

A meeting of the Meridian City Council was called to order at 6:10 p.m., Tuesday, January 26, 2016, by Mayor Tammy de Weerd.

Members Present: Keith Bird, Joe Borton, Genesis Milam, Luke Cavener, Ty Palmer and Anne Little Roberts.

Others Present: Bill Nary, Jaycee Holman, Bruce Chatterton, Warren Stewart, John Overton, David Jones, Bill Parsons, and Dean Willis.

Item 1: Roll-call Attendance:

Roll call.

<u> X </u> Anne Little Roberts	<u> X </u> Joe Borton
<u> X </u> Ty Palmer	<u> X </u> Keith Bird
<u> X </u> Genesis Milam	<u> X </u> Lucas Cavener
<u> X </u> Mayor Tammy de Weerd	

De Weerd: Thank you for being here. Sorry we are getting started late, but welcome to our City Council meeting. I'd like to welcome the Rocky Mountain High School football champions for joining us here tonight. It's okay if you clap. Item No. 1 is roll call attendance. Madam Clerk, will you, please, call roll.

Item 2: Pledge of Allegiance

De Weerd: Thank you. Item No. 2 is the Pledge of Allegiance. If you will all rise and join us in the pledge to our flag.

(Pledge of Allegiance recited.)

Item 3: Community Invocation by Troy Drake with Calvary Chapel Meridian

De Weerd: Item No. 3 is our community invocation. Tonight we will be led by Pastor Troy Drake. He is with Calvary Chapel here in Meridian. If you will, please, join us in the community invocation or take this as an opportunity for a moment of reflection. Welcome.

Drake: Hello, Mayor, Council Members. Let us pray. Lord God in Heaven, just want to -- on behalf of the city express our gratitude towards you that we have this country, this state, this city where we can live and work and play in freedom, God. So, we just appreciate that so much and we just ask for safety for the citizens tonight and, Lord, that you would root out evil and protect our law enforcement officers, God, so that we can pursue the dreams that we desire and, Lord, also I just thank you for these people here that serve you, Lord, tirelessly and I just pray, God, that you would bless them, God, that they would do like your Prophet Micah said, that they would -- that we humbly serve you, God, and we just thank you for them and pray that you would give them wisdom here

tonight as they work through these matters of business of the city and I pray that you would bless them for their time and their efforts and you give them just supernatural wisdom to accomplish your will. So, we appreciate you, God. We appreciate them. And it's in Jesus' name we pray, amen.

Item 4: Adoption of the Agenda

De Weerd: Okay. Item No. 4 is adoption of the agenda.

Bird: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mr. Bird.

Bird: Under 6-G, the resolution number is 16-1116. Under 9-A the ordinance number is 16-1670R. And we would like to add Item 11, which is an Executive Session as per Idaho State Code 74-206(1)(a), which is to consider hiring a public officer employee, staff member or individual agent wherein the respective qualities of individuals are to be evaluated in order to fill a particular vacancy or need. This paragraph does not apply to filling a vacancy in elective office or deliberations about staffing needs in general. And with that I move we approve the amended agenda.

Borton: Second.

De Weerd: I have a motion and a second to approve the amended agenda. All those in favor say aye. All ayes. Motion carried.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Item 5: Proclamation

A. Proclamation for Rocky Mountain High School Football State Champions Day

De Weerd: Item 5 is under Proclamations. I will move down to the podium. It's taken us a little while to get our high school champion football players here to celebrate their big win as our state champions and so I would like to invite them forward at this time to come join me as I read the proclamation. So, come on up, guys. Okay. I have two proclamations here. One has listed all your names and that's not the one I'm going to read, because I know I will mess every single one of them up. But I will tell you that it will be listed in our minutes for the history of this day and so if you ever want to send your grandchildren back to say I was at this City Council meeting, I had a day named after me and my name is in the records of the city, you can do that. So, I will give that one to your coach, but for now I will read this proclamation. Whereas being a Rocky Mountain football player is more than tackles, yardage, kickoffs and touchdowns, it is training to build leadership, character, confidence, teamwork and resilience, all traits that are needed to succeed on the field, in the classroom and in the real world and whereas the Rocky

Mountain football team's overall record for the 2015 season was 11 wins and one loss, and whereas their hard work and teamwork resulted in recently winning the 2015 state championship tournament for football, the first in the school history and whereas the capturing of the state title builds school spirit and allows these student athletes to walk the halls of Rocky Mountain High School with a little extra swagger and whereas the leadership, training, and discipline of their coaches helped all team members to focus their talents and passion to becoming a winning team and each player making a valuable contribution to their victory, therefore, I, Mayor Tammy de Weerd, of the City of Meridian do hereby proclaim January 26, 2016, as Rock Mountain High School football state champions day in the City of Meridian and call upon the community to join me in congratulating the Grizzlies on their remarkable athletic achievement for representing Meridian so proudly in the state championship. So, if you will all join me in congratulating these young men. And I'm going present this to your coach and ask for a few words on behalf of the team and if you would all be interested, we'd love to have you introduce yourself, the position you play, and what grade you're in. And so, coach, I, with honor, present you this proclamation and along with our congratulations on this tremendous feat and so proudly representing our community.

Criner: Thank you very much. Appreciate it. First of all, for all the hours and hours and hours of work that our coaches, our players, our parents have put in for this to come as an honor -- an additional honor for this football team for all those hours is fantastic. It's something that will be with us forever and they will never be able to take that away and I thank the City of Meridian, the Council, the Mayor, for giving us this consideration and we have got one down and we are going to work to get another. All right?

Perez: I'm Devon Perez. I'm a senior and I played cornerback.

Shaw: I'm Jacob Shaw and I play receiver and I am a senior.

Belderrain: I'm Tyler Belderrain and I'm a sophomore and I played safety.

Nyirakomini: My name is Moses Nyirakomini. I'm a senior and I play quarterback.

Alibergic: My name is Nino. I'm a kicker and I'm a senior.

Roper: My name is Jake Roper. I play running back and I'm a senior.

Dalmas: My name is Jonah and I'm a junior and I'm the kicker.

Walters: My name is Roshawn Walters. I'm a senior and I played safety.

Page: My name is Trent Page. I play quarterback and I'm a freshman.

Black: My name is Will Black. I'm a senior and I play safety.

Gillespy: I'm Ryan Gillespy. I'm a senior and I play receiver.

Ewing: My name is Tucker Ewing. I'm a junior and I play receiver.

Peewee: I'm Peewee. I play outside linebacker and I'm a junior.

Blackstock: I'm Bailey Blackstock. I'm a senior and I play cornerback.

Robinson: I'm Caleb Robinson. I'm a junior and I play center.

Novakiny: I'm Austin Novakiny. I'm a junior and I play safety.

Frazier: I'm Kyle Frazier and I play outside linebacker and I'm a junior.

Tuccindardi: I'm Joey Tuccindardi. I play defensive lineman. I'm a sophomore.

Freeborn: I'm Keeghan Freeborn. I'm a sophomore. I play left guard.

Sever: My name is Reece Sever. I'm a senior. I played outside linebacker, middle linebacker and defensive end.

