Meeting of the Meridian Planning and Zoning Commission of Thursday, August 7, 2014, was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by Chairman Joe Marshall.

Present: Chairman Joe Marshall, Commissioner Scott Freeman and Commissioner Patrick Oliver.

Members Absent: Steven Yearsley.

Others Present: Machelle Hill, Ted Baird, Justin Lucas, Brian McClure and Dean Willis.

Item 1: Roll-Call Attendance:

Roll-call

__X__ Scott Freeman _____
__X__ Patrick Oliver _____ Steven Yearsley
__X__ Joe Marshall - Chairman

Marshall: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. I'd like to welcome you to the regularly scheduled meeting of August 7th for the Planning and Zoning Commission and ask for the roll, please.

Baird: Mr. Chair?

Marshall: Yes.

Baird: If I could make a correction for the record. As of this week Commissioner Miller has established she's no longer -- a resident in Boise and, therefore, is no longer eligible to serve on the Commission, so she has stepped down. So, let the record reflect that her absence is because she's no longer serving on the Commission. And the seat will be filled shortly.

Item 2: Adoption of the Agenda

Marshall: Thank you. All right. So, first thing on the agenda is the adoption of the agenda and I have no changes to the agenda.

Freeman: Mr. Chair, I move that we adopt the agenda.

Oliver: Second.

Marshall: I have a motion and a second to adopt the agenda as written. All those in favor say aye. Opposed? That motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: THREE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Freeman: Mr. Chair?

Marshall: Yes.

Freeman: There is a change to the agenda, because we are going to be continuing Item 4-C; is that not correct?

Marshall: Yes, but we still call them forward to know the --

Freeman: Okay. That's fine.

Marshall: -- the reasons -- and in which case I do believe this is staff initiated and so it will probably remain on the agenda as --

Freeman: You may have to keep me in order tonight. It's been a while.

Item 3: Consent Agenda

A. Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law for Approval: CUP 14-008 Leap Ahead by Nathan Kramer Located 227 E. Fairview Avenue Request: Conditional Use Permit Approval for a Daycare Center for up to Forty (40) Children

B. Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law for Approval: MCU 14-002 Fairview Lakes by Fairview Lakes, LLC Located North Side of Fairview Avenue, Approximately 1/3 Mile West of N. Locust Grove Road Request: Modification to the Conditional Use Permit/Planned Development (CUP 02-014) to Remove the Requirement for Detailed CUP Approval on the Remainder of the Undeveloped Site; and the Removal of the Requirement for a Water Feature to be Provided as an Amenity on Lot 4, Block 3

C. Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law for Approval: CUP 14-010 Polaris Pre-School at Fairview Lakes by Fairview Lakes, LLC Located 950 E. Fairview Avenue Request: Conditional Use Permit Approval for a Pre-School (Daycare Center) for up to 150 Children in a C-G Zoning District

D. Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law for Approval: CUP 14-009 Overland Park Apartments by Derk Pardoe Located North Side of W. Overland Road and West of S. Stoddard Road Request: Conditional Use Permit for a Multi-Family Development Consisting of 190 Dwelling Units (11 Multi-Family

Structures) on Approximately 8.67 Acres in the C-G Zoning District

E. Approve Minutes of July 17, 2014 Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting

Marshall: All right. Seeing how we have adopted the agenda as written, first thing on the agenda is the Consent Agenda and we have quite a few items. We have the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law for CUP 14-008, Leap Ahead. We have the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law for MCU 14-002, Fairview Lakes by Fairview Lakes. Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law for approval of CUP 14-010, Polaris Preschool. Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law for approval of CUP 14-009, Overland Park Apartments. And the approval of the minutes of July 17th, 2014. So, Commissioners, any comments, adjustments, anything we need to know?

Freeman: No.

Marshall: All right.

Freeman: Mr. Chair, I move that we approve the Consent Agenda.

Oliver: Second.

Marshall: I have a motion and a second to approve the Consent Agenda. All those in favor say aye. Opposed? That motion also carries.

