

**Meridian Planning and Zoning Meeting**

**May 19, 2016**

Meeting of the Meridian Planning and Zoning Commission of May 19, 2016, was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by Chairman Steven Yearsley.

Present: Chairman Steven Yearsley, Commissioner Rhonda McCarvel, Commissioner Patrick Oliver, Commissioner Gregory Wilson and Commissioner Ryan Fitzgerald.

Others Present: Machel Hill, Andrea Pogue, Caleb Hood, Sonya Watters, Josh Beach and Dean Willis.

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

Roll-call

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

Yearsley: Good evening. We would like to call to order the regularly scheduled meeting of the Meridian Planning and Zoning Commission for the hearing date of May 19th, 2016, and let's begin with roll call.

**Item 2: Adoption of the Agenda**

Yearsley: Thank you. At this time the next item on the agenda is the adoption of the agenda and we would like to -- if the clerk could actually give us the resolution number for item -- on Action Item 5-B.

Hill: Mr. Chair, that number is 16-1141.

Yearsley: Thank you. And, then, also the only other change on the agenda is hearing number -- or file number H-2016-0036, the Gibson Amity Property, is being continued to June 23rd, special meeting. So, with those changes can I get a motion to adopt the agenda as presented?

Fitzgerald: Mr. Chairman?

Yearsley: Commissioner Fitzgerald.

Fitzgerald: I move for adoption of the agenda as amended.

Oliver: Second.

Yearsley: I have a motion of the -- for the adoption of the agenda. All in favor say aye. Opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

**Item 3: Consent Agenda**

- A. Approve Minutes of May 5, 2016 Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting**
- B. Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law for Approval for Dance Arts Academy and Preschool (H-2016-0042) by Amanda Bidwell Located 2989 E. Copper Point Drive Request: Conditional Use Permit Approval of a Daycare Center for up to Eighteen (18) Children in a C-G Zoning District**

Yearsley: Next item on the agenda is the Consent Agenda and on that we have to approve the minutes of the May 5th, 2016, Planning and Zoning Commission meeting and, then, the findings of Fact and Conclusion of Law for the approval of the Dance Arts Academy and Preschool of file number H-2016-0042. If there are no changes to the minutes, could I entertain a motion to approve the Consent Agenda?

Oliver: Mr. Chairman?

Yearsley: Commissioner Oliver.

Oliver: I move that we approve the Consent Agenda.

McCarvel: Second.

Wilson: Second.

Yearsley: I have a motion and a second to approve the Consent Agenda. All in favor say aye. Opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Yearsley: Thank you. Before I go any further, I'd like to explain this hearing process, since there is a significant number of members in the audience today. So, we are going to open each item one at a time. The staff will first present their findings of how the project adheres to our Comprehensive Plan and the Uniform Development Code with staff recommendations. After the staff has made their presentation the applicant will have an opportunity to come forward to present their case for approval and to respond to any staff comments. The applicant will

have up to 15 minutes to do so. After the applicant has had a chance to testify, we will open up this to public testimony. There is a sign-up sheet in the back for those wishing to testify. Any person wishing to testify will be allowed up to three minutes. If they are speaking for a larger group and there is a show of hands who they are speaking for, they will be given up to ten minutes. However, those people who they are speaking for will not have an opportunity to speak, given the large amounts of people. So, just kind of try to clarify that a little bit. After the applicant -- or after the public testimony we will have the applicant come up and respond to the comments from the audience and so -- and, then, after he's had a chance to talk we will close the public hearing and the Commission will have an opportunity to discuss and deliberate and, hopefully, make a recommendation to City Council.

**Item 4: Action Items**

- A. Public Hearing for Sonic (H-2016-0045)** by White-Leasure Development Company Located 1535 Celebration Avenue
  - 1. Request: Conditional Use Permit** for a Drive-Thru Establishment on 0.84 of an Acre in a C-G Zoning District

Yearsley: So, with that I would like to open the file for public hearing H-2016-0045 on Sonic and let's begin with the staff report.

Watters: Thank you, Chairman, Members of the Commission. The first application before you is a request for a conditional use permit. This site consists of .4 of an acre of land, zoned C-G, located at 1535 Celebration Avenue. Adjacent land use and zoning. To the north is vacant land and commercially developed property, zoned C-G. To the east is vacant land zoned C-G. To the south is vacant land and a parking lot, zoned C-G and to the west is a Subway restaurant, zoned C-G. This property was annexed back in 1996 with a C-G zoning district and platted as part of Destination Place Subdivision. Several property boundary adjustments have been approved for this site, the last of which created the current configuration of the property. The Comprehensive Plan future land use map designation for this site is mixed use regional. The applicant in -- the applicant's request for a conditional use permit is for a drive-thru establishment for the Sonic Drive-in Restaurant in a C-G zoning district. The CUP is required, because the proposed drive-thru is within 300 feet of an existing drive-thru establishment, which is Dutch Bros southwest of the site. The site plan depicts how the site is proposed to develop with a 2,308 square foot restaurant with a drive-thru and in-door and out-door seating for approximately 60 customers. The indoor seating area can be accessed through man doors and a roll-up door that will be open as weather permits. Drive-in stalls are also proposed to be provided where customers can order and eat in their vehicles. Access is proposed via East Cinema Drive through the adjacent property to the west by a cross-access easement and via South Celebration Avenue at the east

side of the site. So, this is Celebration Avenue right here. The driveway coming in here and, then, this is the other public street access here that comes in and shares a cross-access easement with the property to the west. A total of 19 drive-in parking stalls and nine regular parking spaces are proposed for a total of 28 stations, which exceed the minimum UDC standards. Written testimony has been received from Jeff Huber, the applicant's representative. He is requesting condition number 1.3A is deleted, which requires one tree per 35 feet within a perimeter buffer along the southern boundary of the site. The plat incorrectly identifies a 20 foot wide easement along the southern boundary of the site for a sewer main and water easement, but is actually only a sewer and water service line and only requires a ten foot easement. And I just remembered that I forgot to show you the building elevations. The building is -- consists of stucco, with stone veneer accents, glass doors and windows. Staff is recommending approval with one change to condition number 1.3A as follows: We'd only like to keep the first sentence out of that requirement, which reads one tree for 35 linear feet is required within the perimeter buffer along the south boundary of the site in accord with UDC 11-3B-8C. Delete that second part of the sentence which state because trees are not allowed within the city's sewer and water easement the applicant shall either provide an additional five feet outside of the easement area for trees apply for alternative compliance. Staff will stand for any questions the Commission may have. Staff is recommending approval with the conditions in the staff report.

Yearsley: Thank you. Are there any questions? Would the applicant like to come forward? And, please, state your name and address for the record.

Huber: Mr. Chairman, my name is Jeff Huber. My address is 8385 West Emerald, Boise, and I represent the applicant. We are in agreement with the staff report. It's been a pleasure to work with staff on this -- on this application and we would request your approval tonight. Any questions and would be happy to answer.

Yearsley: Are there any questions?

Fitzgerald: Mr. Chairman?

Yearsley: Commissioner Fitzgerald.

Fitzgerald: Is this the same building elevation project as they just built over off of Linder and Chinden? Kind of the same --

Huber: Very similar. Yes.

Fitzgerald: Thank you.

Yearsley: Are there any other questions? No? We don't have any other questions.

Huber: Okay. Thank you.

Yearsley: Sign-up sheet? While we are getting the sign-up sheet, is there anybody wishing to testify on this application? I guess with that we would entertain a motion to close the public hearing, since we don't need the -- okay. So, I would entertain a motion to close the public hearing.

Wilson: Mr. Chair?

Yearsley: Commissioner Wilson.

Wilson: I move to close the public hearing.

Fitzgerald: Second.

Yearsley: I have a motion and a second to close the public hearing on file number H-2016-0045. All in favor say aye. Opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Yearsley: Any comments or thoughts? I guess I will go. I'm excited to see it here. I think it's a great location, right next to the school, close to my house, so I can go -- easy to get a milk shake at 8:00 o'clock. So, I think it looks good. I'm in agreement with everything. So, I would recommend approval.

Oliver: Mr. Chairman?

Yearsley: Commissioner Oliver.

Oliver: I agree as well. That's a perfect spot for a Sonic restaurant, as well as -- as we probably have seen at one time or another the Rocky Mountain High School, how much they use the Sonic there. It's kind of a gold mine for Sonic I think there and as well as being right next to Mountain View -- Mountain View? Yeah. Mountain View. It will be another one that will be, as well as having the theaters right next by. It's another alternative for people to go and catch a bite to eat and go see a movie and the design is really really well -- I love the fact that Sonic started including the walk-ins where you can actually have seating in it, so I'm in agreement really well.

Yearsley: Thank you. Any other comments? If not, I guess I would entertain a motion. And just to clarify that we are not recommending this to City Council, we are actually approving this since it's a CUP. So, I would entertain a motion.

Wilson: Mr. Chair?

Yearsley: Commissioner Wilson.

Wilson: After approving all staff, applicant and public testimony I move to recommend approval or -- is that right?

Yearsley: Yeah. Recommend approval.

Wilson: Recommend approval to City Council --

Yearsley: No. Just recommend approval.

Wilson: Recommend an approval to city -- of file number H-2016-0042 as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of May 19th, 2016, with the following modification to 1.3A.

Yearsley: And what's the modification? Do we want to --

Wilson: Striking the second sentence from the condition.

Yearsley: Okay.

Fitzgerald: Second with one caveat. Is this 42 or 45, just to make sure we are on the same page.

Yearsley: 45.

Fitzgerald: Okay. 45. Second.

Yearsley: I have a motion and a second to approve file number H-2016-0045. All in favor say aye. Opposed? Motion carries. Thank you.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

**B. Public Hearing for Chinden and Linder Crossing - Retail Shell (H-2016-0046)** by Nate Hosac Located Northwest Corner of Chinden Boulevard and N. Linder Road

- 1. Request: Conditional Use Permit** Approval for a Drive-Thru Establishment in a C-C Zoning District Within 300 Feet of Another Drive-Thru Facility and Existing Residences

Yearsley: Next item on the agenda is the public hearing for file number H-2016-0046, Chinden and Linder Crossing Retail Shell and let's begin with the staff report.