Nawahine: My name is Gavin Nawahine. I'm a junior and I play D end.

McKernan: I'm Blake McKernan. I play fullback and I'm a senior.

Rinker: I'm Alex Rinker. I'm a senior. I play receiver.

Redd: I'm Zach Redd and I played center and I'm a junior.

Allegood: I'm Parker Allegood and I played tight end and I'm a senior.

Wetherell: I'm Den Wetherell. I'm a defensive lineman and I'm a senior.

Kraft: Josh Kraft. I play wide receiver and I'm a senior.

Jacobs: I'm Connor Jacobs. I'm played offensive right guard. I'm a junior.

Perkins: I'm Thomas Perkins and I play quarterback and I'm a junior.

Blaser: I'm Christian Blaser. I'm a senior and I'm quarterback.

Mitchell: I'm Ryan Mitchell. I'm a senior and I play corner.

Tia: My name is John Tia. I play safety and I'm a sophomore.

Parendo: My name is Andrew Parendo. I play D line and I'm a senior.

Shelton: My name is Cordell Shelton. I play corner and I'm a junior.

Piper: My name is Jake Piper. I'm played wide receiver and I'm a senior.

Wood: My name is Connor Wood. I play right tackle and I'm a junior.

Hill: I'm Tamir Hill. I'm a freshman. I play D line.

Martin: I'm Taylor Martin. I'm a senior and I play middle linebacker.

De Weerd: If we can get all of you here for just a quick picture and, then, we will excuse you. But I would say -- this is the kind of group that I group up in. My father was a football coach and so kind of used to the chaos, but also know the hard work and discipline that it takes to have a championship team. So, big congratulations to this group. Okay. On the count of three let's do it. One. Two. Three.

B. Proclamation for School Choice Day

De Weerd: Okay. Our second proclamation is on School Choice Day and I would ask those that are here to receive this to come forward. If -- we know how to clear a room. But if you couldn't -- I know. If you couldn't tell the -- the priority of youth and education in our community -- they just left the room. But it's with honor I read this proclamation. Whereas being a student is more than reading, writing, and arithmetic, it is developing leadership, character, confidence, and teamwork, all traits needed to succeed in the classroom and in the real world; whereas Meridian is home to a multitude of high quality diverse educational options, such as public, charter, magnet, STEM and home schooling from which parents can choose for their children and whereas educational variety plays a huge role in the success of all of our students, as well as greatly enhances the vibrancy and economic vitality of our community and whereas the leadership, training, commitment and discipline of our teaching professionals in all types of school settings offer the highest quality education possible for our children and whereas on January 27th many will rally together to fill the steps of the statehouse to show their support and favor school choice. Therefore, I, Mayor Tammy de Weerd, do hereby proclaim January 27th as School Choice Day in the City of Meridian and call upon all of our citizens to recognize and appreciate the value and importance of educational variety for our youth and for our community. So, I sign that this day and look forward to presenting this to Krysten Counts. I will present this to you and --

Counts: I'm really thankful for school choice, because I grew up with a very difficult childhood and having school choice really blessed me and going to Cole Valley has really pushed me to my full potential and to show that you may struggle, but the outcome is greater and so I just thank you all for coming tonight.

LeClaire: So, my name is Briana LeClaire, I'm executive director of the Idaho Federation of Independent Schools, which is Idaho's statewide private school organization, and I would like to -- well, I will let the rest of the folks up here introduce themselves, but I just

want to say that we really appreciate the support of the city and our of mayor. This means a lot that the City of Meridian considers school choice and private schools to be of so much importance that they would declare this. So -- come up here and say hello.

Bartelsen: Hello. I'm Mary Bartelsen and I'm here because with my kids we have done every kind of school choice you could do.

Lockhart: I'm Jean Lockhart. I'm the board chair of Federation of Independent Schools and I also work at the rescue mission and we are excited about school choice, because the kids who come to the rescue mission are always struggling in school and having options always helps them.

Norton: My name is Greg Norton. I'm from the Sheridan Academy. We are on Overland and Eagle. I encourage you to come by and say hello, check out our school. High school and junior high.

Wilson: I'm Leigh Wilson. I'm the executive director for Sheridan Academy and what he didn't tell you is he is also the founder of Sheridan Academy.

Den Hartog: I'm Lori den Hartog. I'm the senator for District 22, which is part of Meridian, and a proud supporter of school choice. My kids go to Nampa Christian and I think there are a lot of opportunities and a lot of different ways that we can educate our kids. Thank you.

De Weerd: I will point out that this weekend I wore my Cole Valley Chargers T-shirt and so had even a comment on it on Facebook.

Item 6: Consent Agenda

- A. Indemnification Agreement with The Sundance Company for Use of 2100 S. Silverstone Way, Meridian, Idaho for 5-9 Police Training Event**
- B. Professional Services Agreement with Daniel Borup For Fabrication And Installation Of Meridian City Hall Plaza Artwork for an Amount Not-to-Exceed \$36,100.00**
- C. Approval of Task Order 10050.b to MOUNTAIN WATERWORKS, INC for the "WRRF CENTRATE MODIFICATIONS - DESIGN" project for a Not-To-Exceed amount of \$146,975.00**
- D. Approval of Task Order 10517.a to THE LAND GROUP, INC. for the "WILLIAM WATSON-BAINBRIDGE PARK - DESIGN" project for a Not-To-Exceed amount of \$80,960.00.**

- E. Sanitary Sewer and Water Main Easement for Cavanaugh Subdivision**
- F. Sanitary Sewer & Water Main Easement Decatur Estates Subdivision No. 1**
- G. Resolution No. 16-1116: A Resolution Approving the By Laws of the Meridian Historic Preservation Commission as Amended on January 14, 2016.**
- H. Approval of Twenty-Three (23) Development Agreements for South Meridian Annexation (H-2015-0019) by City of Meridian Located Along Amity Road, East of Linder Road, West of Eagle Road and North of Columbia Road for the Annexation and Zoning of 1,322.14 Acres of Land with R-4 (1,241.10 Acres), R-8 (10.37 Acres), R-15 (30.10 Acres) and C-G (40.57 Acres) Zoning Designations**
- I. Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law: Eagle Commons at Overland (H-2015-0024) by Eagle Commons at Overland, LLC Located Northeast Corner of S. Eagle Road and E. Overland Road Request: Execute a Development Agreement Required with the Annexation of the Property for the Purpose of Including a Concept Plan and Specific Provisions Relevant to the Development of the Property**

De Weerd: Okay. Item No. 6 is our Consent Agenda.

Bird: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mr. Bird.

Bird: I as stated before, Items 6-G, the resolution number is 16-1116 and with that I move we approve the Consent Agenda, for the Mayor to sign and the Clerk to attest.

Milam: Second.

De Weerd: I have a motion and a second to approve the Consent Agenda. If there is no discussion or questions, Madam Clerk, will you, please, call roll.

Roll Call: Bird, yea; Borton, yea; Milam, yea; Cavener, yea; Palmer, yea; Little Roberts, yea.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Item 7: Items Moved From the Consent Agenda

De Weerd: Item 7. There were no items moved from the Consent Agenda.