MOTION CARRIED: THREE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Marshall: So, now that we are to the Action Items, I'd like to explain a little bit about how this works. First I will open each item at a time and ask for the staff report and the staff will provide their findings as how the project meets city code, ordinance, and whatnot there. And, then, I will ask for the applicant to come forward to see if they have anything additional they'd like to add to the staff report. After that I will call up members of the public to testify if they so wish. It would be very helpful if you were to sign up in the back and I will call those names first and if you decide later to testify I will also have an opportunity for you to testify after I have called all the names on the list. Then I will ask for the applicant to come back up and they will get an opportunity to address any issues that might have arisen during testimony, at which time we will probably close the public hearing and deliberate. Hopefully render the best decision for the citizens of Meridian.

Item 4: Action Items

A. Public Hearing: CPAT 14-001 Existing Conditions Report Update (2014) by City of Meridian Planning Division Request: Amend the Existing Conditions Report, an Addendum to the

Comprehensive Plan, for the Purpose of Revising the Text, Updating all Facts and Figures and Reformatting the Report

Marshall: And given that I would like to open the public hearing for CPAT 14-001, the Existing Conditions Report update by the City of Meridian and ask for the staff report.

McClure: Thank you, Chairman Marshall. I would like to begin by thanking Bill Parsons for writing the staff report for this 2014 update to the Existing Conditions Report, which is an addendum to the City of Meridian Comprehensive Plan. Staff is before the Planning and Zoning Commission tonight requesting recommendations for approval to the City Council. First some background. As previously mentioned, the existing report is an addendum to the City of Meridian Comprehensive Plan. The comp plan, at a minimum, is supposed to address 16 elements required under the Idaho Local Land Use Planning Act. None of the elements necessarily drive policy, but that is what the Meridian Comprehensive Plan is largely used for. The chart you see here is just a comparison of future land uses, both annexed and not. There are 16 elements to be addressed under this -- these are the 16 elements to be addressed under the state code. I will let you read that for yourself. To streamline the comp plan, which was getting larger and harder to use -- a growing city, after all, does have more to talk about -- it was decided prior to 2009, 2010, Comprehensive Plan update to split the document in two, one section looking forward that focused on language policy, which was the comp plan, and memorializing where we had been, a benchmark moving forward, which is the existing conditions report. The chart you see here is just a comparison of the zoning by district, by percent area currently in the city. So, that was done. But why are we here tonight? Well, a lot has changed since 2009 when most of the previous ECR, Existing Conditions Report, was drafted. There are 10,000 more people, a changing demographics a different economy, many new commercial office and residential developments and expanded city services. Again, the chart here is out of the ECR. The ECR was a good idea, but it wasn't necessarily the best implementation. So, this was -- so, with this update and the updating from the data, we took -- we decided to make an effort to improve the usability of the document as well. Some of the conversations were long and the formatting wasn't necessarily the best. The page you see here is currently what we have on the books. An example. So, what has changed in this update? These are the new format. It is upgraded demographics. Description of services and projects. It consolidated the repeat topics and discussions and added some new discussions, including agriculture, to help meet some of the previously lifted state requirements. I should note that the agricultural requirement was something that came down right around the same time as the comp plan was being adopted last time. The image you see here is the same trades, only the new format. So, we have updated -- we have relied on other departments heavily to revise and verify services and data. We also relied on other agency partners, including COMPASS and the school district. So, what are the next steps? Assuming positive feedback from the Commission, we will be going to Council for adoption in September. And, of course, things do change, we will be back to update this again in a few years. Hopefully with even more improvements. With that staff is requesting recommendation to City Council and I will stand for any questions.

Marshall: Commissioners, any questions of staff?

Freeman: Yeah. I have one. It sounds like this is largely, if not wholly, a formatting issue. There is very little additional -- there is additional content coming as far as the agricultural section, right? What else, just in a -- in a nutshell has changed?

McClure: The text was wordy before and there still are some pretty wordy sections. We will look at reducing some of that more next time. Another example of the changes would the economic development section. We have flip flopped some of the sections, because it made more sense. Rather than getting into the weeds immediately, we kind of picked a higher level approach and, then, got into the weeds. Most of it really is just updating the action figures, new formatting and doing some wordsmithing. There is no goals or objectives and action items, there is no policy in here, it's just really kind of a snapshot of where we are today.

Freeman: Okay. Thank you.

Marshall: No? Since there is no other questions, I'd like to ask the applicant to come forward, but it appears the applicant is staff, so at this time I'm going to ask if anyone of the public -- no one signed up, so would anyone else to like address the conditions report? Existing Conditions Report? No? So, it appears that staff has nothing to address at this time. Commissioners, maybe I can get a motion.