Watters: Thank you, Chairman, Commissioners. The next application is also a request for a conditional use permit. This site consists of .67 of an acre of land in the C-C zoning district, located at 1805 West Island Green Drive, which is just north of Chinden Boulevard and west of North Linder Road. Adjacent land use and zoning. To the north is rural residential property zoned RUT in Ada County. To the east is vacant, undeveloped land, zoned C-C. To the south is Chinden Boulevard and vacant undeveloped land zoned C-G. And to the west is also vacant undeveloped land recently approved for a drive-thru restaurant, Carl's Jr., zoned C-C. In 2006 this property was annexed with a C-C and TN-C zoning districts and rezoned to entirely C-C in 2011. In 2014 a preliminary plat, final plat, and development agreement modification was approved for the development of a nine lot commercial subdivision. The Comprehensive Plan future land use map designation for this site is mixed use community. The applicant has submitted a conditional use permit application for a drive-thru establishment for a restaurant in a C-C zoning district as required by the UDC and the development agreement, because the proposed drive-thru is within 300 feet of another drive-thru establishment Carl's Jr. and a residential district and uses to the north. The applicant has submitted a site plan as shown that depicts a 5,820 square foot multi-tenant building with the 3,180 square foot restaurant with a drive-thru at the rear of the east tenant space on the site plan on the left. Parking is proposed on the north and west sides of the building and a patio area is proposed around the building. The owners are in negotiations with a restaurant chain that may want the entire building. Therefore, the applicant has submitted an alternative plan that depicts a 3,200 square foot single tenant building and that is shown there on your right, for a restaurant with a drive-thru. Parking is only proposed on the north side of the building and a patio area is proposed around the building. Access is proposed via West Island Green Drive along the north boundary of the site, which is a local street. Direct access via Chinden is prohibited. A cross-access easement exists for all lots within this subdivision. Parking is proposed in excess of UDC standards. This is a copy of the landscape plan that they are proposing for the original site plan. Building elevations were submitted for the proposed structure as shown. Building materials consist primarily of stucco, effice with stone veneer and thin break accents with metal awnings and parapet caps. Final design should substantially comply with their proposed elevations and also be consistent with the design standards listed in the UDC and the architectural standards manual. Written testimony has been received from Nate Hosack, the applicant's representative. He is in agreement with the conditions in the staff report. Staff is recommending approval with the conditions B of the staff report. Staff will stand for any questions.

Yearsley: Thank you. Are there any questions?

Oliver: Mr. Chairman?

Yearsley: Commissioner Oliver.

Oliver: I have just one to ask. In the bottom picture, the elevation, is that a representative of what I see at the top, the three buildings or four buildings there?

Watters: Yes, Chairman, Commissioner Oliver. The bottom elevation would be the rear of the building facing Chinden and also the east side of the building. As you can see, the -- the drive-thru is located right at the corner. That coincides with the site plan that was first shown and this would be the north side of the building where my pointer is at to top and, then, I believe this is the west side right here.

Oliver: Did we happen to get one for elevation for -- in case they go through the whole building, what that would look like?

Watters: They did not submit one for the whole building. I'm not sure if it will change at all or -- the applicant could probably address that.

Oliver: Okay. Thank you.

Yearsley: Thank you.

Fitzgerald: Mr. Chairman?

Yearsley: Commissioner Fitzgerald.

Fitzgerald: Sonya, for -- I think maybe this is an applicant question. Along there, that road, it's currently blocked off in front of Primary Health. Is that a zoning compliance issue on accessing Chinden or is there always going to be a -- I guess my question -- on your aerial that dotted blue line in 1900 -- on Block 1900, there is Primary Health there and there is a road that has stubbed into Chinden, but it's blocked off with Jersey barriers. So, is there a -- something we are waiting for or is that ever going to gain access?

Watters: Commissioners, I believe that that's a right-in, right-out. Do you recall, Caleb? It appears it's a right-in, right-out. It's shown on this site plan right here, but I'm not absolutely positive. This lot does not have direct access to Chinden, though.

Fitzgerald: I was wondering if there was something we are waiting for or is that substantial completion or --

Watters: I'm not aware.

Fitzgerald: Okay. Just a question. Thank you.

Yearsley: Thank you. Would the applicant like to come forward? And, please, state your name and address for the record.

Hosack: Good evening. My name is Nate Hosack. The address is 408 South Eagle Road in Eagle. We appreciate the opportunity to come before the Planning and Zoning Commission. We are in agreement with all of the findings and recommendations contained in the staff report. It's been great to work with staff on this project. Just real quickly, to answer the question that was brought up about the right-in, right-out that is next to the medical center, that was a -- an access that was originally approved by ITD and what they said was you didn't need to do a traffic study for it and, then, later they came back and said, actually, we would like you to do a traffic study and so that was just completed and actually earlier today they received permission by ITD to go ahead and finish the work.

Yearsley: Thank you.

Hosack: That was why it was delayed and blocked off like that.

Yearsley: Any questions? Commissioner Oliver, did you want to ask that question?

Oliver: Yeah. If you'd just address that as far as the elevation, if you were in negotiations with one that was going buy out the entire --

Hosack: Yeah. If the restaurant operator ends up taking the entire building and we go with that alternate site plan, the design will be substantially the same.

Oliver: Okay.

Hosack: It will look almost the same as what you're looking at there, just a little smaller.

Oliver: Okay. Thank you.

Yearsley: Thank you. Are there any other questions? Thank you.

Hosack: Thanks.

Yearsley: I have a couple people signed up, but they wished not to testify. Is there anybody wishing to testify on this application? Okay. With that, since we don't need the applicant to come back, since no one testified, I would entertain a motion to close the public hearing on file number H-2016-0046.

Oliver: Mr. Chairman?

Yearsley: Commissioner Oliver.

Oliver: I move we close the hearing on H-2016-0046.

Fitzgerald: Second.

Yearsley: I have a motion and a second to close the public hearing. All in favor say aye. Opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Yearsley: Any comments or thoughts?

McCarvel: Mr. Chairman?

Yearsley: Commissioner McCarvel.

McCarvel: I think the elevations and everything look great. Getting that area filled in up there and I'm sure it was -- more building is coming and restaurants will be welcome.

Yearsley: Thank you. With that, if there is no other comments, I would entertain a motion. Again, this is a conditional use permit, so we are not recommending approval to City Council, it's just for approval. So, I would entertain a motion for approval.

Fitzgerald: Mr. Chairman?

Yearsley: Commissioner Fitzgerald.

Fitzgerald: After considering all staff, applicant, and public testimony, I move to recommend approval of file number H-2016-0046.

Wilson: Second.

Yearsley: I have a motion and a second to approve file number H-2016-0046. All in favor say aye. Opposed. Motion carries. Thank you.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

**D. Public Hearing Continued from May 5, 2016 for Gibson Amity Property (H-2016-0036) by CLG, Inc. Located 357 E. Amity Road**

1. **Request: Annexation and Zoning** of Approximately 5.864 Acres of Land with an I-L Zoning District

Yearsley: Next item on the list is -- we are going to open the public hearing on file number H-2016-0036, Gibson Amity Property, for the sole purpose to continue this to June 23rd. Can I get a motion?

Fitzgerald: Mr. Chairman?

Yearsley: Commissioner Fitzgerald.

Fitzgerald: I would move that we continue H-2016-0036 until the hearing date of June 23rd, for a special meeting.

Oliver: Second.

Yearsley: I have a motion and a second to continue file number H-2016-0036. All in favor say aye. Opposed? Motion carries. Thank you.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

**E. Public Hearing Continued from May 5, 2016 for Rainier Villas (H-2016-0041)** by Aaron Elton Located West of N. Meridian Road and South of E. Franklin Road

1. **Request: Preliminary Plat** Approval of Twenty-Three (23) Residential Lots and Four (4) Common Lots on 5.354 in an Existing C-G Zoning District
2. **Request: Conditional Use Permit** Approval for Ninety-Two (92) Multi-Family Dwelling Units on Approximately 5.354 Acres in an Existing C-G Zoning District

Yearsley: Next item on the agenda is the public hearing for file number H-2016-0041, Rainier Villas, and let's begin with the staff report.

Beach: Good evening, Chair, Commissioners. This is an application for a conditional use permit and a preliminary plat. The site consists of 5.35 acres of land, which is zoned C-G, located west of North Meridian Road between West Corporate Drive and West Pennwood Street. To the north we have vacant commercial property zoned C-G. To the south we have a self-storage facility, also zoned C-G. To the east is the Trade Plaza Subdivision zoned C-G. And to the west is a vacant and undeveloped commercial property also zoned C-G. In 2008 this property was platted as part of the Trade Plaza preliminary plat. That plat has since expired and this is a remnant piece that must be subdivided in

order to be eligible for a building permit. The Comprehensive Plan future land use map designation for this property is commercial and so, as I said, the property -- the proposed preliminary plat consists of 15 multi-family residential building lots and five common lots on approximately 5.35 acres of land in the C-C zoning district. The average lot size proposed for the development is 7,500 square feet. In the C-G zoning district the UDC does not require a minimum lot size. Access to this development is proposed from the extension of Southwest 3rd Street -- let me get to the plat so you can see it here. So, access is proposed from Southwest 3rd Street and extension of that, as well as two accesses onto West Corporate Drive. The property was granted cross-access to the commercial property to the east, with the Trade Plaza Subdivision. Staff recommends that the applicant remove the eastern access and redesign the site so that it takes access from the curb cut developed with the Trade Plaza Subdivision or obtain Council approval for a conditional access to West Corporate Drive. The applicant will have to execute a reciprocal cross-access and shared parking agreement between all the lots to insure that they -- they will have local street access in accord with the UDC. The applicant wants to include a note on the plat stating such and have that recorded with the plat. A couple of things here in reviewing this that I would like to cover, so that the Commission is aware. There is several things that staff were not able to review as part of this application and so we have structured the staff report to have those things be submitted to staff for our review with the certificate of zoning compliance. Now, that's not typically how we do that. Typically we like to see those things with the Planning and Zoning Commission, so that you folks are able to review those and provide recommendation. Having said that, I will go through some of the things that we are -- that we are recommending, so you understand where staff's review has been limited with this specific application having to do with the -- the architectural elevations. We have been provided architectural elevations from the applicant. Based on that, our initial review, there is potential that these four-plex structures here can meet our architectural standards if they are designed in a certain way, though there could be some changes made in order for that to meet code, which, again, can be obtained through the certificate of zoning compliance and design review process. The 12-plex structure, as shown here, does not meet the architectural standards required by the city code and so staff has required that the applicant make some changes and meet that code, with the understanding that we will have to redo that and approve that prior to certificate of zoning compliance and so I think that's -- that's one of the main things I want to bring your attention to. Some of the other minor things are staff is recommending that based on the number of units here, 92 units that the applicant remove the four-plex here, which is Lot 7, Block 1, and provide that as open space. The applicant is proposing to use this space here as both an amenity and open space, which is not allowed under the code. It's one or the other. So, in order to accommodate that they would need -- in order to accommodate that as their amenity they would need to provide additional open space elsewhere. Staff is also recommending that they remove the sports court and the statue and provide a clubhouse and with a fitness facility to make up for

that additional amenity due to the large number of units. Those -- those were the main things. There are some -- some additional conditions from staff. The applicant can meet at the time of certification of zoning compliance, but I wanted to give you a brief overview of where staff is. So, with that, with the understanding that the applicant will have to come back through and get an approval through the certificate of zoning compliance and design review process, staff is comfortable recommending approval of this. We did receive not written comment -- no written testimony and, again, staff is recommending approval with those conditions and I will stand for any questions you have.

