

**Meridian Planning and Zoning Meeting**

**February 18, 2016**

Meeting of the Meridian Planning and Zoning Commission of February 18, 2016, was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by Vice-Chairman Patrick Oliver.

Present: Commissioner Patrick Oliver, Commissioner Ryan Fitzgerald and Commissioner Gregory Wilson.

Members Absent: Chairman Steven Yearsley and Commissioner Rhonda McCarvel.

Others Present: Machel Hill, Ted Baird, Bill Parsons Sonya Waters, Josh Beach and Dean Willis.

**Item 1: Roll-Call Attendance:**

Roll-call

<u>  X  </u> Gregory Wilson	<u>  X  </u> Patrick Oliver
<u>      </u> Rhonda McCarvel	<u>  X  </u> Ryan Fitzgerald
<u>      </u> Steven Yearsley - Chairman	

Oliver: Okay. Welcome. We will call to order. Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. At this time we would like to call to order the regularly scheduled meeting for the Meridian Planning and Zoning Commission for the date of February 18th, 2016. Let's begin with roll call.

**Item 2: Adoption of the Agenda**

Oliver: Thank you. Next will be the adoption of the agenda. As it appears we have only have one item, that's the minutes. Any comments?

Fitzgerald: Mr. Chairman?

Oliver: Commissioner Fitzgerald.

Fitzgerald: I would move for approval of the agenda as amended with the change to Logan Creek.

Wilson: Second.

Oliver: All in favor say aye. Approved.

MOTION CARRIED: THREE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

**Item 3: Consent Agenda**

**A. Approve Minutes of February 4, 2016 Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting**

Oliver: Next we will be moving onto the Consent Agenda. Next -- let's see. That's the minutes. So, we will move onto the actual --

Hill: Mr. Chairman?

Oliver: Yes.

Hill: You need to approve the minutes.

Oliver: Approve the minutes.

Hill: We just approved the agenda.

Oliver: Thank you.

Hill: There you go.

Oliver: We will approve the minutes for February 14th.

Fitzgerald: Mr. Chairman?

Oliver: Yes.

Fitzgerald: I would move for approval of the Consent Agenda.

Wilson: Second.

Oliver: All in favor say aye. Approved. Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: THREE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

**Item 4: Action Items**

**A. Public Hearing Continued and Re-Noticed from 1/21/16 for Logan Creek (H-2015-0037) by Jim Jewett, JLJ, Inc. Located 4617 & 4620 S. Martinel**

- 1. Request: Preliminary Plat Approval Consisting of Sixty-Eight (68) Building Lots, Eighteen (18) Common Lots and Two (2) Other Lots on 21.76 Acres of Land in an R-4 Zoning District**

Oliver: Now we will move onto the Action Items. We have first H-2015-0037, which is Logan Creek, for the purpose of continuing it and moving it to the -- renoting the public hearing for March 17th, 2016. Could I have a motion?

Wilson: Mr. Chair?

Oliver: Mr. Wilson.

Wilson: I move we continue H-2015-0037 to the date of March 17th, 2016.

Fitzgerald: Second.

Oliver: We have a motion to move H-2015-0037, Logan Creek, to the date -- public hearing date of March 17th, 2016.

Fitzgerald: Second.

Oliver: We have a second. All in favor say aye. Opposed say nay. Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: THREE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Oliver: Okay. Now, we will go ahead and get in -- started to the Action Items for this evening. Let me explain a little bit of how this will work. We will open each item first. Staff report will have the findings regarding how each item adheres to our Comprehensive Plan and the Uniform Development Code with staff recommendation. The applicant will come forward to present their case for the approval of their application and respond to any staff comments. The applicant will have up to 15 minutes to do so. Any public testimony will, then, follow after that. There will be a sign-up sheet that you will find in the back of the room as you enter. Anybody can -- wishing to testify may. If they are speaking for a large group, like an HOA, there is a show of hands, then, they will be given -- that one person will speak for that group up to ten minutes to testify. After all testimony has been heard the applicant will come -- have an opportunity to come back up and respond to the testimony and, then, we will close the public hearing and the Commission will have an opportunity to discuss and, then, hopefully, make a recommendation to the City Council.

**B. Public Hearing for Verraso Village No. 2 (H-2016-0005) by Chad Olsen Located 3476, 3478, 3510, 3524, 3540 & 3564 Modelo Lane AND 2975 N. Records Avenue**

- 1. Request: Conditional Use Permit Approval for a Multi-Family Development Consisting of Thirty (32) Residential Units on 2.61 Acres of Land in a C-G Zoning District**

Oliver: So, we will start with -- which will be the first item, which will be Item B on the Action Items. It's a public hearing for Verraso Village No. 2, H-2016-0005, by Chad Olsen. We will start with the staff report.

Watters: Thank you, Chairman Oliver, Commissioners. The first application before you tonight is a request for a conditional use permit. This site consists of 2.61 acres of land. It's currently zoned C-G and is located south of East Ustick Road on the west side of North Records Way at 3476, 3478, 3510, 3524, 3540 and 3564 Modelo Lane and 2975 North Records Avenue. Adjacent land use and zoning. To the north is vacant, undeveloped land, zoned C-G. To the south is multi-family development, the first phase of Verraso Subdivision, zoned C-G. To the east are single family rural residential property, zoned RUT in Ada County and Records Avenue. And to the west is commercial development, Gold's Gym and Rosauers, zoned C-G. This property was annexed in 2006 and included in the Una Mas Subdivision plat. The Comprehensive Plan future land use map designation for this site is mixed use regional. The applicant requests approval of a conditional use permit for a multi-family development, consisting of 32 dwelling units on 2.61 acres of land in a C-G zoning district for the second phase of Verraso Village. The development is proposed to consist of 32 three bedroom, three and a half bath units. The residences will be constructed as attached units in sets of two, with shared common area and amenities. Because the units are not on individual lots, it is considered a multi-family development. Access for the lots on the south side of the MEW is proposed via East Modelo Lane, a private street and the MEW is the area you can see right here between the units. Access to the lots on the north side of the MEW is proposed by a driveway from North Records Avenue. Grasscrete is proposed along the west side of the site for an emergency access connection between Modelo and the driveway. The grasscrete is along the west side right here. Records Avenue is along the east side. A 25 foot wide street buffer is required along North Records Avenue and the sidewalk already exists. The specific use standards for multi-family developments apply to the development of this site. The proposed plans comply with the private and common open space, as well as the site amenity requirements. The MEW is proposed to be separated and screened from Records by a five foot tall wall. The wall will have a wrought iron gate on the west end for an open view of the courtyard and pedestrian access gates on the east end on either side of the wall. The common area is proposed to be constructed concurrently with the adjacent dwellings. Building elevations were submitted for each of the five types of residential structures. Construction materials consist primarily of stucco with cement board siding and metal accents with metal or composition shingle roofing. Staff recommends all structures incorporate a minimum of two different material types, along with stone or brick accents on the street facing elevations to enhance design and variety in accord with the design standards and guidelines. Additionally, a cohesive color scheme featuring a minimum of two field colors, a trim color and a front door color with coinciding garage door colors should also be used. Prefabricated steel panels are only allowed as an accent material. Because the proposed development only includes a portion of Lots 11 through 13, Block 1, a property boundary adjustment just will need to be approved to adjust those property lines. Written testimony has been received from Chad Olsen, the applicant, in agreement with the staff report. Staff is recommending approval with the conditions in the staff report. Staff will stand for any questions.

Oliver: Any questions?

Fitzgerald: Mr. Chairman? Sonya, on the -- the lot line adjustment do we need to include that in any motion we make?

Watters: It's already included as a condition. Thank you.

Fitzgerald: Thank you, ma'am.

Oliver: No other questions? Seeing none, will the applicant please come forward? Please state your name and address for the record.

Olsen: Chad Olsen. 12790 West Telemark Street, Boise, Idaho. 83713. So, this is, basically, phase two of a project that this Commission already approved and the first phase has gone really well for us. We worked pretty close with staff on the phase one to get phase two perfect and I'm ready for any questions you might have.

Oliver: Commissioners? Just like to make a comment. From the first phase that I have seen I really like the looks of it, so if that's going to be kind of what we are looking at for phase two, this could be a nice addition.

Olsen: Yeah. The staff had really stressed to have some modulations, articulation, different, you know, building characteristics and it was a little difficult, but it's really been rewarding to be at the end of this project and make it look as good as it is and I don't think it would have happened without the staff's help.

Oliver: That's great. And that's going to be gated?

Olsen: Yeah. It's got that fence -- a fence that's a solid wall in the front. There is a gate on the side and in the back it's got a fence as well that this Commission had recommended last time we were here to screen us from the -- the 35 foot tall Norco. In this case it will be the 35 foot tall Gold's Gym and part of Rosauers and so that fence is there, as well as a wrought iron gate that allows you to kind of look a little bit more into the open, rather than just, you know, kind of condense it too tightly.

Oliver: Okay. Thank you.

Olsen: Okay. Thanks.

Oliver: Okay. All right. Testimonies. We have one person signed up by the name of Jeff Prudhomme. Would you like to come up and testify. Thank you. If you have a question you will need to come forward, state your name and address for the record.

Prudhomme: My name is Jeff Prudhomme. My address is 2751 North Duane. I just wanted to make sure the height of the phase two is the same as phase one, so that -- for view purposes.

Oliver: Great. Thank you. Seeing no others signed up for that, is there anybody else that would like to testify in this? If not, could I have the applicant come forward and respond to the question.

Olsen: Do I give my address again?

Oliver: Yes.

Olsen: Chad Olsen. 12790 West Telemark Street, Boise, Idaho. 83713. The buildings are the exact same height.

Oliver: Great. Thank you very much. Is there anyone else to come forward?

Fitzgerald: Mr. Chairman?

Oliver: Mr. Fitzgerald.

Fitzgerald: I would move we close the public hearing.

Wilson: Second.

Oliver: I have a motion to move and a second to close the public hearing on -- where is it? H-2016-0005, Verraso Village. All in favor say aye. Opposed say nay. It is now closed.

Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: THREE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Oliver: Questions?

Fitzgerald: Mr. Chairman? I -- as you already have commented, I think the applicant has done a great job on the initial phase of this project. I think their -- the modulation that staff should be commended on their efforts to make this a good product. I think Records is going to be a -- a very cool street by the time this thing is -- all the things that are going on down there are done. So, I will be in support.

Wilson: I agree. I like the look. I will also be supporting it.

Oliver: Yeah. As I said earlier, I think it's just a really nice look area. As I say, going up I think it's a perfect placement for it. It's going to work real well there, so I think we have no problems. Do I have a motion?

Fitzgerald: Mr. Chairman?

Oliver: Mr. Fitzgerald:

Fitzgerald: After considering all staff, applicant and public testimony, I move to recommend approval to City Council of file H-2016-0005, as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of February 18th, 2016.