Freeman: You can. Do we need to close the public hearing and deliberate or -- again, you're going to have to keep me in order here.

Marshall: Yes, Commissioner Freeman, I think it would be appropriate to close the public hearing before deliberations.

Freeman: I move that we close the public hearing on CPAT 14-001, Existing Conditions Report update for 2014.

Oliver: Second.

Marshall: I have a motion and a second. All those in favor say aye. Opposed?

MOTION CARRIED: THREE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Marshall: So, Commissioners, any comments? Commissioner Freeman, you appear to have something.

Freeman: This is one of those things we have to do every now and then, because things change. I appreciate the fact that we are trying to consolidate and make it a little simpler. The formatting changes look great to me. I see no issues. I don't think there are any issues to see, so I'd love to get this approved and move on.

Marshall: Commissioner Oliver?

Oliver: I do agree.

Marshall: I also agree. I think staff has done a nice job. I can't really -- I'm not an expert in any of these areas and I really rely on staff and the experts that have helped put this together and appreciate it. So --

Freeman: Mr. Chair?

Marshall: Commissioner Freeman.

Freeman: After considering all staff, applicant, and public testimony, I move to recommend approval to the City Council of file number CPAT 14-001 as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of August 7th, 2014.

Oliver: Second.

Marshall: I have a motion and a second to approve -- recommend approval of CPAT 14-001 to City Council. All those in favor say aye. Opposed? That motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: THREE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

B. Public Hearing: CPAT 14-002 Downtown Master Street Plan by City of Meridian Planning Division Request: Adopt by Reference the Downtown Meridian Street Cross-Section Master Plan into the Comprehensive Plan

Marshall: Now, I'd like to ask staff to step up again, because I'd like to open the CPAT 14-002, for the Downtown Master Street Plan and ask for the staff report.

McClure: Thank you, Chairman Marshall. Again, I would like to thank Bill Parsons for writing the staff report for this project for the Downtown Meridian Street Cross-section Master Plan. I will likely paraphrase that to street plan. Just a word of warning to you. This is an entirely new document, so I will spend more time on this one. Staff is before Planning and Zoning tonight requesting recommendation for approval to City Council. I have talked about this quite a few times with MDC and City Council, but I know this is the first time the Commission has seen this, so if I gloss over anything at anytime, please, let me know. When this project began more than one and a half years ago now we set out to accomplish the following objective. Identify key street and street crossings and preserve for them. Enhance connectivity and place making. Identify other plan and guidelines. Clearly identify new development expectations and support collaborative partnerships. Briefly this has what's transpired leading up to today. We have established a work group that included city staff and parks, public works, and planning representative from ACHD and included a number of MDC representatives. Identify

needs and adopted guidelines and plans. Discussed challenges and goals and brainstorm solutions. We also met regularly to discuss progress and make revisions as authorized and as available. We engaged in public outreach that included several hundred mailers to all property owners and physical addresses in the planning area for an open house. And the open house was also advertised as part of the parklet project last year. That also included the usual e-mail blast, and posted notifications on the city website and included some by several local media outlets as well. We have also maintained a website which during the public review phase had an online questionnaire available. Following the open house we reset again to target stakeholders in Idaho in particular, that cross-section is a little unique. We have also coordinated with ACHD. At ACHD planning projects routing a draft plan through their legal. Development Services and traffic departments and some revisions were made as a result of their comments. We have also coordinated with how to integrate this plan with the development review process. This plan will have an integral GIS component to make sure that everyone is on the same page. I can't promise the plan won't sit on the shelf, but the implementation process will not. After we went through this rather long technical coordination process MDC was given a presentation and endorsed the plan. With this endorsement plan staff then sent to City Council. That was done because ACHD staff felt the commission needed comfort knowing that City Council was supportive before they asked their commission to support it. On the same side the City Council wanted to know that ACHD supported it, because the plan is almost entirely within ACHD right of way, so there was some kind of back and forth there. So, we changed it out and gave them both opportunities to chime in. Neither City Council or ACHD commission voiced any concerns and had nothing but positive comments. ACHD staff's intent at this point would be to adopt the present master street plan update, assuming City Council adopts them. And here we are today. This, in case anyone is not familiar, is the area that is known as the city core. North is to the right. The city core is something of an older designation, which predated the Designation Downtown vision plan by MDC. Destination Downtown plan is adopted by reference in the City of Meridian Comprehensive Plan. The boundaries are from Ada to Carlton and Meridian to East 3rd. It's also recommended at the time also adopts the Pine and Main Street corridors, which extend outside of the city core, because those are considered important entryway corridors. The plan also acknowledges the -- East 3rd Street south of Broadway all the way down to Franklin for connectivity purposes. The city core also coincides with the downtown license agreement that the city currently has with ACHD. So, it's the right of way outside of the actual street. There are areas of Old Town land use designation is almost entirely all Old Town zoning as well. So, that's kind of the background. So, specific use, how are we going to implement this and how are we going to use it. There is a lot to read here on this slide, but the good news is there is really only seven pages like this and only half is actually what you need to know. The blue slider that you see on the side occurs on most every page and it's really an opportunity to have some educational discussions and to not be bored. The way this document is set up is that all the intent history and condition type text is covered at the beginning. The rest of the document is pick and choose. You really only need to review the relevant information up front and, then, you, basically, use the rest of it like a cut sheet. You can pick out the streets that are applicable or of interest and you review those, you don't have to review