Yearsley: Are there any questions? You look perplexed, so I wasn't sure if you were going to ask a question or not. Would the applicant like to come forward? Please state your name and address for the record.

Robnett: My name is Shannon Robnett. I'm at 5109 Zamora, Meridian. I wanted to give you guys a little history about how we got here. We started this process in February with a layout that had 96 units and with the required open space of 23,000 square feet and 184 parking spaces. We had a first proposal of 23,570 parking -- or, sorry, square feet of open space and 188 parking spaces. After meeting with staff we came up with a better site plan and after a third review we came up with the site plan you're looking at. One of the things that I want to point out to you is that we have 38,000 square feet of open space. We are required 23,000. I also want to point out to you that we are required 184 parking spaces. We have 214. I want to point out to you that we are required to have four amenities. We have five. I want to point out to you that we have done everything that we can do to make this the best project that we can make it. Let's talk about the specifics. The access. The access -- we understand that it's helpful to have cross-access amongst neighbors to reduce the entrances onto a collector. I disagree with staff, however, as the elimination of our proposed entrance to the east would create a number of problems. First of all, in reading the recorded plat the cross-access easement does not refer to us. In fact, if you look at it, it refers to our parcel as unplatted. Currently the agreement speaks to the access that parcels have and it refers to the center line of the properties. So, if you can imagine there are four properties, they are split right down the center for access. Also, I'd like to bring up that we have a much larger traffic count. That other parcel is just over an acre. We are five. We are an apartment complex. We will generate far more traffic than they will and do they really want us running through their property accessing from there. It will also encourage our residents to think about illegally parking there, which is something the business owners won't want. Thirdly, I want you to think about the fire department. If we redesign that it makes it a longer pull to the center of the project where the problem might be. ACHD has further commented that they have no problem with our access. Since we weren't part of the original plat of that original parcel and according to staff that has expired, can you really think that that's something we need to do? However, like everyone has pointed out, if that's what we need to do, we have the ability to do that, because we have no buildings on that side, just

landscaping. So, to punch an access through at some point to cross-access, could be part of a condition. Staff's also pointed out the sidewalks need to be brought in off of 3rd Avenue. One of the amenities as staff also didn't mention is that we have walkways through our parcels. The reason that we have walkways because we want to encourage people to stay interior in our complex, in our common areas, and not be right on the road. But if staff wants that, again, we are okay. The conditional use permit asked us to dedicate minimums and I want to remind you that we have dedicated over 66 percent more open space than required. We have shown a site plan that has 30 more parking spaces than required. We have a pool and we can all argue that that's the most costly amenity you can put in. We have walking paths that offer pedestrians a safe route through our site, public art, a sport court, and a 50 by 100 open area. And contrary to the staff report, we have included five amenities, rather than four. I don't see how limiting us to 88 units, after we are so far above the standards is appropriate action for Planning and Zoning to take. Specific use standards. We are very aware of the fact that we have to comply with the city in our CZC process and fully intend to do so at this -- at every step. The reality is our last meeting was with staff on April 20th when we came up with the site plan we currently have. During that time we have developed a footprint and an elevation. That shows our intent. We all know that these things cost money to develop and to design, but at this point it's not required. I believe that while the city has to take up -- take steps necessary for developers to have certain documents completed at certain times, the bottom line is we are here for an approval of a CUP and a preliminary plat next month to City Council and we will have to submit construction drawings for all site improvements for city engineers, development department, to take and review and that will take approximately 90 days. After that we will have approximately 90 days to construct the on-site improvements before we can submit for a building permit. And CZC is before that. So, you can clearly see that we have about seven months to develop that elevation. We don't have an issue constructing a separate site management office. We have plenty of extra room to do so in our common space and a site management office would probably be an amenity that everybody could see. But to require us to not only comply with five amenities, but, then, give you six with a clubhouse and seven with a fitness facility, I think is a little overstepping. This is a relatively -- sorry -- relatively small complex and it won't be hard to accommodate those things. I just can't see how removing the building on Lot 7 and dropping us to an occupancy of 88 units is going to enhance that. However, we are also questioning staff's comment about the 50 by 100 common area. We have a 50 by 100 common area on the south property line. We are required to have one. We also have a sport court public art in another area that could be a 50 by 100 common area. We just need to know which one you want. If you would like it on the front we can move or if you would like it on the north we can definitely move everything that's in the other areas to that. We could even change from a sport court to a plaza and put it in the front on the south. We are flexible, but when we have five amenities, only required four, it makes it confusing. Another comment was that we don't have a berm separating us from Corporate Drive. We would

be more than happy to do that. As for comments regarding for the four-plex units, we will definitely work with staff as our plans on the larger buildings are a newer rendition of our site development. I would raise questions again about the ability of staff and Commission to require them during this process when they are clearly covered in the CZC. That being said, we have and will continue to work with city to meet the requirements as set forth in the architectural standard manual. We will supply all necessary legal binding documents at the time they are required regarding maintenance and management of the development prior to our CZC. As far as staff comments about design review, we could not agree more with these comments and suggest that everyone involved just limit our discussion here tonight about the appropriate ones regarding the applications that are at hand and not the ones that are not. Our purpose here tonight is not to delve into these items as it would create a quagmire that would unduly bog down the efficiency of not only Planning and Zoning, but City Council as well. One can rest assured and no building will be built and our effort here tonight would be in vain if we fail to comply with the design standards at the time they are to be reviewed. In closing I would like to point out again that our compliance with open space requirements and our dedication to this project we are providing an additional quarter acre of open space. Our design has an additional 30 parking spaces and we already have five amenities. We have overcomplied where some just trying to meet the minimums. We have been helping to develop in the Treasure Valley since 1982 and know that providing more than is required is one of the best ways to insure that your project is successful, not only here, but in the other marketplace where he's trying to rent it, lease it, and sell it. I want to urge staff and Planning and Zoning also that if you guys feel that your minimums are just not enough, to revise your code. That would help all of us in the development community to quit guessing about what you really want and be able to just follow the code and divide properties properly, subdivide, develop and insure that we are all meeting the same standard that we all want. It would create much clearer guidelines for all involved and make it more streamlined to work with city and everyone involved. I want to thank you guys for your time. I'd like to turn the rest over to my development partner Aaron Elton.

Elton: Thank you. Greetings to the Commission. My name is Aaron Elton. Office address is 2949 East Copperpoint, Meridian, Idaho. I am in agreement with everything that Mr. Robnett just presented and I would just reiterate the -- the importance -- if you look at the site plan just generally, if you see the termination of 3rd Street there with the cul-de-sac coming in, that's not the prettiest thing in the world that we would like to do with this site plan, if you can imagine having a cul-de-sac as your center piece isn't the greatest, so we are in full agreement with the staff that we should be having lots of common area, common space, and so I would reiterate the -- what we are calling overcompliance or we are very compliant with the amount of common space and do not agree with the recommendation to eliminate the four-plex on Block 7 as -- as discussed, so -- any questions?

Yearsley: Are there any questions?

McCarvel: I have got one. Where would you put the office area then?

Elton: We are very flexible on that. Right now we are thinking just -- if you see the pool just southwest of that, basically on that corner. But it could be anywhere.

McCarvel: So, what would that cut your open space down to then?

Elton: Right now we are at just over 38,000 and depending on the size of the -- the parcel that we use or the block that we use on that, cut it down by 2,000. So, we are still very compliant. If we -- I would also point out, just running the math, you know, we -- I think it's very important that we discuss whether or not it's common space. The -- I think it's called open space. It's one of the amenities if it's 100 by 50. If we cut that down, that's 5,000 square feet. We are still 146 percent compliant. Right now we are saying we are 166 because we have got 38,000. So, cutting out a little bit for an office is not going to hurt it at all. We have lots of common area.

Fitzgerald: Mr. Chairman?

Yearsley: Commissioner Fitzgerald.

Fitzgerald: How are you managing it with the current site plan? How would you be managing --

Elton: Property management.

Fitzgerald: Through outside? No one's on site. No one is on site in the current plan.

Elton: As proposed we were -- as proposed we had an office in a unit. We were going to use a unit --

Fitzgerald: Okay.

Elton: -- for the office. So, yeah, we are not going to do it without office space.

Fitzgerald: So, that would be in one of the four-plexes or in a --

Elton: In one of the units, in one of the four-plexes, which was in that same one that he proposed to --

Fitzgerald: To remove.

Elton: -- to eliminate.

Fitzgerald: That's what I'm saying --

Elton: The office was going to be in there.

Fitzgerald: Okay. That's what I'm saying, you got a dotted -- dotted dashed line.

Elton: Yeah. That's exactly what the dotted line is. Correct.

Fitzgerald: Okay. Makes sense. Okay.

Yearsley: Thank you. Any other questions? I actually had one question. Just for clarification. Can you list off your five amenities?

Elton: Yeah. As proposed?

Yearsley: Yes.

Elton: We got the pool. Sport court. There is public art in there and as staff noted, we shouldn't count that as an amenity and open space, but that's in the part that we are not calling one of the amenities, so public art is a third one and, then, the common space on that -- on the south -- on Corporate Drive in between the 12-plexes.

Yearsley: Okay.

Elton: So, those are at least the four. There is also a fifth one that are the walking paths that's specified in there and there is also a mention of plaza. We have been discussing putting a plaza there and that would be six, but for right now we are calling it those five.

Yearsley: Okay.

Elton: Does that answer your question?

Yearsley: It does. And according to staff if you considered an --

Elton: Amenity.

Yearsley: -- amenity, it can't be considered open space I think is the contention is this -- from how I understand that and so --

Elton: Right. But -- correct.

Fitzgerald: So, Mr. Chairman?

Yearsley: Yes.