Wilson: Second.

Oliver: We have a motion and a second to approve H2016-0005, which is Verraso Village. All in favor say aye. Opposed say nay. Motion carries. Congratulations.

MOTION CARRIED: THREE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

**C. Public Hearing Continued from 2/4/16 for Copperbrook Subdivision (H-2015-0029)** by Hayden Homes Idaho, LLC Located 4725 N. McDermott Road

1. **Request: Annexation and Zoning** of 51.45 Acres of Land with an R-8 Zoning District
2. **Request: Preliminary Plat** Approval Consisting of 199 Building Lots and Eight (8) Common Lots on 51.45 Acres of Land in the R-8 Zoning District

Oliver: All right. Moving on to Item C, which is the public hearing for -- that was continued to -- excuse me. February 4th, 2016, for Copperbrook Subdivision by Hayden Homes.

Watters: Thank you, Chairman, Members of the Commission. The next application before you is a request for annexation and zoning and a preliminary plat. This site consists of 51.45 acres of land. It's currently zoned RUT in Ada County and is located at the southwest corner of West McMillan Road and North McDermott Road at 4725 North McDermott Road. Adjacent land use and zoning. To the north is West McMillan Road and rural residential, agricultural property, zoned RUT in Ada County. To the east is North McDermott Road and property currently in the development process. Residential homes and a public park, zoned R-8 and R-15, and to the south and west are rural residential and agricultural property, zoned RUT in Ada County. The Comprehensive Plan future land use map designation for this site is medium density residential. The applicant proposes to annex and zone a total of 51.45 acres of land with an R-8 zoning district for the development of 198 new single family detached homes, consistent with the medium density residential land use designation for this site. There is an existing home and associated outbuildings that are proposed to remain on Lot 12, Block 1, which is this long lot along the frontage of the site on McDermott, which is designated on the plat for future right of way for the construction of State Highway 16. When the highway is extended all of the structures will be removed. At this point we don't have a definite time frame for the extension of State Highway 16. It could be quite sometime in the future, just a side note. The applicant requests approval for the existing home to remain on well and septic and not be required to hook up to city services and that the accesses via McDermott also be retained. A preliminary plat is proposed as shown consisting of 199 building lots and eight common lots on 51.45 acres of land for a gross density of 4.3 dwelling units per acre and

that does exclude the lot for the existing home. The subdivision is proposed to develop in nine phases, with the last phase being the 300 foot needed for the extension of State Highway 16 where the existing home is located. Access is proposed via West McMillan Road, an arterial street, along the north boundary of the site and another is proposed via North McCrawson Avenue, the collector street proposed along the west boundary of the site. No stub streets exist to this property and none are proposed to adjacent properties. The applicant requests the accesses via McDermott for the existing home are allowed to remain. However, city code requires all subdivisions to provide local street access to any use that currently takes direct access via an arterial or collector street. Thereafter, staff is recommending access is provided internally and access via McDermott is removed. The Idaho Transportation Department State Highway 16 corridor study depicts a north-south street between McMillan and Ustick Roads at the quarter mile between McDermott and McCrawson for connectivity and access to the adjacent property to the south owned by the McFaddens and Maxwell Goldbox. That access plan is shown in this line here right through the center. The street is intended to provide access to the properties to the south of the creek that currently take access via North McDermott Road. When State Highway 16 is extended they will no longer have access to McDermott. State Highway 16, as I stated, is being extended eventually through this area here. McDermott Road will still exist on the east side of the state highway. Without this access or an alternative access these properties will be landlocked. A north-south street is not depicted on the plat as shown on the corridor study. In lieu of a north-south street, the applicant should provide an alternative access plan to the Idaho Transportation Department for approval prior to Council approval of the subject application and that condition is included in the staff report. A 35 foot wide street buffer is required along North McDermott Road, an entryway corridor. A 25 foot wide buffer is required along West McMillan Road, an arterial street, and a 20 foot buffer is required along North McCrawson Avenue, a collector street. Again, McDermott -- or, excuse me, McMillan runs along the north boundary and McCrawson is proposed along the west boundary here. A 35 foot wide common lot with a berm and landscaping is also proposed at the back -- back edge of the right of way for a future street buffer adjacent to Highway 16 and that is this buffer you see here along the east boundary of the site. A minimum of ten percent or 5.15 acres of qualified open space is required to be provided within this development. Not all of the common area proposed is qualified. Therefore, prior to the Council meeting the applicant should submit revised plans that demonstrate compliance with this requirement. A minimum of two qualified site amenities are also required. The applicant proposes a sand volleyball court in the storm drainage lot at the southwest corner of the site, which is right here you can see -- as the only qualified amenity. Staff recommends if a volleyball court is provided that it be relocated more centrally within the development and not within the drainage area. The Five Mile Creek runs off site along the south boundary of the site. A portion of this site along the southern boundary lies within the flood plain overlay district and will require flood plain permit application to be submitted prior to the development in this area. The pathway master plan depicts a regional pathway along the north side of the creek. Staff recommends the applicant construct a ten foot wide multi-use pathway off site along the southern boundary of the site along the creek as depicted in the pathways plan, which will count toward the required amenities for this site. Building elevations were submitted for five different styles of homes within the development as shown. The building materials

consist of horizontal lap siding, with shake accents in the gables with optional masonry accents on the front elevations. Because the rear or side of homes on lots that face North McCrawson Avenue, West McMillan Road and a future State Highway 16, collector streets and a state highway, they will be highly visible. Staff recommends the rear or sides of structures on these lots incorporate articulation through changes in materials, color, modulation, and architectural elements, horizontal and vertical to break up monotonous wall plains and roof lines. There is an outparcel along McMillan Road. You can see this little rectangle here. It is not included in the proposed subdivision. Staff has verified it is an original parcel of record, therefore, it is not required to be included as part of this subdivision. However, staff has encouraged the applicant to include this parcel in this development, but they are unable to reach the property owner at this time. At staff's request the applicant has submitted a concept plan showing how this parcel may integrate into the development in the future as a street buffer along McMillan and three building lots and that is the plan you see before you. This lot right here would be the street buffer along McMillan and, then, the portion of that property, along with the lot included with the proposed subdivision could create three future building lots. Staff has also requested as a provision in the development agreement that the applicant construct a detached sidewalk along the frontage of this outparcel with this development. Written testimony has been received from John Carpenter, the applicant's representative, and I will let him go through his comments. Staff feels that annexation and development of this property may be premature at this time, because of the desire to retain the existing home and outbuildings and access to McDermott Road, the future extension of State Highway 16 along the frontage of the site on McDermott Road, the inability to include the outparcel within the development and possibly not provide a sidewalk across the frontage of the property along McMillan and the lack of north-south street across the creek for access to the properties to the south. Staff only recommends approval of this project if the applicant complies with the conditions in Exhibit B and enters into a development agreement with the city, with the provisions listed in the staff report, including the following: The submittal of a surety for the cost of construction of a pedestrian bridge over the Five Mile Creek for future pedestrian interconnectivity between developments. Construction of a sidewalk along McMillan Road off site along the frontage of the Evans property, the outparcel, with approval from the property owner. Construction of a multi-use pathway off site along the north boundary of the Five Mile Creek. The access driveway via McDermott Road for the existing home being removed and access provided internally. Hook up to city water and sewer service for the existing home. Working with the Idaho Transportation Department to determine alternate access plan for the properties to the south when State Highway 16 is extended. Preservation of a 300 foot right of way strip along McDermott Road for the future extension of State Highway 16. Removal of any existing structures that comply with the setback standards for the R-8 district. Extension of the existing water main located in McMillan Road, approximately a half mile east of the site. Payment of The Oaks lift station and pressure sewer reimbursement fees in the amount of \$265.25 per building lot prior to the first final plat application being submitted. And payment of 125 percent of the upgrade cost for The Oaks lift station, currently estimated at 250,250 dollars, unless that cost has been previously paid. Payment of the \$312,812.50 upgrade cost is required with the first final plat application. Staff will stand for any questions the Commission may have.

Oliver: Any questions?

Fitzgerald: Mr. Chairman?

Oliver: Mr. Fitzgerald.

Fitzgerald: Sonya, on the -- The Oaks lift station reimbursement fees, is that -- they have to pay per plat approval or is it all of the lots in the --

Watters: It's all up front, Commissioner Fitzgerald.

Fitzgerald: It's all up front. Just wanted to make sure. And, then, in discussion you have them -- is there a reason there was not a -- and I will let them answer this, but your feedback on the not putting a pathway along -- these that we have in our future land use maps and everyone is aware of where we want -- I guess roads and canal pathways, was there a discussion that you can give me feedback on, just so we are prepared to answer that and --

Watters: The applicant will cover what they are in agreement with and what they are requesting a change from when they cover their --

Fitzgerald: Okay.

Oliver: Commissioner Wilson? Nothing? Seeing nothing else, could I ask the application, please, come forward. Please state your name and address for the record.

Ketterling: Good evening. Casey Ketterling. 332 North Broadmore Way, Nampa, Idaho. 83687. Do we have our PowerPoint on there? All right. Thank you. Commissioners, I appreciate the opportunity to stand before you and give the presentation this evening and I wanted to express appreciation to your staff for working with us as we come to this point. As you can see there is a lot of details in this application, so look forward to the discussion here. Before I begin I'd like to give a quick introduction of our team that's here with me today. So, Hayden Homes has an office in Meridian, Idaho. They have been developing residential communities in the Pacific northwest for more than 25 years, including developments in Meridian, Boise, Nampa and Caldwell. They have over 9,000 homes to their credit and they represent a solid development company. They have a great quote on their website. I hope this was something worth sharing. They are encouraging folks to consider new developments in Meridian. They say Meridian has a knack for preserving its small town charm, while gracefully embracing growth all around. A perfect community for families. Meridian is nestled between Idaho's two largest cities, Nampa and Boise, making it an excellent real estate opportunity and an even better place to call home. So, that's how Hayden Homes is viewing your community and they have located an office here and they are excited to sell homes here. Nathan Machiela is with Hayden Homes and he is here today and is available to provide testimony related to that company, if that's needed, so -- got to get used to your smart board here. And I'm Casey Ketterling and I'm T-O Engineers and the spokesman for this presentation. John Carpenter is also here with

