are they willing to do to restrict further development from happening on this site, because, in my opinion, staff's opinion, they should probably adjust their phasing lines to make sure that they don't go beyond a certain threshold until such time as the property to the south develops. I think that's really really critical in this particular development, just because of all of the other constraints that we have going on here and it's something that we talked about, again, at all of the pre-app -- pre-application meetings. Is this the right time for this particular development given what's -- since we don't really have a lot of connectivity out here. So, again, the preliminary plat consists of 112 lots. Ninety-three of those are residential, two our office, and, then, there is that one ME lot over here that will develop. The residential portion is, again, 31 acres. L-O is 1.6 and the ME is 6.77. The applicant gave us a general concept for phase two, but nothing specific per se. So, we do have a recommended DA provision that they come back and modify that DA in the future when

they have actual development plan proposed for that future lot. They were amenable to that as well. As I mentioned to you, access -- this is the access here. You can see my cursor. This is the only public street access in here. Like -- I don't want to keep beating that drum, but it is something to be really cognizant of tonight is -- there is a lot of people that could potentially live out here with very limited access and I know that is a concern for our Fire Department, even though they do meet their requirements. So, I'm hoping this applicant can work with the property owner to the south and figure out an appropriate street segment in the future, some connectivity. We did receive written testimony from the developer of the southern property and he would like this stub street on this -- in the southeast corner to shift over a little bit farther to the east, so it aligns more with the development plan that they have -- or they want to bring forth to the city at some point. Applicant is required to provide ten percent qualified open space. The plan here, because of the abundance of open space that they are providing, they have 7.64 acres of open space, which is approximately 23.8 percent open space. So, a tremendous amount of open space for this particular development. If you also notice in the staff report to try to get some of those densities numbers up is we tried to make the justification that this really was a buffer to minimize the impact on the adjacent residential. So, we actually removed this buffer out of the requirement for the density and it did up the density slightly to 4.38. So, not a significant increase, but an increase nonetheless. And, then, there is also a minimum two qualified open spaces -- or qualifying amenities are required. So, the applicant is proposing a swimming pool, pedestrian pathways, an additional qualifying open space of 20,000 square feet and, then, also children's natural play area and they did give us some exhibits on how some of that would look and be developed along the state highway in that large green central open space area. Again, here is their -- their parking exhibit. I know that's pretty important to all of you, too, so they showed us how they could park all of these units. Again, you can see the circulation on the side and how it relates to Owhyee High School and, then, they also provided some proposed elevations. Again, because this is going to be visible from the state highway we are requiring that they get some level of review from planning prior to issuance of building permits. The other unique item associated with this is that staff is recommending a six foot berm with a six foot tall sound attenuation wall along the highway there and the reason why is because the project to the north, which is Chukar Ridge and, then, Gander Creek, which is farther north -- which is north of that development, the Commission was pretty consistent and they -- they wanted to see more sound -- sound attenuation along that state facility. So, staff felt that we should be consistent in those approvals, so we required the same thing of this proposed development. And, again, staff did receive concurrence from the applicant that they are in agreement with all conditions in the staff report. So, with that -- as I mentioned to you, Todd Tucker is here this evening to speak to you probably on the relocation of that stub street. But with that staff is -- is recommending approval of this application this evening and I will stand for any questions you may have.

Seal: All right. Thanks, Bill. Would the applicant like to come forward?

Adams: Good evening. This is Matthew Adams, 462 East Shore Drive, Eagle, Idaho. And I'm representing the applicant tonight. And I would like to share my screen. All right. Can everybody see my presentation up in blue?

Seal: Yes, sir. Thank you.

Adams: Excellent. All right. Thanks. I'm really happy to be here and very thankful that you allow for remote presentation. Appreciate that. It's been a long night, so let's think of this as a nice evening together discussing great community planning, rather than just a presentation. The Aviator Springs Subdivision -- I'm going to go over Comprehensive Plan alignment with you, the proposed project, why it's amazing. Community partners that it takes to put this project together. Then I would like to spend some time on the context and how it relates to the Fields Sub-Area Plan that you are actually going to hear next after my item. And, then, at the very end we do have some municipal code alignment items to share. Ultimately at the end of the day what we are requesting is approval of the annexation, rezone, the preliminary plat. So, I do want to say Aviator Springs is the right community at the right time in the right place and this is why. Really Aviator Springs embodies the 2019 Meridian comp plan. It is a premier community that is safe and secure, where people can live and possibly work, but at least easily get to work on the roadway network with Highway 16 and Ustick and thrive. We meet the evolving community goal of the comp plan, because we are adapting to change. This area was conceived as a neighborhood. The high school, the highway, various conditions have required that we adapt and present the best possible community we can in this area. Livability. We are promoting family friendly recreation for healthy living. We are focused on stewardship through natural systems. For stormwater, cooling of the air, and we are making a major focus in coordination with Fire and Police from Meridian city on promoting public safety through crime prevention environmental design standards. It's a vibrant community. We are maintaining the historic character of ag and the drain systems -- drain ditches in this area and we are also nearby creating good safe connections to vibrant activity centers that the school itself and the future park spaces in the sub area plan to the west and, finally, it's a connected community. It's safe. It's got efficient transportation. And we are working closely with ITD to ensure that Highway 16 to successfully move forward. So, as you can see we meet all of the intended goals of the Comprehensive Plan. So, let's talk land use for a minute. This is the 40 acre project and you are looking at it from the south. We are looking to the north and slightly to the east, with Highway 16 on the right side of the screen and, then, the high school would be on the left side and the residential project shown in yellow. This project is a mixed use neighborhood. We have got R-8 zoning. Residential. We have L-O zone for our civic uses of LDS seminary and the Boys and Girls Club, which we are very proud of. And we have ME zone proposed for the Acclima Research and Development facility on the east and we do provide the three unique zones that are required in the MUN land use designation. We are primarily a single family detached residential development, which is also MUN. The LDS seminary is more than just a place where some of the kids go during the school day, it really acts as a youth community center for many many children for a long long time and it is an anchor to the community. The Boys and Girls Club is very exciting as it's an opportunity for boys and girls to have some presence in the west end of the city, which they do not have right now, and it also creates a lot of great positive energy and positive interaction within this community and for -- you saw all the rooftops, the lots Bill showed on the image before. There are going to be hundreds of kids in this part of Meridian and a Boys and Girls Club is a great -- great opportunity for them. And, then, we have got Acclima as a

