

A meeting of the Meridian City Council was called to order at 6:05 p.m., Tuesday, April 12, 2016, by Mayor Tammy de Weerd.

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

Others Present: Bill Nary, Jacy Jones, Caleb Hood, Kyle Radek, Jamie Leslie, David Jones, Todd Lavoie, Crystal Ritchie Mike Barton, Hillary Bodnar 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	

Planning and Zoning Commissioners

X Patrick Oliver	X Rhonda McCarvel
O Gregory Wilson	X Ryan Fitzgerald
X Steven Yearsley - Chairman	

De Weerd: Okay. I will go ahead and open the special meeting of City Council and our Planning and Zoning Commission. We will start with roll call attendance for City Council and, then, I will turn this over to Chairman Yearsley to have roll call for the Planning and Zoning Commission. Madam Clerk, will you, please, call roll call attendance for City Council.

Yearsley: Thank you. I would like to call to order the special Planning and Zoning Meeting for the hearing date of April 12th and let's begin with roll call.

Item 2: Adoption of the Agenda

De Weerd: Okay. Thank you. Item No. 2 is adoption of the agenda.

Bird: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mr. Bird.

Bird: I move we adopt the agenda as published.

Borton: Second.

De Weerd: I have a motion and a second to adopt the agenda as published. I will ask for you all to weigh in. All those in favor say aye. Sounds like all agree. That was pretty awesome. That would be really frightening to have all of you as city council members.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Item 3: Scope Of Review And Approval – The Differences (And Similarities) Between Council And Commission

De Weerd: Item 3 is a scope of review and approval. The differences and similarities between Council and the Commission. We look forward to this discussion.

Hood: Thank you, Madam Mayor, Members of the Council, Members of Planning and Zoning Commission. We sure appreciate you all taking the time out for this special meeting tonight. We thought it would be a good opportunity in the past -- we have tried to annually have the Planning and Zoning Commission get together with the City Council just to touch base, meet with each other, see if there is any changes potential for policies, just make sure we are all generally pulling in the same direction. It was a chance to also break bread and get to meet each other if you haven't met each before and to just kind of put a name maybe to a face. You read some minutes, you kind of -- you don't know who that person is. We have got some newer Council Members and some newer Commissioners, so I just wanted an opportunity to provide a forum for you all to come together here and while we have your attention we thought there would be a couple of things that we could maybe help facilitate some of that dialogue, maybe some things we staffed to do some guidance and hear that from both bodies and maybe where there is some dialogue just amongst yourselves, too, for a couple of different topics I think that Bill is going to touch on here in a minute. So, into Item 3, scope of review and approval, Bill is going to mainly lead this. I think for tonight, though, it is -- it is informal. If you have questions, comments at anytime, please, feel free to interrupt Bill, myself, and we can -- we can address those at that time, so -- you want to sit here?

Parsons: Good evening, Council, Members of the Planning and Zoning Commission. As Caleb mentioned, I do want to kind of touch bases on some of the hearing level applications that maybe the Commission doesn't realize what the Council acts on and vice-versa. I know City Council knows what P&Z does, but I don't know if P&Z always knows all the applications that the city -- the City Council takes action on and so the first slide in my presentation this evening is really to go over a variety of hearing level applications. I won't read all of them, but the ones that are highlighted in red are really the power that's invested -- or vested to the Planning and Zoning Commission for making decisions on those land use applications. So, you're looking at the conditional use permits, and,

then, also any time extensions for conditional use applications. All the other items on this list -- or a majority of these items P&Z is a recommending body. So, I at least want to just touch bases on those and tonight I will go over the conditional use process as far as what your purview is when you review those, your scope of review for those applications. I will even touch on what staff -- the Planning and Zoning staff does as far as analyzing a project and bringing forth a recommendation to you. I will start from -- we begin with the pre-application -- pre-application meeting all the way through with the finished product, which is our staff report that includes our recommendation for the project as well. So, going to this next slide, that's really what this is. I have labeled it project review for hearing level applications and so a lot of times the Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council don't always see us interacting with the customers and what it takes to get a viable project in front of you and it really starts off with the applicant scheduling a pre-application meeting. That's when we sit down with the applicant, we will discuss their proposal, talk about what the comp plan designation is for that property, what zoning regulations apply for that property and we do encourage the applicant to bring a site plan or a preliminary plat, so at least we can look at a preliminary layout and give them guidance as to what changes, if any, are desired by staff based on not only our code, the direction from City Council and our Planning and Zoning Commission, but also maybe even our partners like ACHD, Fire, Building, et cetera. So, as I mentioned here in the slide, there is -- sometimes these projects are complicated, so you don't always get -- get to capture everything in one pre-application meeting, so we do schedule -- we give the applicant the ability to schedule another pre-app and have a follow up, so we can make sure those issues are addressed and what our goal is there is try to avoid surprises, not only to the applicant, but also in front of you the recommending bodies and the decision making bodies. We certainly don't want to go in front of you with a whole bunch of conditions or outstanding issues that you have to take under consideration. We are your partners. We -- you give us the tools to work with and we try to communicate those as effectively as we can and try to address those concerns or issues before they come before you. So, after the applicant does a pre-application meeting there is a requirement in the UDC that requires the applicant to hold a neighborhood meeting. A vast majority of our projects that require a public hearing require that the applicant or property owner notify all the residents or property owners within 300 feet of the project. The only one -- now under the UDC the director does have the ability to require a greater radius, but most of the time it is that 300 foot radius as prescribed in the UDC. All of our applications and checklists come with -- or all of our applications come with a checklist that specify the items that are required with an application submittal. So, we as planning staff we accept the application and the fee. Myself personally I assign it to the planner who pre-app'd with the developer slash applicant and, then, before I even move that application on to a planner for review, we make sure that the applicant provides us CAD drawings. So, for example, if there is an extension of city infrastructure, water, sewer, our Public Works Department wants CAD files, so that they can model sewer -- model the water and model the sewer to insure that services can

be provided for that development. So, that happens before we even deem the application complete. Next thing -- once -- once I have confirmation that that's been verified -- we do that through Accella, our database software, so I insert the plans into Accella and assign to Public Works where they grab it and they -- they model it and before I even move that project forward to a planner they sign off that it's been modeled or tested. For annexations and rezones, we also have a legal verification -- we have a parcel verification process where they verify the legal description and the exhibit map that accompanies that application and our GIS department verifies that the boundaries of the project that's being proposed to be annexed into the city or rezoned, if it's concurrent with other applications. So, that's another cursory review that we do before we even give it to a planner. And, then, once that -- those two items are reviewed or it's entered in GIS for modeling, then, it's assigned to the planner that, again, pre-app'd with the applicant. They are most familiar with that. That really is our standard practice. You start with one planner and you end with the planner. That's the goal here so you consistency throughout the process, so everyone understands what's going on with that particular project. The Clerk's Office has been transmitted the application once it's deemed complete and they also scheduled a hearing date and, again, that is done through Accella and, then, once they accept -- or once they schedule a hearing they hit transmit for review and, then, there is various internal and external agencies that get copied -- get a copy of the plans or get an electronic copy of the plans and I have listed some of those examples for you here in this slide. So, we receive comments from Central District Health, the irrigation districts, ITD, ACHD, our Public Works Department, Parks, and, then, even the school district. I'm sure you're aware of some of those as they come forward at the public hearings. So, we do get comments from all of those agencies and those are all included as part of the public record as well and on your searchable documents website a lot of the external agencies will -- the clerk will keep that as part of the public record and always available for you to review as well. So, after that gets scheduled and transmitted, then, we also have what we call a project review meeting. Typically I'm in charge of scheduling those for review, so I have a running list that I send out to various agencies and departments within the city and this is mostly internal departments, not external, and so I have listed that. Typically we hold those meetings three weeks prior to being heard by Planning and Zoning Commission. What that does is, one, if there are any concerns at that meeting from police, fire, or any other internal department, we can get out in front of those and communicate those concerns to the applicant before we get into the staff report and so they can make necessary changes or at least understand where staff is coming with a specific provision or a condition that we are going to impose on them and so I guess the gist of this slide is let you know that we try to be very up front with the applicant and we try to work with them on their design, their layout, try to get in front of their concerns or any issues that may arise as part of -- as they move through that public hearing process. Again, we do not want any surprises. We want them to be well informed in their decision and, quite frankly, sometimes applicants -- sometimes they will just ignore staff's concerns and, then, submit an application and there is

nothing we can do on that. We -- we provide them a detailed list of what the city requires and how they procedure with that application it's up to them. So, again --

Hood: Sorry, Bill.

Parsons: That's okay. Do you have any --

Hood: Yeah. I was just going to kind of piggy back a little bit on that and just a little bit of our mantra, particularly at the, you know, no surprises that Bill mentioned that's got listed here. We really want to announce that early on in the process, where developers are doing their due diligence. Am I going to be able to get this project through the city. So, before they go and put that earnest money down on a piece of ground, we try to give them a list of issues. It's not -- it's not always comprehensive, but we try to give them as many of those issues that we see looking at the -- you know, before they have made any real investment to have something engineered to say, listen, you're going to be swimming upstream against the comp plan map or, boy, if you don't provide this connectivity over there staff isn't going to be supportive of your project. So, we really try to put those deal breaker type things out there. Again, early on in the process, before they purchase the property or have that option on the property, before they pay our fees -- there is several thousands of dollars usually to process an application. So, denial isn't fun for anyone. So, we really try to have sometimes multiple pre-apps. You know, the first one, if we are like, yeah, we are not real comfortable with what you showed us today, see if you can make some tweaks and let's meet again. You know, we both want to be comfortable before we even get that application submitted to us. Again, our mantra is kind of -- can we get to yes. We don't like to tell people no. Sometimes we have to, but we -- we try to say if you can kind of contort it a little bit this way I think we can support your project, but we do want to raise the bar on these projects. We don't want to just get to the bare minimum, we want them to exceed our bare minimums and be the better project. So, that's no -- not to recommend denial, but just to highlight that early on in the process we do try to work with them, again, to get to a project that we think you all will agree is to the appropriate standards.