Fitzgerald: So, if they remove the open space and call it an amenity, is your open space then -- what is it percentage wise then? Did you say 146 percent?

Elton: Yeah. If we --

Fitzgerald: So, you remove the 5,000 --

Elton: Five thousand square feet from that piece and we are still at 140 -- we are still -- we are 46 percent over compliance.

Fitzgerald: Thank you.

Yearsley: And I guess is that -- Josh, is that -- is that correct or is that -- just trying to make sure I understand. Because I thought that -- the big lot down at the bottom was considered an --

Elton: Amenity.

Yearsley: -- amenity. Is that correct or was that considered --

Beach: Make sure I'm understanding your question. Are you asking me if that area on the south boundary -- if they are considering that open space?

Yearsley: Yes.

Beach: They have considered -- they have used it as both --

Yearsley: Okay.

Beach: -- in their calculations. They have used it as an open space area, as well as one of their amenities and our code only allows them to use it for one or the other. Having said that, there is also a minimum size that can be included in their open space calculations --

Yearsley: Uh-huh.

Beach: -- that's ten by twenty -- 20 by 50. Sorry. So, if it's -- if the open space is less than that in area it cannot be included as their usable open space. We will have to do an analysis to see where their open space is and what they have included as open space and if that meets our -- our code requirements.

Yearsley: Okay.

Beach: So, hope that answers your question.

Yearsley: It does, because it sounded like there was a significant discrepancy. I was trying to figure out how those two discrepancies co-overlapped and how that made -- I'm trying to understand that, so that's why I was just asking, so --

Robnett: Mr. Chairman, if I may clarify. The code says that open space in the configuration of large -- has to be larger than 20 by 20, not 20 by 50 to be counted. Isn't that correct; Josh?

Beach: If you are reading that verbatim, then, you're probably correct.

Robnett: Yeah. Twenty by twenty --

Beach: Yeah. Four hundred square feet.

Robnett: Yeah. Not 1,000 square feet.

Beach: Four hundred square feet. So, if they had an area that size that would count -- but a lot of the things between the building -- they are not big enough to count towards that usable open space --

Yearsley: Okay.

Beach: -- and so we would have to take a look. Removing that Lot 7, Block 1, would, then, potentially make them meet that requirement if they can't meet it with using that as an amenity -- this southern lot as an amenity, rather than open space. So, there is a lot of juggling that has to be made just to make sure that they can meet that requirement, as well as the amenities, so --

Yearsley: Okay.

Robnett: Mr. Commissioner, if I may again. I'm sorry. I just want to clarify that, Josh, if we have that 50 by 100 in our calculations, the way that you calculated it we are at 38,347 according to your staff report; is that correct?

Beach: You need to direct questions to the Commissioner.

Robnett: Okay. I'm trying to clarify -- in the staff report it says that we have 38,400 -- or 347 square feet of open space. Now, unfortunately, I didn't bring my calculator here, but if we take that out -- I'm trying to figure out and boil down the real number. So, are we 66 percent compliant -- over compliant or are we 46 percent over compliant? If we are calling it an amenity it's -- and we are okay with calling it an amenity, but that only makes us 46 percent over compliant and I'm a little disappointed, frankly. But if we do not call it an amenity and it counts,

then, we are at a 166 percent of what's required and I'm just trying to clarify that. Which one are we?

Yearsley: And that's what we are trying to figure out as well, so I understand. I am -- okay. And I don't think we have the time or the -- this is -- you know, at this point we are not the ones to make that decision with that and so we will have to --

Fitzgerald: Deliberate.

Yearsley: -- deliberate on that to try to figure that out, so -- okay. Are there any other questions? Thank you. I do not have anybody signed up to testify on this. Is there anybody wishing to testify on this application? I guess if not I would entertain a motion to close the public hearing on file number H-2016-0041.

Fitzgerald: Second.

Yearsley: I have a motion and a second to close the public hearing. All in favor say aye. Opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Yearsley: Any comments? This is kind of a tough one, you know. I understand staff's point of view. You know, our concern and our goal at this point is to make sure we have a good product in our city and not have something that's not undesirable and I know that that's what they are doing their best to make sure that that happens. It sounds like there is some confusion back and forth on open space amenities and that -- and, then, there is also a significant amount of conditions imposed on this, just because of not understanding. You know, typically when we have it come before us we get renderings that are in compliance with the CDC -- or CZC and making sure that we have a chance, the opportunity look at that. I don't know, I kind of would be interested to hear your thoughts. I'm almost wondering if we may want to continue this to get some of these answers clarified and -- have a better look at it.

Fitzgerald: Mr. Chairman?

Yearsley: Commissioner Fitzgerald.

Fitzgerald: I -- the minimum is 23,000. they are at 38,000. If we take 5,000 out we are still at 33,000. So, I mean I -- I understand where the applicant is coming. I understand where Josh is stating we need to have some additional amenities here that -- I think the challenge I have is we are removing a building to add another building somewhere else. That's going to have the same thing that that building does. So, you're having a multi-functional residential building and a manager's office that's already on the site and we are asking the applicant to remove that building to move it to somewhere else and I guess that confuses me

a great deal, because I think -- I understand we are trying to maximize the open space, but also give the applicant a great -- as much space as they can to build what they want and so that confuses me first and I -- but I do think we are -- we probably need to get some more information. I don't -- I think having a sport court and a pool is an impressive thing for a multi-family project and so I -- I understand where the applicant is coming from on this as well.

Yearsley: Oh, absolutely.

Fitzgerald: And I -- I guess -- I guess I understand the frustration. Maybe. So --

Oliver: Mr. Chairman?

Yearsley: Commissioner Oliver.

Oliver: I -- the project itself, where it's located, I think is great and I think will be functional and work well there, but I still have a lot of questions in my gut as far as confusion between the applicant and the staff trying to figure out which way to go there, that we, obviously, have some questions that haven't been answered and they haven't been discussed and I'm just not -- I don't feel comfortable right now making a decision based on the fact that we have so many questions yet. I agree with taking about the -- the court and putting in some other facilities there for fitness and whatnot, a clubhouse you might say. I think that works great. Putting the berms like we said on -- on -- was it Corporate? I think would be fine. But I just think that when we talk about that open space and, then, the amenities, I think there is confusion there between the two and I'm not sure which way to go. If you got a question that you could -- Josh.

Beach: If I may. I think -- I think most of the disconnect with this is staff had very limited time to review this. Give the applicant a couple of options as to what they would like to do. Initially staff has recommended that they continue this so that we had adequate time to review both the site plan and the landscape plan. The applicant indicated that he would like to move this forward and staff had indicated initially that we would recommend denial of the project. Upon further review staff felt that most of these things could be overcome. I think -- I'm not so worried that the applicant can't get to the open space. I'm not worried that the applicant can't get the amenity package at least meeting one of those categories. I think the -- the thing that staff -- at least myself wants to impress upon the Commission is that which amenities do we want? Do we want the applicant to provide certain things for the development -- and that's up for you folks to -- to decide. Staff did make recommendations. I think, Commissioner Fitzgerald, your question as to losing one of the units. Staff's recommendation in the staff report is that they -- essentially that's Lot 7, Block 7, building go away --

Fitzgerald: Yeah.

Beach: -- and that the basketball court also go away and that's where the clubhouse would go. At least in staff's mind.

Fitzgerald: Which I don't think is a good idea.

Beach: Sure. And that's up for you to determine. But at least that's what staff was thinking. So, I just wanted to make that -- that clear. I think that we can get there as far as the certificate of zoning compliance, those issues, the code, as well as the architectural standards and working with the applicant. It's the comfort level of the Commission tonight as to whether or not they feel comfortable where we are recommending approval.

McCarvel: Mr. Chairman?

Yearsley: Commissioner McCarvel.

McCarvel: I'm just curious -- I mean do -- don't want to muddy the waters here, but if there was an imaginary line down the middle of that open space is there enough there to be qualified as two open spaces and one be an amenity and one be your open space? I mean if we are going to get technical with the calculations. I mean -- because it sounds like that open space is just huge way over what it needs to be and they are still looking for an amenity. So, part of it could be calculated as an amenity and part of it as the open space and I'm just wondering on the four-plex where the office currently is, if you could use -- they are, obviously, using one section of it, so it's technically a three-plex and, then, maybe just use another section of it as a fitness area. I mean I wouldn't imagine that, you know, there would probably just be a couple -- I don't know. I just -- I think there is a lot on here and I get -- we just need to start checking them off what can we agree on to move it forward or do we just want to continue it? I mean it sounds like time is of the essence for the project moving forward. Always is.

Yearsley: Oh, yeah.

Beach: And just -- this will be my last little interruption. The applicant -- staff had presented to the applicant several deficiencies with the site plan after they had submitted it to us on Wednesday and to the applicant's credit they quickly turned around a staff report -- excuse me, not a staff report, but a revised site plan and landscape plan that was significantly improved and met a lot of the -- the concerns that staff -- that the staff initially had. So, I don't want you to feel like the applicant hasn't made any strides to correct those -- some of those things. There just wasn't sufficient time between when we got the staff report -- or when we got the site plan just today for the applicant to get it all the way there, so --

McCarvel: Mr. Chairman?

Yearsley: Commissioner McCarvel.

McCarvel: I guess maybe we try to bite off --

Yearsley: Absolutely.

McCarvel: -- yeah -- a chunk at a time here and take some of the easier ones first. I -- the -- I think the access -- I think the size of the complex could very well -- I'm in favor of having both accesses there. I think it's better for the property next door to it. I agree, I don't think they are going to want all that traffic and I think that one -- I think the two accesses make more sense.

Yearsley: Okay.

Fitzgerald: I would agree with that, Mr. Chairman.

Yearsley: So, we are looking -- you know, right now we are looking to get ready to nix the condition to provide -- closing one access and do the cross-access easement on the other one. So, we are, basically, saying to keep it the way it is.

McCarvel: Uh-huh.

Yearsley: Okay. I think that's probably agreeable. Any other --

Fitzgerald: Anytime ACHD says they will give you an access, I would take it. And the applicant has already agreed to do the berming, which I think is fine.

Oliver: Mr. Chairman?

Yearsley: Commissioner Oliver.

Oliver: As far as the basketball court, I keep thinking that there are going to be families moving into this facility and knowing where it is, it's not the most -- it's not the best place to put -- for children to be gaining access to other facilities close by. So, having a pool and a tennis -- or a basketball court facility for families, kids, would keep them in that area without having to try and go out somewhere else to try and find it. So, I'm kind of leaning towards the fact leaving the basketball court and doing what Commissioner McCarvel said is maybe putting an amenity in that Lot 7 with the manager's area -- if they could work it out that would be great on the ground floor.