research and development center and an employment center, which is also exciting. It is impossible for us to provide a direct connection between the housing and that research and development and employment center. However, it does provide a really great buffer to the existing rural development and county sub that's on that side of the property and to the east of McDermott and when we had our neighborhood meeting the neighbors were quite excited about the arrangement of the uses on the site. And, then, I will point out you can see the little graduation cap. Of course we have the high school to the west. Now, we have got great pedestrian connectivity to that facility. Circulation is critical in communities. We have got the ten foot multi-use pathway that is on the east edge of the residential development within the buffer to the highway. We have got detached sidewalks, which allow you to have a great tree canopy and great walkability throughout the community and, then, again, we have the strong connection to the high school. We also have connectivity so you can get to the future elementary school, which is north of the high school. Again, as I said, we are partnering with ITD to ensure success of Highway 16. We have got roadway connectivity to the north and to the south. So, we are not land locking anybody. We are providing great connectivity. And, then, the last thing I want to say is there is a little purple kind of line in the bottom left. We have coordinated with Joe Bongiorno with Fire and we have recorded easements in place to provide fire access through the high school site to this property that will provide the secondary access until the public roadway system extends south to Ustick. We all wish we had access to south to Ustick, but this applicant does not control the property to the south and, therefore, we cannot dictate what happens there. And last let's talk amenities on this project. We have got pathways, which are safe and abundant in this property. We have got a pool and play field. The play field's clipped a little bit. You will see it more in future slides, but we have the pool itself with a lot of lawn space around it and a play field in that southwest corner. We have the high school itself and the elementary school. Those are amenities. Tennis courts at the high school. Large open grassy areas and the playground and open grass field with the elementary school as an amenity. And, then, we have this really great open space buffer on the east side of our project. Now, we are required to do a 35 foot landscape buffer between ITD's property and our homes. Well, I mean in reality that is not great, 35 feet from an expressway. What we have done is we have actually done a minimum of a hundred foot landscape buffer and, then, if you take from the nearest home to the actual pavement of the highway, we are at 200 feet. So, we have got a 200 foot buffer from the roadway itself. One hundred foot width of that is landscape and includes pathways, stormwater management and play features. Pathways. Really really great system throughout the park. These are some images of what these can look like, really, to demonstrate that we are servicing all segments of the community on the pathway system from young to old, families, kids, retired folks, et cetera. The pool. We are very excited about the pool. When you have kids between -- I guess four and 12, the pool is the prime spot and when you turn over houses and you keep little bubbles of kids moving in and growing up through communities, the pool stays active and it can be a great great amenity. We also have our playfield. There is extreme pressure on playfields throughout the Meridian community, for soccer, T-ball, flag football practices and we have got a nice large one acre spot for that kind of activity to occur. The open space on the east it will have some lawn or turf grass. Landscape. However, there is a large portion of it that is designed to handle stormwater and to be climate appropriate

and resilient, that we anticipate low water use or water wise, climate appropriate landscape. It will provide habitat, unique aesthetics, and it will minimize the maintenance. Important to us is the HOA inherits a landscape that is maintainable and that they can afford to maintain and intense areas of turf grass are not always affordable for a long time. This is also meant to really lock in or maintain the rural character that is slowly dissipating in this area. Play. We are really proud of the play features that we have come up with. Within that buffer we have created an unstructured play environment that is safe. So, the parents can send the kids out the front door, down to the end of the cul-de-sac and they can play in a space where there is no outlets, no street, and the parents don't have to worry about them. They can play in an unstructured way. They can climb on rocks. They can look for bugs. They can dig holes. This is free range kids in Meridian, Idaho. Very exciting. This is a view of what this play area could look like and you can see that the planting is not traditional mown grass, it's actually much better. It's an area where kids can find, again, bugs and butterflies and beetles and maybe even water snakes and everything else that it's fun to find when you are a kid. And we have got these great nontraditional features where the kids make up the game. The kids decide what they are doing. The kids decide what this means. They use their imagination and they can thrive here and stay healthy. All right. We do have some architectural character included. As Bill said, we need to follow the code, because we are visible from the highway. We do take that serious and we have got some different styles that we want to implement on this project. The one thing that I think can get lost in these projects is how many people it really takes to pull it off. It seriously takes time, effort, energy, investment and commitment from the City of Meridian, from West Ada School District, from ITD on this one in particular, from Ada County Highway District, from Nampa-Meridian Irrigation District, who we work with closely. From the LDS Church on this particular project. The Boys and Girls Club of Ada County. All of these groups have worked hard to bring this project to you tonight and I think that needs to be recognized. Also Lennar Homes. Jeff and Nick from Lennar. IAG capital. That would be Larry, Ryan, Wade and Brady. Those guys work hard and they let us kind of have free range with design, which we appreciate. And, then the Landreth team, Tyler, Chad, Jim, Kristin, Mike, Dan, Ben, Dustin, and Dylan, all have worked really hard to get this in front of you tonight. So, big big effort, big investment of energy and time. Context. The Fields Sub-Area Plan. We are going to -- in the following slide look down at this lower corner, which is Star Road on the left or west. McDermott on the right. McMillan on the north. Ustick on the south. We feel that we fit excellent -- or we integrate in an excellent way into The Fields Sub-Area Plan. That blue square is where our project sits. So, this is the land use plan. The star of The Fields Sub-Area Plan and that's where our projects sits and if you look at The Fields Sub-Area Plan, the higher density projects are appropriately placed near the center of the community, near the corner of the major transportation route. Higher density is not appropriate any longer in this location, because of the way the highway cuts through the project. This is the transportation graphic from the sub area plan and I should say thank you to the City of Meridian and Logan Simpson who helped us get these graphics together and let us use their graphics. We are connecting to all of the anticipated connectivity identified in that sub area. Economics. This is where they show kind of mixed use centers. Appropriately place that at signalized intersections, not backed up into the corner against the new state highway. Our project does provide economic activity and the high

school does and the Boys and Girls Club, but it would not be appropriate to have a major commercial development in this neighborhood. And, then, here is the park and pathways --

Seal: And in the interest of time we need to have your wrap up pretty quick. The timer is dinging over here.