Parsons: And so after we go through all that process, then, we do formulate a staff recommendation and do a staff report and in that staff report we detail the description of the project. We make findings and insert policies in there how the project meets the policies and the goals of the Comprehensive Plan. We try to make sure that the proposed project complies with the UDC and all the requirements, whether that's sidewalks, open space, dimensional sizes of the residential districts, to meet the block length standards of subdivision design standards in the code and, then, we take all of that information and we formulate a recommendation for the Planning and Zoning Commission. As Caleb mentioned, most of the time we strive to get to -- we recommend approval of a

project. We don't -- again, don't want to blind side anyone. We want to be forthright and convey that message right out the gate from start of the process. And, then, we generate conditions of approval, not only for community development, but also police, fire, ITD, ACHD, all of those are incorporated well and, of course, we have to make the findings based on whatever land use application that they are submitting, so preliminary plat, annexation, rezone, there is findings that are attached in the UDC that we have to make in order for you to make an informed decision on that application and so --

Hood: And maybe, Bill, before you move on, just a little bit more. I want to just touch base again with you all. We have had a higher level of denials over the past six months -- than the past 12 years that I have been here. So, I just wanted to touch base with you and get some feedback on some of those projects we thought we could condition to get to that higher bar. We are not afraid of recommending denial. It's not -- again, that's not fun necessarily either. My just kind of observation on some of those projects -- and I'm not going to pull out any one specifically -- we have had some neighborhood opposition that we don't always get to see as we are writing the staff report and I think that's influenced some of what's gone on here. So, we sometimes are a little bit in a vacuum when we are looking at the goals and objectives of the policy and the code and writing our recommendations, the piece we don't see is -- is there going to be an angry mob here that says this doesn't work. On paper maybe it does, but, again, just an opportunity to touch base and say, you know, some of these projects, even if -- put the neighborhood opposition aside, even if they met the bare minimum of the code, the expectation is that it should be higher than that and that's really what we should -- if we are recommending approval of something it needs to be substantially better than the minimums or are you okay for the most part with, you know, our staff reports, you know, again, using the past six months or so as a sampling size or if you have specific examples of, hey, you guys were way off base recommending approval or denial or whatever we recommended of this project. If you had any of those that were -- you know, you're just like, yeah, I don't understand how staff got to that recommendation. Some of that feedback I think would be appreciated, so -- and each project is different. They are case by case. There is no real rules in this, but any kind of, you know, feedback on hey, if you see this it's -- yeah, amenities, you know, you kind of -- I get a gut feel for amenities and say, you know, that 300 lots, you probably need a swimming pool, you know, but that's just me and we can't write that in code necessarily, but you just got a little open space, it's ten percent, is that enough to keep 300 residents entertained, you know? I mean a lot of city parks, too, but just that type of feedback. I'm not saying let's change our code, but if you have any -- anything in our staff reports and our analysis that you think could be beefed up or done differently or better, again, we are -- we are open to that.

Milam: Caleb, mostly you in here know that I have been having a little problem with these minimum -- I call them minimalist subdivisions and as far as I'm concerned, we have so much growth, we don't need to be in a hurry to be

annexing and approving subdivisions that are going to be the ghetto in seven or eight years and they are just a bunch of houses with nothing and a volleyball pit or -- you know, minimum amenities, minimum open space, that 10.01 percent. That's the minimum and as far as I'm concerned our minimum standards maybe we need to increase what our minimum standards are. If that is what our code is, maybe we need to -- maybe we do need to look at our code.

Hood: If I --

Milam: You guys are -- you're doing your job and you're -- you know, you're -- they qualify, but as far as I'm concerned we don't need it.

Parsons: The last couple of controversial projects that have come before you I have tried to get out in front of it and I e-mailed the Mayor's office and said, hey, I want to let you know we have got a -- some opposition to this project. I guess to kind of go a little bit farther from what Caleb was saying, if you know we do have 200 residents against a project, do you want staff to recommend denial of it, to kind of help support you or do you want us to say, you know what, let it play out at the public hearing the way it's supposed to and that's -- I guess some direction on that would also help staff as well. We typically analyze it based on the Comprehensive Plan and the UDC. We don't necessarily take in that -- that component of public testimony early on.

Nary: Madam Mayor?

Bird: Bill, I think you need to stay neutral like you are and you guys do a great job and it's between the Planning and Zoning and the Council to do the recommendations and the -- either the approval or denial and I'm getting to the point of -- of a denial -- and, Caleb, you're a hundred percent right, we've probably had more denials in the last two or three months than we have had in the last 16, 17 years, but I think it's -- but, also, we haven't had the -- as much of the R-8s -- I will just put in bluntly. And bigger, more density, and I know if you -- you got to go buy all these studies of Smart Growth and all this stuff, it -- it encourages high density stuff. Well, I have never bought into it and I don't plan on buying into it, so -- but I think you guys just stay neutral, you do a great job -- you do a great job of presenting to use, it's always clear, and when you bring something from the Planning and Zoning it's -- you tell what the Planning and Zoning's problems were, if they had any or anything, I think you guys just stay neutral and let us do the -- the denial or approvals.

Hood: I do want to maybe just clarify a little bit and I -- I haven't -- I have kind of stepped back the past few years anyways in Bill's reviewing, but I think, you know, Josh and certainly Sonya -- I know they do consider -- particularly if you're an adjacent property owner. So, it's not the volume of folks that may write letters and come in, we will let you guys kind of sort through that. But you're a directly adjacent property owner and you have a concern and you call up the planner and

you say, listen, here is my situation, I farm this or three stories next to single level, this is my bed -- those types of things we will consider in the staff report. Typically if you're, again, an adjacent property owner, but just because there is 200 signed petitions -- sometimes they are legitimate concerns, sometime they are not. So, we try to wade through those a little bit, but it's not just because there is 200 people that have participated, it's, oh, there is a concern here, we need to address it in the staff report. But just because someone is opposed to something doesn't necessarily -- it's why are you opposed to it. Is it because of the connectivity or -- or is it a fear that all the kids in the neighborhood are now going to get ran over. I mean there is some -- again, there is sometimes that there are -- there is just fear for change and sometimes there is legitimate concerns about a project and, hey, I'm running horses here and I've got an electric barbed wire fence, you shouldn't put your open space next to it. And so we can make some of those -- we can make some of those tweaks to our staff. So, I just wanted to clarify that. It's not that we -- that public comment falls on deaf ears here, it's just we aren't persuaded, necessarily, by a petition. But I appreciate that feedback.

Bird: Nor should you be.

Hood: No. But, again, I just want to clarify, you still -- the general public still can contact us with concerns, as I write in the staff report.

De Weerd: I think you're always going to get the minimum when you set minimum standards. That's -- that's been our experience. With many of them -- our larger and more popular subdivisions, they are larger, more popular, because they have amenities that appeal to our families and we have a balance and I think that's important, because there is a cost balance as well. I -- I do -- I do continue to struggle how we can continue to look at our codes and make it easier for those that go the step beyond, that go beyond the minimum and -- because I think those are -- are the ones that take longer to get through and there is almost a deep disincentive to do that. So, I don't know -- I don't have a recommendation on how to address that, but it has been a day old -- day long issue.

Hood: And, Madam Mayor, I do think Bill has some of that later on when we get to Item 7 on the agenda. I know he's working to pass on some of that, about equity and putting value to some of those amenities and things that maybe do give some more credit to, you know, something you bought at Walmart versus something that was stick built and has some real value -- nothing against Walmart, but just -- you know what I'm saying? Just something off the shelf versus something that there really is a true amenity that most all can enjoy in a subdivision, so --

De Weerd: Any other discussion on that? Okay.

Item 4: How To Make Meaningful Motions

Parsons: I will just provide one additional comment from what I hear from developers on when they come in with this nice open space and nice amenities. A lot of times they are afraid to show you their cards, because they are afraid staff is going to say we want you to build exactly what you show us and we are like, well, yeah, because we want you to build exactly what you show us. That's our job. If you're going to show us more than what code requires, we want to hold you to that standard, because that's something that we want to represent to our Planning and Zoning Commission, to our citizens and to our Council. They -- that's the expectation we want to lay out for you for our decision making body. So, I try to tell the applicant tell us what you want and don't hold your cards so close to your chest, because -- and a prime example is like Heritage -- I believe it was Heritage Grove over there off of Locust Grove and Ustick, where that developer was kind of -- they know they wanted a 55 and over community, they knew they wanted to market it that way. They weren't quite sure on their amenity package, but as we went through that public hearing process they had better and better ideas and if you have ever driven through that project now it is denser than what we typically see in Meridian, but you see nice open space, you see that they have added that clubhouse and at least as he went through that public hearing process I was able to convince him that tell us those details. Yes, we are going to hold you to that, but it's going to make for a better project for you and you're going to see -- you're going reap that reward of that, because that's what people are looking for and I think they have been very successful out there. So, I just want to at least pass that comment along to you as -- from what we are hearing from the development community, too, that they are -- sometimes they comment and up their amenity package after they have been through -- through the process with you. Not all of them, but the majority of the time. There is some positive stories out there as well.

Hood: The other thing I will just highlight on that note -- and this goes to Council Woman Milam's comment a little bit as well -- is nine out of ten subdivisions you see have an associated annexation. The open space requirement is in the subdivision. If you don't like the subdivision -- you don't have to like their annexation or, again, you could condition their annexation and say you need to have 20 percent open space. We know the minimum is here, but, again, most of the projects you see -- and this is kind of why we are here and Bill has got some other slides on this, but the scope of review -- you got annexation. With annexation you can pretty much require anything that there is a nexus back to that project for, so -- and if you don't like the layout of the ground underneath the ground you're -- they are asking to be annexed for, deny the annexation. And I know you know this, but just to reiterate that, with the annexation you can require things that mitigate the impacts. So, if you think it's -- you know, whatever the case may be. You have a huge tool there with the annexation, because without annexation you can't do the subdivision and the subdivision -- again, we will talk a little bit more about what the minimums are, but that's the highlight that with an annexation or a rezone you have a lot more discretion. Subdivision not so much.

But, again, they need that zoning to even get the subdivision. So, if you want to, you know, curtail a project or make it better, tell them you're not going to annex them until you have a better amenities package,. Whatever. So, just to kind of reiterate that.

Palmer: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mr. Palmer.

Palmer: I feel it's -- it's hard to -- like in the Joe example, you know, we hired Joe -- figurative Joe -- to do a job. When he did exactly what we hired him for, we had set minimum requirements for him, it's hard to be mad at Joe for doing exactly what we asked him to do, you know. So, that's -- I looked at, you know, when the developer comes in, even if they are near minimum, I have a hard being mad at -- at them for providing everything we have asked them to provide and so -- so, I mean it's up to us to decide whether, you know, what they have presented is, you know, still not quite up to par for what we are looking for, but I think the feeling we need to portray a little bit better is that you did exactly what we asked for. You could do better. But -- I don't know. I just -- I feel like we are -- if we want higher standards, then, let's increase the standards, but -- if they come with the minimum they have done exactly what we have asked them to do, so --

Hood: It's a fair point. I guess -- again, all these are case by case. Having a project that comes in next to Settler's Park, why would you want them to provide 20 percent open space? There is a regional park right next door. So, it's tough to write code for all cases. That's why it is a minimum. In certain cases we are probably going to want a little bit more, because you're the first in and there is nothing around you that can kind of offset maybe there being a Settlers Park next to you as an example or some of those things. So, it's nothing against the developers for doing the minimum, it's just in certain cases it may be appropriate for you all to say, yeah, you did the minimums, but in your case the minimums wasn't enough. It's tough to -- I'm a little bit leery of, you know, requiring everybody to do 15 percent open space or 20 or whatever, because, again, then, you get -- get somebody that's next to Kleiner Park and you want all this open space and they are like, why, they are not going to use it. They got -- there is a park here with all the amenities, so it -- and that the difficulty with our code being so -- it's black and white, but there is some discretion and it's a little bit -- it's difficult to just say in all cases thou shalt do this and that's why it's a minimum that really isn't a minimum. It's the minimum, but we really do kind of expect a little bit more in most cases. So, it's -- and we -- a lot of times at least as staff we kind of portray it that way and we try to -- again, no surprises. We try to say, hey, ten percent for you is probably okay here, don't -- you know, we are not too worried about that or the way you -- how are you using your ten percent? Is it in drainage swales? That's probably not enough for your 200 lots. If it's a nice central park with amenities that we can envision, you know, people congregating

in it, yeah, that probably works. But a design plays into that. You can't really legislate design of subdivisions all that much. So, I appreciate what you're saying and that's what makes this so difficult is there is a human element. So subjective for a lot of these things and that's why we are -- I -- I don't think we are on the other page -- and, I'm sorry, I appreciate your comments, Mr. Bird, about, you know, we think we are doing our job, but just this opportunity to touch base because of the denials and some of the comments that we are hearing back, should we maybe shift the way we have done business and -- anyway. So --

De Weerd: The denials don't reflect on you. I mean I think it's often something that I say in my role and I know staff needs to say we are following the policies that are set. The Council as a body is the one that can -- that has that flexibility to do something different. But we follow the codes that they set.