Item 8: Action Items

A. Public Hearing Continuing from January 19, 2016 for UDC Text Amendment 2015 & Meridian Design Manual Revamp (H-2015-0011) by City of Meridian Planning Division Approved

1. Request: Text Amendment to the Unified Development Code (UDC) as follows:

- a. UDC Sections: Definitions; Residential Dimensional Standards; Fencing; Structure and Site and Multi-Family Design Standards; Common Open Space and Site Amenity Requirements; Specific Use Standards for Drinking Establishments, Flex Space and Home Occupations; Timelines for Signatures on Development Agreements; Subdivision Design and Improvement Standards and Other Miscellaneous Sections
- b. Reformat of the Meridian Design Manual Including Reducing Duplicate Guidelines; Removing Site Design and Transportation Related Guidelines; Emphasize Architectural Elements and Change the Name of the Design Manual to the City of Meridian Architectural Standards Manual

De Weerd: So, A-8 is a public hearing continued from January 19th on the UDC Text Amendment 2015 and the Meridian Design Manual revamp. I will turn this over to Bill.

Parsons: Thank you, Madam Mayor, Members of the Council, new Council members. I'm glad to be here this evening before you to hopefully get these UDC text amendments wrapped up at the beginning of the year. This project was continued from your December 15th, 2015, hearing for three reasons mainly and I prepared a memo for you that outlined what we were looking at this evening. One would be looking at our -- removing our R-4 dimensional standards or not moving forward with the proposed changes that I shared with you on the December 15th hearing. The Council directed staff to look at some other options for some creativity to our open space site amenity standards and, then, a previous council member also wanted staff to look into providing some language in the UDC for allowing transitional lot sizes being added to our UDC as well. As I have mentioned to you this evening, the -- this project is broke down into two requirements or two sections. One is item A on your agenda. The other item is B. On the first are the three items that I talked about and, then, item B were the changes to the design manual, which the previous motion on those changes were approved and supported by the Council at that time. So, tonight again I'm only going to touch on these three items that we talked about in my

memo. The Meridian design manual itself, Council approved those changes, so tonight is really just about item A on the agenda. So, I at least wanted to provide those clarifications to you. One other item that I would like to share with you is I wanted to thank Council for indulging staff and the BCA last week for continuing this item. We do have a representative from the BCA tonight to share his concerns or his comments with the letter that you received in your packet last week. So, as I mentioned to you when I presented to -- presented this project back on December 15th, staff was proposing some modifications to the R-4 dimensional standards. In particular we were requesting a 50 foot minimum street frontage requirement and a minimum lot size of 6,000 square feet. Some of the Council members at that time felt that was a stretch and the lot sizes were getting too small, getting closer to our typical R-8 standards. So, what staff has done -- and I did revise the table that accompanied the memo that I prepared last week, but we, actually, aren't even proposing to move forward with any modifications to the R-4 dimensional standards, so that currently is off the table. Staff also went even further and we also removed the R-2 dimensional standards. Again, that's something we discussed with the UDC focus group, but in staff's mind there weren't really -- our philosophy was -- on that instance was if something isn't broke why fix it. So, we really weren't hearing any issues from the development community as far as our minimum street frontage and lot sizes for the R-2 district. So, staff went ahead and removed that table as well and so we will leave that. We are recommending that those dimensional standards remain the way they are currently in the UDC. The other item that Mr. Rountree brought up at the hearing was -- and I think you have seen it probably over the last several meetings where the neighbors come out and they testify about transitional lot sizes adjacent to their subdivisions. Typically from a planning perspective residential to residential to us there is no transition needed. That's residential use to a residential use. We are more concerned with transition between commercial and industrial uses to residential. So, staff did not prepare any language to add to the UDC. We went back, we looked at the Comprehensive Plan. We feel that we have policies in place in that document that we can use as a tool and provide our development community the tools or the -- at least take a message forward from this Council that they are looking for that as part of their annexation and their subdivision projects and I think one thing that I have communicated to our staff that I will after this hearing is that when we pre-app with developers or even owners, that we need to let them know that this is a concern from the city that we do want you to take advantage and listen to the neighbors during your neighborhood meeting and provide some of those transitional lot sizes along the perimeter of your development and, then, go to your smaller lot sizes. It's, again, something supporting the comp plan and certainly sounds like it's supported by this Council moving forward. The last item came down to our open space requirements and we did have a developer that stood up and talked about just trying to get some kind of proportionate share of -- if I do this style of amenity can I offset my open space in lieu of that and at the time staff wasn't ready to move forward on any of those types of revisions, because we knew that would take a lot more work, a lot more effort, with the development community, city staff, and also our BCA partners and so what I have done this evening and I have outlined in my memo is I came up with two options. Now, keep in mind this isn't ready to be adopted tonight, it's merely just discussion points for this evening, but I would like Council to give me direction on if staff is at least piquing your interest or if there is something there that you see you want us to pursue that we can take

up with our next UDC text amendment, at least let me -- provide me with that feedback so I at least can get that out in front of the development community and get it out with our next round of UDC changes. So, to accompany my memo last week I did have option one for you to consider. Now, keep in mind these still need to be vetted and this is something that Mayor brought up last time as well, it's -- currently as you all are aware we require ten percent open space in the UDC for developments five acres or greater and so we realize that sometimes when an R-2 development comes in there are potential for more open space on the residential lot and so we had proposed some language at that time that said if you had a certain lot size -- an average lot size you wouldn't need to meet the open space requirements, but you would still have to meet the minimum site amenities requirement. We still see value in that. We have not -- might not necessarily want to move forward with that at this time, but in my option one I still kept that in as a viable option for us to look at at a future UDC text amendment update and so that provision is still here located on item A and, then, item B goes to something that we can entertain or -- again, this is staff's best guess at this point and it was brought up by that developer. So, for example, you have a large open space lot or an essential open space lot and on that lot you have a clubhouse, a pool, and maybe a tot lot. Well, at that point maybe there is -- there is an option to reduce your open space, because you have everything consolidated on one open space. The clubhouse can be used when the pool is not in session. You have a tot lot that can be used as well and, then, they can also recreate in the open space. So, this was our first look at saying, okay, if we do have that nice amenity package on one large consolidated lot maybe that does work, maybe we don't need that open space, because we can get everyone congregating at one central open space. And so what I have tried to do here is, basically, allow that, but, again, we don't want that open space to go below five percent. We still think there is a value to have a minimum open space in the code under this scenario and, then, under our qualifying site amenities I have highlighted which appropriate site amenities would count towards a reduction to your open space and the reason why I left it as determined by the director built into this is because, again, at annexation or plat we still want to leave that discretion open if we feel like this amenity package isn't meeting the intent of the open space or site amenity ordinance, we still want to leave that discretion to the director as part of our recommendation to the Planning and Zoning Commission and to the City Council and that's why I left it pretty open and I think in particular in talking with the development community there seems to be one of the amenities that they think is above and beyond your typical tot lot is a clubhouse and I agree, I mean certainly we can all agree here that there is a value to a clubhouse and to a pool and so I was trying to break it down and now these amenities that I represent here they are all in the -- currently in the UDC. There is no minimum size requirements at this time. That's something that we still need to explore. But we highlighted the clubhouse and here in this particular case I did add 500 square feet and this was something that I took up with our building department just to make sure what's a good -- what's a quality site with a minimum size we could see based on say a hundred acre subdivision or a 50 acre subdivision and this seemed to be something that would be a fitness facility, it could be incorporated into a clubhouse. Currently we do allow for a neighborhood business center and there are specific standards in our code that they would have to meet in order for that to qualify and, then, going back to the swimming pool scenario if one was provided. Again, there would be a minimum square footage area