all the other material in it. The plan looks big, but functional use is much smaller. This is a corridor description. This occurs for each street and typically includes an extra narrative and discussion for special error and conditions along a street. These generally aren't required reading, unless you're working in a special area, like an entryway corridor or an area with unique existing conditions. One example would be Main Street between Franklin and Ada. It morphed rapidly with the split corridor and the bike paths, so you can't really capture that in one cross section. So, this kind of talks about it a little bit more than a cross-section could. This is the text to our specific cross-section. This is just one example. All these are designed to work largely independently from most of the other pages. After you have reviewed the first two pages you will pull up the relevant cross-section, which is north of Graphic. The cross-section is a key bit here, but the text helps to provide for alternatives and meet the draft regardless of location or the circumstance. The cross-sections themselves aren't set in stone. Only with support and how they would be integrated into the rest of the urban framework. The text for the cross-sections are explained to convey intent and need, allowing for creativity, rather than simply listing expectations without explanation. Just a side note on this one, that the four foot buffer adjacent to the pathway on the far left is for pathway separation. On Broadway, for example, which also has a pathway, if there was no pathway because it was relocated internally, then, you wouldn't need that four foot buffer either. That would probably need to be a little more clear that the buffer is for the pathway. Moving forward how is that to be used? At a minimum city staff will use the plan in coordination with ACHD for private and public redevelopment. It will be used to preserve and approve connectivity and encourage safe pedestrian and bicycle environments connected to and through downtown. It is not intended to require anything that's not already on the books, other than proposing solutions to an array of previously identified needs. The text does describe needs versus wants. This is intended to make supporting Destination Downtown, the City of Meridian master pathway -- pathway master plan, MDC and ACHD design guidelines, the City of Meridian design manual and the East 3rd Street extension report more straight forward. They kind of speak past each other. This is for all of them. This is used more directly with currently planning applications and in the context of one vision supporting other adopted plans and studies, rather than reference to a bunch of plans and studies are sometimes overly broad or overly specific, but not necessarily explaining the great context. The plan will allow and support consistent improvements, i.e., installing sidewalks and tearing them out and relocating them later. The city and ACHD may not make actual place making improvements apart from the MDC or large urban development projects, but they will reserve for them. How is the plan best used? That's a little more subjective, but the hardest part, really, is intended to convey the idea of partnerships. This plan doesn't have to be illustrative to describe sidewalk alignments and they should build and sell type language. In most cases the only sidewalks in preservation for future improvements are required. It's illustrated to be transparent to encourage ease of use and promote joint efforts. So, all the bits and pieces working together. We want this to be supportive of the current plan and study and good urban design practices that contribute to the unique placement of opportunities down to be attractive and stand apart from the other competing elements of urban development. It is hoped that this plan can be of benefit to and used by MDC, to take it in full context of