me and so there may be certain items or meetings that he attended that he may have more information on, so he may be able to provide more information than myself. I'd like to give a couple project highlights and I know that you have had a staff report, I know you have had information in front of you, so I'm not going to read the whole thing back to you or I'm not going to read our entire application to you, I just want to pick a few highlights out. First, the property -- as was stated, the property is located on the southwest corner of McMillan and McDermott and it's -- on its southern border is the Nampa-Meridian Irrigation District's property, which contains the Five Mile Creek. This property is currently farmed. There is the city limit. You saw it on a prior slide by your staff and the Comprehensive Plan identified this area as medium density residential, which would allow up to eight units per acre and 51 and a half acres, with 199 lots, our density is about half that at about four units per acre. McDermott Road, which is adjacent to our site, is -- is that planned extension of Highway and its improvement is very important to the valley. It's an important consideration. We know that the planning for this is a long ways out, although when they draw this on a map it becomes something important that we have to consider. So, it is impacting our property. You will see that our layout, what we have attempted to do is to respect ITD's planning for this area setting aside 300 feet or creating a lot that's -- that takes into account this 300 foot setback. So, the future planning could -- could take place with State Highway 16 and as stated during the staff report the plan is for the existing resident owner to stay at home and live there until that phase of the development is developed. The preliminary plat contains 199 building lots and eight common lots and this includes a mix of -- I don't know how well you can see that detail on your small screen, but it does include a mix of alley-loaded units and two and three car garage units. So, there are kind of a variety of products placed in there. There is a large park in the middle of the development and the site will be accessed at two locations, one off of McMillan Road and one off of the new collector McCrawson. A very quick summary of the design elements. So, water -- municipal water would be extended to and through our development. As far as sewer, we have worked with staff and we feel like we reached an agreement on the -- the buy-in charge for the regional lift station, as well as the cost to upgrade the system. So, we are in agreement with that. Pressure irrigation will be provided from the Settlers Irrigation lateral and the central access will be installed and irrigation will be provided to the homes. As far as roadways, we have met with ACHD and ITD multiple times to try to get an understanding of the best way to provide access to our development and to take into account the regional roadway network that is impacted by this development and it's our understanding from working with these agencies -- and we will talk a little more when I go over some of the staff specific comments. It's our understanding that the 300 foot wide lot there set aside and -- and also a collector, have them both meet what the districts are looking for. So, we can discuss that in just a little bit more detail. Pathways. We understand our development is lined up with a regional pathway system and so we intend to provide that ten foot wide path through our property. We have discussed it with the parks department, City of Meridian, and our conclusions from those discussions is that there appear to be two viable locations for the pathway, one along McMillan Road and one along the Five Mile Creek and I will have a detail coming up and it's a little better that shows our thought process on that. At this time we would like to request that the regional pathway be located on McMillan. As far as open space our intent is to provide ten percent or more of qualified open space and we agree to work with staff. Appreciate their

recommendation that prior to the Council meeting we come to an agreement on what is qualified open space and make sure that we have an adequate amount. So, we will work with your staff on that. I do want to talk a little bit about some potential amenities that could be placed in the central park that may meet the requirement for active amenities. To maximize the use of a large park and continue to have a large open space, we would recommend a multi-use field be placed there and we -- to show how large it is, that's a soccer field, so this property could be stripped and kids could play soccer games in there. We also are recommending picnic areas on the periphery of the park. Those uses could co-exist. We could use them while they are using the soccer facility or other groups could use them while they are there. Okay. With that very brief introduction -- I will try not to repeat everything that Sonya just said, I would like to talk about a few staff specific comments and we have received the staff report. Actually, really appreciate the level of detail contained in the staff report, so thank you, staff, for that. I'm not going to go over every condition. The ones that we agree with I'm going to skip over those and we are just going to talk about those conditions that we would like to gain more clarity on what the city would like to see and I'm also going to number them the same as they are numbered in the staff report, so we can try to keep track of the conditions as we talk about them. Okay. So, the first condition we would like to talk about is 1.1.1A and this -- this condition is -- it identifies that we would like to place -- the city would like to place a pedestrian bridge in our development crossing the Five Mile Creek and what you will see in this display here is those five red arrows represent existing crossings over Five Mile Creek or planned crossings. The crossing there in The Oaks development is planned in the future. And so our position with this -- looking at how the spacing of these crossings are typically within Meridian, knowing they are about half a mile spacing makes -- seems to make sense and the yellow arrow, which would represent where we are being asked to place a crossing, that would be about a quarter mile spacing. So, good access is something we agree with and having access to these types of amenities is something we agree with. Where we want to be cautious of is providing too many crossings or too many interruptions in the Nampa-Meridian Irrigation District's system that they have to maintain or deal with. So, our request this evening is to not be required to place that crossing, but, rather, it is satisfactory that we have a crossing on both our east and west boundary of our site at about a half a mile apart. The second condition I'd like to discuss is related to condition 1.1.1B and this is related to the request that we construct sidewalk across the Evans property and just stated very clearly, we have made several attempts to contact the property owner and have been unsuccessful. The property owner lives out of state and it's our desire to construct a sidewalk across that property as well, so that's something we are going to continue to pursue.

Watters: Excuse me. Casey, if I may real quick, your numbering is off on your -- on your provisions there, so, Commission, if you're following along you might look at the staff report available on your screens or in your packet. Anyway, I just wanted to note that, so there wasn't confusion as you're going along. It kind of renumbered, it looks like in --

Ketterling: I'm not happy about that, doggone it. Okay.

Watters: Sorry about that. Anyway, just wanted to note that.

Ketterling: I have always been considered perfect by myself. We will just have to deal with that. Okay. I don't know why my numbering is off. I will allow you to correct me on the numbering, if that's okay, for the record. Okay. And the second part of that comment -- oh, that's going to become cumbersome. I will blow my time here -- is related to the pathway along Five Mile Creek and there is actually -- there are actually four site specific conditions I will discuss with this item. So, I'd kind of like to talk about them all at one time if that's okay. And the -- what we would like to discuss is -- is -- first of all, we -- we have talked about this pathway with the parks department and Jay Gibbons several times and tried to gain some clarity on their thoughts for the regional pathway and make sure that what we are doing is consistent with what they would like to see. What I show here on this display is two potential options. One would be to have the pathway run along McMillan and the other would be to have the pathway run along Five Mile Creek drain. What you can see is those yellow arrows indicate areas where there is going to be a crossing and the pathway needs to be at McMillan Road and so what -- a couple of thoughts here -- or at least the way we are seeing it is that because it needs to cross McMillan Road at Star and at McDermott, there is good reasons for the path to be on McMillan. One of the things you will see on the regional pathways, people are traveling through and they may or may not take a quarter mile detour south and, then, redetour back north again. So, we are recommending it be along McMillan for that reason. But, you know, I do want to point out that there are issues, actually, with both alignments, so the McMillan alignment one of the issues is the outparcel. There is a piece of property we don't own, so we are still trying to -- trying to work that out. As far as the Five Mile Creek, the issue there is we don't own that property, that's actually contained within the property owned by Nampa-Meridian Irrigation District, so there would be issues with just access and easements and continued maintenance with other items within this property, the ditches and other items like that. So, at this time what we would like to request is this: We are willing to condition this that says we will construct a ten foot pathway satisfying the city's regional pathway network and that we be given the option to put it in either McMillan Road or Five Mile Creek. That's how we -- that's our request this evening. Okay. And since I have screwed up the numbers -- I don't like that I did that, Sonya. That's bumming me out. I'd like to talk about this request to go to ITD and, essentially, seek their approval of the adjacent roadways or the collector roadway. And I had those as 1.1.1D and I don't know what that -- that is in the -- it's G? Goodness sakes. I'm way off. Okay. What I want to point out is there is two pieces of correspondence that we have related to this, because we have tried to work with both ITD and ACHD on this issue. So, the first is a piece of an e-mail from ITD's engineer and what he's, essentially, saying in this e-mail is that -- well, partially what he said -- and I'm not sure I clipped that out of the section, but in this -- these collectors, because they are outside of the state highways, it would be outside of ITD's jurisdiction. So, there is a point here where they defer back to the city and to ACHD and allow them to make that decision. However, what he does say in his e-mail is that greater separation is better and his last sentence there is, therefore, that half mile spacing would seem to be appropriate and more desirable than quarter mile spacing. So, that is the opinion we got back from ITD. And that as well as them stating that this would be out of their jurisdiction. The other item is out of ACHD's staff report. They clarified that their collector offset policy is that you have at least a half mile spacing

between collectors and, then, their staff recommendation is that the applicant's proposal meets district policy and should be approved as proposed. So, when we move forward with our collector street shown on our west property boundary, we did that with the belief that that was what would meet both ACHD's and ITD's expectation and that's where we are at right now is we would like to continue with that alignment for that reason. Okay. Just a note of clarification. The 300 foot -- I'm certain I have got the numbers wrong, but it's related to --

Watters: J.

Ketterling: J. Thank you, Sonya. Item J. And it's -- it's related to the 300 foot right of way strip and we would just like that clarification that that 300 foot may be comprised of both right of way and landscape buffers and just to have that clarifying statement added in there. Okay. So, I'd like to talk about the block length, which I had as L. I'm certain that's incorrect. The city's ordinance requires that you don't have blocks longer than 750 feet and, then, in the city code there is actually -- and, in fact, if you look at the block along the Five Mile Creek drain it is longer than 750 feet. However, in your ordinance, which I have put here just for us to take a look at, it does allow an exception from this to be made by City Council and one of the reasons it can be accepted -- you see down there in B at the bottom -- I have just highlighted it lightly in yellow -- is that if this is adjacent to a large irrigation facility and so given what borders our property, we are recommending that that larger block length be allowed to remain just along our south border. And with that -- that's actually the conditions that I wanted to bring to your attention. I'd like to request approval of our preliminary plat this evening and where we stand with some modifications and conditions. I believe there is going to be some discussion, obviously, and just appreciate your willingness to listen and I will stand for questions at this time.

Oliver: Commissioners, do you have any questions?

Wilson: I wanted to go back to those crossings real quick.

Ketterling: I could get us there.

Wilson: Yeah. So, the one we are looking at in red -- so, to the west of -- or to the east of the yellow one, the proposed pedestrian crossing, is that a -- is that across McDermott, then?

Ketterling: Yeah. It looks like my arrow slide over. So, that was intended to point out McDermott there. There will be a crossing at that location.

Wilson: Well -- and that crossing will change, obviously, with the new Highway 16; right?

Ketterling: That's correct.

Wilson: Okay. And none of these -- none of these are -- I mean these are all across roads. None of them are specifically pedestrian crossings over that irrigation.

Ketterling: That is correct.

Wilson: Okay. Thank you.

Fitzgerald: Mr. Chairman? In regards to the pathways discussion, I believe the only challenge I have is trying to figure out -- I think people don't like to be in a concrete jungle all the time and along a highway specifically and so give me your thoughts on -- I mean I think in looking around our city we like to have things along creeks. It's just the way it is.

Ketterling: Yeah.

Fitzgerald: And we usually will put lights up so people can get across the street, we will put up a pedestrian crosswalk up and put a light up and it happens along those regional pathways. So, I think in -- you're requesting that we could put it in either place, that may not fly. So, I guess the question I have is would you guys be willing to put that -- or would it shift your lots north, how would you handle the restructuring of your plat if that was the minimum that we required?