around that clubhouse that could be used as your open space as well. And, then, they would have to provide two additional amenities in order for them to take advantage of that reduced open space. Now, keep in mind, again, this is my first blush at it, but I felt in looking at typical developments in Meridian what I have seen over the last couple of years we have typically seen a pool, a changing room, a tot lot, and, then, some grassy open area for people to recreate in and to me that seems to be what's attracting people to those communities. So, this is -- and, then, I took a look at what we currently have in code and how could we keep what we have, but kind of modify it in order to give that developer or that property owner a comfort level that they could ask for a reduction in open space. So, I will pause for a moment and let you ponder this and stand for any questions you may have on option one.

De Weerd: I guess, Bill, my question is are we incentivizing something different, you know, or are we just going to expect cookie cutter options and with less open space and less imagination? I -- I think that ultimately this Council has wanted to incentivize the -- the creation of communities within a community and to have something that's different, unique, and responds to the -- the demand that is different than what we have and to be incentives to -- to innovate, instead of just more of the same, but less amenities and less open space and more people tighter together. Does that make sense?

Parsons: Madam Mayor, Members of the Council, I think -- I think the status -- I mean certainly the code the way we have it now, nothing is broken in it. I mean we are trying to work with the development community and we feel that what we have in place does give them viable options, but we do want to try to incentivize these projects, so we don't get the same cookie cutter development. Right now the way that I have it structured we are using the amenities that we have in our code. We haven't looked at other communities to see what they allow for as far as their amenities go and this is -- this only touches on a very small portion of that, amenities, and, then, as you get to option two you can see how we have some more of those options available to you, but this is just a first blush. If we are going to reduce -- there is -- I guess for staff we struggle there is -- there is always a value to open space in a development and there is always a value to an amenity in a development and that's how we feel. We want inclusive communities, just like the Council wants, and we don't -- we don't want to lose sight of that. So, we don't want to go too far one way and reduce the open space where, really, all we are getting is homes and, then, an amenity package that no one uses. That's always -- that can be the case, too. Or put a financial burden on an HOA in 20 years from now, because they can't afford open space or those expensive amenities, because they have to maintain them. So, there is always a fine line there on how you do that and, to be frank with you, this is a struggle, this isn't easy to do, and we are trying to work within our current code, but I think that's why we are asking for tonight take these under -- take these options under consideration. If you don't like any of them tell us to go back to the drawing board and we are happy to do that. We just want to make sure we give you some options and provide you some clarity on where we are struggling with it, too, and, then, hopefully come back in six months with something that we can all agree to and build in better incentives for the community as a whole and provide usable open space and amenities that everyone can take advantage.

Palmer: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mr. Palmer.

Palmer: Madam Mayor, thanks. I may be -- I'm probably alone in this, but I would be in favor of seeing that sentence go away, that if a developer can convince the director that his amenities are worthy enough of four percent or three percent open space left over, then, by all means. My two cents on that.

De Weerd: Any other --

Cavener: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mr. Cavener.

Cavener: Bill -- and, Madam Mayor, thank you for your comments, because I think you hit the nail right on the head for at least where I'm coming from related to a lot of these amenities. And so, Bill, really, my questions are the proposed size of these amenities, such as 500 square feet for the clubhouse, I think you said 550 I think in the pool -- is that on par with what we have seen in some of these communities already? My point is that I don't want us to set a minimum threshold that is at or near the bottom of what a lot of our development community has proactively done on their own to create really some amazing communities in Meridian and -- and I want to make sure that if we are setting these minimums that they are at least meeting with the averages or enhancing what is already occurring. And my second question is related to the fitness facility. Is the intent of that that is to be an indoor facility or an outdoor facility or a combination thereof?

Parsons: Madam Mayor, Members of the Council, Councilman Cavener, the first part of your question -- typically we see clubs -- I -- the only clubhouse I have seen with residential development was the Heritage Grove Commons project and I believe they put in roughly 1,000 to 1,100 square foot clubhouse. Most of the clubhouses come in with our multi-family developments and they can range anywhere from 1,000 square feet up to 3,500 square feet, depending on the size of the apartment complex. Certainly these numbers -- again, they are arbitrary. They are not based on anything at this point, except my interactions with the billing department as far as how many people can occupy -- technically fit within a certain size pool, a certain size clubhouse and still feel like you could go have a good congregation of people there and not feel like you're bumping elbows with your neighbors, which you could actually do events therein and do community -- I guess do community events there and that's where I landed on this 500 square feet. As far as fitness facility, to me it would be indoors. But it does -- code doesn't say that at this point. Typically the fitness facility would be a separate space inside a clubhouse. So, it would be another amenity in conjunction with that overall structure. So, technically you could get a thousand square foot clubhouse in a fitness facility for a thousand square feet. And, then, the pool, we don't even have regulation on that. The square footage that building code will dictate that based on the occupant load that the architect based on part of their building permit. So, he crunches those numbers and tells us whether or not the

pool -- how many occupants can go in that pool facility. It's not based on size of the development at all, it's basically built on code -- building code.

Cavener: Okay.

Parsons: And that's why it's tough to put a minimum square footage on these. I can give you an example of a project off of Pine where the neighbors came out and they were -- they testified, because they had a residential pool and three or four hundred homes using this one little pool and they were concerned that other HOAs coming on would have problems -- wouldn't be able to use their pool, because it was undersized and we certainly don't want to go down that road and that's why I'm trying to be cautious this evening that these things need to be discussed further, so we can all have a better understanding of what these -- what it will take in order to incentivize our open space and our site amenities. And, again, this is just option one, but we can certainly get into option two if Council and Mayor doesn't have any further questions.

Milam: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mrs. Milam.

Milam: I do have a question, Bill. Maybe I'm just not understanding why the additional qualifying amenities would need to be on the same open space.

Parsons: I think the idea there are, Councilwoman Milam, is that you get a larger area to recreate on. So, rather than having these little pocket parks -- or these little remnant pieces of open space, you actually get one -- the intent is to have one grander, more usable, larger open space, consolidated open space that everyone can go and share in one central location, so you bring the community in one space. A lot of them disperse them throughout, but certainly certain developments you have seen there is plenty of walking paths, micropaths throughout the development that can also be used to recreate and add value to the community, too. But that -- that was the intent behind this provision is my thinking on it.

Milam: Thank you.

De Weerd: Bill, I guess I heard you talk about -- mention multi-family. So, in what way does this impact what's happening -- what the requirement is now for multi-family?

Parsons: Madam Mayor, Members of the Council, this is only to our open space standards. It doesn't affect the amenities required for a multi-family development. Still are under a separate section in our ordinance.