Yearsley: Okay.

Fitzgerald: Mr. Chairman?

Yearsley: Commissioner Fitzgerald.

Fitzgerald: I think that's a good compromise. Because I think you still are giving the applicant an ability to utilize that building and still have the amenities that we have there. I still think it's -- I think it's positive. And I also think -- I mean we are -- we give them guidelines in the code to 23,000. So, if we take 5,000 out and you still have an open space, whether we agree on the numbers or not, they are still exceeding it by a significant amount and so I have a tough time, you know, penalizing that applicant's efforts to find open space. I mean they could have slid those buildings apart so there is big gaps in between and you don't really have an amenity in the middle --

Yearsley: Right.

Fitzgerald: -- and still get the open space requirement. So, they are trying to provide a bigger space for people to go play soccer or whatever they want to do and, again, I don't want to penalize the applicant for attempting to meet our code, but also trying to make it a nice project and they are adding a pool and sports court and those kind of things in here. So, I think by giving them maybe that -- that building on Lot 7 with maybe -- it's got a two-plex with an exercise requirement in there, you give them both pieces and I think we may garner a -- a way to move forward.

Yearsley: No. I think that's not a bad -- not a bad proposal. Okay. The way it sounds like, the staff is comfortable with them to come forward with making sure that they meet the architectural standards in the future. I'm trying to think -- was there anything else? I'm just going through the conditions to make sure there wasn't anything else that -- I think those are the two major items, weren't they?

Fitzgerald: The main things, Mr. Chairman.

Yearsley: So -- okay. I guess at that point I would be -- entertain a motion based on that.

McCarvel: Okay. Let's see. Okay. After considering all staff, applicant and public testimony, I move to recommend approval of file number H-2016-0041 as presented in the hearing on May 19th, 2016, with the following modifications: Keeping both accesses as shown on the plat presented. Adding the berm that was agreed to --

Yearsley: The berm was already in the staff report.

McCarvel: Okay. Thank you. The -- keeping the basketball court as presented. Allowing staff and the applicant to work on architectural design to be sure and meet the code. And that the management -- the management office be -- remain as shown.

Yearsley: And that building is remain as shown?

McCarvel: Yeah. And the building is remain as shown, with making it a duplex with an exercise area and office.

Fitzgerald: Before we do a second, I just -- I want to clarify -- we are keeping the two accesses. Are we going to require them to execute a cross-access easement or are we going to try to -- okay. So, just -- so you're saying -- it's your motion, so you need to make that decision if we want to have that -- keep that or remove that.

McCarvel: Do we want to go back to discussion? I had thought not, but --

Yearsley: I'm open either way. So, make your motion and, then, we can --

McCarvel: I think to have the two entrances as shown without the cross-access into that business.

Yearsley: Okay.

Fitzgerald: Second.

Yearsley: I have a motion and a second for approval of file number H-2016-0041. All in favor say aye. Opposed? Motion carries. Congratulations.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

**F. Public Hearing for Verado Subdivision (H-2016-0047) by DevCo, LLC Located Southeast Corner of N. Locust Grove Road and E. Ustick Road Recommend**

- 1. Request: Annexation** of Approximately 20.28 Acres from RUT in Ada County to the R-8 (Medium Density Residential) (5.12 Acres) and R-15 (Medium High-Density Residential) (14.23 Acres) Zoning Districts
- 2. Request: Preliminary Plat Approval** Consisting of 122 Single Family Residential Lots, 8 Common Lots on Approximately 19.35 Acres in the Proposed R-8 and R-15 Zoning Districts

Yearsley: All right. For the hearing we have all been waiting for. I appreciate your patience and deliberation -- or, you know, waiting for this. I understand that there is a lot of people here and there is a lot of stuff. I just want to make sure that we are all -- before we go forward with this, let's -- let's all be kind to one

another. Let the applicant speak, we will let you guys speak, and we will get through this and so I appreciate your patience and that.

Yearsley: And so at this time I would like to open the public hearing on file number H-2016-0047, Verado Subdivision, and let's begin with the staff report.

Beach: Good evening, Chair, Commissioners. This is an application for annexation and preliminary plat. The site consists of 19.35 acres of land, which is zoned RUT in Ada County. It's located near the southeast corner -- excuse me -- the southwest -- no. Southeast corner of North Locust Grove and East Ustick Roads. To the north is East Ustick Road, single family residential properties in the Summerfield and Champion Park Subdivisions, zoned R-4 and R-8 respectively. East is single family residential properties in Packard Estates Subdivision zoned R-4 and county residences zoned RUT in Ada County. To the south are single family residential properties in Packard Acres Subdivision, zoned R-4 and single family residential properties in Chamberlain Estates Subdivision zoned R-8. And to the west are single family residential properties in Chamberlain Estates Subdivision also zoned R-8. As I said, this is an annexation, so there are no -- there is no history on this specific property, at least as far as Meridian city is concerned. The Comprehensive Plan future land use map designation for the property is medium density residential. The applicant has applied for annexation and zoning of 20.28 acres of land with both R-8 and R-15 zoning districts. As discussed staff believes the proposed zoning designations are generally consistent with policies in the Comprehensive Plan. The applicant proposes to develop 122 new single family residential attached and detached homes. The property -- the proposed plat, as I said, consists of 122 building lots, 18 common lots on 19.35 acres of land, zoned R-8, and I will get to the site plan here and indicate which are R-8 and which are R-15. As you can see this is the -- the R-8 section here on the south and the R-15 original proposal is that this area to the north -- north of the canal be zoned R-15. Staff does have some recommended changes to the plat and I will go through those quickly with you. Staff recommends that the applicant provide an additional stub street to the -- to the east in this location here, so that these properties upon development will have additional opportunity to connect there. Realign the pedestrian pathway that are shown here on the landscape plan. Realign the pedestrian pathway further to the east so that it lines up with the proposed park. Lots south of north Devlin Way should be zoned R-8 in order to offer a transition to the lots in Packard Acres Subdivision, which is zoned R-4. Lots along the east boundary between North Devlin Way and East Ringneck Street should have a minimum Street frontage of 40 feet and 4,000 square feet lot size. So, staff is recommending that the lots here along this southern portion here and the eastern portion be zoned R-8 to act as a transition to both the county parcels to the east, as well as to the Packard Acres Subdivision to the south. An additional open space lot for the lots on the south side of the South Slough, staff is recommending Lot 32, Block 4, to convert into open space and develop with a qualifying amenity and, then, reconfigure the northwest corner of the proposed

subdivision to allow for redevelopment of parcel -- of that parcel. So, staff -- original proposal was that the applicant extend both of these streets here -- essentially make this longer, so, then, this street here would touch the parcel in the corner, if that makes sense, and, then, allowing the -- that parcel to punch a road through there and develop their -- their property into several lots. A minimum of ten percent qualified open space is required to be provided for this development based on the area of the preliminary plat, which is 19.35 acres. A minimum of 1.93 acres of qualified open space is required to be provided. The applicant has provided 10.5 percent qualified open space and it is consisting of half the street buffer along East Ustick Road. The regional pathway that runs along the South Slough and the micropath lot and the internal common open space area to comply with the UDC. As I said, staff recommends that Lot 32, Block 4, be converted to common lot and developed with a qualifying amenity. Having said that, that is not a requirement of the UDC that that happened, but staff is recommending that so that the folks on the south side have an amenity closer to them. The pathways master plan depicts a regional pathway on the site along the north side of the South Slough. The applicant proposes to provide the extension of the regional pathway as an amenity for the proposed subdivision. A ten foot multi-use pathway must be paved and landscaped in accord with the UDC standards and, as I said, the South Slough bisects the property and that is an 80 foot wide Nampa-Meridian Irrigation District easement and that's -- the ten foot wide multi-use pathway will be installed within that easement and the applicant should coordinate with the irrigation district on maintenance of that common lot. The applicant will be required to request a waiver from Council to allow the South Slough to remain open and due to its large capacity Council has routinely waived that requirement. The applicant has submitted some conceptual elevations as part of the -- the application. Building materials consist of a mix of board and batten and horizontal lap siding with stone accents. Because homes on lots that back up to East Ustick Road would be highly visible, staff recommends that rear and sides of structures on the lots that face the street incorporate articulation through changes in materials, color, modulation and architectural elements to break up monotonous wall plains and roof lines. A certificate of zoning compliance and design review application are required to be submitted prior to issuance of building permits for any single family attached homes within the development. The applicant must comply with the design standards in the UDC and the guidelines contained in the architectural standards manual. With that the applicant did submit their response to staff's report, indicating a couple things that they would like to discuss and we did receive a comment from Randy -- and I believe this last name is Pipal -- who is the -- I believe it's the president of a homeowners association of the Packard Estates, indicating that they would like to see some transition in lot sizes from the Packard Estates to the smaller lots to the north. With that staff is recommending approval with the conditions in the staff report and I will stand for any questions you have.

Yearsley: Are there any questions? Thank you. Would the applicant like to come forward?

Conger: Mr. President, Members of the Commission, Jim Conger, 4824 West Fairview Avenue. We will get loaded up here with Josh and we will hit it. Do I need to hit a button? We are excited to present the Verado Community to you guys tonight. This is a perfect blend of matching three highly sought after housing products with an amazing location on Ustick. This project will be a great fit in East Meridian and along that -- towards that Eagle corridor -- Eagle Road corridor. Also with this project comes some great public benefits. Verado will contribute to ongoing success of the shops and services along the Eagle Road corridor, as you can see on the right side of the map here our proximity to that. Ustick Road was also recently improved to five lanes. We will complete the Ustick frontage landscape buffer to enhance the livability of this corridor. We will use existing water mains, sewer mains and infrastructure, which the sewer actually runs -- you can see the -- the green line through this property. Yes, our land seller actually provided the sewer easement that allowed Packard Estates to develop and currently runs through there as we speak. We are walkable to Riverview Elementary, south and east. And, lastly, ACHD's big noted benefit is the connectivity of the roadway system to the south neighborhoods. They can now easily and logistically get to Ustick Road, which, again, is the pinch point -- kind of the corner point where Packard ends. It's not right yet. Let me take a moment to share with you our wonderful housing product that we have developed for the Verado community. Our first product offering is the Village collection, which is single level detached homes in the core of the project. You can see the yellow area in the center core of our project. Next we have the Cottage collection, which is a single level attached housing product that his popular with our empty nester clientele and that will be on the Ustick frontage. Finally, we have the Homestead collection, which consists of 21 home sites, which are larger traditional type homes sites with lot depths of over 135 feet to transition to existing homes. We are excited about our overall amenity package that we offer for our future residents. I will play this. It's a quick -- quick video. Possibly I will.