Ketterling: Commissioner Fitzgerald, I appreciate the question. What we are being asked to do by -- by staff is actually to put it off of our property onto the neighboring property, so it wouldn't affect our lots as proposed.

Fitzgerald: Okay. And I guess -- we can do that -- I mean it's happened a number of times where we have made agreements with Nampa-Meridian Irrigation to have something like that built. Is that a problem? Is that something you are -- if it's put forth?

Ketterling: Not necessarily a problem. Part of where we ended up with -- with our thoughts on this were actually from discussions with Meridian's park staff and -- and the conversation was largely around the fact that the road -- the pathway has to come back to McMillan to cross at those two locations and so, you know, our view on that is it's a little easier to negotiate with ourselves in locating a path than to go and negotiate with -- with another property owner. So, placing it on our property is -- it is a little easier for us to do as far as -- that decision we can plan around that, we can make that work.

Fitzgerald: And, Sonya, I -- in regards to the outparcel that they can't contact the owner, is it -- could we incorporate a development agreement that once they have permission or - - I mean we can't -- without permission can't go build something on somebody else's property. So, what's the staff's recommendation for -- everybody wants to have a sidewalk there, they don't disagree with that, but it's having it at the time that's, I guess, appropriate. How would we do that?

Watters: Chairman, Commissioner Fitzgerald, the staff report requires the applicant to construct a sidewalk off site along the frontage of the Evans property with their consent.

Fitzgerald: Okay.

Watters: Specifically.

Fitzgerald: So, eventually, whenever they can get it, if they can get it.

Watters: Right.

Fitzgerald: Okay. Thank you.

Oliver: Any other questions? I have none? Seeing none, thank you.

Ketterling: Thank you for your time.

Oliver: At this point we have no one signed up for the Copperbrook Subdivision to testify. Is there anyone that would like to come forward now to testify? Okay. Seeing none, I'd like to have a motion, please.

Wilson: Mr. Chairman?

Oliver: Mr. Wilson.

Wilson: I move we close the public hearing on H-2015-0029.

Fitzgerald: Second.

Oliver: We have a motion and a second to close the hearing on Copperbrook Subdivision, H-2015-0029. All in favor say aye. Opposed say nay. Motion -- motion carries.

**MOTION CARRIED: THREE AYES. TWO ABSENT.**

Oliver: Okay. I will go -- is that -- and, then, we can go from there to give you time to think. After having a lot of time to look at this subdivision, just a lot of things that I kept going and over and over, looking at, and looking into thinking it's just -- for some reason it didn't set well with me looking at different things and what would be changed, things that need to be completed, things that need to be adjusted and as far as when the time frame would be for the new highway to be built and I feel like as far out as it is currently being asked to be built that it just doesn't seem to fit well with what we are doing right now. Maybe at a later date that it would work better, but right now we are working so far out of the city that it would be maybe better terms to put it on hold and come back at a latter date to do this, but for me it's just something that's just not right at this moment. So, I would kind of look at it as just -- let's put it on -- down the road, but for right now I would not vote for it.

Wilson: I would agree. I mean I was talking about the crossings and there is -- that's just one example of several kind of outstanding questions that you -- that as a Commission we

are having a hard time answering, because this is so far out in the future, so I would agree with you, Mr. Chairman.

Fitzgerald: This is hard, because I think -- I don't fault the applicant for bringing it. I mean this is contiguous, it is -- I mean we are growing that direction quickly. I think the question marks are in the staff requirements to be in compliance would be I think a challenge to work through some of these things, but I think the staff worked diligently and I think their recommendation may be the one we need to move forward with. This may be a little too premature.

Oliver: Thank you. Seeing no other questions. Comments? Looking for a motion.

Wilson: Mr. Chairman?

Oliver: Mr. Wilson.

Wilson: After considering all staff, applicant, and public testimony, I move to recommend denial to the City Council of file number H-2015-0029 as presented at the hearing date of February 18th, 2016. I think one is the unknowns associated with the future projection of State Highway 16 and the challenges of trying to navigate staff recommendations with a lot of unknowns in terms of development.

Fitzgerald: Second.

Oliver: I have a motion and a second that we deny the Copperbrook Subdivision, H-2015-0029 by Hayden Homes for the reason simply because that it is not in the best interest of the city right now to push this through, so maybe at a later day, but right now it is not the best interest of the city to do so. All in favor say aye. Opposed say nay. Motion carries. It is denied.

MOTION CARRIED: THREE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

**D. Public Hearing Continued and Re-Noticed from 2/4/16 for Brinegar Prairie Subdivision (H-2015-0046) by Suggs Community Solutions Located 2220 N. Ten Mile Road**

- 1. Request: Annexation and Zoning** of 23.46 Acres of Land with an R-8 Zoning District
- 2. Request: Preliminary Plat** Approval Consisting of Ninety-Four (94) Building Lots and Thirteen (13) Common Lots on 22.6 Acres of Land in a Proposed R-8 Zoning District

Oliver: Moving onto the next item on our agenda is Item D. This is the public hearing that was continued and renoticed from February 4th, 2016, for the Brinegar Prairie

Subdivision, H-2015-0046, by Suggs Community Solutions and we will start with the staff report.

Beach: Good evening, Chair, Commissioners. This is a -- an application for annexation and zoning and a preliminary plat for the Brinegar Prairie Subdivision, which is located at -- well, the site consists of 23.46 -- it's located just south of Chateau Drive on North Ten Mile Road and the site consists of 23.46 acres of land, which is currently zoned RUT in Ada County. It's located at 2220 North Ten Mile Road, which is on the east side of North Ten Mile Road and that's north of West Cherry Lane and south of West Chateau Drive. Adjacent land use and zoning. To the north has single family residential properties in Kent Field Manor Subdivision, which is zoned R-4. To the east single family residential properties in Cherry Lane Village Subdivision, zoned R-4. South is the single family residential properties in Sunburst Subdivision, zoned R-4, and to the west is single family residential properties in Devlin Place Subdivision. I think I have those backwards. Devlin Place is to the east and Cherry Lane Village is to the west. There is no history on this property, because, as I said, it's in the -- it's in the county, zoned RUT. The Comprehensive Plan Future land use map designation for the property is medium density residential. The applicant has submitted an application for annexation and zoning, as I said, of 23.46 acres of land with an R-8 zoning designation. A preliminary plat is also proposed consisting of 96 single family residential buildings and 12 common lots on 22.6 acres. The applicant has applied to annex and zone a total of, as I said, 23.46 acres of land with, as I said, an R-8 zoning district and the proposed zoning is consistent with the corresponding future land use map designation of medium density residential. The legal description submitted with the application shows the boundaries of the property proposed to be annexed and zoned. The property is contiguous to land that has been annexed into the city and is within the city area of impact. The proposed plat consists, as I said, of 96 single family residential lots and 12 common lots on 22.6 acres of land. Average lot size in the proposed developed is 6,536 square feet. The proposed gross density of the subdivision is 4.25 dwelling units per acre, which is consistent with both the density requirements of the Comprehensive Plan and the proposed R-8 zoning district. Staff has reviewed this proposed plat for compliance with the dimension standards listed in the UDC for the R-8 district and found the plat in compliance with those standards. The minimum lot size for a single family detached dwelling is 5,000 square feet, with 50 feet of frontage. The plat as submitted complies with the dimensional standards of the UDC. Access to the site is proposed on the plat via two public streets that line up with both Swainston Avenue and North Morello Avenue. If you look at the plat here Swainston is this road here to the west and Morello is the street to the east and those will line up with existing streets that are for the north. The UDC requires detached sidewalks to be provided along all arterial and collector streets. However, due to the fact that ACHD is part of -- recently constructed an attached sidewalk along North Ten Mile Road that runs the length of the property, staff is in support of leaving the attached sidewalk as is. Street lighting is required to be installed within development in accord with the city's adopted standards, specifications and ordinances. All development is required to connect with city water and sewer systems, unless otherwise approved by the city engineer. The applicant shall provide six foot tall privacy fencing along the border of the subdivision. Acceptable fencing has been provided within an adjacent subdivision. For the internal common lots

the applicant is proposing to construct four foot tall vinyl fencing consistent with the fencing standards set forth in the UDC. The developer shall install the fencing to distinguish the common from private areas in accord with the UDC. And temporary fencing shall be installed during construction. Based on the -- the area of the preliminary plat, which is 22.6 acres, a minimum of 2.3 acres or ten percent of open space is required to be provided on site in accord with the UDC. The applicant has proposed ten percent open space and as you can see there is a long linear open space here, as well as an east-west pathway that will connect Ten Mile to a pathway that will stub to this street here. There are three proposed drainage ponds as part of the development and the applicant shall provide details of these ponds at the time of final plat submittal. The applicant is proposing several amenities, including a play structure, a community park, and a micropath through the open space, as well as a connection to the north -- to North Ten Mile Road. The Rutledge Lateral runs across the site and will be tiled as part of the development. The existing irrigation easement bisects the property is to be relinquished and replaced with a new easement as depicted on the submitted plat and the irrigation will be located in this area here along this multi-use pathway. The applicant has submitted conceptual building for future homes in the development, including -- included in Exhibit 8.4. Building materials are proposed to consist of board and batten, stone accents, covered front porches, et cetera. Staff is in favor of the proposed elevations with their associated architectural features and staff did receive written testimony from Sean Brownlee, who was substituting for the agent or the applicant. The actual applicant is out of the country now, so Sean is substituting for that. Staff is recommending approval of the proposed annexation and preliminary plat request for this site with the conditions listed in the staff report. And I will stand for any questions that you have on the application.

Oliver: Commissioners, any questions? Thank you. At this point we have -- the applicant, please, come forward. State your name and address for the record.

Bailey: Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, my name is David Bailey. I'm with Bailey Engineering. Representing the applicant Trilogy Development. My address is 4242 North Brookside Lane, Boise. 83714. And I'm standing up for Sean, who is here, as the applicant and Jane, as Josh said, is out of the country. She got a trip to go to the Amazon and do some neat stuff, so I told her I would step in for her and I haven't done this in a while, so hopefully you will be gentle with me. Josh did a great job describing the project and what we had on this and how we put the thing -- put the project together. This project is an enclave and, you know, there is nothing that hasn't been developed with -- within about three-quarters of a mile, you know, in all directions from this project. So, we looked at being compatible with the neighborhood around here and dealing with the issues that we had associated with the site. We had great access to it and, you know, we have met everybody's conditions on this. I know that we -- that Jane had met with the neighbors on several occasions. We talked about a variety of items with them. One of the -- the key points that we got out of that was that all of the lots adjacent to -- immediately adjacent to neighbors do meet the R-4 zone for dimensional standards and size, but we are compatible in size with the neighboring lots and I do know there was some questions about traffic on Chateau Drive, which is a collector that was built, you know, some time ago, and, you know, we have worked with the highway district on that and had the

numbers as far as how that goes on that end. With that I'm not going to go a whole lot more into anything. I guess we have got some neighbors here that want to talk, we will let them do it and we will answer their questions as best we can and I would be glad to stand for any questions you have right now.