De Weerd: So -- but this would impact open space for multi-family?

Parsons: There is the potential for that as well. Correct.

De Weerd: Because the argument of reducing the impact fees charged from multi-family was because they have the open space that -- that captures the kids and activities in the development. If we are reducing that, that kind of goes counter to the argument we had in reducing the per unit impact fees.

Parsons: Madam Mayor, Members of the Council, if you look at item A you can see that we also -- there is a couple of caveats here. One there is an average lot size of 12,000 square feet, but if you're in -- say, for example, if you're over at the apartments near Kleiner Park, that developer would also get -- based on this scenario, that developer could take advantage of reduced open space, because they are next to a regional -- walking distance of a regional park. So, you don't necessarily need that much open space as part of that. You need the density to support the commercial and that mixed use development and the idea would be they could recreate in the park and so, again, this is one effort --

De Weerd: I would agree with that if they paid, then, the full impact fee.

Parsons: Yes. And that's --

De Weerd: So, I mean you can't have your cake and eat it, too, but I guess we could consider that, but I guess when I started hearing that I thought, um, that kind of counters the argument we had when we talked about park impact fees and -- and how it was justified to reduce those because of the open space requirement. If we change that it opens up that dialogue again. Okay. Any other questions from Council at this point?. Okay. I --

Parsons: Option two? Would you like me to move on to option two?

De Weerd: Yes, please.

Parsons: Thank you. So, option two goes back to a point system. Again, this is just a first blush at this, but all of these items that are here are currently in the code, just structured differently and, again, this provides that and hopefully incentivize open space and site amenities so that we do get an overall integration and quality design with the development. That's critical to recognize that, too. That it is integrated as part of the overall development, just not remnant pieces of open space, which I think this Council and even staff has seen over the years and so what the attempt here is is we would, basically, set a level of point system on the type of amenities that is proposed and also the type of open space that is proposed. There will be required open space. As I recall Mr. Rountree said at the December 15th hearing that he still wanted to see the street buffer landscaping go in collector roads, arterial roadways, still have that street beautification and that's -- in this table here it represents that your arterial street buffers and your collector street buffers -- again, that's going to be required open space. You have to do that. And, then, we have tiered our amenities based on a level one, a level two and a level three and also our open space. So, this first table breaks down our qualifying open space that we currently have in code. Level one, of course, the minimum, essentially, and, then, level three would be something above and beyond what the code requires. So, I will let you

look over that. So, currently we have 5,000 square foot, 50 by 100 area could as qualifying open space, a plaza, community gardens, water features. I know some of our subdivisions out there have grand entry features and water features into the subdivision. We see value in that. We have added that as one of those enhancements as part of this point system if you will. We have devalued ACHD storm drainage facilities as a level one. Some of those aren't always integrated into development very well, so those aren't very attractive. And, then, the list goes on and on. But, again, these are things that are currently in code that count towards qualifying open space. This second table again would be our site amenities. Again, it's a three point system, level one being the lower end of the spectrum, level three being the higher end and each one of those are broke down and these -- some of these qualifying amenities do relate to multi-family amenities as well. And so going down that, currently we have things like art -- public art are level two. There is your clubhouse. There we put a little larger square footage on that and to count towards more of a -- a point system or amenity package to allow them to reduce the open space and, then, it just goes on from there. One thing that we see -- that Council sees as well is, you know, as developments come forward you can see more and more expansions of our -- our public amenities, our fire stations, our parks, our walkways, our multi-use pathways and so those -- those are valuable and we can work with the developer and get either that land donated or a partnership with them to create those public amenities for our community. So, we have rated those a little bit higher there on the level three. So, that's something that I would like the Council to look at and see if they see value in that, too. That could even be a school site, park and ride facility, a park. So, I will let you digest those options and if you need me to go back to the present -- the previous slide I can certainly do that as well and if you need anything else further to explain I can -- I'm happy to do that. Again, this has not been vetted with any of the design professionals, the UDC focus group, or the BCA. I haven't even run it against a hundred acre subdivision. So, this is really just something that I put to paper about six months ago and at this time we have kind of saved it on one of our drives just to kind of look at it in the future to try to see if we can morph this or work this into a future discussion with the BCA and also our UDC focus group and ultimately the City Council and Planning and Zoning Commission. So, with that I will stand for any questions on option two.

De Weerd: Council, any questions on this particular topic?

Cavener: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mr. Cavener.

Cavener: Questions and comments. Bill, I guess question one would be is -- I don't want to assume, which is why I'm asking, but as you would proceed with flushing this out there would be some more -- oh, side bars or definitions associated with some of these things. There is some that I feel are very arbitrary and some that have a little more meat to them and I would want to make sure -- that I guess we are adding a little more meat to all of them as it would move forward and I just didn't want to assume that was your intent, I wanted to make sure that as you progressed that that would be your intent.

Parsons: Madam Mayor, Members of the Council, some of these amenities you see here -- I'm assuming you're talking about amenities and not necessarily open space.

Cavener: Correct.

Parsons: Some of those do have some design criteria that are -- that aren't represented on -- on this table here. For example, the dog park. But the clubhouse and some of the things, right, we probably want to further look at that and see how we want to define these amenities. Our ordinance right now on some of this is -- it's not spoken to in the definition section of our code and we certainly want to look at that. Now, when I presented it back to you on the 15th of December, we did tell you that we are proposing some changes to a couple of these amenities. One was the picnic area. We had some more specifics to that and I'm not sure of the other one. I would have to look up the table, but I can look at that really quick. Oh, I think we were taking out the requirement for the five percent additional open space would count as an amenity. We basically said an area that's 20,000 -- at least 20,000 square feet. So, we are shrinking that down and adding that requirement for the 20,000 square foot area. But, yeah, some of those probably need to be defined a little bit better on -- particularly from how are you going to separate a level one amenity from a level three amenity, because if you came in with a half basketball court and, then, you came in with a horseshoe pit, well, what -- what amenity -- what's better? That's tough and that's why I put it at level one regardless of what it was, because it's hard to define something like that, but that's certainly a good observation, something we need to take under consideration if Council allows -- wants us to move forward on something -- a system like this.

Cavener: Great. Thank you.

De Weerd: Any other questions? Okay.

Parsons: So, to wrap up this evening, if -- if Council wants to -- wants staff to explore any one of these -- option one or option two, I would certainly encourage that in your motion. With my memo last week I did have a revised table for you. As I mentioned to you in my earlier part of my presentation we did remove the changes to the dimensional standards of the R-2 and the R-4. So, those have been removed. We can look at those at a later date and we took out some of the open space changes as well. So, tonight we really would like to have Council move this -- or conclude this UDC text amendment and provide some direction on how you want us to move forward on the open space. With that I would stand -- conclude my presentation and stand for any questions you may have.

De Weerd: Thank you, Bill. Council, any questions at this point?

Cavener: Madam Mayor, one additional question, if I may. Bill, on the -- option one versus option two, I guess my other question I didn't get to was related to the point system. Is that a best practice at other municipalities across the country are -- are using and do we -- do we gain anything by -- by heading down this path that we are not already

gaining or -- I guess talk to me a little bit about why the -- why putting forth this as an option.