Palmer: Madam Mayor, follow up?

De Weerd: Mr. Palmer.

Palmer: And exactly what you said. I guess I could have worded it better. I feel like -- like we -- our attitude might need to be adjusted. I think it's good customer service when you give them a heads up like, hey, you're meeting minimums here, but the attitude of Council lately is, you know, they may not, you know, feel that you're doing what you could do here. So, you know, if that's the way, you know, that we are trending in recent history, then, yeah, again, I think it's good customer service for you to give them a heads up, you know, not making the decision, but giving them a heads up that our attitude isn't favorable to their project at the moment. So, that's definitely, like you said, not a reflection on you, that's -- that's on us.

De Weerd: And if all else fails you can blame the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Bird: Madam Mayor?

McCarvel: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Rhonda.

McCarvel: You know, you guys, I think some of the denials have come from some of the projects that we have seen lately I think -- yeah, they may have met the minimums, but they are kind of the last thing in an already surrounded area and maybe because of what's surrounding them there needs to be elevated minimums or something that just makes sense. It feels like lately we have been trying to force some square pegs into round holes into what's around it and it just -- based on public hearing and just common sense -- like you said, on paper it makes sense, but in real world and just a general feeling it hasn't --

De Weerd: I think you have reiterated that it's -- it's individual, it's case by case --

McCarvel: Yeah.

De Weerd: -- and it's -- it's hard with your crystal ball to always have it work, but as long as you work the policy and you also have the benefit of the historical actions that are taken by Council and the Planning and Zoning Commission to be able to advise the customer. They are going to do what they are going to do, as you well know. I know there is a number of times that you have advised them on something that they didn't change and it did come back and either the Commission or the Council said you need to work on this and so you -- you have a good pulse on -- on this process. To share it is -- is great, but I would continue to follow the policies and the ordinances that have been created.

Parsons: So, that was a good discussion. Thank you. So, moving onto kind of our next slide here, which really is what all of our roles are in working together on a beautiful Meridian and so as you know, City Council members are elected. They are our leadership and they set the policies that we all have to follow. They also appoint the Planning and Zoning Commissioners, which are a volunteer's duty. You get to make the recommendations and you do have limited purview on decision making, which, again, would be that conditional use permit and the time extensions for any conditional use permits and, then, as far as staff's role is we are your technical expert. We, basically, know the code, we know the comp plan, and we report that back to you and also formulate a recommendation to you. We do have limited authority for decision making and that's really those staff level applications. A lot of times you will see an alternative compliance or Council waiver or something as part of your Planning and Zoning Commission hearing and you feel like you can't act or say anything on those, but you can. If alternative compliance is part of that project there is analysis in there if -- we typically say the directors approve that, but if you want something changed there you have that ability to do that. If you support a reduced buffer on -- on the perimeter of a project, you have the ability to include that in your recommendation to Council. If you like the access to a development, but -- or ACHD supports it, but staff -- the ordinance doesn't, you could still include that recommendation that you want Council to take that under consideration in accordance with ACHD. So, you have that in your purview to do that and I think the Council would agree with me that they don't want you to just pass the buck to them, they want you to weigh in on those decisions so they can see how you interact -- how you deliberated on those issues, so that they can make an informed decision. So, that's really what this is trying to -- striving to do here. So, as I mentioned to you, you do have the authority on conditional use permits and so I took these definitions right out of the UDC to help the Planning and Zoning Commission weigh in and look at your purview and your scope of review when you're looking at conditional use permit applications that are before you. So, really, a conditional use is a use that is allowed -- that is approved by the

Planning and Zoning Commission. That is an allowed use in that district and so, really, the UDC gives you a guide as to what you can do to make sure that that project is compatible with adjacent properties and there is eight of them here listed and that, again, comes right out the UDC. I know a lot of times we are before you and you feel like you can't make a recommendation on something, because it's outside of the normal code provisions. Right here I have highlighted a couple of them that you can take under consideration when you look at conditional use permits. One, again, for off-site improvements. If you think there is an adjacent property and that sidewalk makes connectivity something, well, they need sewer and water to service this and it's off site, you can recommend that as part of your conditional use process. They have to extend that in order for the development to move forward or they -- you want them to construct that sidewalk. Now, if the applicant doesn't agree with that, they have the ability to appeal your conditional use permit. So, they can take that -- that issue up with City Council and that's happened the last couple CUPs that you have had as well, in particular with the reduction to the land use buffers when commercial developments are up against residential developments. So, again, a lot of times we hear a lot of people testify about overcrowding of our schools and we always say, well, that's not our purview. Well, it can be. I mean it says right here if you think that development is going to impact the schools, you can weigh in on that issue. I don't -- I don't know how defensible it is. I would turn that -- I would leave that -- turn that over to the city -- the city attorney's office, but, again, some of these things are in your purview and you can require more than the bare minimum again, going back to that earlier discussion. If you think there should be 12 trees and they only show eight, you can require 12 trees. If they have a 280 unit multi-family development and the neighbors want less density, you have the ability to say we want 260 on this site. So, keep that in mind when you're deliberating on these applications. You do have the ability to require more restrictive standards than those required in the UDC and certainly as your technical expert staff and the legal team that's here at the hearing can help guide you on some of those decisions as well. They are always there to help out and provide a suggestion.

Hood: And I want to point out with CUPs as well -- kind of like the code you were talking about before, Bill mentioned them being, you know, an allowed use and that is partially true. They are conditionally allowed, which means to me -- the best word I can just think off the top of my head is marginal. I mean it can work, but it doesn't always work. So, there are special conditions and considerations, like all projects, it's site specific. So, the trees example. If we think we need a wider buffer than what the code requires, because we have got a school next to it, you can require that. There needs to be a nexus. It's got to tie back a little bit, so -- and the other thing I would just point -- I mean this is -- CUPs are real similar to annexations and rezones, where you have a lot of discretion. You don't need the code as much. But if you're going to deny a conditional use permit you need to be very specific in what they can do the next time to gain your approval. So, you can either condition them and say, hey, this is enough mitigation or you

could say, you know what, I -- I can't envision what this looks like, there is too many conditions, deny it. But if you bring it back to me with half as many units and a wider buffer and a pathway over there, that's what I'm looking for. And so your motion just needs to be a little bit more specific in those CUPs if you do deny them. But like Bill said, you have a lot of discretion in these and even to the -- I'm not the attorney, but even the school district one -- again, you need to tie that back to the project somehow. Why are you requiring them to put another portable in? Is that because the school district sends you a letter saying that this is going to be 30 more kids and one portable equals 30 kids? I mean it needs to tie back somehow. It can't -- you can't just be, you know, pulling out, you know, conditions that are off sight or for the school that don't have some defensibility. But that is something certainly you need to consider. And, again density. If it's too many. This is too intense. It doesn't mean you can't approve any multi-family there, because it is a conditional use permit in the zone, but it doesn't mean it has to be however many they are proposing there, because maybe that's just too dense. So, just to kind of put a little bit finer point on conditional use permits. And, again, probably not 90 percent like annexations and subdivisions, but some 75 percent of your CUPs have an associated other application as well. So, City Council is going to see quite a few of the CUPs, although the Commission has authority to approve just CUPs. Most of the time they come along with a rezone or a development agreement modification or a plat or some other thing that kicks it up to the City Council. So, as a Planning and Zoning Commission, again, you have that discretion to say this is what it will take to make it appropriate in that location.

De Weerd: So, Bill, I would have a question for you. Could you ask for a portable as a condition? Because it isn't our jurisdiction. I'm just curious, since it was brought up just now.

Hood: While he's coming up -- that may not be. That was just off the top of my head. I don't even know if they want a portable. I was just thinking of some school district --

De Weerd: Yeah.

Nary: Madam Mayor, Members of the Council, Members of the Commission, that one -- that one might be a little tougher. I mean mitigation generally has been things like access, pathway, maybe extended sidewalk, those things, so that you have a way to get there. To actually require an off-site improvement of that degree -- we certain would have to look. Off the top of my head I would say that one would be a tough one to sell. But I -- so don't know that it's an absolute no. It's a probable no. But other things -- and I do agree with Caleb, there are other things that can help lessen or mitigate the impact of this development and we have done some of those and there certainly are maybe more out there. I mean the laws are ever changing, so there is certainly ways that we can do that. And also -- and maybe to reiterate another thing that Caleb said, in the annexation

stage many of -- many of the developers will offer up those things to make it more attractive and inviting to annex their property, so if they want to agree to it, that's fine, that's not a problem. If they are willing to agree to it, then, that's a different discussion and that becomes part of the development agreement. So, again, I think all of you know this, but annexation is the biggest tool you have and the biggest hammer you have to shape the city the way you would like it to be.

De Weerd: Bill or maybe Caleb or Bill. Bill. Bill. Caleb. Can the -- can we work with the school district that might suggest what some of those cost impacts or alternatives might be? I was part of a discussion today and they used Alaska as an example of the cost of -- of development when it's not dense or near services and they used schools as an example. The debt that was incurred because of building developments that were so far away from school, the cost of busing was just astronomical and I remember a recent application that said, oh, don't worry about the safety aspect, they have safety busing. Well, there is a cost to that and we just need more information from the school district as to what -- what some of the choices are or cost impacts, because you don't have connected sidewalks or there is a water feature that is a big obstacle and they don't want to mitigate that, it's that kind of information, if we don't have a commission or a council can say I'd like to know what some of the ways to mitigate some of these concerns might be and can you ask for feedback from either ACHD or the school district, what are some of the opportunities there?