Oliver: Commissioners, do you have any questions?

Fitzgerald: Mr. Chairman?

Oliver: Mr. Fitzgerald.

Fitzgerald: David, what was the response from ACHD's traffic counts. Did you guy meet your traffic levels for that collector on Chateau?

Bailey: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Fitzgerald, the actual count that they gave us was on January of 2015. So, about a year ago was 1,515 vehicle trips per day. That collector street should handle 4,000 to 6,000 vehicle trips a day and, then, there -- within their staff report -- and I don't have the numbers in front of me, but they talked also about p.m. peak hour and traffic within that and that we didn't meet the conditions for that. That road was planned and the traffic was planned and the intersection with Ten Mile was planned as this would be developed at some point in the future and this would be, essentially, the last traffic to go on it. Just to add onto that, too, is that while this would not generate the warrants for a signal at Chateau, at some point in the future Chateau would be the place that the signal would go. It is the half mile and we can expect maybe a long time from now, but when the warrants are met that ACHD would proceed to put a traffic signal at Chateau.

Fitzgerald: Do you know if there is -- that's on their ten year or five year --

Bailey: It is not.

Fitzgerald: It's not.

Bailey: No. They just -- they just recently rebuilt all of Ten Mile out there and it's not on their five year or ten year plan for that.

Fitzgerald: Thank you, sir.

Oliver: Mr. Wilson? I have just a couple questions. So, coming out on Chateau towards Ten Mile, there would be possibility you could go either north or south at that intersection.

Bailey: Correct.

Oliver: Of course, it would be much easier to go south than it would be -- or just to go north than it would south, trying to cross over there. Looking at the picture I have in front of me, the first driveway that would come into the inter -- into the subdivision, which would

be closer to Ten Mile. It seems like that could be possibly really congested in the mornings or in the evenings when people are trying to get in or out of that subdivision. Is there any way that they could push that particular entrance further to the east and change that section of your housing a little bit, so you allow people to get down the road a little bit further, rather than walking right into traffic waiting in line to get out onto Ten Mile? Am I making --

Bailey: Yes. Mr. Chairman, I would say -- I suppose it's possible, but we lined up the streets across the street for traffic purposes, you know, with the existing streets that are there and I don't know that any specific analysis has been done on what the effect that would be, you know, on the stacking on -- basically is what we are talking about and it's stacking on Chateau getting out onto Ten Mile Road. So, I don't know of any specific studies on what that looks like or what those numbers are and that's the first suggestion I have heard to that effect. I suppose technically it's possible, but that's --

Oliver: Yeah. I guess I just know -- I know the road and I know it isn't very wide and you are going to widen it somewhat for the frontage?

Bailey: Yes.

Oliver: I was just looking at it thinking that if you can move that back further to the east and maybe that would reduce some of the congestion getting in and out, so you might keep that in mind. Other than that, thank you.

Bailey: Thank you very much.

Oliver: Okay. At this point, if there is no other questions, we will go to -- to testimonies. This is going to be interesting. So, I'm going to give her a go and if I say it wrong just correct me. Burkhart? Say again. Great. Thank you. All right. Jeff Chappy. Please state your name and address for the record.

Chapple. My name is Jeff Chapple. No problem. C-h-a-p-p-l-e. I live on Bonner Street. My house backs up to Chateau about the middle of where these -- the subdivision is going to be across the street. This is my wife.

C.Chapple: I'm Claire Chapple. Our address is 3017 West Bonner.

Oliver: Thank you.

C.Chapple: 83646.

Chapple: Basically our -- our interest in this is -- and you apparently have more information about it than what we have received -- is the traffic situation for Chateau. As you were indicating, Mr. Chairman, there is one -- you know, about four or five car spaces between Ten Mile and where these accesses are going to be, this initial exit, and during rush hour traffic it's already backed up and it's difficult for the people in the Kenwood

Subdivision, which is the north side, to get out already and this one on two, with that density, is going to create a real -- a real problem trying to get traffic onto that street at all. The street is not, as you know, that wide and it has received a lot of the use from commercial vehicles, as well as multiple residential areas around there.

C.Chapple: Let me talk. Let me talk. I have a statement to read.

Chapple: And as usual my wife wants to say something, so if you don't mind --

C.Chapple: Our backyard is against Chateau. The development is right across the street, so we are directly involved. We have lived there ten years. So, we know that there is a problem there already. It is a two street -- two lane road. There is no way to develop that road into four lanes. So, the road along here has a problem with traffic and we are not here to stop the development, we are here to work with them, but they have felt unworkable with us to attuned to just now, making statements that were not true. So, here is our plan for you to -- to look at. After Ten Mile completion -- and it's not even finished. There has been cars that are backing up onto Chateau from Ten Mile, as well as cars going from Chateau into Ten Mile. You can go both ways onto Ten Mile. It's a mess. Fire department, buses, emergency vehicles use Chateau for emergencies all the time. They need that access and they need it clear. Also other subdivisions use that at Chateau. It is free and it cuts over from Ten Mile over to -- and people who know the quick way to bypass the big go that way. So, we have a lot of traffic twice --

Oliver: Just remind you that is your -- end of your time.

C.Chapple: Oh.

Oliver: If you just wrap it up for us.

C.Chapple: Oh. Okay. Our suggestion. As you can see I want an exit off this development onto Ten Mile. Chateau cannot take the traffic and if you don't do it now, we have already had Ten Mile -- two kids got hit. We have a real problem there. Put a street light at the exit from the development directly across the street is another street that's perfect for a light or just have an exit off this development. They need it. Thank you.

Oliver: Thank you. Ron Stokes. No? Patrick Cunningham. Please state your name and address for the record.

Cunningham: Patrick Cunningham.

Oliver: Do we need some adjustment for the microphone?

Cunningham: 2910 --

Oliver: Excuse me just a moment. Let us adjust the microphone.

Cunningham: 2910 Candice Court. 83646. I have a couple of questions. One is my -- my house is on the southeast side of the development and it's actually where the Nampa water main comes through, where the irrigation easement is and currently on the easement -- the easement runs east and you're going to change it, so it runs west and I wanted to know if I'm going to -- will I get my land back and my yard -- there is about five feet there or something like that that the last five houses east of that easement -- or have that easement right now. Also, our land is probably five or six feet higher than the land that they are going to be building on and are they going to put in retaining walls and is that fence going to be on my level or down on the level below that? And I think that's about the only questions I have.

Oliver: Thank you. Those questions will be addressed when the applicant come back up.

Cunningham: Okay. Thank you.

Oliver: Thank you. Deborah Hoberg.

Hoberg: Hi. Thanks for letting me speak tonight. My name is Deborah Hoberg. 2254 North Swainston. I'm a resident of Meridian, for 20 years now. I'm right on the corner of Swainston and Chateau, the intersection that everyone is talking about with this traffic and I haven't done any public speaking for 20 years, so bear with me. The traffic does back up there tremendously and I know there was a traffic study done in January 2015, but they divided that between a.m. and p.m., because I talked to them. I know this. I talked to them today. They did not do it at peak hours and I might add there has only been one neighborhood meeting called by Suggs. Well, Jane Suggs said to me at that meeting that it doesn't matter what you do, you can't change this. It's happening. Well, I'm sorry, I think that the people of Meridian should have a say in that. There is a lot of traffic. It backs up almost to Morello in the morning. I know I put in windows to help cut the sound from all the traffic. People from Linder to Ten Mile, Ustick to Cherry all filter down through Chateau. They will zigzag in and out of those neighborhoods to get out onto Ten Mile that way to reach the Ten Mile access to the freeway. Understandable that they would do that. However, that road wasn't originally designed for that. I don't care what the commissions say. When I moved there it was blocked at the end down by the irrigation run through. It was completely blocked. When they built Chateau Park, which is there, they opened that up. Understandable. You have a lot of kids and families going down there for sporting events and that is packed, by the way, you know, by Morello where Chateau meets Morello there, it's packed during the summertime with kids and families. The traffic is backed up. You can't find parking for the sporting events. So, there is a lot of kids that run out in the street. I travel that street. I drive very slow through there, strictly because of the kids. I know kids will run out. I have 12 grandkids. Please. This cannot be moved according to the traffic commission, because they say there has to be so many feet between the streets, as the request of the lady before me wanting it moved halfway down the road. That would be one of my requests also, because it is too congested now. It's going to be worse. People coming out -- if they are headed north on Swainston, coming out of this new division will be making a left turn onto Chateau. They are not going to be able to do it. It will be completely blocked by cars coming out from the east to the west on

Chateau. In addition to that, all the school buses pick up on the corner of Chateau and Ten Mile. All the kids walk there. Middle school, high school, and the elementary schools. Our schools are overcrowded as it is. You can't turn on a news program now that you don't hear them talking about the rezoning or redoing the districts bordering, you know. They just don't have room for the kids now. What will 96 homes do? Do you know how many kids per house in Meridian? There is a lot. It's a family community. So, in regards to that, the overcrowding of the schools, what I would recommend that instead of doing an R-8, do an R-4. That keeps it consistent with the surrounding neighbors, number one. It keeps our values of our homes up. The comps up as well. And, you know, throw in some retirement homes. You know, the boomers, we got more disposable income for things like that anyhow and we are looking to downsize. That is why I bought the house I'm in now. That's my retirement home. I don't want a streetlight on my corner, although we do need lights down Chateau. Those kids walk to the school bus in the dark and I surely do not want a stop light on my corner. My lot. If they do I will be laying out there blocking the bulldozers, because I don't want it.

Oliver: Mrs. Hoberg, that's the end of your three minutes. Do you have a conclusion for us? What you want to say and finish out. Your time's up.

Hoberg: Okay. That is correct. That is for emergency vehicles going down there. If it's blocked there won't be enough room. So, the overcrowding of the schools and the traffic, those are my concerns and they -- it's a great concern. If anyone wants to sit in my front yard on a Monday morning and see the traffic go by, they are more than welcome to come over and I will serve you coffee.

Oliver: Thank you very much. Is Andy Emery -- but you didn't say you wanted to testify or not. Okay. Thank you. Same thing with the next two, Kevin and Robin -- and I cannot even read the name. No? Okay. The next one would be Timothy and he did the same thing. Okay. And, then, we go to Kathy Hall, who would like to testify. Kathy Hall here. No? Okay. It's Randy -- say the last name. Okay. Go for it.

Witt: Hi. I'm Randy Witt and I live at 283 West Kandice in the Sunburst Subdivision. Is that the right person?

Oliver: Go ahead.