Parsons: Madam Mayor, Members of the Council, Councilman Cavener, no, no other jurisdiction has this. It's something that I have created based off of direction that I have heard from previous Council meetings when we first brought this forward. We thought this would -- I think the previous -- my predecessor brought forth something similar to this and talked about a point system and it seemed Council embraced it at that time and so I searched high and low through codes throughout the country and nothing like this exists and so that's the challenge is if you go this route are you making it better or are you making it worse and that's -- that's why we have said tread lightly with this, because we really want to look at this, get it in front of our community members and say is this really the direction we want to go or are we happy with what we currently have.

Cavener: We don't make it easy for you.

Parsons: Yeah.

De Weerd: No, but isn't it nice to -- to think that they are taking notes as suggestions and conversations are made throughout various applications and I really appreciate that staff is being responsive to what you here in Council bring up and also that they hear the applicant's also raise questions about it. So, thank you for the attempt and we will see how it starts to move along. Okay. At this point it is a public hearing. I did have one person signed up as neutral. James Budge. Would you like to provide testimony at this point? Okay. Thank you for signing up. We appreciate that. Okay. Yes, Dave. If you will, please, state your name and address for the record.

Yorgason: I will. My name is Dave Yorgason. My address is 14254 West Battenberg Drive in Boise, Idaho, and I am here representing -- do I have three minutes? I want to make sure I'm -- do I have a time limit?

De Weerd: We will give you five and we do have your letter that you submitted on behalf of the BCA.

Yorgason: Thank you. I'm not here to talk long. Here to answer any questions as well.

De Weerd: Okay.

Yorgason: I am here probably wearing a few hats. I have developed a few subdivisions in your city, including some that have water features and grand old swimming pools and large open spaces and walkways and so forth and also some more in fill tinier developments. I'm also here as a member of the UDC focus group and thank the city and the staff for the opportunity to be a part of that group and also here representing the Building Contractors Association of Southwest Idaho. So, with that in mind --

De Weerd: So, which hat are you wearing?

Yorgason: Probably all of them, Madam Mayor.

De Weerd: Okay.

Yorgason: Because I think my answers are all the same. I take doing business in the city quite seriously. I really have appreciated the opportunity to do business here and look forward to future business in the city as well. Prior to my land development career I actually had a lot of experience in putting forth incentives to -- for corporations to put forth the results the corporations wanted to have and so I understand the desire to maybe improve or provide more creativity or better enhancement or whatever the city may desire to have and with that is putting the proper incentives in place to get the results that you the city want. So, I appreciate that process and I look forward to, if the city desires, my input to providing further comments to make that work for you. I heard three comments and I'm sorry I was not here on December 15th. I had another conflict on that night and likewise had one last week, so appreciate your postponement until tonight. I heard three items. I will go in reverse. One is transitional lot sizes. All I can ask is if there is some concern, please, state those as staff to the applicant at the time of the pre-application meeting. We need to know at the very front end when we do our design. We don't want surprises when we do our design later at the city -- P&Z hearing or City Council meetings. So, I'm sure staff has done a pretty good job of that, we would just ask for that to continue to happen, so that we can take that consideration on. As a developer we purchase property and pay a certain price tag with certain expectations. Second is open space amenities. I just kind of refer to those there. Look forward to working with -- with your staff as I'm sure it's not a complete version -- it probably will never be complete. I, frankly, think the point system is going to be a tough formula to create that will be a permanent final version. It will always be an ebb and flow. So, I applaud the staff's effort, but I think it will be a challenge to get there, but I certainly do support the process in trying to add some flexibility or incentives to have the improvements and the results that you desire of the city to improve the amenities, the -- the entrances, whatever it may be. I would add that I don't think a 500 square foot facility is large enough for a fitness facility, a swimming, that's probably getting pretty close, depending on the size of the development. More comments if you want later. Last one is the dimensional standards. There was a lot of discussion with the UDC focus group regarding dimensional standards and the primary reason why we even broached that topic is because more and more -- and Council Member Borton, I very clearly remember an application I brought to the city that you were concerned about. You probably don't remember, I still remember, because it kind of burned in my soul a little bit, because you were the one dissenting vote. But the point being is we had an application to try to achieve the density for the -- that was shown on the Comprehensive Plan, but we had to ask for an R-8 zone only for the reason of trying achieve R-8 dimensional standards for an R-8 -- actually, it was more like up to R-3 -- we were just shy of three units per acre with the R-8 zoning dimensional standards. Sometimes parcels are irregular shaped, sometimes they are just smaller in fill, but here at the city, as you continue to grow you will see more and more in fill on tougher and tougher parcels and,

then, also the larger parcels that are upward against existing, but larger developments -- maybe they are older developments with larger parcels. And so that was the reasoning is because of those more challenging sites and trying to not scare the neighbors with an R-8 application thinking and we will have eight units per acre, but, rather, we are just trying to achieve what's already desired in the Comprehensive Plan of densities closer to that. So, that's what -- the whole reasoning behind the change to the dimensional standards was. It wasn't to pick on R-4 or R-8 or R-15 or any of them, but look at all of them with those intentions in mind. Our hope is that -- and I'm speaking for several developers when I say this -- that you would consider adopting the proposed -- originally proposed dimensional standards for the R-4 -- R-2, I guess, but that's not really where most of the applications are. If there is too much concern we respect that and if you want to pull that piece out and have a workshop session, I know a few developers that do a lot of business in the city who would be interested in that if that would be your preference. As I mentioned before, there was a lot of work, a lot of discussion as to what those recommended dimensional standards should be and that's what was proposed to you on the 15th and where we are today. Those are my comments. I appreciate your time and consideration and stand for any questions you have.

De Weerd: You know, Dave, I guess your first statement about no surprises, if our staff had a better crystal ball in determining what the City Council might think or even Planning and Zoning for that matter, they would be millionaires and they certainly wouldn't work for us. Because it is -- every application is different and sometimes when you come in and walk through the door with your application, you haven't even had your neighborhood meeting to know what the neighbors are going to be bringing up and so it just kind all gets messy from there. So, we would love to have things so nailed down and buttoned up tight that you will never have a surprise, because I understand surprises are money and they -- they demand redesign and, then, that impacts your -- your business analyst and what -- what they have projected as to what your ROI is and all of that. We get it. We try to minimize surprises, but it's a public process and it can change, you know, on -- on a dime. So, that one is difficult. I love your idea for an R-4 work session. We have a new Council up here and I think our staff would look forward to that opportunity as well to really get an idea to have developers come and talk about visioning and what they want and how things should look and get an idea of what Council is looking for. I think that is a perfect idea in looking at the dimensional standards and even how that would translate into a lot of the recommendations. So, that in and of itself might be a great approach in looking at this after tax season so -- or legislative season.

Yorgason: Yeah.

De Weerd: But I appreciate that suggestion. Council, any questions from Mr. Yorgason?

Palmer: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mr. Palmer.