Hood: Madam Mayor, I think we can -- we can work more closely with the -- with the school. It's been some time. Dr. Gestron is who I would regularly work with. I don't know who is writing their letters these days. You know, basically, I -- the last one I saw was cut us a check for this much and that will mitigate it. So, I -- but I haven't -- with some of the changes over there I haven't engaged with them. We certainly can see what may be other appropriate forms of mitigation, whether it be off-site connections to alleviate some busing concerns. I really do think that they missed an opportunity in reviewing some of these projects to think outside that box a little bit. They are just looking at the number of homes and the number of kids. Well, what's going on around? How close is it to a school? And if this little piece of sidewalk got connected and now all of a sudden it opens up two neighborhoods free of safety busing, well, there is a fiscal, you know, response that mitigate some of the -- having to buy -- hire another teacher or two, but yet they don't have to run a bus in that neighborhood. So, we can -- I mean we will work with them and see if we can't get them to think along the lines through the -- through their review of our projects, just to reiterate. The clerk transmits to them all these applications, but maybe just a refresh to whoever is writing those letters. Now, that, you know, think a little bit outside the box of what maybe we can do to help you out with some of these things that aren't requiring the developer to cut you a multi thousand dollar check.

De Weerd: Yeah. And I guess just to capture, it may not be a cost that we know, but it's going to be a cost that they know and it's a cost that we pass off to

someone else, that also impacts the taxpayers that we need to be more cognizant of and that's -- that's what that discussion earlier today really raised is you -- you may not consider, but your decisions do impact other agencies and their cost. So, are you considering those. Same in the discussion with our -- our directors in terms of if you don't phase developments from the inside out and, then, you have to extend your water and sewer line all the way to the outside and, then, they start building back in, it's a huge cost and -- and so those are some of the conversations I hoped to -- to offer up as considerations during those discussions.

Bird: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mr. Bird.

Bird: While we are on that subject -- and I hope the Commission and the Council will never forget -- myself, I learned one good lesson on a deal that -- when we approve subdivisions, let's make sure that we have got a safe way to get children to school. That the sidewalks are in place before we -- as part of it, so that we are not coming back and having kids walk in gutters to get down there, you can't bus every subdivision and I think it's a priority to make the safety of the children walking to school a major priority when we approve these subdivisions and I hope we will never forget that.

De Weerd: Any other comments? Questions? Okay.

Parsons: I just wanted to touch base on what you had to say, Madam Mayor, is I have reached out to the school district. I left a message for Joe Slocum or Yocum --

De Weerd: Yocum.

Parsons: -- and asked -- I invited him to attend all of our pre-application meetings, come to our project review meetings and I haven't heard back from him yet. So, I will continue to do that to make sure that he's more informed early on in the process, so we can get at least some kind of comments or let them know what's coming down the pipeline, so he can at least take some of those issues under consideration for the school district, if he is the one that's writing those letters. I was told by a developer that he's the one handling that now for the school district and so I have reached out to him.

De Weerd: Thank you.

Parsons: So, the last couple applications or scope of review I wanted to touch on -- I know at the beginning of the presentation I gave you a laundry list of applications that you review, but as Caleb mentioned, it's really annexation, rezone, preliminary plats -- that really what -- and multi-family developments,

conditional use permits, that we have seen the bulk of applications coming to the city. So, those are really the ones that I focused on as part of my presentation this evening. So, I'm going to bulletize these. I think Caleb has probably talked about your discretion, your authority at annexation and rezone, so I won't tie -- touch too much on that. But annexations themselves -- as you know, properties must be contiguous. Typically annexation requests happen after a request of the property owner. We don't typically force annexations. We -- the applicant comes to us and they talk to us about annexing and what it would take to develop the property in the city. Rezones. A little bit of a different animal. Typically already in the city, they just have a different vision for the property and so they want to rezone it to either residential to commercial or commercial to residential and typically how we analyze that or how -- our discussions with them is the zoning that they are requesting has to correspond with the future land use map. That's our guiding document. Our policies that drives the zoning in our city. As I mentioned to you, typically if we don't have an accompanying plat, conditional use permit, or planned unit development with these subdivisions our code requires that they submit a conceptual development plan, so that Council mainly and even Planning and Zoning, but mostly Council annexations or even with you, at least you can see what the vision is for that property, so that we can put appropriate conditions in that development agreement. Most of the time with annexations and rezones we do require a development agreement. Again, that's our bite at the apple to get the specific development we want for that particular property. In my years with the city there has -- typical things in the DA will be items for timing for infrastructure improvements. Sometimes a developer doesn't -- there might be an existing structure on the property that the owner doesn't want to hook up to city services at this time, so Council has made concessions to allow that to happen within two years of development of the site. A lot of times we want certain improvements to Mr. Bird's comments about -- as far as sidewalk and landscape improvements with first phase of development, to insure those connection points. We tie that into the development agreement, because we think we see value in that. What we try not to do is attach code requirements in DAs, because we have code that -- to drive that. Really the DA is really to -- to memorialize a commitment from the developer for off-site improvements, the extension of sewer and water, interconnectivity with the adjacent property owners maybe ties in to that concept plan and elevations and, then, a lot of times as you -- over the last couple months with that south Meridian annexation, there is some properties we just annexed in that have some nonconforming uses occurring on the site and so we set a sunset clause in those development agreements for how long those uses can continue until they have to cease and so that's really what we try to capture in a development agreement and, as I mentioned to you earlier in my presentation, both the Commission and City Council -- you have the authority to recommend DA provisions above and beyond what code rec -- what staff recommends in the staff report. So, I don't ever want you to think that you don't have that ability. You do. And a lot of times that happens. Things happen at the hearing and conditions do morph based on public testimony, based on the commitment the applicant is willing to do, if -- as staff or the Commission, staff,

and the applicant are at odds on that specific DA provision. I know the Commission and Council at times have -- have wordsmithed several of those conditions to make it work and try to find a workable compromise on certain provisions. So, you do have that ability to do that. But, keep in mind, the ultimate decision lies with the City Council. And, then, just a reminder to refresh everyone's memory, we just recently went through that UDC update and so now the DAs must be executed, if they are required are part of an annexation or rezone, must be executed within six months of City Council approval. So, that used to be two years, so we have expedited that process based on Council's direction and keep in mind if that -- that development agreement isn't executed, the project never officially gets rezoned or if the DA isn't executed and approved by the Council and not recorded, the ordinance doesn't get done and the property isn't officially annexed or rezoned in the city. So, that's really a key for staff -- for us to track those. I know sometimes the -- it can be a burden on our legal department to keep a running list of all those outstanding DAs out there, but I did want to let you know that sometimes people will look at at our map and say why isn't my property in the city. Well, you haven't -- you haven't followed through with the entire process. So, I at least wanted to share that with you.

De Weerd: So, Bill, at one point do -- would they have to go through the process to annex again? When they don't do it during that timeline does it expire and have to start over again?

Nary: Madam Mayor, Members of the Council, to maybe give some historical context to it, we -- as Bill said, we used to have a two year window and one of the problems with that is that other things get developed around it in that two year window and your expectation and the Commission's expectation is that you were going to build this sometime soon and by the time things get built around it maybe doesn't fit anymore. So, that was the reason we shortened that time window. But it does require the city to initiate contact, then, with the developer saying your time is up, you know, you have this time to sign it, otherwise, we are going to consider your project withdrawn and we are going to go through the process to, essentially, erase all of that approval and, then, you are going to have to start over. Since we -- we have done that we have -- I'm trying to think, it was probably a couple years ago that we had a few of those projects that we notified that we no longer would accept the development agreement, because our ordinance didn't allow it and some we never heard of, some had gone bankrupt, some had -- you know, had left and the property went back to the bank and a few came in and signed them and got it taken care of. So, doesn't require our initiation to get it finalized, but it does, again, shorten up the time, so that things get built and get done timely.

De Weerd: Do those come back before Council, so they -- they are aware?

Nary: Yes.

De Weerd: Okay.

Parsons: So, touching on the preliminary plat applications, I know we have recently had one that was denied for a Cooperbrook Subdivision and so that -- I really wanted to again, this -- this doesn't really -- next slide really talks about what our vision or what objectives are for approving subdivisions in the City of Meridian and one is always to always promote the Comprehensive Plan. I mean that's our vision, that's what guides our development in our city. I remember for Copperbrook it was minimal design. It wasn't even an attractive design and so, again, we have policies in our UDC that says we support that. We want creative designs of our subdivisions.

De Weerd: But, Bill, I think that that example also was -- there was a real consideration to Highway 16 wasn't -- you didn't know where it was going to go and where was the right of way, what was the design and were you creating a potential conflict as -- as that road project moved forward. I think that and orderly growth was a big consideration of that.

Parsons: And I -- and you're right. All of that is addressed in this slide. It talks about orderly growth and development as the next one and how you extend your water, sewer, transportation facilities, which is ITD's future Highway 16. Certainly you touched on it a little bit earlier, Mayor, on do we want to extend all of our infrastructure out onto the fringe and, then, work our way backwards. Again, all of those things you touched on with that project fall into play. We try to avoid those things. It's addressed in this here specifically. Roads and streets, that's how we get the developer or applicant to dedicate right of way. One thing I didn't mention in my earlier presentation is based on the number of units proposed with the development, ACHD is going to require a traffic study and that -- that slows their review and our review of a project down, because we have to make sure that what the developer is proposing can be handled by the existing infrastructure and what improvements will be triggered because of that development coming into the city.

Hood: And if I can, Bill, just to interrupt again real quick. Just a little bit behind the scenes of what we do with the traffic impact study, too. We require that ACHD accept the traffic impact study before we begin to process an application. What we have -- their review of that TIS can be lengthy. Sometimes several months. What we have agreed to do -- and this is, again, kind of a checkpoint with you all -- sometimes we will send a staff report up to the Planning and Zoning Commission without having ACHD comments on those applications where we have said we are not going to send that forward to the City Council until we get that, because the Council needs to have all the facts to consider as they make that decision. So, it's kind of a compromise, because it doesn't seem fair to hold up a developer to wait oftentimes several months for ACHD to complete their review, but it is -- the Planning and Zoning Commission kind of gets caught in that a little bit, because they don't have the staff report from ACHD

sometimes and, yet, we are asking them to make a decision about this or at least a recommendation on it, so -- but, again, there is some -- a little bit of a compromise there with the development community and what we thought we could still make a recommendation on as staff. There is still coordination and communication with, but we don't have that final staff report and maybe don't know everything they are going to require. But, again, we have said ACHD you absolutely have to have -- we have to have that for Council. So, it will make the process longer. Ideally we would have all that information as staff so we can make a full informed decision to make a recommendation to the Planning and Zoning Commission, who, then, in turn, can make it to you. But TIS's are -- yeah, they are lengthy, involved and, again, it takes months for them to review and time is money. So, I just want to let everybody know that's kind of how things play out. It's not ideal, but that's -- that's how it happens on the back end.