Adams: You got it. This is the parks and pathways. We are connecting with multi-purpose pathways to all of the anticipated pathway system that goes to the west. All right. Really quick. Zoning. This is the zone. Bill showed you this. We are really proud that we are providing all three uses as required. We have got safe, efficient and connected circulation systems and we have paid a lot of attention to a great pedestrian connection to the high school. We can get a lot of kids walking. We are required to provide four stalls per housing units. That's in the garage and on the driveway. Not -- that's off street. That would be 372. This subdivision can park 400 -- 546. So, we are anticipating reality over the code regard parking. We are really excited that we have got 23.8 percent open space. Bill said ten percent required. I think the new code bumped that to 15. And, then, the amenity points in the new code we are required to have eight. We are providing 11. We have no objection to the ACHD staff report conditions. We have no objection to the Meridian Planning and Zoning conditions. And I will just finish by saying that this is really a partnership to bring 93 new homes to Meridian. It's fully integrated with the Comprehensive Plan and The Fields Sub-Area Plan. This is a premier community for a growing city. It's a family friendly community with great connectivity to activity centers. This is the right community, the right project, at the right time, in the right place. Thank you.

Seal: Thank you. Do we have any questions for the applicant or staff?

Grove: Mr. Chair?

Seal: Commissioner Grove, go ahead.

Grove: I guess the first question is for Bill. What's their general guess for the highway extension? I know they have said, but do you have a crystal ball guess?

Parsons: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission, I haven't been part of those discussions at all, so I don't want to speculate what it is, but I know there is momentum there, obviously, and there is funding being set aside for it. And as part of this project we actually have applicants, when they come in and annex, we have them set aside that lot as a nonbuildable, so when the time is ready ITD can negotiate and purchase that lot, so they can extend the highway and that's what we have done pretty consistently along that corridor. This applicant is required to do that, just like every other one, and it's conditioned appropriately. But I don't have a timing -- a time frame for you as to when that's going to be constructed.

Grove: Thank you. And, then, Matthew, I had a question for you. Is there a connection

between the -- between the LDS and the Boys and Girls Club? It looks like there is a sidewalk. Does that -- are you planning to have that connect into the high school property or does that terminate before it gets there?

Adams: That's a great question. Thank you, Chairman and Commissioner. We have -- so, we have a nice oversized sidewalk that takes you from kind of the south end of the community to the north end and provides access to the pool area, Boys and Girls, and the LDS seminary and, then, we have a five foot sidewalk that takes you into the high school site and we have coordinated with West Ada to have an opening in the fence, so the kids can cut -- go straight through and, then, there is a safe sidewalk connection all the way to the building entry as well.

Seal: I have got a quick question for you here. It looked like on one of the slides he had that the -- the bike paths actually joined into other existing bike paths.

Adams: Yes. So, there is a requirement -- code requirement that along all state highways or expressways -- I don't know exactly how it reads -- that you have to do a multi-purpose pathway. So, Chukar Ridge has a multi-purpose pathway and we are connecting and extending that southward. And, then, it's our understanding that Gander Creek will also have some connectivity. So, you should be able to take pathway systems to the north and, then, we do connect to the west on our sidewalks system and get you out to Owyhee Storm, so you can get into the -- the heart The Fields Sub-Area Plan. So, as far as we know we are connecting everywhere we need to and we are compliant with the pathways master plan.

Seal: Okay. Quick question on -- there seems to be a glut of swimming pools. Would you be willing to consider something more of a water feature type park, instead of a pool? Those just seem to have a lot more longevity.

Adams: Yeah. I think -- I'm not the decision maker on that, but I can definitely take that back to the developer, the client, and see what they think on that.

Seal: Thank you. Mr. Yearsley, any questions?

Yearsley: I know Bill had brought up the activity -- the connectivity right now. ACHD has their condition that they would like. What is your plan for that -- meeting that condition? Are you going to build your 96 -- or 93 homes first or be less and do the Boys and Girls Club? What's -- what was your plan with that?

Adams: Thank you. Good question, Chairman and Commissioner Yearsley. What we -- right now we need to meet and talk with the Boys and Girls Club. So, we got the staff report on Tuesday and so we haven't had a chance to meet with everybody. But they need time -- they have accepted the donation, but they need time to fundraise and come up with a plan; right? So, it is likely -- most likely scenario that they won't be ready to construct until there is connectivity to the south. So, right now our plan would be to construct the 93 homes. To plat the lot for the Boys and Girls Club, but have that lot be

conditioned that you can't construct there until there is public roadway access to the south. We need to meet with them. If they are fast tracking and they got a huge donation tonight, because of this amazing presentation, then, we would -- we would consider and look at that and -- and what it sounds like is we need to be able to present at the Council level what that plan is. So, it can be in the DA and not be kind of vacillating around. It feels like it needs to be pinned down at the DA level.

Yearsley: I agree. And I have reservations of 96 lots dumping out into one street right now. So, I -- I think something needs to be looked at very closely on how best to work.

Seal: All right.

Grove: Sorry. I had one more question. Bill, I'm not real familiar with the ME. Is that something that we have a lot of or have some of in -- in Meridian and, if not, like can you give me like a 30 second rundown of what that means.

Parsons: Certainly. Happy to try to explain it to you, Mr. Chair, Members of the Commission. So, ME's -- there is some of it in the Ten Mile area and when you look at the broad definition of that -- it's a commercial zone and in that it's -- it's meant to be on collectors, arterials, great access for research, development, office type uses and that's why the applicant's requested that zone. And given the -- what he's -- what they have explained to us at the pre-apps -- pre-application meetings and everything, it seems like this -- this Acclima is -- it's just that, they actually test sprinkler systems and grow things and try to manage water conservation, if I'm not mistaken. Matt could probably give you more details on that. But to me it seems to kind of -- that's the one thing that I think intrigued staff, was that we are keeping with our heritage of having agriculture and keeping some of that out in this area I think makes a lot of sense, just given the fact that that's what everyone's asked in the Comprehensive Plan. How do we preserve open space and keep it going and this seems to be like a unique situation to do that and that's why we felt comfortable at least allowing ME to go, but we want to make sure -- like I said in my presentation, we wanted to make sure that we at least have the development team come back with a development agreement modification when they are ready to actually construct on the property, so it doesn't get sold or something else occurs and we end up not knowing what -- and we end up giving too much away. We want to make sure we have a detailed plan for that property before anything happens on it.

Grove: Thank you.

Seal: Mr. Wheeler, do you have questions?

Wheeler: I do. Thank you, Chairman. I'm with Commissioner Yearsley on this. Just wanted to see just some more thoughts out on the connection part of it, too. And, then, the other thing that kind of strikes me a little bit is the playground areas up against the buffer that acts -- as a buffer next to a major thoroughfare. I'm just kind of thinking of, you know, semi trailers, things like that, that are going to be going by, equipment, things of that nature or just a lot of traffic at that juncture. So, I'm just -- I'm trying to get my head

around that, but -- yeah, that's kind of where I'm at on it.