efforts to explore opportunities for the greatest return and may also be used as a starting point for specific concept plans and construction of actual improvements. Where do we go from here? Hopefully P&Z will be comfortable in endorsing the plan, at which point we will go to City Council for adoption and, then, ACHD will adopt it into the master street map. Moving forward this is an opportunity for expansion. This is something that we talked about internally and was also brought up by MDC when we presented it to them. The city core isn't really a zoning designation, land use or designation downtown boundary, it kind of flows over all of those and doesn't necessarily line up with any of them. There is some areas being excluded outside the city core that we probably want to look at addressing, such as between Ada and Franklin; north of Carlton, or the residential areas. Do we, for example, want to preserve for traditional parkways? So, what is this plan not? It doesn't make money, but it does discover a whole host of expensive improvement, especially for in-fill redevelopment and we will be integrating the current storm water systems downtown, which are a mess of unknowns. Some of this is going to fall on large redevelopment and agencies and it's inconceivable to expected most of this in small parcels of redevelopment. In fact, the study says this. There is, essentially, three categories of redevelopment that outline the broader higher level explanation requirements. There is direction for agencies, for small parcel redevelopment, a majority block or greater of redevelopment. In all cases, though, it's really going to take everyone chipping in to get a lot of this done. There has been suggestions for prioritization of improvements, but in most cases this will be something that MDC will have to decide upon and lead. It is not feasible for them to do most of this, though. They don't have CCDC's budget. Really, this is going to take everyone pitching in, finding grants, and other sources of funding and occur over a very long period of time. I'm also happy to have the life for downtown in terms of connectivity. This process in planning is drawing a lot of attention with MDC and help to foster a greater understanding of the need to partner with ACHD. ACHD is now looking more closely at both Pine and East 3rd Street. Both of these are very important corridors with real connectivity needs. As mentioned before, this plan doesn't necessarily depict the only way to do things, so some elements may morph a bit. The cross-sections will support critical pedestrian considerations, be consistent with adopted plans and studies, use good urban design practices and make needed quality of life improvements to foster a vibrant active urban environment. We have included a few alternatives in the back of the plan will be recognized up front that there is some challenges in some areas. The plan really is kind of a vision. Not necessarily all of it is going to be feasible all the time. To conclude, this has been a very long process with a lot of back and forth and staff would appreciate your recommendation for City Council to adopt this plan. With that I will stand for any questions.

Marshall: Commissioners, any questions of staff?

Freeman: Yeah, Mr. Chair, I just want to make sure I -- I understand. You mentioned funding and it sounds like I will -- the best way for me to ask the question, I guess, is by example. If somebody in the downtown district wishes to develop a bare piece of land or demolish an old building and build something new, for example, we already have requirements for landscaping on street frontages and stuff like that: right? Is it going to

be -- is it not going to be that particular landowner's responsibility to install curb, gutter, sidewalk according to this plan at their expense? Do we know how that is going to work?

McClure: Sure. That's a great question. It depends on the size in part. For example, a small parcel redevelopment, all we would be looking to require there are, basically, important ADA safety and connectivity needs, such as a sidewalk, and preservation for those other improvements later. This plan identifies that as something we would not push on small parcel redevelopment. Certainly they would be welcome to do that if they understood and wanted those benefits, but we wouldn't be requiring that. For the larger developments or agency led developments, some of that may be required. But even then some of these -- because some areas of downtown are so lacking would require partnerships and others to step up and help. I don't think we see any of this as being done by this one agency or one -- one development.

Freeman: One development.

McClure: To the point of we already have requirements. You are correct. Largely this plan takes the requirement and makes them one kind of vision and all align. You know, our landscaping requirements, our parking requirements, pathway requirements, for example, pathways required on East 3rd Street and Broadway, this really kind of just helps to mesh all of those again and present a clear understanding of what you need to do and one way of doing it.

Freeman: So, if I understand it, this is the vision and you said that really clearly. This is the vision. As things come together this is what we want to see on these streets, but as far as how to actually get there, that's all to be figured out still?

McClure: A lot of that, to be frank, is in MDC's kind of ballpark.

Freeman: Who has no budget.

McClure: Correct.

Freeman: Okay.

McClure: So, you know, I have stressed it before it's really about partnerships.

Freeman: Uh-huh.

McClure: ACHD loves partnerships. MDC is really into partnerships. They are already looking at some of these improvements and how they can do that.