Witt: Oh. Okay. Sorry. And my wife and I have lived there for six years now, moving from the midwest, and the points of reference for my concerns are three fold. One, my wife and I raised three kids. We have a grandson over regularly now. Second is we take lots of walks. We have covered every subdivision within a couple miles and so on, so we see how people live and the third is Meridian's stated value of we are a good place to live and raise a family. Well, one of the things we see as we walk that we didn't see in the midwest is people use their garages -- it's single story homes. People use their garages here for living space or storage space often, if it's a single story home, and that tells me they don't have enough space already and we are talking zoned R-4 or whatever you call that. A lot of houses. And this zoning proposal is for lots smaller than that and I struggle

to see how that zoning can be a good thing for living and raising a family. I think the house -- I saw the pictures of the nice houses on the screen and I struggle to see how you can build those in most of those lot sizes and I think we want -- the lady that spoke before me mentioned we want to have the subdivision and neighbors on this one retain their value and continue to be a good place to live. We want to stay where we are living and I struggle to say, okay, who is going to live on these tiny lots. I could not -- there is no way I could picture raising our three children in a lot that size. So, what is it? Is it a house for transients that are coming in, living for a while, just to move somewhere else? Is it going to be like government subsidized housing for people or something? I struggle to see how this R -- whatever the -- eight zoning is is a good thing for the city or for any of our neighboring subdivisions. I would suggest that -- I love the idea of housing there. I just think it needs to be rezoned so it's actually a place where people want to live and stay in those houses and be a community, not just people that come in and, then, move somewhere else.

Oliver: All right. Thank you very much

Witt: Thank you.

Oliver: Next we have Darin W. State your name and address.

Welch: Hi. My name is Darin Welch. I live at 2084 Leann Way, which is to the east of this proposed development. I know, you know, progress marches on and development can't be stopped and I'm in the construction trades and I'm generally pro development. This one affects me a lot and I have -- I have some concerns about it. My -- my first concern echoes the Commissioner's concern with the traffic stacking up in that short distance to that first lot. I know they tried to line it up with the road in the Kentwood Subdivision to the north, but I don't see any traffic between the two neighborhoods, so I don't think that's necessary. I, too, would like to see that entrance moved further to the east. But that's a really hard intersection to turn left on in the morning and in the evening people that turn right are generally going pretty fast, so rounding that corner with such a short distance between that entrance is another reason not only for morning, but for evening. Because it's so difficult to cross those two lanes to get into the center and, then, merge to go south, I think this is going to push a lot of traffic to the east on Chateau and, then, south on Todd and, then, Todd dumps out right across the street from the Compass charter school. That's a very busy area in the morning. There is a crosswalk there. There is kids -- parked on Todd dropping their kids off to go to school. I worry about the increased traffic there. Chateau Park just to the east, like another gal said, is very busy, especially in the summer. There is often not a place to park on the north or south side of Chateau right there. I wondered if there were any provisions for -- for a bike lane or any kind of concern for the -- the traffic of people going to the Chateau Park along -- along Chateau with this new development. I know in the past there has been a proposition for a regional pathway along that drainage that they recommend relocating. I kind of don't see any future provision for that. I wonder kind of where that's gone. I'd like to conclude with fact that this -- this development is surrounded by -- by areas zoned R-4. I appreciate the developers effort to do R-4 along the existing. However, in sticking with the character of

the greater surrounding area, which extends beyond the immediate perimeter, I think that area should be zoned no more congested than R-4. Thank you.

Oliver: Thank you. I just want to give an opportunity for Michael Mattson. Do you want to speak? Again, just, please, give us your name and address.

Mattson: Michael Mattson. 2343 North Morello. 83646. Just north of this proposed subdivision. And I have a few concerns. One of which -- will, most of which have been stated by everyone already. The Swainston entrance just ridiculously close to the intersection. My kids that are back here -- one of them is now asleep waiting for the meeting to be over. We -- we go to the bus stop every day and, you know, cars like the previous gentleman said, are zipping around that corner, turning right into the subdivision and, then, leaving as well. In the morning I typically drive my kids to school and turning onto that intersection, even to turn right to go up to her elementary school is near impossible. We are stacked and waiting, like most people have said, and -- and it's just -- the biggest danger is not so much the -- the lanes of traffic, as it is the speed. As has been referenced, there was a study done in 2015 for the traffic and that was previous to the -- raising the speed limit to the 40 miles an hour, which, you know, as many cars as are turning out there and it will increase, it will just be even more dangerous with that added five miles an hour that they have changed the speed limit to. The other gentleman -- the previous gentleman also addressed the park situation. Chateau Park is right there. I'm at the park daily with my kids and there is -- there is too much traffic there as it is right now. The -- the backing up for parking for the people that come to the park for Lacrosse and flag football and all the other practices that they have. The dog parks. The -- all the courses -- everything that's going on in that park all summer long, it's just very congested. People routinely park into the farm field that's there now and where are they going to park once that's developed? And the last thing I guess I have to say is right now the development that we are in that's north of that, we have 55 homes in that. It's R-4 I believe as has been stated and we just can't see how you're going to fit that many homes onto a lot that size and still maintain the values that previous speakers have all brought up about having it be consistent with the -- with the feel of the city and the surrounding area and just fitting that many more people into such a small area that already has such -- such a high volume of traffic.

Oliver: Just a second. Could I ask staff to go back to the actual development plan, see what it looks like for just a second? So, looking at -- if you can see it, can you tell me where the bus stops to get the kids?

Mattson: Yeah. It stops on the -- pardon me, on the north side of the Chateau-Ten Mile intersection on Ten Mile. I have actually e-mailed and had conversations with Cascade Bus Transportation several times and the school district trying to get that moved. Their route timing is difficult, because there is no place for them to stop, so at their first stop at the Sunburst neighborhood to the south, they stop there, probably 15 or so kids get on and off the bus and by the time they reach the next stop -- you know, they have their routes times off and there is no place for that bus to stop. They need a place to be able to pull in and get the kids gets off of that major intersection and I proposed that they should

drive through the neighborhood and pick them up at the end of Victor and whatever is at Saddlevue right there to the north of us. But there is several kids between those two neighborhoods, ours and the one north of us, they get on and off the street. It would take all these kids away from Chateau and Ten Mile where -- where it is just really busy and we have a wider sidewalk now, but even just today as I'm getting my kids off the street, we had a car come flying past the bus, the bus driver was trying to write down, you know, the driver who is flying by, but they make sure the kids are getting off the bus safely and there is only five or six kids that get off at my daughter's elementary school in the afternoon, but we fill up the sidewalk with parents and the dogs and everyone else who is there to pick up the family and pick up the kids and there just is a lot of activity and it's just going to be more dangerous and more kids there.

Oliver: These are all parents walking their kids. There is no cars pulling up to that intersection?

Mattson: Occasionally there is. Occasionally there is. In the morning -- actually, my wife called several times, because there was a person waiting on Chateau at Ten Mile to drop their kid off waiting in their car and they are, you know, 50 feet from the stop sign. So, to pull around that and the street is already not wide enough.

Oliver: Okay.

Mattson: It's just very congested there and having that intersection at Swainston will add to that, plus that many more homes will add to that and it will just -- it will just become more and more dangerous.

Oliver: And one more time. You said how many students are getting on at that time?

Mattson: Well, my daughter's bus for her elementary school there is about four or five kids, typically, that get off at that stop. The Sunburst one right before it has about 15 or so.

Oliver: Okay.

Mattson: But I know that, you know, the elementary -- the middle school and high school kids, those ones have more. Those probably have ten to 12 to 15 each.

Oliver: Okay. Thank you very much. The last person I have is Peggy Gardner. Is she here? Please state your name and address for the record, as if we don't know who you are.

Gardner: Peggy Gardner. 2156 West Chateau Drive. I am about a half mile from this project. Not against the project. However, I do think the density is a little too much for that area and -- and, I agree, the stacking for cars to get onto Ten Mile is extremely bad in rush hour time and my daughter used to live across the street from me and even when Ten Mile was not widened there were, you know, 15 kids waiting for the bus, so I'm sure

there is that, if not more now. So, that's a real concern. Chateau is the only through street in that square mile and so, yes, it is a collector and I would disagree with their counts, because they took them in January of 2015 before the completion of the Ten Mile widening and since that we have gotten more traffic and so that would be a real concern. They need to move that entrance down so it doesn't align with Swainston, because there is just no way that people are going to be able to get out of their driveways and in -- into the street with the way it is right now. There is a light at Linder and it's a two lane road at this point and, yes, it is proposed at some point to be widened, but there is a light on that end of the mile, but not on the other end where Ten Mile is and it's not a five lane road -- it doesn't make sense. Not that I want more cars coming down my street, because I think that's what it will cause to have more cars coming down the street. But it's not safe. It is not safe to get out on that road. So, I think the density is a little high for -- for this subdivision and the access is just not appropriate, so --

Oliver: Thank you very much. That's all I have on the list for testifying. Is there anyone else that would like to come forward and testify? Again, your name and address for the record.

Fulkerson: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. David Fulkerson at 2370 North Morello, Meridian, Idaho. Just a little bit north of the proposed subdivision. I would just like to echo the concerns you have already heard, but I think the density is a little too much for this place. I'm happy to see that we are going to have residential there versus some commercial development. I think that's a plus for the city. However, the traffic is going to be a concern for several reasons. The map doesn't completely show that, but Chateau does make a jog by the park, so it's inherently very difficult to see down that street anyway, even more so when the cars are parked there, because of the practices and stuff. Chateau didn't originally go all the way through, it was not a pass-through street, so that -- because of the configurations of the existing subdivisions and the park there is a little jog there. So, I -- I think this is going to be a cause for concern with traffic and accidents, as well as what you have heard about the school bus stop out on Ten Mile. The traffic study is a year old, so I would encourage a new traffic study to be done before any decision is made on the subdivision, because it was previous to the Ten Mile widening getting completed and I think the traffic has actually increased now that that's been completed and just because it is the four lane north-south connector, so it's -- people are picked up there and, then, they can use Chateau as a cut-through to get the spots, so they don't have to go down Linder or one of those other ones, so --

Oliver: Thank you very much. I will ask one more time if there is anyone else that would like to come forward and make -- please give us your name and address for the record.

Zagada: I am Randy Zagada. 2063 West Bonner Street.

Oliver: There we go.

Zagada: Across the street. 83646. I see this a little differently. I am a farmer's son and I grew up on a farm. I was raised on a farm. When I bought my house over ten years ago,

when I first went out in my backyard I was thrilled to see that it was open land and every year I have always enjoyed watching what the farmer plants, how it goes, how it develops, how it matures, the harvesting of that and everything. When I got the notice in the mail I was absolutely downtrodden, because, first of all, the traffic situation, noise pollution, light pollution -- noise pollution, it's just -- it's abhorrent to my normal way of thinking, because I know inevitably things happen. When I first moved there I was shocked at this amount of vacant land was in the -- particularly in the middle of Meridian. So, the traffic, situation, as everybody has stated, is absolutely true. My bedroom faces the south -- faces Chateau. There are times I have to wait to get to sleep. People who will drag strip down that street. I mean they have to be going 40, 50 miles an hour and -- yeah. It's just really unreasonably. I just don't see how they are going to do the traffic part of it. So, with all of that I just wanted to give my input on that from kind of a different perspective.