Beach: I will see if I can get it here, sir.

Conger: Yeah. That would be great, Josh. Thank you. You can kill the music. I thought I already did. Good grief.

(Video played.)

Conger: So, our video starts out at our entry off Ustick. You can see the landscape buffer of the park from the entryway. We have approximately two and a half total acres of open space. We will have a half acre community park. It will be secured and fenced for child safety. That's what we have done with the last couple of our parks. We will have turf play area as, you can see in the

background. A concrete track for kids to ride their big wheels and scooters. And, finally, we will have the swing sets, climbing dome, and a play structure. We tend with these type of projects and the amount of homes that we have we can afford to load up the amenity package. We also will construct that ten foot -- as Josh indicated, that ten foot wide regional pathway that is along -- we call it the Finch Lateral, but it's the South Slough. We have been in discussions with Nampa-Meridian Irrigation District already and actually have some license agreement applications already on my desk. As you can see we have put a lot of time and effort into planning this community park. It's actually a big element of our communities and the selling point of -- for our homes. However, we are confused about staff's recommendation to delete a lot and add an additional park, which we are calling a micro park to the south. It's less than 150 feet from our community park. As you can see, this would create a split park scenario and that would cause us to divert our resources from the main park and amenities from the master planned community park down to the I guess micro park as we call it. We are dumbfounded as this would create an unsafe situation for mainly the children in our neighborhood. You could imagine a parent tending to their three year old in the -- playing on our play structure in the community park, yet that same parent has her ten year old that's unattended that's now on our climbing dome that we are required to move down to this micro park. She can't watch -- watch both at the same location. This would cause frustration for parents having kids playing between two different parks that are bisected by a public roadway. We see no merit in staff's request and no benefit to split our community park and we request that this condition be removed. You heard Josh indicate moving the -- sliding the right of way. We actually don't have an issue with -- with accommodating access to this .8 acre county outparcel. We have pushed that right of way as far as we can push it before it starts becoming detrimental to our project. We are proposing the ability -- we will provide a 20 foot access easement. They will be able to have a common drive and per your code that would allow up to six units in that location. You can see we front it with five units. So, they would have the potential in theory of four to five units of development on that property. This would provide them the access for the future one that has been annexed and, you know, a development application has been submitted for. We simply need -- why we can't slide that anymore in that red area, we simply need ample open space to be able to landscape to -- to create a landscape screen buffer to provide the public with a better esthetic view than what currently exists today. We have to buffer that -- the general public of any of the neighborhood striding down the public street would -- would be looking straight into this if we had the right of way shoved to it. It sounds like staff is -- is okay with our layout that was resubmitted and was also put in the packet to you guys yesterday that was dated 5/17 of '16. In closing, we -- for the last six months we have been working closely with the police department, the fire department, public works, planning department, the irrigation district, Nampa-Meridian, to obtain approval, as well as the project was approved by the Ada County Highway District on their Consent Agenda. Verado will be a wonderful community that utilizes the existing services and infrastructure that's in place

while allowing people to live closer to that Eagle corridor core and the commercial services that are there. We have worked continuously with staff and respectfully request that you approve the Verado project in accordance with the conditions -- recommended conditions of approval with the two modifications that I have indicated, condition item 1.1.2C3, the outparcel, that applicant shall shift North Sumner Avenue to the west as resubmitted on the preliminary dated 5/17/16 with the requirement to provide a 20 foot wide access easement that can be used when the property is annexed and develops in the city. And I believe staff is in agreement with that by our -- what I heard earlier. The second item is site specific condition Item 1.132, the split park syndrome, we are just respectfully requesting you delete that condition and let us continue with our amazing park as master planned. Thank you.

Yearsley: Thank you. Are there any questions? I do have one. Just want to clarify -- the area on the east and the south of that -- making that R-8, instead of R-15, are you in agreement with that?

Conger: Yes. Yes. The conditions as noted are fine.

Yearsley: Okay. I just wanted to make sure that you're okay with that one. With that I don't think we have any questions, so thank you.

Conger: Thank you.

Yearsley: I have a lot of people here signed up. Most of them have asked not to testify. So, I think at this point -- this does go on the record, so it is actually part of file that the City Council will see and I am just going to go ahead and open it for those wishing to testify on this application. Is there anybody wanting to testify? Please come forward. Wait until we get to the microphone so we can get it recorded.

Brod: Okay.

Yearsley: Name and address for the record, please.

Brod: Jason Brodt. 2915 North Devlin Way. It's -- could I use this to show you?

Yearsley: Up top. Okay. I think we saw where you were pointing, so --

Brod: Okay.

Yearsley: It was shown.

Brod: Thank you. Let's see here. I was making notes. But thank you, Commissioners. I appreciate being able to be part of the process to improve our community and increase -- but if we can increase our property values, at least

maintain them -- I understand that progress happens, but I expected it when the homes that would be built eventually -- next to my house, across the street, would be similar to the home I invested in ten years ago. The only reason that I can see zoning it R-8 and R-15 on the proposed property is just making as much profit as possible and the investment of the folks that bought the property. A couple of days after the sale -- oh, excuse me. Oh. More specifically, what I'm a little upset about is that any street that you look at the fronts of the houses face the street; right? Everybody's -- that's how it works. Where my home is, we are going to be looking -- sorry. I will get back to my notes. Oh, specifically about the development, never seen a street where the back yards of homes actually face the street. Like the front yards in my home and at least six of my neighbors will face the backyards of 16 of the proposed developments and I -- according to their plat map that's just what I counted. I understand that it increases the value of their investment to make it that way, but maybe not the value of the homes that are currently there. One other thing I was confused about is that in the very beginning of this project about three months ago across the street at the property that was bought, they had -- I guess a showing of what the houses would look like. I actually took pictures. They are on my phone. They didn't look anything like the pictures that I just saw upon the TV screen. Big wide homes. They were much smaller. Two story homes. Vary narrow lots. So, I guess those are my two concerns. I'm sorry. It's -- maybe you should ask the guys that are selling this for what the real property looks like. Some of those they showed us. Only about five people showed up to that, by the way. That's really all I got to say. The biggest part is I just don't want to look at 16 -- or a bunch of the backyards of their homes. Like I did over here on the left-hand side of this community, it appears to me that the homes face the streets, but just they have forgotten ours. Okay. That's it.

Yearsley: Thank you.

Brodts: Thank you very much. I appreciate it. Have a great night.

Graves: Thank you for hearing us this evening. My name is Shannon Graves. I live on 2766 North Chancery Way. The current corn field, we -- it's behind our fence. So, a lot of our fence -- actually, all of ours. So, good to see that there is bigger homes laying back there, but preferably not two stories would be great. We just -- I think we are what's moving to Meridian. My husband and I moved here three years ago from southern California. I have a young family. Don't want to raise them there. Love Idaho. We just bought a home in November and we love that there was a corn field behind us. Didn't know there was a development being planned. What I'm most concerned about is the -- the elementary schools are already, as you know, really overcrowded. This is going to bring on a lot of young families, which is good, but not -- we don't need that many in that condensed of an area. You guys you understand, I mean you all have kids and you live in neighborhoods yourself and if you have that many families that close together that brings in a lot of kids and a lot more traffic and a lot -- we are going

to need more police officers. I calculated in Boise -- I couldn't find Meridian's stats, but Boise currently has one police officer for 695 people. This new development is going to bring approximately that amount, so that would mean adding another police officer 24 hours, so, you know -- however long their shifts are. But that's going to be pretty costly to the city. Also just the sheer volume of people driving down Ustick and Locust Grove is going to cost more in traffic repair -- road repairs, more car accidents. Another one I'm concerned about is our parks are already packed and I'm glad to hear they are building a park and I would like to implore you to let them build a larger park, if that's, in fact, what they are going to do, because I think that will keep the families in that development, rather than going out to Settlers Park, which you know is already packed. You guys are already planning to build another park, which is great in Meridian, but that's not going to lighten up Settlers that much. So, Settlers Park and Kleiner Park are already packed with kids. Even during the day -- I actually home school my kids, because the elementary schools are so packed and so I just implore you to think about that. The generation that's moving here has young children and it's -- I am actually considering moving, because we don't want to live in this high density. We just moved from there. You know, we moved to Meridian because we like that we can have all the amenities, but not have all the people. It's important for growth, but not -- not in this -- not this close I guess. I'm all for homes, but not this many. So, if you can get rid of the -- the high density homes that would be great. Thank you.

Yearsley: Thank you. Anybody else? Please come forward.

Jenkins: Hi. I'm Bob Jenkins. Address is 2127 East Kamay Drive. First for the record they took the sign-in sheet before everybody had a chance to sign in. There is some more people that want to sign in if you can get it back to them.

Yearsley: Okay.

Jenkins: And we have some petitions that we have signed opposing it, if I can put -- give those to you.

Yearsley: Please give those to the clerk.

Jenkins: Oh. And I have one letter from another neighbor that -- first I want to thank you guys for volunteering to do this. I know it's a thankless task sometimes, so we appreciate it. So, now let's get to the thankless part, okay? In response to this application I went out and gathered over a hundred signatures and some other people gathered another 50, roughly. Every person I talked to, after they looked at the plat map, showing the R-15 and the ramifications of crossing the slough with an access to Ustick, the ramifications for Packard and Chamberlain Estates of -- if you look at the Ada County Highway District traffic number it was around 1,100 plus. As soon as those people figure out that they can avoid Eagle Road -- the applicant says it's easy access to I-84 and Chinden

in their application and anybody that lives in Meridian knows it's not that easy in the morning to go down Eagle Road. As soon as they figure that out they are going to be going through our neighborhoods. We are going to see an increase of -- I'm -- after talking to people I think it's around 300 cars a day going down Devlin, which right now at this -- right now Devlin probably -- in front of my house the traffic count is zero, because it's a dead end. So, we understand it's going to be developed. We understand the traffic count is going to go up, but three to four hundred cars is quite a change for our neighborhood and we think with the R-15 density, that we can -- if you went with an R-8 density, which is -- the property is surrounded by R-8 and R-4, that if there was an R-8 density the traffic would be more manageable. The product that they are going to sell would be closer to our neighborhoods. As a matter of fact, it would be very close to both of the neighborhoods. The plan itself -- I notice he -- in his presentation he showed you some artist renderings and I would -- I would ask why he didn't show you actual pictures from Solterra that you approved two years ago that is on the other side of Packard that is R-15. Unfortunately, it was on the other side of Packard and nobody really paid attention, because they were told it was single family homes and they didn't realize the product that was actually going to be provided. They are actually zero lot lines. There is no lot -- the artist renderings show grass and trees. There is no grass. There is pea gravel between the houses in the front yard, because it -- they can't grow grass.