Palmer: Madam Mayor. Dave -- well, I guess actually what you said, I would love that opportunity as well, let the developers know what I'm looking for, but for them to tell me what they are looking for and with the proposed -- it looks like option one is where you prefer, the point system. I think I'm with you there. In -- obviously that would probably help the developers opportunity to make a profit around -- on the property around the parks. Would you see that the long term property values would be an increase in that kind of situation where there was more amenities, but less open space than with, you know, possible deterioration or lack of ability of an HOA maybe to maintain those things than if we just kept requiring that ten percent.

Yorgason: Madam Mayor and Council Member Palmer, I don't want to stand here and advocate for option one or two. If option two could be identified and figured out, that's great. I just think that could be a little more of a challenge. But maybe not. Having said that, I think you need to have flexibility. I wouldn't just stand here and say the apartments next to Kleiner Park are going to devalue, because they have less open space. I don't think that's going to be the case. What I do think, however -- kind of a joke, but thanks for catching that. What I do think, though, is that there is a significant balance when a development is created. Open -- and staff correctly pointed out you have to not just consider the actual initial capital infrastructure costs to develop into the pencil, but the longevity of it. Can it be maintained with proper association dues or whatever it may be. And I see as the city becomes a little more urban, especially in your downtown core and there may be some actual in fill or type developments there where the parcels are smaller, you can go a little more dense with those types of units and it's okay if they are not just a 20,000 square foot park next to get credit for it, but rather have a little more compact, a little higher dense use if you will, where a clubhouse can't have that. It's like a multi-family community I guess in some ways. But I can see that -- and I'm not going to stand here with all the answers, because I don't do all those developments, but just -- I can see the flexibility with someone who has a great idea that maybe comes from out of town and this worked very well for them in X city and they want to bring it here. So, I think it's important to have that flexibility, but at the same time I would caution the city, because I have seen both sides. You don't want to just open yourselves up to have less and you don't want less. That's where I'm encouraging as I have been in that other role before to have more incentives to -- to encourage better, but open the door so that there is less.

De Weerd: You know, you raise a really good point and maybe that's something else to -- to have in the consideration is does that amenity or that contribution have to necessarily be on site. There was a high density, low income housing unit down in Garden City and we give them credit for the Boys and Girls Club. There had to be a work out in terms of offsetting some of the costs of the impact having that high density development that close to the club, because that just put them over in their numbers, but it is those kind of things in working together to say, well, this is too small to have an on-site amenity that's going to be of any kind of quality. So, if we are looking for that, if there is something nearby that you can transfer that impact and invest in that, would that be something that could be considered as well. And now I just welcomed an even messier idea, but it -- it at least has some merit if there is anything that is going on in other areas, even that example of how

did they institutionalize that, those kind of considerations as well. Don't reinvent something, but see if there is a good model out there.

Chatterton: And, Madam Mayor, you bring up a good point. There are systems around the country that do allow for, as Mr. Yorgason said, off site improvements, off site amenities. Typically, though -- and he also brought up the example of more urban higher density development, at least than what we typically do now. Usually you will see off-site amenities being done in a situation where there isn't room for it on site. So, we are not quite there I don't think in terms of -- you know, as we start experiencing more in fill I think this will become an issue for us. You typically are not going to see, for instance, off-site improvements for a single family subdivision. I actually haven't heard of that. But it's fairly common to require it in a more urban setting.

De Weerd: Yeah. An interesting conversation. So, I think that would be kind of fun. Any other questions? Okay. We appreciate you being here and wearing the multiple hats. I know with your experience with the city, the quality of development that you have done and knowing how things need to pencil out, one of the things that really struck me is -- I do know the investors -- the people that come in want that predictability piece and if we are trying to get some something different, how -- how do we -- how do those incentives look, so what we do bring to our community is for the good of the whole and that is what we continue to struggle -- how do you -- how does that look and we appreciate having partners to be at the table to help us tackle some of those more difficult conversations. So thank you.

Yorgason: You're welcome, Madam Mayor. And I thank you as well, because these are not solved in a one room meeting setting, they are ongoing and we appreciate the opportunity to continue to work with the city. I do want to leave with one thought and that is I don't want you to think that in my pre-application meetings with the city that there is a lot of surprises later. That's not my experience. But we recognize there are surprises through the process. That's the risk that we take and we try to figure that out, but we -- we don't have lots of negative -- but for the occasional big use we just encourage the staff to continue to -- to put warnings out there that there may be some -- some concerns of transitional size lots, whatever it may be.

De Weerd: I think some have more surprises than others.

Yorgason: Yeah. Thank you.

De Weerd: This is an open public hearing. Is there anyone who would like to provide testimony? Okay. Well, Council, I do know that Bill asked a question of a direction for a path moving forward and would open it up for your discussion. I guess, Bill, I would -- I would maybe suggest bringing what you just presented to City Council and some of the questions that you received through to our UDC committee that you have been working with, as well as some of our key community partners to start the dialogue, but I would also suggest moving forward and getting something scheduled and maybe getting a good representative group to come in and have kind of a -- a Development 101 discussion on

the subdivisions, both -- the different densities, including multi-family, what they can look like given different open space standards or the flexibility for the -- of varied amenities and -- and maybe even include ULI in the conversation to start putting ideas in front of Council. I do know because two of our Council members that just retired off the City Council, they also had served on Planning and Zoning prior to coming in here, where part of the rewrite or even the establishment of certain ordinances and so they had a good base of knowledge and background of the conversations going into a number of the policies and those conversations are just as important as the policies themselves. So, starting a conversation with our Council members and -- would be a really good thing in my opinion and I would look to our City Council that I'm offering up your time for such a workshop to see if that's something that you're interested in.

Bird: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mr. Bird.

Bird: Bill, first of all, you and the staff done a great job of putting this together and also to presenting it and I appreciate that. But as I understand, you would kind of like us to -- to either pass or deny the main portion and, then, the options come later, is that not what I got?

Parsons: Yeah. Madam Mayor, Members of the Council, correct. I have revised the table with the changes that we discussed at the 15th, so we are ready to go forward this evening with those changes that I presented in my presentation this evening.

Bird: And I'm one Councilman that's ready to agree to that and to -- or to go forward with that part and while I am willing to listen to changing, as David had said on the R-4, I -- you're going to have to do a lot of arm twisting on me. But, anyway, as I understood it, you would kind of like us to do something on the first part and with the options we can state in the motion if we want you to go ahead with option one or option two or both options to pursue them farther; am I not right?

Parsons: That is correct.

Bird: Okay. Thank you. Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mr. Bird.

Bird: With that, if the Council don't need anymore public testimony, I will move we close the public hearing on H-2015-0011.

Milam: Second.

De Weerd: I have a motion and a second to close the public hearing. All those in favor say aye. Okay. All ayes.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Bird: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mr. Bird.

Bird: After hearing all staff and applicant -- public testimony --

De Weerd: We are the applicant and staff.

Bird: I know. I'm just reading. I will be politically correct this time. Okay?

De Weerd: Okay. Sorry.

Bird: There is so many times I'm not, so -- anyway. After considering all staff and public testimony, Council's talk, I move that we approve the file number H-2015-0011 as presented by staff at the hearing on January 26th, 2016, and also to have the staff go ahead and work on option one and I wouldn't even mind having them look at option two myself. That's my motion. Continue to work on it.