Oliver: Thank you very much.

Zagada: Thank you.

Oliver: And last call for testimony? Please give us your name and address for the record.

Miller: Mike Miller. 3044 West Kandice Street. And -- right here is my backyard. Is that pointing on there?

Fitzgerald: Pick red and, then, circle it.

Beach: The colors are on the top of the screen there, if you --

Miller: In this area. And, then, it showed a walking path going on there. What's going to be my backyard? And some other gentleman that was down -- further down same as it is -- the elevation is lower in this field. Is that going to be brought up? What's going to go on there? What's the elevations going to be in there? I'm a heavy equipment operator and I'm just curious to what is going to be in my backyard and there is 30 some houses too many in there. Zoned way wrong. And it's going to -- it's like everybody is saying, this is horrible for property values. I bought this house to live here, to stay here. If this goes on I will be selling my house, because it's a great place to live, but I don't understand why everything surrounding this whole project is zoned the way it is and you're going to allow this many homes in this little area. What about everybody else that owns a home here? It's going to destroy our property values, especially mine. I'm right on -- that's my backyard that I look into that. Like he said, the last guy that was up here. That's why I bought this place. I know eventually it would probably happen, but I didn't figure it to happen so quick. That's all I got to say. Thank you.

Oliver: Thank you very much. I think we have got everybody. Sir, would you like to come forward? Again, please, your name and address.

Loshbaugh: Yeah. I'm Dave Loshbaugh. 3041 West Bonner Street. I live next door to Randy. Been there 12 years and I saw the picture of those houses you have on there.

There is no way you could put those on those lots. My house is 1,500 square feet and I have got five feet on both sides of the house and our lots are bigger than those. There ain't no way you could put a three car garage and all that stuff in there. And I think if you want to have an exit out of there you should have it going across Ten Mile, adjacent to that street right down the street there. And that's -- that would make Chateau a lot better. Anyway, that's all I had to say.

Oliver: Thank you.

Loshbaugh: You have a nice day.

Oliver: You, too. Seeing no one else to testify, could I have the applicant please come back up. State your name and address for the record.

Bailey: David Bailey. Bailey Engineering. 4242 North Brookside Lane, Boise. Want me to go first or go --

Oliver: Go.

Bailey: Okay. Since most of it was on Chateau traffic, I assume we will have some discussion on that, but let me touch real quick first on -- quickly on the properties to the north and -- or to the south and the evolution of the -- Rutledge Lateral. So, it does come in about the south middle of the property. When the -- when the pipe -- when the subdivision to the south Sunburst was developed and that -- the Rutledge Lateral was piped, tiled, within that subdivision, the entire 40 foot easement for that and the ditch was piped within that property and so that 40 foot easement is on those lots and those neighbors do have short backyards, but that easement was there and the pipe was in the ground before the house was even built on that property. We did have some early plans that looked at, you know, continuing a pathway through and, basically, that would have had -- made a little room there, but in talking with the Nampa-Meridian Irrigation District I suppose they could have moved their easement at some point and provided some relief for them and that didn't work out for a variety of reasons. One, the staff and your police department was concerned about that -- that long pathway that went down there. We do not have an exit for it on the east, the pathway to connect to at the east end of this and so the layout was changed at that point. But we haven't taken anymore ground from those folks or, you know, caused them any hardship. The ditch and the access road is all on their property to the south, so -- it's just something that's there and it's still there, so we haven't done anything with that. As to the west there, we have actually gone through this and worked -- worked quite a bit with Nampa-Meridian Irrigation District. We have plans into them. Was reviewed and actually about to get those plans approved to tile that Rutledge Lateral on there. So, we have very detailed plans about that. It will be -- the ditch there, it will be landscaped. It will have an access road for the irrigation district along the south boundary there and it will also have a five foot concrete sidewalk or a pathway through there that will connect to the site and actually kind of create a mini loop anyways, but, you know, that we can get access through there. So, we have worked on it quite a bit. And also as they noted, associated with both of those, the property is low to the

southwest and to the northeast and this property sits down below. It actually is the max -- the very maximum point at the southwest corner is about three and a half feet below the sidewalk on Ten Mile and the houses to the south and in the southeast corner it's about two and a half feet I think is what it is. And the way this works out is with the sewer that we have provided from the north we are going to have to fill the site back up to bring that back basically to grade and level that out in order to make the project work. So, we plan on importing soil, moving some soil around, and -- to take care of all that to make the project work. So, that's the -- I guess the answers to those pieces there. As to the traffic on Chateau, you know, I guess I have been doing this a long time and we hear that and I certainly understand the concerns of those people and, of course, I have been out to the site and seen the traffic, you know, that -- that occurs out here and the thing I can -- the only thing I can ever come up with is not to say they are wrong, they got their experience and, you know, what they see out there -- on the other hand, we do go to the highway district, we do do the traffic counts, we do look at the numbers that are out there, the highway district give us numbers on the traffic and what the capacity of Chateau is and what will be done. Within their policy there is no way we will ever get a connection to Ten Mile Road from this project. That just will not happen. So, to get this project out we go to Chateau and that's been long planned, actually, when all of the rest of the subdivisions went in here, when they made the -- finally made the connection to the east that this is a mid mile collector street and it doesn't have any houses fronting on it for a good portion of it, specifically so that it can handle that kind of traffic. The collector street here by ACHD's standards, which everybody complains about, I understand, but by ACHD's standards should handle at least 4,000 vehicle trips per day on Chateau Road and now could we do some stuff with this intersection, you know, to the west to do that? It certainly would be worth studying and if that's something you make a recommendation on it's obviously something we would look hard at and see if that would help things and we would talk to the highway district about that. As far as getting the traffic out anywhere else, we just don't have any options. None of the properties to the south or the east, when they developed, provided any stub streets and it kind of comes with the territory. You know, your previous projects you looked at you had -- you know, you had nobody standing up to speak, but they had a laundry list of problems they had with the layout on the project, no one standing up to speak as to where they were located. Here, you know, we think we have worked hard, we have changed the plan several times at the request of your staff and at the highway district to make sure that we are trying to accommodate everything we have and we expect to see a lot of neighbors out here, because it's right next door and -- you know, and it certainly affects them and we understand that. So, with that I would be glad to answer any questions you have on -- on the project.

Oliver: Commissioners, do you have any questions?

Fitzgerald: Mr. Chairman?

Oliver: Mr. Fitzgerald.

Fitzgerald: Dave, was -- is -- ACHD's recommendation you line the streets up was on -- I can't remember what the --

Bailey: Swainston and --

Fitzgerald: -- Seminole or whatever -- I can't remember what that first one is.

Bailey: Mr. Chairman, Mr. -- Commissioner Fitzgerald, it was. Actually, their policy is that you either have to alignment up or offset them by some distance from each other. So, in order to offset it we would move it significantly to the east. Like I said, we haven't done a real specific analysis of -- you know, of any of these intersections and it's very common that we try to align them up that way, that way we can trade traffic and, really, the stacking on here would be more impactful on this development than it would be on the project to the north when we talk about stacking distance, the ability to turn left out of here onto Chateau, if it's stacked back passed that intersection, so --

Oliver: While he's waiting I have a question to ask. I'm going to go back to the same one I asked earlier is that you said you would be able to or wouldn't be able to look at moving it towards the east again and maybe even to the center, that instead of that first entrance coming off of Ten Mile moving more towards the center of the subdivision and allowing that and getting rid of that, adjusting it -- if you were to do that how long would it take to re-adjust that if it's possible?

Bailey: I guess -- I don't know how long it would take. It would be whether the developer, you know, wanted us to look at that and I would just comment that it -- the place to move it -- that we would have to move it would be to the next road over, just so -- it would have to line up with our street inside also or offset from it by policy or to move it another whatever -- in the middle -- say in the middle of the park, so it would come in towards the park in the center there where our -- where our common area is as they are shown now.

Oliver: Do you see that as feasible?

Bailey: We could move those -- excuse me?

Oliver: Do you see that as feasible, then, to move that to the park?

Bailey: I see that as feasible, but I -- I don't -- the piece of it I don't see is that I don't know how that affects or helps the traffic on Chateau. Well, that would be my objection if you have any, to doing that. Certainly moving it over there -- and I'm not sure how we would exactly measure that. So, again, if you directed that we do that then -- and the Council directed we do that, I think -- I think we would be required to take a look at it. From my calculation, my numbers, my perspective, you know, in doing the engineering work on it, I don't think it changes anything.

Oliver: Thank you. Mr. Wilson? No other questions? Do you have any -- Mr. Fitzgerald.

Fitzgerald: Actually, I do. On the -- the park -- the pocket park at the bottom in the south, Dave, that's just -- it's the end of the path; correct? There is no other amenity down there? It just ends at that park -- the pocket park down at the bottom?

Bailey: It is. And the reason it's got on odd shape to it there is the irrigation ditch had come up through there before.

Fitzgerald: Thank you.

Oliver: Okay. Thank you very much.

Bailey: Thank you.

Parsons: Mr. Chairman, before Dave leaves the podium, the neighbors did raise some concerns about the density and why he's going R-8, instead of R-4. So, let's at least have him address why they are picking R-8 over the R-4 zoning districts.

Oliver: Thank you.

Bailey: Mr. Chairman, the R-8 over the R-4 is really based on your Comprehensive Plan. It says -- you know, it says when we do an in-fill project, then, we want to make use of the services that are in place and they recommend that we actually increase the density from the neighbors -- from the neighboring properties, because we make good use of your fire and your sewer and your water and your police services and -- that are already in place for the area and the roads as well. So, that's the reason we went with that. You know, of course, any developer, you know, wants to look at, you know, what's the highest and best use for the property and the reasonable density to use on it. The homes that are shown actually were fit on the lot by the builder for this, so the homes that are shown actually can fit on these lots and they build the lots and Meridian has a lot of R-8 ground that we put, you know. 50 -- actually, these are deeper lots, they are 50 by 115 feet deep, so we have more room for some backyard and some different design of the homes, but, you know, they are very feasible and, you know, I suppose we could question the validity of your R-8 zone, but I will leave that to you if you want to -- if you want to do that. So, the R-8 zoning standards are met for those homes.

Oliver: What's the average size of each home; do you know?

Bailey: I don't know that off the top of my head. I think we have a minimum lot size of -- or minimum home size -- I guess we don't. I'm guessing -- Sean? 1,800 to 2,400 square feet. And I think the R-4, when these were developed to the south there was a 1,305 or 1,450 minimum on the existing -- 1,400 on the existing R-4 lots.