Seal: Question, Bill, for the -- well, I guess is for the applicant or Bill. Do we have a good graphic of where the -- essentially, the fire road comes in on the adjacent property and what that looks like? I haven't -- I mean we have got kind of this thing that shows a pencil drawing of it, but do we have something that's a little bit more representative of exactly what a fire truck would have to go through in order to get there?

Parsons: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission, we don't.

Seal: I mean this drawing right here shows that we are going to go out into a -- you know, a football field area or baseball field. So, I'm just -- I'm kind of scratching my head on how a fire truck gets in there.

Parsons: Certainly the -- the Fire Department has provided comments on it. They support the secondary access and Matt's very aware -- aware of the Fire Department's requirements. So, that road is 20 feet wide. It has -- has to be able to -- capable of supporting 80,000 pounds and so I know Chief Bongiorno has looked at it and signed off on it. I did the sign-off on the high school when they opened up, did the inspection out there, and it's -- it's more open back there than you think it is. The irrigation district, if I'm not mistaken, don't they have their pump house back there, Matt, are somewhere in there as well.

Adams: Correct. It -- can everybody see my cursor?

Seal: Yes.

Parsons: It comes through, yes.

Adams: Okay. So, from Owyhee Storm Ave there is a dedicated fire lane and driveway access that comes south of the high school building and, then, there is a dedicated -- it's actually an easement and a sewer maintenance road, as well as maintenance access that comes through and, then, there is -- there is two turns for the fire truck. So, they come straight in, two turns, and they are right into the neighborhood -- right into the community. And we -- Joe is great, because Joe makes himself available. We can run ideas back and forth. We can show him all this and he -- he is quick to say no if he's not okay with it and, then, he is -- he is also quick to say yes once we get him something he is satisfied with. So, from Owyhee Storm we have good, clear access through established fire lanes on the high school site and, then, we have this in here. We also have an easement agreement between the high school and the school district and this developer that runs with the land that protects and maintains that as an open route and it requires that it be maintained properly for the fire department to access through. So, we are really -- really confident that this does provide access. I want to say we are not going to be built out until 2026 on these homes and it would be great if some things could happen where we get public roadway access, but if that doesn't happen this does meet Fire Department requirements.

Seal: Okay. Thank you. All right. If there is no more questions, public testimony? I think we have one person signed up.

Weatherly: Mr. Chair, indeed we do. It's Todd Tucker.

Seal: Just need your name and address and --

Tucker: Good evening, Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission. My name is Todd Tucker. I represent Boise Hunter Homes. Business address 729 South Bridgeway Place, Eagle, Idaho. 83616. So, we -- we are actually the landowner of the property directly to the south of this subdivision and we are in support of this application, actually, but we do have one -- one minor request that we wanted to get on the record. I did submit a letter last week, but just wanted to provide public testimony as well in the verbal form. So, we did submit a development application about a year ago for the property directly to the south of this and we are currently working on some revisions to that -- that -- that development plan. But in either scenario we provide, with our development -- or anticipate providing with our development a frontage road, we would call it, that actually runs parallel to State Highway 16. So, we -- we actually have some of the same concerns that, Commissioner Wheeler, you hinted at a little bit with -- with common area, play area next to a highway. We understand that that is -- that that's part of the -- the code and what's been required of the other developments. We have a little bit different feeling about how that should function. I have lived here for 15 years now. I have never seen one person ever walking on Eagle Road. Never once. And I have also never seen anyone walking on Highway 84 either. I-84. I have never seen anyone ever walking along that way. They do have sound walls. They do have developments on the backside. I did a quick search today, just to kind of look on I-84 to see if there is any pathways anywhere near I-84. I couldn't find one anywhere in the valley. So, we have a little bit different view. We think that it's a better design and safer to run the street and have the street function as the buffer along Highway 16 and that provides more developable space, more area for usable open space within the development. So, our -- our meager ask is really just that they -- they are providing a stub street to the south that would connect to our development, which is great. It's -- and it's almost in perfect alignment, but we just request that that be moved approximately 40 to 45 feet to the east, so that when we come in with our development proposal that those projects could align and we would have a better connection in that area. So, I will leave that with you. That's -- that's our testimony. I will keep it quick, because it's been a night -- long night for everyone. So, that concludes my testimony.

Grove: Mr. Chair, can I ask a question?

Seal: Absolutely.

Grove: Mr. Tucker, a question. I'm not great with geometry, but are the -- I mean it looks like there is room on your project and where they are proposing that they can somewhat align. It doesn't look like it's that far off. Is it -- is it possible to -- is there an agreement to come to or is it kind of a black or white scenario?

Tucker: No. Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Grove, I think we could work with the applicant to the north and come up with a solution. He actually reached out to me when I submitted the letter and -- and had some questions about the 35 foot buffer and he's like I don't want to -- really want to redesign this, unless the city is on board with your design and so you are right, I think with a little bit of a give on their part and a little bit of give on our part I think we can make it work pretty easily and not negatively affect either one of our developments.

Seal: I got a question real quick, so -- I had a question on the bike paths and everything connecting to the north. It looks like with this configuration the bike path is just going to end, so -- and I will let you know that's one of my pet peeves, because I live in an area that has some beautiful biking paths that go nowhere. So, this seems to be one of them. How -- how is that going to be -- it's not your project, but if they -- if the road does align the way that you want it to align, how is that bike path going to continue on through?

Tucker: Sure. Mr. Chairman, I think, you know, with -- with a public road we are going to be required to provide sidewalks. This is a situation where we could provide maybe a wider sidewalk that would accommodate pedestrians and bikes -- bicyclists. It is going to be a public road. But, like I said, I think we can make some flexibility and to move some stuff around, so that we would have that connectivity of bike lanes, pedestrian pathways and it would all work. It may transition from a pathway to a sidewalk, but still it would be a dedicated area for pedestrians and bicyclists.

Seal: Thank you. Anybody else? No one else signed up.

Weatherly: Not that I see, Mr. Chair.

Seal: Anybody else want to raise their hand and come forward on this one? No? All right. With that if the applicant would like to come back up -- come back on. Do you have any closing remarks?