Parsons: And a lot of times -- sometimes we will have a draft staff report, so we do get that early on, but, as Caleb mentioned, it's -- we don't -- the most important step is getting that accepted, now we know they are actually -- we don't even accept the application until it's accepted. Don't even schedule it for a hearing and that, because that's how important it is to us. So, I just want to preface that to you. ACHD has done a pretty good job communicating to us their timelines for developments and when they expect to get comments to us and we at least -- again, our goal is to get draft comments for Planning and Zoning. If they can't make the deadline for a final draft staff report -- or final staff report, then, we at least try to get a draft staff report in front of Planning and Zoning Commission. If not, then, we at least, like Caleb said, hold it up until we get to City Council. And, certainly the Planning and Zoning Commission, if there is a lot of public testimony there about transportation and we don't have a staff report, the P&Z has been very good on saying maybe we should continue this out until we have ACHD's comments. So, you will have that in your purview. If you don't have enough information to make a recommendation, recommend a continuance until we get ACHD's comments. You understand you have the authority to do that. So, I won't discuss about the scope of review of anymore applications. I think we have -- we have beat that to death, but you can see a lot of times these applications they do come in concurrently and you all have different responsibilities -- roles and responsibilities as far as your scope and purview, but right now I will turn it over to Caleb and -- I will stand for any questions and, then, Caleb can finish -- go onto the next topic for tonight's discussion.

De Weerd: Anything from Commission or Council? Okay.

Hood: So, this next item, Item 4, is going to be pretty quick I think. Just wanted to -- again, just refresh everybody or beat it into you if we need to -- we do prepare -- we lovingly call them cheat sheets, but they are the hearing outlines, you know, just at the top with some room for notes, kind of summarizes everything about a project, any outstanding issues, recommendations. In that we have proposed -- the proposed motion. So, you know, unless you modify what's

written and presented to you in -- in the record, that's what we are going to go with. So, just -- it's a request for you to make -- and you guys are doing a great job of it, but it makes explicit changes -- unless we hear that from you in the motion, we are going with what's written. We get -- the public comment will be part of the record and if you want to make that as part of your motion that's fine, but we aren't interpreting that public comments to say, on, yeah, let's change this condition. So, just -- again, just a request -- and, again, we have come a long ways in that. I think you guys are doing a great job of explicitly saying this condition amend it this way and this one amend it that way. You know, unless we hear that from you in the motion it's going to stay as written in the staff report. So, just remember that if you will. The other thing that I will just point out or, again, ask if there is any feedback -- is the fairly new format that we have on your agenda, the H numbers that you are seeing now instead of the -- you can still see some of the PP's and the RZ's on there, but they are all H level applications. You can approve those in one motion. Just -- again, if you are going to do that just say and in the condition of approval for the preliminary plat I want them in this one and in the condition for the rezone I want them in that one, but you don't have to take them -- you know, it only saves a minute or two, but you don't have to do roll call and all that for each individual one. And, again, I think you guys are all doing that, I just wanted to reiterate that. So, with that I think that's all we wanted to -- to get in front of you is just, again, a refresher on. If there is any questions about making those motions I just wanted to kind of clarify that.

Borton: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Excuse me. Yes, Mr. Borton.

Borton: Bless you. Sort of on the -- on this point is there are times when a developer will have an application, meetings will close, and there will be comments and even a motion and in particular if it's to deny based upon something where the applicant may at times wave and wish they could address it and -- and begs to be tabled for two weeks and -- I don't know how we reconcile our process, the Commission and Council, to try and either signal our motions or concerns. Something in a manner that allows the applicant time to not just wave at us, but give some input that says, hey, give me some time, I can address that condition, or I can clarify your concern. I don't know if staff is hearing any comments from developers saying we wish we would get a heads up earlier.

Hood: Madam Mayor, I haven't heard any of that feedback necessarily, but just a thought. I mean you could after -- it looks like the rest of the public testimony is concluded -- obviously, we can talk or you can ask staff questions, you can say, you know, kind of -- before you ask the applicant to come up for his final -- and kind of give a heads up. Not directly addressing him, but with staff even have that dialogue and say, you know, this doesn't really feel right to me, this is one of the things I -- you know, I'm not real comfortable with. What does staff think about the fencing along there. Should -- you know, maybe that's a bad

example, because you can condition fencing pretty well. But -- but whatever that thing may be that is leaning you towards denial, say, you know, staff, three things with this one just are kind of bugging me a little bit and the applicant is sitting right here and can hear that with the idea -- but do the timing of that -- do that before the Chair or the Mayor asks them to come up for their final comment and then -- because oftentimes we will do that and, then, there will be questions of staff from that dialog and you guys are talking. So, maybe you have some of that be -- after you have already heard all those -- the public comment. And sometimes there is going to be things that the applicant is going to need to address or brought up by the public, you know, what's going to happen with my irrigation ditch. Well, maybe you do want to hear from them first, but there could be an opportunity before they come back up, even, where you say, boy, staff, have you thought about the irrigation ditch? What happens if they leave it open, is that going to be -- is that a problem with code or -- but the timing of that and there may be an opportunity to have some of that dialogue and kind of, again, give a heads up to the developer that these are some concerns you heard just from hearing what -- was it public's testimony or raised in the staff report or whatever -- I think you have that opportunity. And, again, the Chair's discretion to invite them back up. I mean if there is nothing to say -- I mean once you close the public hearing you'd have to motion to reopen it, but they are waving, at the discretion of the chair if they want to -- makes for a long meeting, but -- I think that's more efficient to have -- give them a heads up before they do their rebuttal.

Nary: Madam Mayor -- Madam Mayor, Members of the Commission and Council Members, Council Member Borton, you know, I would concur with Caleb that we haven't had that happen very much. I think all of you have been very good at making clear what you like and what you don't like when the discussion is going on and -- and I think the Council at least has been really good at being able to determine on an individual basis that this could be better -- it doesn't need to -- it doesn't need to go back or go away and there is others that -- there is really nothing to make this better. I mean they really can't fix it. So, certainly a number of years ago there was times that were -- it was a little surprising what the decision might have been, because there maybe wasn't a lot of conversation, but I think the Commission and the Council are pretty good at identifying what their concerns are before they make the final motion. So, I think most of the time they could see it happening.

De Weerd: Anything else on that? Okay.

Item 5: Street Naming And Addressing Ordinance Update

Nary: Madam Mayor, Members of the Council, Members of the Commission, I have the next item on addressing. So, the -- Council Member Cavener, if you will remember about a year ago we had an issue about an address on Overland Road in regards to a Primary Health facility. Subsequent to that -- and we had a lot of different -- differences in our code on how addressing is done and it's the

government, so it's incredibly complicated and so we are part of a committee that's part of a larger countywide committee on how addressing is accomplished. So, we have been working internally and one of my deputy attorneys is on this -- on this internal committee and trying to update our code, make it a little bit cleaner, a little more consistent. We had -- the process got slowed a little bit, because the county was going through their own process of improving the county code on how addressing is done. So, we are still in the midst of working through that. But one of the questions that came up is there is a discrepancy in the city code as to who -- who makes those decisions on addressing. So, the idea that I was asked to bring to you tonight is it is incredibly awkward for the Council to deal with something like this. It just -- it just is a very unusual type of thing that you see, because it's so out of the norm from what you would normally see. A number of years ago we had a different process in the code in regards to people that were disputing their billing in regards to utility billing and that particular process required a board that was made up of the Mayor and some other -- some other city staff. That didn't function very well. So, we changed it to a board that's made up of city staff and a citizen that will hear these types of complaints and myself and our Public Works director is on that board, as well as a citizen, who is the chair, and we have four or five hearings a year on these types of disputes and we have a pretty good consistent process in place and one of the things we did in creating that was we created a very limited right of appeal. So, they still have the ability to appeal to the City Council as the ultimate decisionmakers, but the right is more limited. Instead of having another hearing in front of the City Council, you just are reviewing the hearing that was already held and make sure that due process was held and that they had an opportunity to be heard and they had opportunity to present evidence and findings were made appropriately and if you agreed with those then -- then the appeal is done and there is not another hearing. So, the suggestion of the working group was to use the Planning and Zoning Commission in the same fashion in dealing with addressing problems. Right now the Planning and Zoning Commission is the final decision maker subject to appeal on conditional use permits. We felt this would be appropriate. Again, I don't know that we will have very many. In the years I have been involved with the city in some capacity we have had a few. I mean really a few types of ones that went beyond the staff level dispute over addressing. But that was the request of the committee. If the Council is in favor of that we have some code clean up. We have to work with planning on some of it in -- in the UDC, so there is a process we have to follow to do that, but if you would be willing or you're agreeable to that, we can begin the process to get those changes made if you're okay with it.

De Weerd: Okay. Any comment, feedback for Bill? You guys are way too energetic.

Cavener: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mr. Cavener.

Cavener: For Mayor or Chairman Yearsley, I guess. For me I -- I'd like to hear from the Commission as to their thoughts on this before setting my recommendation. To me it doesn't seem like it's too time consuming or arduous, but --

De Weerd: Mr. Chairman, any comment?

Yearsley: Madam Mayor, I don't know if that would be -- I think that's something that we could take on as a Commission to address those items. I remember before in the past I think we actually did hear a couple of those through the Planning and Zoning Commission before and made recommendations. So, I think that would be agreeable.

Bird: That's agreeable with me.

De Weerd: And, frankly, that was the process, because I don't recall seeing it.

Nary: Madam Mayor, Members of the Council, that's -- that's why I think this committee helped identify. There is one section of our code that sounds as if the Planning and Zoning Commission is supposed to hear it first and one section that says the City Council is the ultimate decider and so we really just want to reconcile that to create that process, so it would go to the Planning and Zoning Commission and it could be appealed to the Council, but in a limited fashion, so that every time somebody doesn't like the decision, then, you're just wasting everybody's time to do it twice.

Bird: I don't think I have ever seen one.

De Weerd: Sounds good. Oh, good. We love to talk about accident --

Item 6: Access Management Along State Highways And ACHD Roadways

Hood: This will liven everybody up, uh? Okay.

De Weerd: Before you move on, I see two young men in our audience and -- are you hear for high school credit or college credit or -- college credit. See, you deserve a City of Meridian pin, Madam Clerk. Anyone who sits through this discussion earns a merit badge or something.

Hood: Madam Mayor, please, make them sit through this portion of the presentation and, then, they have earned their pin.

De Weerd: I think they earned it after our first agenda item.

Bird: Is this a Tom presentation?