Freeman: Yeah. And I don't mean that as a criticism. I understand first you have to start with a vision. This is where we want to go and, then, we figure out all the rest. So, I think the vision is --

McClure: If I may, one of the -- one of the issues currently is we say we require a sidewalk, because you have to have a sidewalk for ADA if nothing else. We don't necessarily know where to tell them to put a sidewalk when someone comes in and the alignment from parcel to parcel we don't want that to vary and as it exists in downtown currently is sidewalks don't line up or they end randomly and aren't necessarily in the best position for the next person to come in. This is intended to make at a bear minimum that we could put sidewalks in, in a good alignment, and that we are not tearing them out and redoing them, because we didn't do it right the first time.

Freeman: Understood. Okay. I think I'm tracking with you and I understand what this is intended to accomplish and what it's limitations are. That was my only question.

Marshall: Thank you, Commissioner Freeman. Commission Oliver?

Oliver: So, again, just going off what he said is that we are kind of looking in phases is the way it would work, is that -- you would work in one section and, then, move to another section as money allowed? Has the transportation commission been involved with any of this as well as this is by the city?

McClure: The transportation commission has not been involved with this. This is really -- it's already been adopted and just meshing it together. Certainly if something came up that was important for consideration -- if someone didn't want to do a pathway, for example, we might have to bring it up before them, but currently it has not been before them, no.

Oliver: I just know it's one of the Mayor's beliefs that connectivity is important and that people are able to get around from point A to point B easily and one of the things mentioned was bike lanes, so I assume that you have that in the plan there that you want to make sure that people have room for bicycles as well to get around easily -- around the downtown core.

McClure: Commissioner Oliver, yes, to a degree though. For example, Meridian Road was originally supposed to have bike lanes. That, obviously, did not happen. Main Street is not capable of supporting bike lanes. ACHD will be installing sherrels out there, but it will not have a bike lane. That kind of leaves East 1st Street as the only north-south opportunity for a bike lane. Right now we are planning a pathway for that as more important than the bike lanes, because as you had mentioned, the Mayor wants to see something that all people can use and younger generations aren't necessarily comfortable or not allowed to use those, so -- generally on the streets we have bike lanes or we identify needs for sherrels -- or an example Broadway, if there is no pathway on the rail corridor or through private development, then, there would be one on that street. So, we did definitely look at -- at connectivity. Parks was heavily involved in this, as was ACHD. Both of which have their own kind of connectivity slash bicycle goals and objectives.

Oliver: Okay. Thank you.

Marshall: I believe -- here is a quick question -- that that ten foot pathway is approximately the same size as what you would have along the rail corridors and the Boise Greenbelt per se where people are both walking and biking and I figure if we were looking at it and seeing a vision of having that along 3rd Street.

McClure: Commissioner Marshall, correct, yes. The pathway is really an extension which is already existing along Main Street up in front of the raceway and, then, with it currently being extended with the new Meridian interchange, so with the extension of East 3rd Street and a pathway on that, the ten foot pathway for downtown would go all the way from Overland up beyond Fairview. There is currently a pathway basically from Fairview up for quite a distance past that, so --

Marshall: Thank you. Commissioners, anything else?

Freeman: No more questions. I know a lot of thought and lot of energy went into this. I think it's a great first step. I'm definitely on board.

Marshall: Well, at this point in time I'm going to ask if there is anyone from the public that would like to address this? I have no one signed up and I see no one coming forward, so --

Freeman: Mr. Chair?

Marshall: -- if there is nothing to address -- readdress from staff -- Commissioner Freeman.

Freeman: I move to close the public hearing on CPAT 14-002, Downtown Master Street Plan.

Oliver: Second.

Marshall: I have a motion and a second to close the public hearing on CPAT 14-002. All those in favor say aye. Opposed. That motion passes.

MOTION CARRIED: THREE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Marshall: So, to address this I guess I can start it a little bit. I appreciate the fact that the city is coming forward with a vision. I think this is a good starting place. I appreciate all the work that's gone forward into it. It's, obviously, been a lot of work and trying to coordinate with everybody and that's where things start and we get hodgepodge without a vision, without a plan in place, and I really appreciate the city staff stepping up and coordinating all this and putting it together with everybody involved and I'm for it. Commissioner Freeman?