Adams: I do. Can I share my screen again? And I will -- let me just start as if that's coming up, but -- so, the play -- the play area, it's not near the highway. It might seem that way. It is on the west side of a six foot berm, with a six foot solid wall, which that wall is over one hundred feet from the highway itself and there are neighborhoods all over Boise that are dramatically closer than that to I-84 and different highways. We have a great separation here. It's very safe and that east buffer is incredible. The play area is -- so, the top of the wall has to be 12 feet above the centerline of the road. That's your code. And so that's why you have a berm and a wall. And, then, our play area is kind of depressed down. So, the play area is down where you don't get the noise, you don't hear the sound, you don't hear through the wind. You can't -- there is no flying debris. We are safe and protected. The second thing is -- that I want to emphasize is 93 families can walk to elementary school, walk to parent-teacher conferences, walk to the special events. The field day at the end of the school year, which is awesome. You can walk to the football game, which would be awesome, too. So, that's -- as the way we all drive now, that's like 180 cars off the road, because every family needs at least two to get to a

football game. And, then, I do want to say on the south road alignment, Todd did send that letter. We responded back immediately. Absolutely. We can coordinate. I hate when the streets have little kinks in them or don't align. I am confused. I don't think you can do a six foot berm, wall, and a multi-use pathway, which is in the Meridian City Code and put the road up against ITD. However, if that all works out, we will shift and angle and align our road, so that we have connectivity between the two projects. We think that's just as important as the neighbor does. And I think that's -- that's about all I would like to cover. I can answer any other questions if you have any.

Seal: Okay. Thank you. Is there any additional questions for the applicant or staff? All right. With that, if anybody wants to motion close the public hearing.

Wheeler: So moved. Your turn, Nick.

Grove: Second.

Seal: All right. It's been moved and seconded to close the public hearing on Item No. H-2021-0065, Aviator Springs. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Okay. Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. THREE ABSENT.

Seal: Who would like to go first with comments or a motion?

Grove: Mr. Chair?

Seal: Commissioner Grove, go ahead.

Grove: I really like a lot of the pieces of this project. Just kind of starting off, the -- the ME is something different. I think that's -- not a huge piece of what we talked about tonight, but just in general I like that. The play area was something that really stood out to me on this project. It is something completely different that we don't normally see. It's not just the standard, you know, green and blue metal tot lot and so I like the creative pieces to it. Also getting some of the other pieces in this with the L-O, you know, Boys and Girls Club and LDS seminary, but great additions to making this a mixed use area and providing some different community pieces there. And I like the -- the thought process behind integrating their design concepts to purposely tie into a larger area, especially in relation to some of the family design features that they are wanting to incorporate. It's really cool when somebody takes -- you know, they have 40 acres and they have donated some of the land. So, I think that's pretty cool. And I don't see a lot of issues with this, it's almost because of the site constraints this to me feels similar to some in-fill projects almost and so that's kind of how my head has been thinking about this as I go forward.

Seal: Commissioner Yearsley? Commissioner Wheeler?

Wheeler: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Seal: Go ahead.

Wheeler: Yes. And I like the -- I like these tie-in projects next to schools a lot. I live somewhat near Mountain View and it is neat to see all of the attraction for residential mixed use development that starts to fill in all around it and how that becomes a fantastic place and actually kind of a hub for light office, commercial, like you say in walking distance, things like this, and taking more vehicles off the roads. That matters a lot, especially during those high commuter times when school starts and when they are traveling -- when they are traveling and so I -- this project to me -- I like that it's just -- it's different to see that playground area next to the Highway 16. I did think -- I saw that as creative for sure, but I'm kind of -- to me it's -- it's kind of unique to see it right next to a major arterial, with walkways and playground equipment close to it. It's just a little different. I'm not saying that it's wrong, not saying that it can't be done, it's just -- just my head goes sideways just a little bit to kind of look at it, but I like the creativeness of it. Thanks also for clarifying the fire access on that and to realize that that was just a couple turns and they can be there quickly. So, thank you.

Seal: Commissioner Yearsley, do you have anything to add?

Yearsley: You know, this is a tough site, even with the access to the south -- or to the south it still has very limited access and -- and -- but -- but, again, you are -- you are kind of constrained on two different sides to provide access. So, I am really concerned about access and about the -- you know, how it's all arranged. It -- to me it doesn't feel like it flows very well to get out of there and I think ultimately it's going to have traffic problems trying to get out, even with the south access. But I do like the open space. I do like the connectivity with it. I'm okay with the density. I don't think we want to -- especially in that area to try to make it a higher density back in there. I don't think it fits, but -- but with that I am in favor of the project.

Seal: Thank you. And I'm along the same lines there, so I'm a little concerned with the access, especially with the road being in a high school, because when I was in high school I never parked anywhere I shouldn't have, of course, like all high schoolers, but that is a little concerning for me that that's the secondary access in there, especially with a seminary and a Boys and Girls Club going in. So, I do like the layout and the concept of it. I like the fact that it has a lot of walking paths, open space, bike paths, that -- that's kind of unique. I'm glad to see that that's going in. I'm glad to see more of it happening in Meridian. The one concern I do have -- and I kind of wish this was coming in together with the southern property, especially if the southern property is a lot of multi-family, is there is going to be a lot of people in this subdivision that are not going to be happy about sharing all those things with multi-family establishment. So, we continually battle that. But that's probably for another day to come in here, so -- but that is a concern looking forward on this. But outside of that -- I mean I agree it kind of feels like in-fill where if this doesn't go in there what will. You know, I mean a business isn't going to survive back here. It's going to be residential. So, I think with the low density like this, with the open

space it has, is about the best fit we are going to have for it. With that I will entertain any motions anybody would like to make. Not all at once.

Parsons: Mr. Chair, I had one clarifying comment for you.

Seal: Go ahead, Bill.

Parsons: I did notice on the applicant's presentation that they were requesting to get one building permit for the seminary or -- so they can get that under construction and, again, it is something we have done with previous projects, so if that -- I know they are in a hurry. I have been working with the architect that's doing the seminary project and in a hurry to get that built, because of the high school and so staff is amenable to that condition, if you want to add that they are able to get under construction with the seminary prior to recording a plat would -- would appreciate it.

Grove: Mr. Chair?

Seal: Commissioner Grove, go ahead.

Grove: Bill, with that do then -- do we need to condition anything else with that, like roads or sidewalks or --

Parsons: Yeah. They -- they will have to bring all of that in as part of their development. So, absolutely. All of that access that you see from -- from here in will have to be completed to make that happen.

Grove: To make the seminary ready.

Parsons: Correct. Yeah. We want to get that connectivity and everything built out there.

Grove: Okay.

Seal: Commissioner Grove. Motion maker tonight.

Grove: After considering all staff, applicant, and public testimony, I move to recommend approval to the City Council a File No. H-2021-0065 as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of October 21st, 2021, with the following modification: That a building permit -- what Bill said is included and they are able to move forward with the seminary.