Hood: No. Five slides I think. In two minutes. Three minutes, maybe. Unless there is discussion to be had. I just wanted to -- Madam Mayor, is it okay to proceed? Just wanted to take a couple minutes and just update everybody on -- again, I'm not trying to talk down to anybody, but I want to make sure that there is at least a similar level of understanding when we talk about some of these things, when we talk about a hierarchy of freeway, to arterial roadway, or a major arterial, a minor arterial, to a collector, to a residential street. So, that's kind of what this diagram shows is -- you know. And think if it in volume; right? You can move cars -- generally more cars at a faster speed on a freeway, a little less cars, a little less speed on an arterial and so on and so forth down the hierarchy. But I wanted to highlight that land use planning decisions do affect crashes and safety and so, really, there are two points here and I will just cut to the punch line now, but, you know, access really is about moving cars -- more cars, more efficiently and safely. So, access points have -- and I didn't bore you with any slides with a bunch of charts and graphs that show, you know, number of accesses per mile, how your crash rate goes up, but that's what it does. I mean every access point reduces the ability for your volume and capacity to move cars more efficiently, because you get a discrepancy in speed. Even if it's a 35 mile an hour roadway, that's really where most of your crashes happen, right, is somebody going faster than somebody else and that's what causes a lot of crashes and -- I do have a little bit, but -- of a diagram, but not to make you feel bad with the second bullet, the planning decision contribute to injury and fatalities, I mean -- but -- but that's true. Land uses and access points do contribute to conflicts on the roadway and so what we try to do is reduce those for the most part. Working with ACHD and ITD, reduce the rate at which a motorist encounters conflicts and the speed differential -- differential that I was talking about are big things. So, this one just shows the amount of conflict you can have with each turn and it can be oversimplified, too, but, you know, a turning movement -- there is multiple lanes at multiple points that you can have, an opposing force that -- that runs into -- or that potential for that conflict. So, you reduce those, reduce the amount of conflicts. So, again, not to make you feel bad about approving driveways, because driveways and roadways, you need them, but just remember that in abundance they can be detrimental to moving traffic and safety of motorists and pedestrians. So, I won't read these to you, but most accidents occur at driveways and intersections. And, then, you can see kind of the statistics where the severity of those crashes are at -- at intersections. So, here is our current city code and it's a little bit different for state highways than your arterials and collector roadways, but with a real similar thought that we try to limit them where possible. So, on state highways you're allowed to use that access until you propose a change of use or intensify an existing use and at which point, then, we will ask you to cease use of that and find another way to access the public roadway networks, so -- and, then, we only allow new public streets at the section line and half mile. So, it doesn't mean it has to be right smack dab in the middle of a section, you know, a half mile, but generally a half

mile location for public streets accessing US 20-26, to Highway 55, 69 -- so, that's the -- that's a policy. And, then, also to construct a frontage or backage road so people can get to that mid mile access. So, you may be on the mid mile. We are going to ask you to construct a frontage or a backage road that stubs to your adjacent property owner, so they don't need access to the state highway, they can come to yours or if you're off of that it's reciprocated and you can get to their access. But, again, especially on highways, 50, 55 miles an hour here in Meridian. So, you put -- every time you put a driveway in -- well, not everybody comes to a complete stop, but, basically, clear from zero up to speed and that takes folks longer and that's where -- where you do get a lot of rear-end crashes as well at those intersections. So, we try to limit those and keep traffic flowing, because now if I have to tap my brakes that has a back stream effect on traffic behind me or may not make that next signal, because they are timed, so I can go the speed limit to get through intersections. So, that's state highways. The arterials and collectors, this one has -- and it kind of goes without saying on a state highway, council still has the discretion to grant the access to state highways as well, but we explicitly state that for arterials and collectors and I know we get quite a few of these. We are not as strict on arterials and collectors, but it still is a very good policy to have, that when available take your access from local streets. If you don't have local streets, you can have that access, but we want to see you share that, reciprocate that access when -- when appropriate. It's not a one size fits all. We don't want necessarily commercial traffic cutting through a residential subdivision to get there. But, then, stubs to those -- to those streets. So, that's -- that's how our code reads in a nutshell for access. Again, this is the punch line. Capacity is consumed with more access points, so you increase congestion. We also have that -- you're inclined to widen the roadways, because you see the congestion, so now you want to say, oh, let's blow out that intersection. Let's widen the roadway. Well, you wouldn't have to if you're able to move as many cars in a smaller footprint, potentially, but that sometimes can be the impact as widening and you get more traffic accidents, so there is safety congestion. The economic impacts are -- are often discounted, but there are longer travel times -- not just for commuters, but also for businesses that have -- you know, they are expected to have deliveries at a certain point at a certain time and if that can't make that, they got to discount their rate or they can only make three instead of four trips per day, because this roadway is congested, it sort of reduces their area to maybe even reach out -- outside and provide their services to a broader market and, then, air pollution, which should also be considered I guess environment, but -- and, then, sometimes we do see those arterials cause cut-through and people look for other alternatives. If this roadway is too congested I'm going to cut through this neighborhood and get to point B, because I'm not going to sit through that congestion. So, anyway, just a quick refresher. I just wanted to kind of -- sorry to rush through that, but just to let everybody know what our current policies are and that there is a hierarchy and we do tend to scrutinize a little bit more the state highways, with the intent that we are trying to -- you know, we like people to come to Meridian and stay, but most of them have a through, you know, nature to

them on a good chunk of the traffic, they are just trying to get through, and so ITD doesn't want to keep those volumes -- excuse me -- the speed limits higher for the most part and -- and, again, from my perspective this is the safety element of that. We want higher speeds -- again, staff has seen them. You know, the higher the speed the more likely we are that the accident is going to be more severe. So, that's why we scrutinize those access points on arterial -- on highways a little bit more than we do arterials and collectors, although they are all important, so -- with that, Madam Mayor, Mr. Chair, I would stand for any comments or questions or feedback you may have on that.

De Weerd: Any comments or questions? Okay. Item No. 7.

Item 7: Potential Code/Policy Changes – Residential Lot Sizes, Transitions And Open Space

Parsons: So, just to follow up on my end of the presentation is something that we have touched upon early in my -- bullet point number two on tonight's agenda, but, really, we are looking for, one, discussing potential code changes and policy changes based on, again, the amount of denials that we have seen over the last couple months, but in particular I remember one discussion that the city council -- previous Council Member Rountree brought with -- in relation to shift two when we were discussion reducing our lot sizes in Meridian and how we provide that transition when we have smaller residential lot subdivisions up against county subdivisions that are one acre or even R-4 or R-2 subdivisions and I believe at that hearing I testified of that we have Comprehensive Plan policies that speak to that, providing that transitional lot size. So, if you remember not too long ago there was a project that came before you, which was Bull Ranch and they had an R-8 development and it was going up against Saguaro and I -- I did bring slides of that to kind of refresh the Council's memory, but in particular the Council had concerns with, you know, how is that lot going to -- how does that provide a transition against these larger lots here. One of the neighbors, they were concerned about having their single family homes up against her one home and so ultimately that project was denied for various reasons, not only based on the transitional lot sizes, but certainly we want to revisit that discussion with you this evening and see if, one, are you -- the communication back then was we would tell -- talk to the applicant early on in the process at preapplication meetings that our expectations are that you provide transitional lots along the periphery of your project, particularly since -- if your lot sizes are quite a bit smaller than the adjacent develops. And, two, we support that in our staff report through the Comprehensive Plan policies. So, I just wanted to refresh your memory on that conversation and, then, see if -- if you had any other input or thoughts or you think that's the appropriate steps to take at this time as far as communicating lot sizes. And, then, another example would be our -- our in-fill -- our in-fill developments and that most recent was Brinegar Prairie. Again, we had a 20 acre parcel that was surrounded by R-4 developments and the developer would -- going through their process to add an MDR designation on the comp plan. They had a density that was appropriate through an R-8. They had lot sizes that

were consistent with those standards and because they made concessions to the neighbors the Council wanted them to come back with a revised plat and provide R-8 lots along the periphery of that subdivision based on those -- based on those concessions to the neighbors. So, particularly for the transitional lot sizes, I think staff is just looking for direction from both Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council as to whether or not the process we have in place now, just getting out in front of that early on in the process and requiring that as part of their subdivision approval or whatever it may be, just using the comp plan policies this far, not necessarily changing the code, but give us some feedback and let us know if you think that's the way you want us to proceed moving forward.

De Weerd: Commission, Council, feedback?

McCarvel: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Commissioner McCarvel.

McCarvel: Yeah. Bill, I think the quicker you guys can get out in front of it the better, because it's always going to be a concern of ours, it's always going to be concern of the public. Those are the people we hear the most from, you know, when we get the 300 people in the crowd and you have got big lots with, you know, an R-8 or an R-15 coming in, they want to know how that's going to transition. So, I think the quicker we can get to that the better.

Palmer: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mr. Palmer.

Palmer: Madam Mayor, I -- I just want to share my experience in my life -- my long life. I have been around --

De Weerd: Long.

Palmer: Yeah. I know. Just under two years ago we moved from an apartment in Meridian to a house that's a thousand square feet in R-8 and we are adjacent to a subdivision of R-4. We get along great with our neighbors in the R-4 zone. There is no giant wall between us. We are right up against them. There is no problems at all and we have apartments adjacent to our R-8 area and had R-8 not existed in Meridian, I would still be in an apartment. Our house size, even through it was built in the '80s, is the most sought after home in Meridian right now, because, for one, there is few of it and there is lots of people that are in apartments that are looking to transition to being able to own a home and because it existed, because it was a smaller house, we were able to go from the rent that we had in an apartment to the same square footage in a house at the same amount that we were paying for the rent now owning a home building equity and now our home is for sale and we have made a tentative offer on the

house in our adjacent R-4 area that's the transition that -- I guess we will be real adults and -- and so I -- you know, while there is a lot of heartburn out there for new homes being built in Meridian, that are R-8, I think it provides an opportunity for people that move into Meridian when they are young to transition out of the apartment situations that they are in into a home where they can, then, build equity to be able to, then, move into R-4s and beyond situation and so I -- I feel like, you know, my -- my story is a success story in, you know, being able to stay in Meridian, come in here young, start building a family and -- and transition into what we are looking for to be built, but I don't -- I don't feel that R-8 is a problem or smaller in Meridian. I think it facilitates people being able to grow up here as kids, stay here and -- and become multi-generational Meridian families that we are looking for.

Cavener: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mr. Cavener.

Cavener: To Councilman Palmer's point, I think that's a great example of how transitioning works, from apartments to R-8 to R-4, and I think when we start to look at -- at in-fill developments, they are a little bit different than, you know, large scale build out projects and I -- I do see a benefit and when we were looking at these in-fills that some of those adjacent properties are transitioning differently and should be transitioning comparable to what is on the exterior of their boundary. For that very reason that Councilman Palmer points out is you have a diverse amount of housing options all relatively close together, because they are transitioned appropriately everybody benefits. So, my -- my comments would be for staff -- and I don't know how the rest of the Council feels, but when you start looking -- and we are going to start seeing a lot more of these in-fill projects. We have been seeing a lot of them. That those boundaries, as best we can, is they do transition to the -- to the adjacent properties regardless of -- of what development or what zoning they are looking for within that in-fill project.

Fitzgerald: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Commissioner Fitzgerald.