Milam: Second.

De Weerd: I have a motion and a second. Any discussion from Council?

Cavener: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mr. Cavener.

Cavener: If I have been reading this correctly and if I'm hearing what Bill asked of us is to give direction on really one or the other. Bill, is that your intention tonight? Are you looking for direction one way or another or --

Parsons: Madam Mayor, Members of the Council, if you like both of them we can still -- again, both these still need to be worked out, so keeping either option on the table -- I think Dave's even in agreement with looking at both of these as we move forward and even taking one step further, even looking at possible -- the possibility of having some kind of alternative compliance process to allow them to relocate their amenities to an off site or a city park or some other type of public facility in the future, so that they can do an in-fill development. We could certainly add that to the mix as well. We just want to make sure we are heading down the right path for you before we come back with something.

Cavener: Madam Mayor, just an additional comment.

De Weerd: Uh-huh.

Cavener: I don't personally have any issues with that. I just want Bill to maybe feel empowered that if -- if one option or the other just really doesn't look like it's panning out, don't feel like that you necessarily need to bring, you know, a proposed plan on one of them if the ultimate thought is going to be this isn't going to be successful.

Bird: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mr. Bird.

Bird: As the maker of the motion I felt that both options need to be looked at and to be continued on, because I think they are both very important to this -- to the layout of the UDC. So, if -- you know, Bill, if you don't mind, I would like us to work towards both of them and I think they both got good points to it and I think it's -- but I think they need to be refined and I just -- I -- that's why I threw both of the options in.

De Weerd: And I imagine that's why you got a second.

Milam: Yeah. Second agrees. And, Madam Mayor, just also want to add a comment -- and I know we have already discussed this, but I want to make sure in these that we are not encouraging the minimum, but incentivizing the maximum as much as possible.

De Weerd: And I will say we -- we didn't -- we shouldn't have to reinvent the wheel. I believe that there was some alternative compliance options for downtown parking that gave credit to reduced parking spaces within an lieu fee that went towards a larger parking facility. So, we have already had some those of conversations. It just -- it's exploring what some of the options and ideas there are. Any further conversation or discussion from Council? Madam Clerk, will you call roll.

Roll Call: Bird, yea; Borton, yea; Milam, yea; Cavener, yea; Palmer, yea; Little Roberts, yea.

De Weerd: All ayes. Motion carried.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Item 9: Ordinances

- A. Ordinance No. 16-1670: South Meridian (H-2015-0019) An Ordinance for the Annexation and Re-zoning for a Parcel Located in the W ½ and the NE ¼ of Section 5, Township 2 North, Range 1 East, Boise Meridian, Section 6, Township 2 North, Range 1 East, Boise Meridian, the NE ¼ of Section 1, Township 2 North, Range 1 West, Boise Meridian, the E ½ and the NE ¼ of the NW ¼ of Section 36, Township 3 North, Range 1 West, Boise Meridian, the SE ¼ of the SW ¼ of Section 25, Township 3 North, Range 1 West, Boise Meridian, Section 31, Township 3 North,**

**Range 1 East, Boise Meridian, and the SW ¼ of Section 32,
Township 3 North, Range 1 East, Boise Meridian, Ada County,
Idaho. This parcel contains 1322.14 acres more or less**

De Weerd: Okay. Item 9-A is Ordinance 16-1670R.

Bird: No R. It's eliminated.

De Weerd: R is eliminated. Madam Clerk, will you, please, read this ordinance by title only.

Holman: Thank you, Madam Mayor. That was a typo. City of Meridian Ordinance No. 16-1670, an Ordinance AZ H-2015-0019, South Meridian, for annexation and rezone for a parcel located in the W ½ and the NE ¼ of Section 5, Township 2 North, Range 1 East, Boise Meridian. Section 6, Township 2 North, Range 1 East, Boise Meridian. The NE ¼ of Section 1, Township 2 North, Range 1 West, Boise Meridian. The E ½ and the NE ¼ of the NW ¼ of Section 36, Township 3 North, Range 1 West, Boise Meridian. The SE ¼ of the SW ¼ of Section 25, Township 3 North, Range 1 West, Boise Meridian. Section 31, Township 3 North, Range 1 East, Boise Meridian. And the SW ¼ of Section 32, Township 3 North, Range 1 East, Boise Meridian, Ada County, Idaho, as described in the attached Exhibit A and annexing certain lands and territories situated in Ada County, Idaho, and adjacent and contiguous to the corporate limits of the City of Meridian, as requested by the City of Meridian, establishing and determining the land use zoning classification of said lands from RUT to R-4, Medium Low Density Residential District; R-8, Medium Density Residential District; R-15, Medium High Density Residential District; and C-G, General Retail and Service Commercial in the Meridian City Code. Providing that copies of this ordinance shall be filed with the Ada County assessor, the Ada County recorder, and the Idaho State Tax Commission as required by law and providing for a summary of the ordinance and providing for a waiver of the reading rules and providing an effective date.

De Weerd: After hearing the reading of that title I'm sure many of you want to hear it read in its entirety. It must be just a real interesting ordinance. Is there anyone who would like to hear it read in its entirety? Okay. Seeing no one jumping up and down, Council?

Milam: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mrs. Milam.

Milam: I move that we approve Ordinance No. 15-1670 with suspension of rules.

Bird: Second.

De Weerd: I have a motion and a second to approve Item 9-A. Madam Clerk, will you call roll.

Roll Call: Bird, yea; Borton, yea; Milam, yea; Cavener, yea; Palmer, yea; Little Roberts, yea.

De Weerd: All ayes. Motion carried.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Item 10: Future Meeting Topics

De Weerd: The next item -- did we put the Executive Session before or after the future meeting -- Item 10. Council, any items for future meeting topics?

Item 11: Amended onto the Agenda: Executive Session Per Idaho State Code 74-206 (a): (a) To consider hiring a public officer, employee, staff member or individual agent, wherein the respective qualities of individuals are to be evaluated in order to fill a particular vacancy or need. This paragraph does not apply to filling a vacancy in an elective office or deliberations about staffing needs in general

De Weerd: Okay. Item 11 is Executive Session.

Bird: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mr. Bird.

Bird: I move we go into Executive Session as per Idaho State Code 74-206(1)(a).

Cavener: Second.

De Weerd: I have a motion and a second to adjourn into Executive Session. Madam Clerk, will you call roll.

Roll Call: Bird, yea; Borton, yea; Milam, yea; Cavener, yea; Palmer, yea; Little Roberts, yea.

De Weerd: All ayes. Motion carried.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

EXECUTIVE SESSIONS: (7:31 p.m. to 8:39 p.m.)

De Weerd: Okay. I would entertain a motion to come out of Executive Session.

Milam: So moved.

Borton: Second.

De Weerd: All those in favor say aye. All ayes.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

De Weerd: Do I have a motion to adjourn?

Milam: So moved.

Borton: Second.

De Weerd: I have a motion and a second to adjourn. All those in favor? All ayes.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 8:39 P.M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS)


MAYOR TAMMY De WEERD

2 / 16 / 16
DATE APPROVED

ATTEST:


JAYCEE HOLMAN, CITY CLERK