Yearsley: I will second that.

Seal: All right. It's been moved and seconded to approve Item No. H-2021-0065, Aviator Springs, with the aforementioned modifications. All in favor say aye. Any opposed? All right. Motion carries. Thank you very much.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. THREE ABSENT.

Yearsley: Mr. Chair?

Seal: Yes.

Yearsley: I move -- I move we adjourn.

Seal: We are not quite done yet.

Yearsley: Oh, we -- we have one more? I thought this was the last one. My apologies.

Wheeler: We will let you do the last motion, since you haven't done any today.

Yearsley: All right. I was getting excited.

11. Public Hearing Continued from September 16, 2021 for Fields Sub-Area Plan (H2021-0047) by City of Meridian, the Location Consisting of Approximately Four (4) Square Miles and Bounded by Chinden Blvd. on the North, McDermott Rd. on the East, McMillan Rd. on the South and Can-Ada Rd. on the West

- A. Request: Comprehensive Plan Text Amendment to incorporate the Fields Sub-Area Plan.

Seal: All right. And we like to pick on Caleb, but I mean that -- that's just going too far. All right. We would like to -- at this time we will open up the public hearing for Item No. H-2021-0047, Fields Sub-Area Plan, which was continued from 9/16/2021 and we will start with staff report.

Hood: Thank you, Mr. Chair, Members of the Commission. If you don't mind I'm going to pull this down, so I can talk and a little bit easier to hear. So, I'm Caleb Hood. Brian McClure is here as well. We have 48 slides, but just because Commissioner Yearsley is in such a rush we will go ahead and, you know, make sure we run through each one of those, so don't worry, you don't have to listen to me the whole time, Brian's going to take about half of them, so -- no, we don't have 48 slides. So, as you -- as you mentioned, Mr. Chair, this has been continued from your September 16th agenda. You asked us to meet with the applicant, discuss some of the concerns they brought to your attention during that meeting and we have done so and I know there is a letter and we have members in the audience that will address you, so I won't go too much into the detail, but we have met with them and good -- good productive meeting and thanks to Brian and -- and the Mark Bottles team for -- for putting up with us as well. So, there is a -- there is a letter in your packet and Brian will touch on some of the details, but I do want to spend just a second setting the stage a little bit more. This project is something that the City Council did ask us to -- to take forward as a continuation of the Comprehensive Plan that was adopted in December of 2019. I need to stop calling it the new Comprehensive Plan, because it's almost two years old now, but it's still relatively new, but they did want us to put a finer point on some of the existing land uses that were adopted with that plan and

go through the specific area plan. So, we retained the services of Logan Simpson to help us craft the specific area plan that's before you this evening and the text of that plan was -- well, the plan itself will be adopted by reference in the text of the Comprehensive Plan. So, that really is the request we have for you tonight is to amend the text of the Comprehensive Plan. Brian's going to summarize a little bit more of what the plan is, but I want to just remind you what this isn't or doesn't do and they are on the slide there, but this is not a future land use map amendment. There was some conversation last month about that. We aren't proposing to change any of the map designations on the future land use map. Again, we are -- this -- the intent of this plan is to put a finer point on the existing map designations. And, then, we aren't proposing to annex any property with this. So, if you are eligible for annexation, this doesn't change that at all and, again, we are just trying to provide some of those details. So, again, without belaboring the point, we believe we have done what you have asked us to do. Brian's going to, again, summarize a little bit more, just because it has been a month, but we are asking for your support tonight and I will turn it over to Brian, unless you have any questions of me.

Seal: No, sir. Thank you very much.

McClure: Thank you, Caleb. Good evening. This slide here helps to provide some geographic context. I'm putting this up front this time. The image -- the image shows the region, the location of the Fields on the left and, then, the adopted 2019 future land uses on the right. As Caleb previously mentioned, the future land uses drive -- are driven by the Comprehensive Plan and these drive densities and more broadly the uses in the area and we are not touching those. As we discussed at the last hearing, the Intermountain Gas liquefied natural gas tank is a big deal. That's called out for reference and the Williams pipeline runs past it. Northwest and southeast through the city. The candy striped line on the -- on the east -- right side of the image there, is the future State Highway 16. You had a question for Bill earlier. The answer to that is next summer. So, they -- they are expecting to start construction on that soon. Now, there is three different -- three different phases of each -- of each project. They may start this -- the north part, the south part, or in combination, but they are going to move on it. That -- State Highway 16 will only have crossings Ustick, Chinden, McMillan, and Five Mile Creek within this area. As previously mentioned, they are moving forward. Star Road down the middle of the area has a river crossing and is planned for five lanes. ACHD is actually going to be making some bridge improvements to support that here in the upcoming years. They are working on the design right now. I probably neglected this area a little bit too much in the last meeting, so I will just try again here. The purpose of this plan is to ensure that the Fields area implements the vision of the Comprehensive Plan and is vibrant, self sufficient and distinctly Meridian. All the unique location, specific circumstances and challenges in this area are opportunities when consistently channeled and furthered within the context of the plan. Said another way, the sub area plan is about the relationship and integration of uses, with a key focus on central neighbor -- on a central neighborhood center, services and accessibility. Finally, a large part of this plan is just how we accomplish this and most of that comes down to money and partnerships. We have already had two discussions with the Council on that point. It was kind of a quick recap. Next up is a specific text amendment request and, then, some recommended changes to address the various