Freeman: I agree with what you just said and I think I already offered some comments. I don't have anything further to add.

Marshall: Commissioner Oliver?

Oliver: I agree. It was a great presentation and it helped me to understand a little bit more about what's happening in the downtown core and I think it's a good thing for our community, so I'm favor of it, yes.

Marshall: Well, Commissioners, then, I guess I need a motion.

Freeman: Mr. Chair?

Marshall: Commissioner Freeman.

Freeman: After considering all staff, applicant, and public testimony, I move to recommend approval to the City Council of file number CPAT 14-002 as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of August 7th, 2014.

Oliver: Second.

Marshall: I have a motion and a second. All those in favor say aye. Opposed? That motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: THREE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

C. Public Hearing: MCU 14-003 Connections Credit Union at Ten Mile by Slichter Architects Located on the Southeast Corner of W. Pine Avenue and N. Ten Mile Road Request: Modify the Site Plan, Building Elevations and Certain Conditions of the Conditional Use Permit Approved for Connections Credit Union

Marshall: All right. At this time I would like to open the public hearing for MCU 14-003 for the purpose of continuing to August 21st. I believe it's a staff requested continuance.

Lucas: Yes, Mr. Chair. Just to clarify, the applicant failed to meet the city's posting requirements, so we are unable to hear this item tonight, but they have to my knowledge already fixed the sign and got it all right, so we are good to go for the 21st.

Marshall: Thank you. So, we will not be taking any public testimony on this or any applicant testimony, so, gentlemen, can I get a motion to continue the public hearing?

Freeman: Mr. Chair, I move to continue Item MCU 14-003, Connections Credit Union to the August 21st hearing date, so that we can allow adequate time for the site to be posted correctly.

Oliver: Second.

Marshall: I have a motion and a second. All those in favor say aye. Opposed? That will be continued.

MOTION CARRIED: THREE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

D. Public Hearing: RZ 14-005 Southridge Commercial by DBTV Southridge Farm, LLC Located Southwest Corner of S. Linder Road and W. Overland Road Request: Rezone of 7.41 +/- Acres from the TN-C to the C-C Zoning District

Marshall: All right. Now I'd like to open the hearing for RZ 14-005, Southridge Commercial, and ask for the staff report, please.

Lucas: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission. As stated tonight before you is a rezone application. The applicant has applied to rezone a total of 7.41 acres of land from the TN-C to the C-C zoning district consistent with the corresponding future land use map designation of mixed use community. The property consists of Lots 1 through 5, Block 1, of the existing Southridge Subdivision No. 1. The applicant requests a rezone because the current TN-C zoning of the property requires all new construction to have a minimum of two stories and a minimum contiguous district size of six acres. The C-C zone allows for a mix of one story retail, office, and service uses with access to arterial on nonresidential collector streets. The applicant feels the C-C district will be more accommodating to businesses who are interested in building on this site. The design guidelines in the Ten Mile Interchange Specific Area Plan are still applicable to the development at this site. Because the future land use map designation for this property is mixed use community, which allows for a mixture of office, retail, recreation, employment and other miscellaneous uses with supporting multi-family or single family attached residential uses, staff feels that the proposed C-C zoning is appropriate for this property. The C-C zone will accommodate all these uses as listed in the Ten Mile Interchange Specific Area Plan as a possible zoning choice in this MUC designated area. A development agreement is already in place for this site. It required compliance with a conceptual plan and several other provisions meant to insure a quality development. That is why staff is not recommending any modifications to the existing development as part of this application. With that staff is recommending approval of the rezone and I will stand for any questions.

Marshall: Commissioners? Commissioner Freeman.

Freeman: Maybe it's a comment question. We will see what comes out of my mouth. So, the reason you're not requiring a DA for this is there was already one standing and

we all understand that it's going to have to change eventually, but we don't need to do that at the moment; is that correct?