Fitzgerald: I will stretch. And I think Bill knows this, because I say it constantly in our meetings. In-fill is new to Meridian. We are kind of in our infancy in regards to seeing enclave parcels up in front of us constantly. I think it's a necessity to have that kind of buffer you can work out -- and I'm a big fan of density on corners. I look at -- drawing a blank right now on my subdivision -- or the community on it. Spurwing. Not Spurwing. Why am I blanking? Anyway -- that's crazy. But there is a need to have a buffer all the way out -- all the way out to -- hopefully commercial where people can walk to those -- those, you know, uses and I think when I talked to Bill about it a couple times in our meetings is there is a need to offset development efforts inside the community, so if you are

going to buffer these lots you probably need to give them a density bonus on another side or give them an alternate compliance or something -- I know Portland and other places that we are growing in to have these things that they can use, alternative compliance or density bonuses or -- I know our neighbor to the east that we won't talk about has density bonuses they utilize that are -- that are positive I think for -- it balances that buffer that developers can utilize. It gives the R-4 houses that buffer that they want to see, but it also doesn't impact the development to the bottom line where they can't build it and so there is a -- I think there is a way for the staff to look at alternative compliance, density bonuses on one half of it or, you know, doing, you know, off-site improvements or something that would give them the ability to stagger that down towards the bigger densities.

De Weerd: The problem is is you are still going to have the request for the R-8, which intimidates the neighbors --

Fitzgerald: Yes, ma'am.

De Weerd: -- and in turn probably raises the red flag up here. I recently attended a discussion about the millennials and the housing -- just what Councilman Palmer said is they are looking for -- to stay in one area that will meet their needs from first starting out to the next move up the next level, get the big house, now you're going to downsize when you get to be the empty nester and -- and they all want to stay in that part of town that's familiar, where their friends are, where perhaps their kids are, because they are transitioning through there as well. The millennials don't want the big yard, the three car garage and some of that. They -- some do. But I think that we have -- we have in our Comprehensive Plan that we are going to offer choices of housing styles, yet when it gets to -- to the subdivisions and the neighbors, no one want choices, they just want the same as what is behind them or what's in their neighborhood and we have to start getting beyond that and having a better conversation that single house -- single family housing is compatible with single family housing.

Fitzgerald: Absolutely. Madam Mayor, can I just follow up real quick?

De Weerd: Uh-huh.

Fitzgerald: And so the neighborhood I brain cramped on was Paramount and there is -- that neighborhood -- if you look at the middle it's very -- it's big lots and big houses and it transitions out to row houses and, you know, alleyloaded, to apartments on a corner to commercial areas that are all around it. That is a walking community with a high school and an elementary school in the middle. Heritage is right across the street from it. It literally -- you can be born there and literally move to a managed care facility in however many months they are going to build that thing, you could never leave the neighborhood if you didn't want to and I think there -- there are some discussion points that needed to happen

around -- you know. And we are running out of those giant tracks of land that we can manage -- you know, we can master plan a community that's a mile square. But there is something to be said for how that was developed and we need to think about how to transition some of those lots there.

De Weerd: And you hit the nail on the head. That was a planned development and it all came in as one big thing and -- because we had neighbors show up on the apartments they were already approved, so we weren't to have the conversation on that, although they didn't want them, and so even that has its -- its problems. But, yeah, those larger -- we don't have those anymore and so you get them piecemeal, one piece at a time, which makes it really painful.

Hood: Madam Mayor, could I just point out kind of to your point a little bit there. Single family to single family, there isn't a required buffer and just to that point a little bit, because we are into the policy, in our comp plan it says three to eight dwelling units per acre. Well, there is a big difference between three and eight dwelling units per acre, but our comp plan says that's the same thing. Now we do -- just to clarify, in pre-apps -- and I don't go to many of them these days, but we talked to staff -- we do ask developers to be sensitive to the perimeter lots, but we don't say we need to match up the yards. So, we do -- you know, we ask them to look at that, but, again, it's not like for like. Just because the lot next to you is one hundred feet wide doesn't mean you have to -- but look at that. You know, be sensitive to that. Especially if you know they are going to come to a hearing, you know. At least know that and try to accommodate that. But, again, we are into policy section. So, if we think we want to change the city's policy where we have always lumped three dwelling units per acre and eight dwelling per acre under medium density, we call that all the same, we can split that out. We see a three to five as medium low and six to eight as medium high -- you know, we can do that if we want to kind of avoid some of this. But I'm a little bit of the opinion -- and, again, it's one of those -- you know it when you see it type of thing. I can't write the code to say thou shalt not do it in this case, but -- but I think you can have small lots next to big lots and it can work fine. But sometimes it doesn't. But, again, that's -- kind of just bring it back to policy. Right now a 5,000 square foot lot next to an 8,000 square foot lot is totally fine. It may not be to the 8,000 foot lot owner, they have an opportunity come and testify and tell you why that isn't appropriate, but as a policy staff isn't telling the applicants to say you need like for like on your perimeter of your subdivision. But if that's what you want us to tell them, we could do that and like was pointed out earlier, we are kind of letting folks know -- I'm going to go to the other example, you know, recently this project was denied, so just to kind of give you an idea -- not saying that on your piece of ground, if you came in with something similar it would be, but here is one that was. So, just be aware of that. You know, it's tough. You have a triangular shaped lot -- you know, match that up, you know, it -- you know, you're kind of stuck there and --

De Weerd: But right next to it is half acre lots.

Hood: Yeah.

De Weerd: You know. And it's hard when -- when you have the half acre lots, you have --

Hood: Ten thousand square foot.

De Weerd: -- an expensive home subdivision that you're going to do something that you already know what it is, it makes it difficult.

Hood: Well --- and just to finish that out, you have got real similar product, then, on the east side of this. So, you have got kind of all worlds here. You have got the -- the density on the one side, you have got half acre on the other -- I mean I kind of -- the rest of Meridian on the south. So, they are stuck in the middle. So, again, this is -- I think goes to show -- it's all single family. It just allows a little -- it allows a choice to have a smaller lot that maybe I don't want to maintain the yard -- now, I don't necessarily want to get into construction and the houses, what they look like and that type of thing, but that certainly is another -- you know, that's another element. We are just talking about transitional lots and if you want us to provide different feedback as a pre-app again, so there is no surprises. If you want us to tell applicants, hey, Council and Commission these days, they are expecting if you're next to a 10,000 square foot lot, you better be eight or nine anyways -- and it's tough, because I understand, you know, people are still going to probably come and testify, but from staff's perspective having two or three backyards -- and it may not be ideal, but -- anyway, that's --

McCarvel: Madam Mayor? Yeah. I think the -- Caleb I mean all we are looking for is transition, so you don't have somebody who is used to some elbow room and personal space and just esthetically -- I mean it looks odd to, you know, go through that street and have all these big houses and, then, you have got really small -- I mean there just needs to be a transition, because there is definitely a need for R-8s and -- I mean in that whole -- everything in the middle. I just think it needs to be an esthetic transition.

Fitzgerald: And I agree. I think if we can -- I mean match up the things that look right and, then, possibly provide density to the -- I mean I think that's -- because you have a big, large scale between three and eight, so put the eight onto the north and put three down at the bottom and see if you can balance it out and, then, still it's a discussion of is there alternative compliance that we can come up with on what that looks like, so that we can still make the bottom line work for the developer and that's -- I still think that's something we aren't ready to answer today, but something we need to look at.

De Weerd: And I think Brinegar was not just the lot for lot, there was concern about that straightaway on the collector. There was concern about this being a

bus stop and where do the parents park while their kids are loading the bus and there were -- and -- so, I could get into all the little nitpicky stuff as well. So, I don't know if it's always lot size, although that was -- a lot of time was spent on that. There is usually other considerations. Use of open space and -- and those kind of things.

Milam: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mrs. Milam.

Milam: And I agree with that. I like seeing the transitional lot sizes and I live in an R-8 that backs up to an R-4, so I know what it's like and my neighbors probably hate the fact that they have two or three lots, you know, backed up to theirs. I always try to look at it from how I would feel if I was -- you know, if we had people testifying, how would I feel if I were them, how would -- you know, from the developer -- from both points of view, so -- but with a transitional say width, it doesn't mean -- you know, they might be able to make them not as deep, so they may not necessarily have to be 10,000 square feet, but do they kind of match up at least on the back side. You know, they can shorten up and still save some space that way. But I definitely like seeing not two or three lots to somebody else's backyard that's been there enjoying their space for a long time.

Palmer: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mr. Palmer.

Palmer: Madam Mayor, I -- just regards to lot size, I totally -- you know, I understand -- you know, I don't know how many that say they look at what was in the land -- future land use or Comprehensive Plan. They all say they do. Whether they do or not I don't know. I will say that they do. But if -- and so if someone's applying for something that's not that, then, I completely understand the argument. But if it fits within it, if it could be R-8 or it could be R-4 and they say, well, we were hoping for R-4, I'm more than happy to tell them, you know what, if you -- if you looked at the map you should have either -- and know that it's possible that there could be small lot sizes there and that's your concern, you should choose somewhere else to live or buy the land and put what you want there. If you're not going to do that you're taking the risk that what we say is going to go there just might happen and, you know, we may get 50 people in here that might not like it, but if it's in the plan and they moved in knowing -- or possibly knowing that that could happen, I have no problems saying that was the plan. Thanks for coming.

Yearsley: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Chairman Yearsley.

Yearsley: You got to be fast in this deal to get your -- your word in. You know -- and I -- I kind of go back to the transitions from between the two. You know, it doesn't necessarily have to be an R-2 to R-4, but try to make it somewhat close, so it at least gives some resemblance of what it looks -- you know, what the adjacent properties look like and -- and, then, maybe make some of the other ones a little denser. And I think the problem with a lot of this is, again, that R-4 designation people relate to to slums and -- and that's -- I don't quite know how to overcome that. The one thing that I found interesting -- I live over off of Eagle and Victory -- and on one side of the road they put 29 homes in -- on five acres.

De Weerd: A county sub.

Yearsley: No. It was approved by -- it's a City Council and it's tight, it's dense, it's -- it's okay. But right next -- across the street they did something very similar, but it was interesting to me that they -- in the look of the homes they made them look nicer. They jazzed them up. They made them different than a normal home and it was amazing to me -- I like the other subdivision much better, because of what they were doing with the home to make the look much nicer and I think some of that we want to put back onto them, too, is if you're going to put the density in there, let's -- let's make this look nice, because if it looks nice, tendency people are going to want it, then, to keep looking nice and maybe that's some of the -- the thing that we want to condition with that is -- you know, if you are going to go to the smaller lots or smaller home, let's -- let's be inventive. Let's just not put house A, house B, house A, house B in that subdivision and try to push them to come up with some better designs.

De Weerd: You mean garage A and garage B, garage C.

Yearsley: Something like that. Well -- and just -- you know. And, then, the same thing over and over again, so --

De Weerd: Because you know you can't put much more than the garage and a door next to it.

Yearsley: Absolutely.

De Weerd: I think your -- you're catching the -- the hint of density should look decent. And it certainly can. One of my favorite subdivisions it Heritage Commons and it -- it's pretty dense and the homes are really close together, but what a nice neighborhood feel, too. And they certainly have the -- the green space to support the -- the play area, but they don't necessarily have in their yards. It's nice. So -- any other comment? Any other information?