plans. A big request, as Caleb mentioned, for Commission tonight is to adopt the Fields Sub-Area Plan by reference into the Comprehensive Plan. This is what that looks like. It goes on page 3-3 of the -- of the beginning of that document. Along with a text amendment we have some recommended changes to the draft sub area plan. These are a result of discussions and comments with other agencies and stakeholders and specific to the sub plan -- the very plan itself. The first group of recommended changes were either included in the staff report or recommended at the September 16th hearing. Specifically we had a few changes to address some comments by COMPASS. We continue to recommend those. The second group of changes came as a result of Commission's requests to meet with the Mark Bottles team and after the last public hearing. Staff believes these changes address some of their biggest concerns by making it clear that the defined vision isn't tied to a specific solution. There is flexibility in how we reach the goal and, hopefully, these changes not only alleviate stakeholder concerns, but serve as a reminder for future entitlement and development decisions. All these changes, except those to address COMPASS comments, were included in the memo on 10/15 that we sent last week. We will step through these quickly in reverse order. This, again, is a new change. These were covered in the memo and, again, came as a result of working with the -- Mark -- Mark Bottles team. The block of text here shows and describes the wants and needs for the main street concept within the Star-McMillan center. The purpose of this section is to provide the vision and describe need, but not intended to be prescriptive. The only will statement included in the text was not brought up as a concern, but has been revised to help in consideration during future review by others. There are many ways to approach these concepts and ideas. There are many ways to respond to the needs and goals. Nevertheless, staff believes that the strength in the underlying text address stakeholder concern, clarify that they aren't explicit or prescriptive in all conditions and does so without undermining the need for a clear vision with appropriate context. We still want the main street. We still want to make use of the pathway integration and we still need an intensity of uses that provide for the geographic consolidation that many of the services that the existing and future stakeholders will need and want. This slide here was not an original stakeholder request. The recommendation by staff came about in discussions with the Mark Bottles team about the types and balances of uses. This small area of the yellow product identified as housing, it's highlighted in pink, now shown as purple, near the central commons. That could have just as easily been purple, which is why we are revising it. The mixed use allows for housing. Simply stated, the reason we changed it is because we want to continue to convey that there is flexibility. Showing specific buildings of similar sizes and specific color sort of lends itself to -- well, that we were being specific and we really weren't. The graphic shown here has been revised since the original was presented to Planning and Zoning Commission as part of the September 16 public testimony. After several iterations by the Bottles team, staff is recommending the concept shown as an additional exhibit in this draft Fields Sub-Area Plan. The balances of use -- the balance of uses, which is very important, is generally supported in more detailed concept by the project consultant, but also conveying to future decision makers that there is flexibility in the final design. A future development application would still need to be considered as a plan text. Elements such as integration with linear open space, authentic pedestrian experience, and so on. Basically a main street. The October 15 memo goes into this first bullet point quite a bit,

but, stated simply, this wording does not disallow any materials. That was the original primary concern in public testimony. The next step would be to better define this and related policies for the Fields area. Many of the materials listed on page 420 in those action items of the sub area plan can be really cool. Unfortunately, they are also frequently abused when you consider our administrative design review process. It provides a fast lane for review that meets minimum level of effort and, then, if you want to be innovated you go through more traditional design and discretionary review process. For the second revised action item, 411, the one on the bottom there, staff and the project consultant are fine with removing that one. The future land use map already does this. If you don't want to meet the density -- the plan density ranges you can apply for a map amendment. These changes are not addressed in the staff report. So, these are the older ones by COMPASS and I neglected include those in the memo last week. But we continue to recommend those, so if you make a motion to recommend the approval of this, please, consider the slide here. And these are all just clarifying comments to address the COMPASS comments. This screen and the next are both in the staff report and the memo sent last week as part of the staff recommendation. I won't linger here. This language is all intended to provide more context on why some of the information is there and why it's important. This page is more of the same. This, again, was all in a staff report and in the memo. So, that's the abbreviated presentation. Staff recommendation is to consider all the changes outlined as presented and included -- includes the original request in the staff report, the changes to this COMPASS comments and additional changes in the 10/15 memo. We are happy to revisit context and slides from the previous meeting or to respond to any questions.

Seal: Thanks very much. Do we have any immediate questions? Mr. Wheeler, go ahead.

Wheeler: Thank you, Chairman. I'm sorry, I missed your first name. I apologize. Brad? Is it Brad?

McClure: Brian.

Wheeler: Brian. I'm sorry. Brian. I'm still learning things here. So, thank you very much. So, Brian, on the -- on the map amendments -- or not the map amendments, but all the verbiage and things like that, you said that there was like a letter that was attached to it; correct? That's going to be added in on it; is that correct?

McClure: I'm not sure I understand that. I apologize.

Wheeler: Is there -- that was -- that was added to it; right?

Seal: Right. Essentially that's -- everything that he's come through tonight is addressed, essentially, in the letter that -- that was submitted, with the exception of what he has listed here as the post 19/16 -- or 9/16 memo.

McClure: So, Commissioner Wheeler, yes. So, there was a memo sent last week on the 15th that identified all the changes that we just showed you, except for the ones from

COMPASS, which I added to the slides here tonight.

Wheeler: Okay. So, that was the one that was saying that's going to be part -- okay.

McClure: But those ones were from the previous public hearing as well. So, they have been reviewed by -- before. Or considered anyways.

Wheeler: Okay. I guess I had a couple questions about some -- some of the changes on there. Like one of them had to do with -- yeah, you can -- if we can keep on going back a little bit to one of the further slides, because I kind of took a look at this, too. Yeah. Go -- we can start right there. And just kind of thought through it. One of them was -- I remember one of the comments that was made was right here, which you guys struck here was the two to three story mixed use buildings. That was something that they -- that -- that some of the stakeholders were like, hey, this is something that might hurt development or something along those lines. I'm trying to envision myself going through some of the other developments around, like even in Meridian, and thinking about going through -- like even The Village and thinking of walking in and seeing single story, you know, just brings kind of a different aura to it and so -- but seeing something that's larger that has kind of that facade stone on it just kind of gives it a different kind of a feel and so I'm kind of curious on what was the -- what was kind of the thought on why we -- why we don't want to have two to three story mixed use buildings in that pathway or that driving path there.

McClure: Commissioner, thank you for the question. So, the intention is to still have some of that. The original language -- the stakeholders felt that it implied that in all conditions that would be there and that was not our intent. It still needed to -- to -- some of it still needed to generate the intensity of uses and the opportunities for all the services we are looking to support, but it doesn't necessarily need to be there all the time either and so the way that's captured now is down below where it basically says -- I lost it. Authentic opportunities for retail or office on the ground floor and residential and/or office uses above. So, we are still encouraging that, we are just not requiring it at all conditions, which was never the point in the first place.

Wheeler: Okay. All right. That sounds good then. And, then, we can go ahead and bump forward just a little bit here. I'm just trying to make sure that I'm understanding some of it. Go ahead and go forward again, if you don't mind. I'm -- one of the graphics there. Yeah. I think this was something that some of the other testimony kind of spoke -- spoke about was some of the -- just really high density dwellings or zoning in this mile by mile block in this area specifically, that it didn't kind of phase down to single family dwellings, that it didn't phase into something different than just exclusively apartment style or very dense residential zonings and I understand that the stakeholders have interest on that, too, but what about the -- you know, some of the other testimony that was given on that about, hey, can we try to spread out some of the density that's in these areas and things?