Yearsley: Your time is up, so if you could hurry up and finish I would appreciate it.

Jenkins: Okay.

Yearsley: Thank you.

Jenkins: The staff report says there is a transition from R-8 in the southern portion. I would ask why there isn't a transition in the northern portion, that there is an R-15 directly next to R-4 in Packard Estates, which I think is totally inappropriate. I have some written testimony I guess I will put in, too, because I -- I have gone through their -- their narrative in there and I would like you guys to read this and think about what they actually built if you -- have you ever gone through Solterra and take a look at it before you approve this? I think you would like to see what you approved two years ago and I think you would be shocked. Thank you.

Yearsley: Thank you. Please come forward. Name and address for the record, please.

Carman: My name is Bruce Carman. My address is 1621 East Cougar Creek Drive in Meridian, on the corner of Locust Grove and Cougar Creek. I'm fairly neutral with regard to this proposal, except for a serious concern on traffic. We already have a lot of traffic going from Packard Estates through our Chamberlain

Estates and coming out to Locust Grove right in front of my house and other traffic coming in the opposite direction. I'm wondering whether the access proposed onto Ustick will be controlled with a traffic light or whether it will just be a stop sign and whether lots of these -- especially the families in the homes on the southern portion of this proposed Verado Estates will come through Kamay and Cougar Creek Drive to get out onto Locust Grove and, therefore, increase the traffic tremendously in front of my house. So, it's mainly traffic control questions and not the development itself, but how much extra traffic might come through Chamberlain Estates and right in front of my home. Thank you.

Yearsley: Thank you. Anybody else? Please come forward.

Catherman: Hi. I'm Chris Catherman and I live at 1838 East Kamay in Meridian. I want to ditto on the traffic concern. Traffic on Locust Grove when you're coming northbound backs up mid afternoon all the way back to Pine. People coming down that -- that road. I talked to your zoning guy a week or so ago and I asked him about that and his comment to me was, oh, that's ACHD's problem. He didn't have a traffic report. So, it's going to impact Ustick and Locust Grove horribly and it's not wise. So, I'd like you to consider that.

Yearsley: Thank you.

Catherman: Thanks.

Graves: Justin Graves. 2766 North Chancery Way. I also have a traffic concern where Cougar Creek -- yeah. East Cougar Creek Drive goes onto Locust Grove. It's almost impossible to turn in to make a left coming south on Locust Grove into Cougar Creek. In the evening when I come home from work -- I car pool with some guys and I feel bad for them, because we end up waiting there for five or ten minutes sometimes and they don't want to exit that way, so they have to go out a different way where there is a signal light I believe down on Chateau Drive. It's just a nightmare there and if we had more houses, especially that have access to that road to come up on Locust Grove, it's just going to make it that much worse and it's -- it's very bad already, so that's all I got to say.

Yearsley: Thank you. Anybody else? Please come forward.

Karmouche: Hi. My name is Jack Karmouche. I'm at 2489 East Meadow Wood Court, Meridian. I'm in the Packard Estates and I just want to say that these homes that they are about to build on the north part of Packard Estates are not compatible with our current homes in the way our homes are pretty spread out. I did check out the homes that they currently have built south of Packard and they are pretty much like cookie cutter homes, like they are really close together. Not -- not like a traditional looking house, you know, and they are no way compatible to our homes that we live in right now in Packard Estates. You know, R-15 and R-8 -- I think it should go R-4 and R-8 towards Ustick would be more compatible,

but going R-15, that's just extreme. That's way too many homes. It's going to make our area not look like a traditional house anymore, we are looking like -- going to look like apartments. I would like you guys to go check out the current homes that they already built and sold and they are very close to each other. I just purchased my house four months ago in Packard Estates. I checked out their homes and I would never want to move into something like that. It looks like an apartment complex. That's how close they are together. It's just not a good look and long term I don't think it's going to be -- I mean even the quality of the homes, because they are making them as cheap as possible, the quality of their plastic on the outside, plastic fences. You know, my house has cedar fence. They are just going as low quality as possible. I think they are just doing it for the money. I just want you guys to just think about it, just get rid of the R-15, go up to an R-8 and just the transition from Packard Estates R-4 or I don't know if there is an R-6 -- I don't build homes, but just by looking at it with common sense it doesn't look right. And the homes n that area facing our current property, that they won't have to show the back part of their homes to somebody else's front part of their home, that's not a good look. I mean just -- it's just going to decrease our home values. No one is going to want to live there. It's not a good look. So, if you could reconsider our -- let's make an adjustment to this and do something different just to make it look right. Thank you.

Yearsley: Thank you. Anybody else?

Innocent: My name is Ben Innocent and I live at 2000 East Kamay Drive, which is the other side of the dead end in Chamberlain. My concern would be -- we moved into the house about a month and a half ago and came into this letter finding out. The concern would be that within Chamberlain the homes are single level and there is a lot of us that are, then, going to have a two story house overlooking our yards. Also there is the traffic and the increased traffic flow would be a concern. So, my request is something compatible to the surrounding houses. Please. Thank you.

Yearsley: Thank you. Please. Name and address for the record, please.

Kerwin: William Kerwin. 2750 North Lapis. I have to second the guy's comment. If you maybe change the -- the zoning from the R-15 to the density and maybe phase it out to Ustick, so that it kind of blends in with the -- the neighborhood that's already there. I think we all know that development is going to happen. We just hope that it will be friendly to -- to those that already live there. You guys -- we have all bought our homes for particular reasons and it's going to have a huge impact on the quality of life as far as the traffic and things like that. I think you guys -- the Commission can appreciate that. So, we are just asking for a little bit of sensitivity in that aspect and, then, maybe the concern with the way that the roads tie in with the existing roads there and maybe not drive some of that traffic through the neighborhoods would also be a concern. That's all I have. Thank you.

Yearsley: Thank you. Please come forward.

McCarney: My name is Katie McCarney and I live at 2460 North Bullock, which is in Packard Estates. I also own a home at 2078 North Chancery Way, which is in Chamberlain Estates, so I have lots of experience here. I didn't plan to speak tonight, but I am just sitting here and I just have to speak up. I don't know that this is the proper place. I'm just wondering what is going on in our square mile. As everyone said, these are not just a bunch of crazy people that don't want people driving passed their homes, these are people telling you we cannot handle more traffic. The developer said that this will help increase business at The Village and all of that and I just beg to differ. It's driving it away. People cannot get through. People do not want to deal with it anymore. I can't tell you how many of our neighbors have left to go to Middleton, to go to Star, to go to Kuna as -- that's where we were planning to go when we put our house up for sale in Chamberlain Estates, because we just cannot get to our homes anymore. It's become too -- that's why I didn't -- that's why we didn't buy a home further into -- I mean further west I guess when we came, it's because we wanted somewhere more convenient and it's now become this endless gridlock and we can't get in or out. We can't handle this many more homes and as they said when they were talking about an easement into this or that for future development, we all know what we are surrounded by. We know that development happens, but we expect some mixed use in that we have a school, we know that the farm in front of River Valley Elementary will be developed in the future. We know that will probably have some commercial, some other things. We know -- knew getting into this what to expect. But we expect some bigger family homes as well. We expect some more established homes to go along with it. I support the school my children are expected to go to. I have a son at Meridian High School where no one else wants to be for some reason. I would like to see us add some homes of some established families in the Meridian High School boundaries. It feels like we are trying to put the big homes and the big subdivisions all for Mountain View and all for Rocky. What are we doing for Meridian High School? I guess this is just a more generalized concern, but I'm just really worried, because I know it's all going to be developed eventually, but we are going to drive out our good homeowners that are on a few acres and we are just going to develop it to death to where we have created a new inner city that nobody can live in and it is really unfair to the people who have been here originally I feel and one last thing, when the developers were talking about covering up the eye sores, that's not my property, but I'm a little offended, because that is Meridian. I want to see an old barn. I want to see some bales of hay and I love to see an occasional cow. That's Meridian and I think that that's what we should continue to try to have. We need growth and development, but at the same time we are killing ourselves by packing in as many taxpayers per square foot as we can. Thank you very much.

Yearsley: Thank you. Anybody else? Please. Wait until you get to the mike so we can get it on the record, so --

S.Jenkins: My name is Sylvia Jenkins and I live at 2127 East Kamay Street -- or Drive and that's in Meridian. So, I live in Packard Estates and I live directly across from the place she was talking about with the old barn and stuff like that and, actually, I don't mind looking at that, because it's like an old farm, it's kind of breathtaking, because you're kind of living in the city, but at the same time, you know, you're able to go ahead and look, you know, at a farm across the street. So, it hasn't been bad as far as that goes. Another concern I have, too, is he was talking about the second park that he was going to go ahead and put in and to me he was saying you can't have one child going across the street to one park and another one playing in another park. Well, if these kids are going to go to school at River Valley they are going to be walking through our subdivision, too. So, you know, to get to school -- because that's the way it goes around, if they choose to go to that school and that's a concern, you know, just by the -- you know, it's -- I don't know. I think everybody's said everything all in one, you know, and I don't know if you guys would like for a subdivision maybe to come in your neighborhood like that and you know it's going to be developed and all you want is the same around you, you know. I mean I think that per your investment, you know, that you would want that for your family. I mean a lot of us have worked really hard to buy our homes and things like that, so -- that's all I have to say.

Yearsley: All right. Thank you. Anybody else? I thought I saw one -- please come forward.