Lucas: Mr. Chair, Commissioner Freeman, actually, I don't believe the DA will need to change. The -- the conceptual plan for this site outlined in the DA is not changing, so the building pad location, the parking lot design, all of those things which we believe are consistent with our Ten Mile Interchange Specific Area Plan, are all still in force. It's really only this one story to two story designation that it is changing and the applicants can speak more to this, but the users that they have had, we want to locate at this site some employment users don't really have a building and really don't want to build one, so when we went back and looked at this the TN-C zone is one of those interesting zones within the city that has some pretty unique requirements. Back when Southridge, this original overall plan was done no one really knew exactly what the users would be at this corner. Now, you know, we are many years removed and there is movement out there, it's just one of those tweaks that appears to be necessary to get some things started out there. I don't know if that exactly answers your question, but --

Freeman: It clarifies. Yeah. Thank you.

Marshall: All right. So, at this time I'd like to ask the applicant to come forward, please, and I'm going to have to ask for your name and address for the record, please.

Eck: Good evening, Council. My name is Timothy Eck. My address is 6152 West Half Moon Lane, Eagle, Idaho. I am a member and the manager of the LLC that owns the property and the applicant. And as stated by staff, the primary reason for requesting the change is to mitigate the two story requirement. I believe it's only required on building with frontage on public streets, which the configuration of this site is all five lots. We do have a very viable client that wants one of the sites. They want to build about a 12,000 square foot single story building on one of the lots. It's a long-term Idaho company. They have been in business for 35 years. I think about 25 in the state. They plan to be here for a long time and they have never owned their own office, they have always leased, and they have felt after 30 years they are probably stable enough to own one, so -- and they have picked this location as a very central, that they don't need high visibility or high frontage, they don't have a lot of, you know, transient traffic or customers and stuff. They are a lumber brokerage firm. They have an occasional client come in from out of town, but most of their traffic will just be the employees that work there. So, we are very anxious to accommodate them. And if Council has any questions I --

Marshall: Commissioners, any questions of the applicant?

Freeman: I don't have any questions. No.

Marshall: All right. Thank you. Also you were the only one to sign up out here. So, I'm going to ask if there is anyone else that would like to address this project? No? Seeing no one else, then, I guess the applicant has nothing to readdress, so --

Freeman: Probably not.

Marshall: -- I guess we could probably close the public hearing.

Freeman: Are you trying to coax a motion out of me?

Marshall: Yes.

Freeman: Mr. Chair, I move that we close the public hearing for RZ 14-004, Southridge Commercial.

Oliver: Second.

Marshall: I have a motion and a second. All those in favor say aye. Opposed? That motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: THREE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Marshall: Comments? Consideration? Commissioner Freeman?

Freeman: I'm always cautious on these, because we put out a plan, we have a vision for the way things are going to work. Sometime I'm very resistant to rezones like this. Given where this one is I'm actually in favor of this rezone. I think it makes sense. I think it's probably the only way we are going to see development in this region in the near future. So, I -- I see no reason to object to the proposal that's on the table.

Marshall: Thank you.

Oliver: Given what the staff report just give us, I don't see anything wrong with it. It's just a small tweak and, yet, at the same time it gets us movement out of that property. I'm favor of it.

Marshall: I also must agree that I tend to be resistant to a change, but this seems appropriate in this case and I would be for the project.

Freeman: It looks like we are in agreement. Am I going to tackle this one? Mr. Chair?

Marshall: It's the last one I will ask you to tackle tonight. How is that? All right. Commissioner Freeman.

Freeman: After considering all staff, applicant, and public testimony, I move to recommend approval to the City Council of file number RZ 14-005, as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of August 7th, 2014.

Oliver: Second.

Marshall: I have a motion and a second to recommend approval of RZ 14-005. All those in favor say aye. Opposed?

MOTION CARRIED: THREE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Marshall: So --

Freeman: You said you weren't going to ask me for another one.

Marshall: I'm not going to ask you for another one. Commissioner Oliver, might you want to make a motion?

Freeman: If you want to go home.

Marshall: Looking for an adjournment, maybe.

Oliver: I move to adjourn.

Freeman: Second.

Marshall: I have a motion and a second to adjourn. All those in favor say aye. Opposed? That motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: THREE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Marshall: We are adjourned.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 6:46 P.M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS.)

APPROVED

JOE MARSHALL - CHAIRMAN

8 | 21 | 14
DATE APPROVED

ATTEST:

Machelle Hill for
JAYCEE HOLMAN, CITY CLERK

INCORPORATED AUGUST 1, 1903
City of MERIDIAN IDAHO
SEAL
THE CENTER of the TREASURE VALLEY