McClure: Commissioner Wheeler, again, thank you for the question. So, as we said

before the land uses here are adopted as they are, they do have a range they are seeking. Part of that is very purposeful, because through -- part of the analysis that the consultant did was to understand what sort of rooftops we needed to support the center that we were looking for. It is envisioned that we have some medium high density residential out here, including multi-family. However, those plans did not depict those in all areas or -- and did not indicate that they weren't transitioning. You can have a variety of product types in the medium density residential, including things like patio homes or townhomes or row homes. There is an opportunity for a lot of diversity in housing out here. It doesn't have to be multi-family. I think you would expect to see more of that in the urban housing or close to the road, but we are not setting that right now. We have concepts and things could happen that way, but we still have the policies in the Comprehensive Plan that fall back on to -- which say things like transition.

Hood: If I can just build on that for one second. I want to go just back -- put that in context a little bit more, because this was also I think something -- the scale of that last graphic kind of gets lost a little bit when we are zooming into that area so much and I want to just put that, again, in context a little bit. It doesn't look like this mouse can do it. But, Brian, if you can kind of just highlight what was just on the screen, when you are talking here, it is just, basically, that brown area right there. So, we are talking four square miles. This is that much of one of them. So, there is density here, but when you look at it overall, the vast majority of it is still medium and low density residential. So, I just want to put that scale back into context for you that we are not talking, you know, a huge community or a square mile of higher density, we are talking about the neighborhood center and the scale of that here in that area.

Wheeler: Okay. Okay. That helps me out on that, too, then. Thank you very much. But is there going to -- so, they can, obviously, have some of the high density apartments there and, then, they can transition that out, like we have seen a couple times tonight, even with like the patio or row homes, is that -- as it goes down further into the mile block, so to speak?

McClure: Commissioner Wheeler, there is lots of ways to transition with roads and landscape buffers and creeks and pathways, than just having different size homes next to each other. The comp plan certainly speaks to having a transition of uses, though, and the land use plan requires a transition of uses just by having them stagger like that. So, it doesn't concern me at all, but --

Wheeler: Okay. And, then, yeah, go forward if you don't mind, please, again. Okay. So, I -- that makes sense, then, on that other one there with the limited single family development on that. That sounds good. Is there a reason -- but it also let me speak to the other thing that's crossed off there on the very top there -- or composition siding into commercial structures. Was there a reason why composition siding was something that didn't want to be used in this?

McClure: I'm not trying to blame the consultant, but I'm not really sure. It's -- it's -- it's a pretty common material and it's probably overused and I think the desire was to have

something elevated and more distinct and not just have a primary material be that. The only way to require that as is, though, would be to specifically put that into a development agreement, because you get to our administrative design review process, is not one of the disallowed materials. So, it's sort of a -- it doesn't do a lot, unless -- unless the Commission and Council want to get really specific.

Wheeler: Good. Good. Okay. And, then, just if you don't mind moving it forward again, please. That's fine there. And, then, just one more time, please. Yeah. I think those were my -- really just my biggest questions that I had in that use there. So, thank you.

Seal: Commissioner Grove, do you have something?

Grove: Yeah. I was just going to provide Commissioner Wheeler with a little more context for the -- some of the planning that went in three, four years ago or whenever it was. But looking at this four square mile area, the comprehensive planning committee spent a lot of time on this -- these -- this section in looking at how to make sure that there was high density areas close to the expressway and being able to also tie into the school system with the high school and the elementary and keeping it close to that area and making sure that it didn't end up, you know, just a sea of single family housing and so that was a big piece that came up multiple weeks during that two year process.

Wheeler: Thank you. Then -- yeah. And that was, I guess, some of my leaning in to try to understand this. We did get the paperwork to take it home, took a look at it, you know, to try and understand it and a lot of it for me was just to make sure that that intent that was originally done there isn't getting, you know, pushed out or getting moved to where all of a sudden, as something has a first splash in this area, that that's going to set a tone and, then, it's going to be the tone that we are all going to want to -- hey, kids, look over there instead when you are driving by it or it's just not going to give the feel that we wanted in this area and so that was some of my -- more my questions were at was just making sure we weren't getting off too much -- or at least from my perspective getting off too much of where the initial intent was and what the vision was that -- when everybody was going through that, so --

Seal: Commissioner Yearsley, do you have anything?

Yearsley: Nope. I'm good.

Seal: Do we have anybody signed up for public testimony?

Weatherly: Mr. Chair, we do not.

Seal: Anybody in the audience would like to come up? No? With that, Caleb, do you want to close or -- all good? All in all good? Excellent. At this time can I get a motion to close the public hearing.

Wheeler: So moved.

Grove: Is this a public hearing that we need to close? Okay. Second.

Seal: Okay. It's been moved and seconded to close the public hearing for Item No. H-2021-0047, Fields Sub-Area Plan. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Okay. Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. THREE ABSENT.

Seal: Anybody have any additional comments or motions? Mr. Yearsley, you can throw one out there.

Yearsley: Are we approving this or recommending --

Seal: Then you can get onto your next one. I know you are in a hurry for that, so --

Yearsley: Are we approving this or recommending approval to City Council?

Seal: I think we recommend approval to City Council on this and the graphic that's on the screen will be helpful in making a motion.

Yearsley: Hold on. I'm trying to juggle screens.

Seal: That's okay.

Yearsley: After considering all staff, applicant, and public testimony, I move to recommend File No. H-2021-0047 as presented in the staff report to City Council -- recommend approval to City Council for the hearing date of today with the following modifications: To include the original staff report changes. Add COMPASS changes and the post 9/16 memo changes.

Wheeler: Aye.

Grove: Second.

Seal: Okay. It's been moved -- moved and seconded to approve Item No. H-2021-0047 Fields Sub-Area Plan with the aforementioned modifications. All in favor say aye. Any opposed? Okay. motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. THREE ABSENT.

Seal: Commissioner Yearsley, I just want to say thank you very much for stepping back in tonight and helping us make quorum. We really appreciate you doing that.

Yearsley: My pleasure.

Wheeler: I second that.

Seal: And -- and with that if you would like to make a -- make a motion.

Yearsley: Mr. Chair, I move we adjourn.

Grove: Second.

Seal: It's been motion and seconded to adjourn. All those in favor say aye. Opposed?
All right. Motion carries. Thank you all.

Yearsley: Thank you.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. THREE ABSENT.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 10:20 P.M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS.)

APPROVED

RHONDA MCCARVEL - CHAIRMAN

_____|_____|_____
DATE APPROVED

ATTEST:

CHRIS JOHNSON - CITY CLERK