Parsons; I'm good on that topic. I will move on to open space and I think a lot of the Commission and Council -- even the Mayor touched bases on it is -- is open space and how to incentivize that process, so that was quite a bit of a discussion

from our development community. If you recall I presented a couple options for pursuing some code updates and that's still on the radar for the next UDC update. Also stated that that needed to be vetted through out UDC focus group. We don't have a perfect solution for that yet and that is going to take some work. But I did want to at least let you know the developer of the Birkhill Estates, they have submitted an application to modify the UDC to reduce the open space from ten percent to five percent based on the -- if the residential development is in excess -- or large -- 16,000 square feet or larger. So, I can't go into too much of those details, because it is a pending application, but Planning and Zoning Commission did take action on that application last week and so I at least want to let you know that there is a text amendment coming your way driven by a developer, not necessarily the city. So, we certainly have to get more tools in our tool box, look at that density bonus, make sure that -- as Caleb alluded to, do the annexation process, do the platting process, do the alternative compliance process if that's a route that we want to take. There has got to be a way if you're going to do something equal to or better than, there has to be a way to incentivize that and I think -- I remember Mayor kind of -- a light bulb went off the top of my head when you said what about alternative compliance. So, certainly that's something we can look at as we move forward and call it incentivization or whatever we want to call it, but there has got to be a way -- if you're going to do a pool or a clubhouse or something on that open space and it's X amount of dollars or it's -- it serves this many people or this many acreage, then, there has got to be a way to allow them to reduce their open space or provide their proportionate share. I think that's the right -- let's try to get away from that here is the minimum number you need. Let's try to say is it proportionate to the development. I think that's the strategy and the approach that we need to take to open space in our amenities and with that I would stand for any other ideas you might on that topic.

De Weerd: And I think some of that open space -- as long as it's all in one place so it's more obvious -- the problem we see with some of the open space is it's chopped up and it really is drainage lots and so you think, well, there is not a lot of incentive behind that. It's not very creative. I thought it was really funny, though, having a volleyball court in a drainage pit. It --

Bird: Mud volleyball.

De Weerd: Mud volleyball. Hey. Or -- but, you know, I guess those kind of things is how -- making use of the open space. It's --

Bird: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mr. Bird.

Bird: I don't have a question or anything, I just got to thank you guys. Caleb, Bill, Josh, C.J. and Sonya, I think this is about as good a presentation as I have ever had between the two deals. You guys seen the problems we have been having,

you brought it, focused on it. While I don't agree with all your answers, you know that, but I -- I appreciate something like this. It's been an enjoyable hour and 45 minutes. You made a very good presentation. You brought the facts and everything out to us. I can't thank you enough for the work you do and your presentations to City Council have gotten better and better and better. Thank you guys for very much.

Hood: It looks like Sonya already left. I appreciate those comments, Mr. Bird. I do want to acknowledge the staff as well. Josh, you know, he has been here less than a year now, but I think he's -- he's really been a great addition to our team. C.J. just goes without saying. I mean he's a star. We have had him for a little over a year now. The Mayor still won't, you know, let us forget that we stole him, but what a great addition and, Bill, even his position changed. So, we got some new staff and I think they have really done a great job and I want to just thank them publicly, although there is not a lot of public here, for the work they do, because for a small staff the volume that we do -- you can't find another planning staff like ours. So, they do a great job and -- and, Sonya, even though she's not here, I'm certainly including her in the comments, so -- but thank you for your comments, Mr. Bird.

Parsons: Yeah. Certainly appreciate the -- we appreciate the feedback. It goes a long way. We take pride in what we do for the city. We are all here working extra hours, making sure we address issues, get in front of these types of concerns, so that -- we try to make your job easier. That's really what our goal is, too, is to be honest with our citizens, our community, and bring forth quality developments and that's what we stand for. We believe in Meridian and we -- we are dedicated and we want you to know that as well and we appreciate that.

Bird: Council, anymore comments or questions?

Milam: Mr. President?

Cavener: Mr. President?

Bird: Which one wants to go first? Mr. Cavener?

Cavener: First? All right. Mr. President, Chairman Yearsley, a couple of comments along your comments, Mr. Bird. For one I would like to thank the P&Z for joining us here tonight. I know it goes without saying, but we appreciate your insight. I know we are not supposed to have cross talk in these types of meetings, but I have had the opportunity a couple times to thank the Commissioners to my left for the insight that you bring and I think the staff does a great job when they give those cheat sheets that summarize what the -- the thoughts and the comments were, not just from the public, but from Planning and Zoning as well and -- and I know that we have seen a lot of denials lately, but the one thing that I think we all need to take stock of, in addition to having some

newer people on staff, we have got a newer and younger City Council and new members on Planning and Zoning and so there is different perspectives on some of this stuff and I think it's important that we -- we share that with -- with the development community that with new people come new ideas and new insight and it's not the products that we are bringing forward are wrong, we are just looking for things to be done a little bit different. So, I thank you for your insight, for your time. I really value your feedback on applications tremendously. So, thanks for all you do.

De Weerd: I would like to say it signifies the public process works. I think some the times citizens walk in here thinking it's a done deal and their voice doesn't matter. I have appreciated that deliberation that I have seen at the Planning and Zoning Commission and some of the concerns or recommendations that you bring forward to have discussed by City Council and, again, that conversation with City Council as they listen to the public. It shows that there is a public process in place and that one voice can make a difference. Oftentimes I think the public really does come and it's black and white. It's either yes or no. And I just appreciate our Commission and our Council that you -- you listen, you try and mitigate the concerns and you try and make sure that what you approve will be an asset, an amenity to our community, and so I think this conversation helps staff know what you're looking for. It also helps you know what you're allowed to even discuss or consider or ask a staff to bring back and it's a healthy conversation. But I would join in the praise for our Commission. I have joked that you take the arrows on behalf of the elected officials and oftentimes you do, but you're that first line that the public sees that, yes, there are citizens -- they are citizens like you and me, they represent us, and when they get to the citizen elected leaders that they -- I hope they feel that they get that same treatment. I certainly see it and I appreciate that.

De Weerd: Mrs. Milam, did you have something?

Milam: No. Madam Mayor. Sorry. I was going to talk on the topic, but everyone is giving closing statements and -- thank you all for being here. I really appreciate all the work that staff has put in and, Planning and Zoning Commission, we truly value what you do and we take it very seriously. So, thank you to all my fans --

De Weerd: I was hoping I came in at the end of the conversation. I thought, wow, you guys really zipped through the rest of those topics really fast.

Milam: Madam Mayor? So, really quickly, though. All I wanted to say is I really appreciate what you said about proportionate as far as amenities go, because that's what I wanted to bring up was maybe not -- just have certain amount of amenities per -- by some acreage, but also by density and by houses. And, then, we don't get in a situation where we did the other day where all they had to do was put in one amenity for 200 houses. Thank you.

De Weerd: You're welcome.

Yearsley: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Chairman Yearsley.

Yearsley: I wanted to ask the Council a couple of questions to make sure that we are doing our job appropriately. I notice a lot of times staff will condition that they modify the plat prior to City Council of something that they wanted to see. Would you rather have us continue the meeting and make those modifications, so -- because my concern is are we passing the buck to the Council for some of these decisions and making sure that we do our job appropriately and be able to weigh on those situations. So, I think that's kind of the one bigger one that -- that I -- we keep coming up with and trying to decide -- you know, we want to push these forward so they can get through the process faster, but yet we don't want to not do our due diligence and actually not do our job and put those decisions on you. So, I would be curious to see what your thoughts on that situation is, just to make sure that we are doing our job appropriately.

Palmer: Mr. President?

Bird: Go ahead.

Palmer: My opinion on that is if it's faster then send on it. I signed up knowing, hey, meetings may go to 11:00 o'clock, midnight, being the free market capitalist guy that I am, if it can speed up the private sector getting to spend some money in Meridian by even a week, send it on, we will have a late meeting. I'm good.

Bird: Commissioner Yearsley, I agree, I think you guys are -- you do a great job. While we don't always agree, you have got to at least send -- send on a project that you have give your concern on and all that whether you and the staff have agreed or not, we get both sides of it and, then, we get to -- most of the time if they are like that we do have public testimony and that's when we have to make -- sit back and listen and make -- like you guys do and make our decisions. But I think you guys do a tremendous job. I can't think of a single project that you have sent forward that has been a real problem -- that we haven't created. And we can create them. Right, Caleb?

Hood: No comment.

Bird: Me, I can --

Yearsley: Thank you.

Bird: Do you have anything?

Cavener: Not -- just a response, Mr. President. Chairman Yearsley, speaking as just one Council member, I don't think we ever feel that Planning and Zoning is passing the buck onto us and to Councilman Bird's point, there is -- there is nothing that we get that comes from you guys that we think is a no brainer. I mean they require additional insight, deliberation, public testimony and feedback from staff. So, don't feel like that you're passing the buck to us at all.

Yearsley: Thank you,

Borton: Mr. President?

Bird: Yes, Mr. Borton.

Borton: We -- this came up most recently three -- two, three weeks ago down off of Ten Mile. I forget the name of the subdivision -- where there was great concern at P&Z about location of an access point. We were just talking about this one. And one of the things Council wrestled with -- yes. Thank you. Was, you know, P&Z brought up some good points and there was a recommendation to move the access and the recommendations and vetting the Commission goes through is extremely valuable, influential, and if -- using this as an example, you want to move an access and look at the plat and it might influence your recommendation one way or the other, I'm comfortable if you feel like you need to table it and you look at it again -- so, using this as an example, you see this plat, you see the relocation, it might confirm what you were going to recommend anyway -- I don't have a problem with that, because ultimately once it leaves your hands if your recommendation is to approve, that we rely on it greatly and your judgment and I know there have been times where we have pondered whether this is a big enough change to go back to P&Z, I don't have a problem if the Commission thinks a change may be big enough that it holds it.

Yearsley: Okay.

Borton: We all want to move things along, but we also want to make sure you have all the information to make a complete recommendation.

Yearsley: Thank you.

Borton: Because it's very valuable.

Oliver: Mr. Chairman, if I'm correct, this is at Ten Mile and Chateau?

Yearsley: Yes.

Oliver: The one that I was fortunate enough to talk with the staff and ask about where the original access was and how close it was to Ten Mile and so it really

did impact those kids that get on and off the bus, which is right there at that corner. So, without their help I don't think I would have known how to make that change and I thought it was great to see this happen at such a busy intersection where you have kids daily getting on and off the bus and to have the developer be so conscious to listen to us and make that change to make it more accessible for people getting on and off the bus, so without staff it wouldn't have happened, so I appreciate that.

Bird: Any other comments? If not, I think the meeting is over. Caleb? I would entertain a motion to adjourn.

Milam: So moved.

Borton: Second.

Bird: All in favor?

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Yearsley: I guess for the Planning and Zoning we still need a motion to adjourn. So, I would entertain a motion to adjourn.

McCarvel: So moved.

Fitzgerald: Second.

Yearsley: Moved and seconded to adjourn. All in favor say aye.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Yearsley: We stand adjourned.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 8:10 P.M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS)


MAYOR TAMMY DE WEERD

5 / 10 / 2016
DATE APPROVED

ATTEST:

JACY JONES - CITY CLERK