Oliver: Some lots are bigger than others?

Bailey: True.

Oliver: Thank you. Staff, does that makes sense?

Parsons: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission, I do want to just probably make one point of clarification as far as if it is your desire to have that road -- that first entrance into the subdivision off of Chateau, if you want that road alignment to shift to the east, we would ask that you would continue the project and let staff go back to our fire department and this has a lot of ramifications about utility extensions, fire department requirements as far as having a secondary access into the development and what that separation would do if they could still meet fire code and we would also have to look at the revised plat and put conditions in place to address some of those changes and, then, bring those back forward to you. So, take that under advisement as you consider this application this evening.

Oliver: Thank you. Commissioners, any other questions?

Wilson: Mr. Chair?

Oliver: Mr. Wilson.

Wilson: I move we close the public hearing on H-2015-0046.

Fitzgerald: Second.

Oliver: I have a motion and a second to close the hearing on H-20165-0046, Brinegar Prairie Subdivision. All in favor say aye. Opposed say nay. Motion carries.

**MOTION CARRIED: THREE AYES. TWO ABSENT.**

Oliver: Who wants to start? I mean I know in-fill is difficult and -- and I appreciate all the neighbors coming out and kind of giving us more perspective about this project. I think where I'm at at this point is if we are going to accept an R-8 zone I think it's reasonable to recommend maybe a -- kind of a reconfiguration of those access points that fits with the neighborhood, fits with the traffic patterns, and I'd like to hear your thoughts along those lines.

Fitzgerald: Mr. Chairman. I think -- I half somewhat agree with the applicant. Meridian is not used to in-fill yet. We are going to get more use to it and we are going to see a lot more of these projects and there is an R-12 zone that's about a half a mile up the road and our future land use map has a -- there is a reason for it and that's to provide density where it's necessary. And so I understand the traffic issue, but we have to take direction from, unfortunately sometimes, from ACHD and I know that frustrates us all. It frustrates me, too. I do think if we are going to look at R-8 -- quasi R-8 to R-4 -- because it is a low R-8 density. It's 4.25 on the gross side. So, it could be a lot higher on the R-8 side. So, I -- I don't have a problem with density and the way this -- because I think it is -- it has the park, it as some good amenities, but I think the stacking issue -- if they are doing kind of a meet in the middle place I think we can help the neighbors by moving that road if possible.

So, I wouldn't have a problem if the -- if we allow the applicant and the agent to go back and -- and work out a different location of the road, I would be okay with the density.

Oliver: Thank you. Leaving it as it is I think we would be okay. Moving that one entrance would be better. If we left it the way it was, I think it would put on the responsibility of the people that live in that neighborhood in that area to contact the police department and to have some ideas put together as to how they can monitor that area a little better. One of the testimonies was talking about racing up and down Chateau. That's definitely a police department -- contact your police and have them have contact with that. If the pick up zone for kids -- and I worry about that. I worry a lot about kids being picked up right at that intersection. I think it's very dangerous and I just would respect the fact that we need to do everything we can to protect those children from harm and that was my thought when I saw that entrance close to Ten Mile, thinking if we would -- the more -- the more we can get them back away from there maybe that's a little bit better for everyone involved. I don't know. I could go either way. But if we leave it the way it is and send it to the City Council that way, then, I would recommend to the people living in that area to contact your city.

Fitzgerald: I think -- in that conversation I think the discussions with the -- the bus stop -- I mean this is going to add kids to that bus stop. I think Ten Mile is a dangerous road to be having the buses stop anyway, but that's somewhat out of our purview, unfortunately.

Oliver: Yeah.

Fitzgerald: And to the neighbors, that -- we have strict things we have to stick to and the school situation and buses is not something we have ability to really easily put into our decision making process, unfortunately, and so I think I'm with Commissioner Wilson, I -- I think the density is a good compromise, but helping the neighbors and the surrounding communities with the moving of that road I think I would feel more comfortable with that. So, my thought -- and the good work of the applicant and the staff not be wasted in this effort, we hold it to a day certain and we can give Bill and Josh the ability to work with the applicant to come back with something that might work a little bit better.

Oliver: Seeing that, do we have a motion?

Fitzgerald: Mr. Chairman?

Oliver: Mr. Fitzgerald.

Fitzgerald: Yes. I move we close the public hearing --

Baird: If you're going to continue it, Mr. Chair and Members of the Commission, you will need to reopen it to continue. However, in preparation for your motion you might have staff have a side bar with the applicant to find out what that date certain might be as far as contacting the fire department, the police department, getting every drawn -- and that's happening right now, so you might just wait a few seconds.

Wilson: Mr. Chair?

Oliver: Mr. Wilson.

Wilson: I move that we open -- reopen H-2015-0046.

Fitzgerald: Second.

Oliver: It's been moved and seconded that we reopen H-2016-0046. All in favor say aye. Opposed say nay. Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: THREE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Fitzgerald: Do I have to wait --

Baird: I'd wait for Bill Parsons to come back and give you a suggested date if that is going -- I don't want to presuppose your motion, but it looks like that's where you might be headed.

Oliver: I'm sorry, you can't testify anymore. We are finished. Thank you. Bill.

Parsons: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission, the applicant has indicated that they would like a condition placed on them that they shift the road and, then, prior to -- ten days to the Council hearing they get the revised plat to city staff to analyze and put the appropriate conditions in place prior to Council acting on the -- on the proposed subdivision and that's happened frequently in the past, so I think staff is in favor of that recommendation as well.

Fitzgerald: So, just to clarify, Bill, we are -- so, we are -- you are okay with us saying we would suggest or recommend -- with a condition that we require them to move the road or --

Parsons: Shift the road.

Fitzgerald: Shift the road to the east.

Parsons: Yes. That they revise -- submit revised CAD files, construction drawings, and a revised plat ten days prior to the Council hearing, so that staff can adequately analyze that and take that up with the Council.

Oliver: In the form of a continuance or --

Parsons: It would not be a continuance. You would recommend --

Oliver: Approvals with modifications.

Parsons: Or you can stand with the continuance and staff would ask that we continue it to probably March 17th in order for us to get all the information we need to bring forth conditions back to you.

Oliver: Okay.

Fitzgerald: Mr. Chairman, I'm okay with moving forward with an approval based on -- on Bill's direction.

Oliver: Second?

Fitzgerald: Well, I -- also we need to probably close the public hearing. Mr. Chairman, I move we close the public hearing again.

Oliver: On --

Fitzgerald: On H-2015-0046.

Wilson: Second.

Oliver: We have a motion and a second to close again H-2015-0046, Brinegar Prairie Subdivision. All in favor say aye. Opposed say nay. Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: THREE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Fitzgerald: Mr. Chairman?

Wilson: Mr. Chairman?

Fitzgerald: Oh. Go ahead.

Wilson: Well, no. I just maybe for the -- the audience just clarification on now what's going to be happening.

Oliver: Okay. So, my understanding we have two options; right? We can take it the way it is. We can continue it to March 17th and that gives you an opportunity to go back with the developer and come up with an adjustment on the plan and what would work with the city and City Council and -- what's the other one?

Parsons: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission, there is three options as you stated. One is do nothing. Move it forward with no changes to the street. Two is open -- reopen the public hearing and continue it to March 17th, so that you can see the changes before you make your recommendation onto City Council. And the third is to keep the public hearing closed, include in your motion of this project onto City Council that the applicant submit a revised -- place a condition that they shift the road to the east in

accordance with ACHD policies and that they submit a revised auto CAD files and the plat to staff ten days prior to the Council hearing.

Oliver: First, second or third? Third?

Fitzgerald: That's my --

Wilson: I'm supportive of the third.

Oliver: Okay. So, we are in agreement that we would go with submitting it as it is?

Fitzgerald: Submitting it with --

Wilson: To City Council for approval.

Fitzgerald: -- the changes with the suggested shift of the road to the east, with -- according to ACHD policies.

Oliver: Do I have a second with that?

Wilson: Second.

Fitzgerald: Am I making a motion? Well, I will make a motion. Mr. Chairman, after considering all staff, applicant and public testimony, I move to recommend approval to the City Council of file number H-2015-0046 as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of February 18th, 2016, with the following modifications: That we -- that the applicant bring back to staff a preliminary plat that shifts the road to the east in accordance with ACHD policies and provide staff the necessary maps and files that they need ten days prior to City Council.

Wilson: Second.

Oliver: I have a motion and a second. All in favor say aye. Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: THREE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Oliver: We will meet back at March 17? Pardon?

**Item 5: Other Items**

**A. Changes to the Development Application Checklist by Planning Department**

Hill: We have one more item on the agenda.

Oliver: Yes, we do. Okay. We have one more item and that's the changes to the development application checklist by the planning department.

Parsons: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission. The last item on the agenda this evening is your consideration of some changes to our design checklist. As you recall a couple months ago we came forward and we proposed some substantial changes to our design manual and now it's currently -- no longer called the design manual, it's called the architectural standards manual for the City of Meridian and so with those changes we need to update our checklist to insure that we are getting the right information from the applicant as they submit their design review application. Our Unified Development Code does require that you -- any substantial changes to our checklist are approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission and so in my memo I outline what the purpose of the changes were and so all I'm asking for this evening is that you give us your blessing on those changes, so that we can upload the document on the website and get the development community on board with our new design manual. With that I will stand for any questions you might have.

Oliver: Commissioners?

Fitzgerald: Mr. Chairman? Only for a comment. Bill, thank you very much for all the work you guys have done with Public Works for the last -- kind of putting everything in place so we have years and numbers and it makes a lot more sense and it's easier to track. So, commend the staff for the efforts and I don't have any questions.

Wilson: Neither do I. I like the look and I appreciate your hard work on that.

Oliver: Yeah. I agree. Thank you. Seeing nothing else on the agenda, do I have one thing --

Fitzgerald: We need a motion to give you guidance; correct?

Parsons: Yes. Just approve the changes as proposed here.

Fitzgerald: Mr. Chairman, I would move that we approve the changes to the planning division application checklist.

Wilson: Second.

Oliver: I have a motion and a second to approve. All in favor say aye. Opposed say nay. Motion passes. Thank you.

**MOTION CARRIED: THREE AYES. TWO ABSENT.**

Oliver: One last thing.

Fitzgerald: Mr. Chairman?

Oliver: Mr. Fitzgerald.

Fitzgerald: I move for -- that we adjourn.

Oliver: We have a motion to adjourn. I got a second?

Wilson: Second.

Oliver: We have a second. All in favor say aye. Meeting is closed.

MOTION CARRIED: THREE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Oliver: Thank you.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 8:02 P.M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS.)

APPROVED

  
~~PATRICK OLIVER - VICE-CHAIRMAN~~

*Steven Yearsley*

ATTEST:

  
JAYCEE HOLMAN, CITY CLERK

3 | 3 | 2016  
DATE APPROVED