Price: Hi. My name is Rosellen Villarreal Price. I live at 2700 North Wingate Lane. We are in Ada County, not in the City of Meridian and so, unfortunately, I don't really even have enough -- much of a say as far as who is sitting here in front of me, because I'm not allowed to vote, but I am still very much impacted by what goes on in Meridian city. We live on a small acreage. We have not quite five acres. I have horses. We have chickens. And I am literally surrounded on three sides by Packard Estates, the Leslie Estates, and now we are looking at yet another very crowded subdivision going in. Wingate Lane has historically had a very contentious relationship with the Packard Estates and the Chancery Subdivision, because of the private road that we have. We have a gate on that road. My husband and I are responsible for taking care of that gate, which gets vandalized and broken quite often, because people want to go through and use that as a shortcut to get into the other subdivisions. We pay for that out of our pockets. We also pay for the maintenance of that road out of our pockets. We have -- this is not a county road. This is not a city road. We have a lot of people that still go up and go in front -- come down the road, have to turn around, they use our property in order to basically turn that into a -- a lane. We have a lot of people who have complained because of the dust. I can see where we are going to get subdivisions that are going to be coming in, not only to the west of us, but

also to the east of us, and this is going to impact us as people who do have animals, we also get complaints about, like I say, dust, smell, flies and you put that many more people -- my next door neighbor also runs a horse operation and so she will also be impacted. The developers did approach her, they approached the people who live kitty-corner from our property and they are trying to buy up those properties as well. We never were talked to probably because of where our little property sits. But this is going to impact our style and our lifestyle a lot and the other thing that we are concerned about is vandalism and the amount of kids and things. They use that private road as a personal park you might say. A lot of people walk, use their bikes, go through it, and, like I say, we have had to replace the gate upwards to four or five times a year because people blow through it and this is costing us money out of our pocket. So, I would -- along with the other people, I would encourage that. You can't stop development, but let's at least make it so that it's more livable for the residents who are already there. Thank you.

Yearsley: Thank you. Anybody else? Thank you. Oh. Just made the buzzer.

Thornton: Vickie Thornton. 2275 East Chemise Drive, Packard Estates. I just to want to say the traffic area -- being a grandmother who just moved here eight years ago, I have watched the traffic impact us in Packard Estates and around us for the last eight years. My daughter and them just moved out to Bridgetower, which is down Ustick Road. When I have to go just to pick up a granddaughter at school, whether it be out or around between 3:00 o'clock and 4:30, 5:00 o'clock it's -- Locust Grove and Ustick -- you can't get on that road. There is not enough stop lights -- it's coming in from Eagle, it's coming down Locust Grove. To get out of Packard Estates to go pick up a grandchild is impossible right now. I can't imagine the density of this new housing making even that much more traffic. So, that's all I wanted to say, that it's already horrible and when grandma needs to pick up a grandchild it's hard. Thank you.

Yearsley: Thank you. Anybody else? Thank you. Would the applicant like to come forward? Again, name and address for the record, please.

Conger: Yeah. You bet. Can you put mine back up? Yeah. Mr. President, Members of the Commission, Jim Conger, 4824 West Fairview Avenue. I would like to address really the two items that are really on the table is the zoning -- Josh, why can't I gain control --

Beach: Where would you like me to move it?

Conger: There we go. Well, I would love you to take me to -- to slide 13, please. Yeah. One more. So, discussing the zoning concerns, I think this zoning map actually is a better illustration of what is out there. You have Packard Estates and a little bit of this R-4 ensemble. Most of it is R-8 that wraps around all sides of it. Again, staff had talked to us several weeks ago about converting to R-8,

which is the condition of approval that we are -- we are accepting of for sure. I think it's also important to note that the existing homes that you have heard about tonight -- I mean that's a regional pathway. This -- this corridor that separates us from Packard Estates is master planned by our Comprehensive Plan to be a very active corridor. We are going to be the second or third development that is putting in this ten foot pathway. You have it to the east, then, you have no development. Eventually it will go through. So, again, there is a natural separation, not only their storm drain park area, but the regional pathway. That, coupled with the South Slough that will stay open and will stay a wildlife amenity. Our density -- we keep hearing density. Ours is around six units per acre. So, we are under the R-8 as far as allowability goes. So, changing zones. I mean we aren't after the high density. It's simply around six units per acre as Josh indicated in his staff report. I think moving -- let's see. You know, development close to the core -- that's what we keep pumping at as one of the original reasons we -- we looked at this Ustick-Locust Grove area close. It's close to the core services. I continue say that. And that is actually what reduces the traffic in this valley and specifically in this Meridian area. We aren't traveling as far to get to the services as all our friends that continue to go to the outskirting cities and the county lands and, then, have to come back into the core for services. Moving quickly onto traffic, which is my last item. ACHD, as you well know, just saying it for the record, reviews the traffic counts and performs a full review on the project and they did approve this project, again, on their consent agenda with no controversy and no public hearing, because it went to consent. We understand the neighbor traffic concerns. However, we were always sympathetic to that. In the same breath we are not generating the traffic that's going to go through their neighborhoods, we are simply providing that connection point that is going to go both ways, which is west to Chamberlain and will continue to go north through our project. We are actually going to get their traffic, which is why we did secure this traffic system. Our first meetings with city and mainly highway district, they were a little straighter roads and we made them quite circuitous, because we will be the ones getting the downstream traffic and one other item that's going to be of benefit with this connection point -- the issue with that -- and if you have ever driven in Packard Estates and don't have -- if it's one of your first times in there and you don't have Google Maps, you probably won't get out, because I have had to use it. They have very limited access points. We are providing them one of -- well, about their only access to Ustick that will take some of the pressure off of Locust Grove, but, again, that traffic is coming through our neighborhood. So, the traffic -- they are worried about -- and it's mainly the people to the north that you heard from -- it's going to be their own traffic coming through their house. They have been out at the end here with two stub roads that have had the type three barricades that we all see on the roads that are going to be developed for the future when they purchased that house. I mean it's -- it's, again, sympathetic, but those roads are going to connect and we are actually solving a traffic -- not only vehicular, but a pedestrian little quagmire back there. I think we stand -- again, with our -- can you slide me one more slide, Josh? Just one forward. I think in closing we -- we definitely appreciate everybody's help to get where we

are today and we definitely accept all the added conditions of approval that are recommended for approval with a modification of the two that you have in front of you.

Yearsley: I have one quick question and I don't know if it was quite answered. Coming out of your subdivision onto Ustick Road one of the maps -- was that going to be a light or is that a stop sign. Is that always proposed to be a stop sign or is there a future light there or -- can you at least address that one?

Conger: Yeah. Mr. President, Members of the Commission, the -- we are on a -- basically a -- just off the quarter mile. So, there is -- per your city's plan and per ACHD's -- and that all kind of goes back to COMPASS, this private lane you heard about earlier that is private and people try to go down it illegally, that region is set for a collector to relieve this area of its traffic. So, any lights will be further east and they are planned.

Yearsley: Okay. And, then, can you take us to your R-15 homes and just kind of walk through that with me if you would?

Conger: Yes. So, Josh, for some reason I need to get smarter, but I would take --

Beach: Elevations you would like to see?

Conger: Yeah. We would take slide three, please.

Yearsley: Back -- right there.

Conger: Yeah. Slide three. Yeah. Perfect.

Yearsley: So, can you give me an idea of what size of homes these run?

Conger: Yes. Absolutely. Mr. -- Commissioner Yearsley. The Village collection, which is the single family detached homes, they range up to 1,900 square feet. We will have a few that get down to 14, mainly 1,500. The smaller ones don't get built that much. They will range in the low 200s and up. It is -- Meridian, if you look at MLS or anything, is very difficult to get a house under -- under 200 in this -- in this city and we -- we struggle to get there, too. We are about 220 a majority of the time.

Yearsley: And, then, as a relationship, you know, your lots are fairly narrow. I'm assuming that these will be spaced fairly close together; is that correct?

Conger: Yes, Commissioner Yearsley. Yes. These have setbacks for the R-15 zone and will be close together and in neighborhoods, you know, we -- we do a lot of material that is maintenance free and life long type materials and side yards

in a lot of these city developments -- if you have a bunch of side yards they just collect trailers and cars and this keeps a tighter, cleaner neighborhood.

Pogue: Please keep your comments to yourself.

Yearsley: Okay. Thank you. I just kind of wanted to walk through those and just make sure I understood how --

Conger: Thank you.

Oliver: Mr. Chairman?

Yearsley: Commissioner Oliver.

Oliver: Going with that, playing off what you just said, the large majority -- the lion's share will be these in yellow.

Conger: What we are seeing right here.

Oliver: Will be these homes from 1,400 to 1,800 you said?

Conger: Yes. Yeah. Mr. President, Commissioner Oliver, yes. Just 1,700, 1740. A little under 1,800.

Oliver: Could we go to the slide where the empty nesters will be -- facing Ustick?

Conger: Yes.

Oliver: And that will be approximately -- two homes connected. They are approximately how large per duplex I guess they are?

Conger: Yes, Mr. President, Commissioner Oliver, they twin homes. They -- each on their own individual lot, single level, and they range in the 1,300 to 1,600 square foot range. They are priced -- they have a little higher amenity. Their price point remains the same as the other -- at the bigger square footage it's still at the low 200s, 210 to 210. So, they have a higher per square foot price. They are a little more amenitized. Again, it is an empty nester type individual that purchases these. Typically speaking we will see a family living in another one and their grandparents will actually buy one of these.

Oliver: This is kind of the same idea as what you see as in Solterra? Is that right?

Conger: It would be the same -- same general concept, yes.

Oliver: Same idea. And, then, finally, we go down to the bottom, which are a little larger lots in the green and they are higher quality as far as larger homes, more expensive homes?

Conger: Yes. Mr. President, Commissioner Oliver, yes, these homes would be 1,800 to 2,600 square feet. They will be two car and three car garages, depending on -- on, you know, the end user. A lot of them will be -- some will be spec, but some will be, you know, for the end user to select. But, yes, larger homes, larger lots, deeper lots as we transition back again both neighborhoods.

Oliver: Okay. Thank you.

Yearsley: Thank you. Any other questions?

McCarvel: Oh, Mr. Chairman?

Yearsley: Yes.

McCarvel: On the setback on those homes, especially in the R-15, how deep are those driveways? Is there enough room to park a car in the driveway without crossing the sidewalks or --

Conger: Yes.

McCarvel: -- or are all the visitors going to be trying to park on the street?

Conger: No. Mr. President, Commissioner McCarvel, no. All the standards of the cities requires -- of the City of Meridian requires the 20 foot setback to allow for parking automobiles and we also have streets that allow parking on both sides as well. We have a 34 foot street section in the city. But, yes, we have each -- each house would have four spots dedicated to parking.

Yearsley: Any other questions? Thank you.

Conger: Thank you.

Yearsley: At this time I would entertain a motion to close the public hearing on file number H-2016-0047.

Oliver: Mr. Chairman?

Yearsley: Commissioner Oliver.

Oliver: I move to close the hearing on H-2016-0047.

Wilson: Second.

Yearsley: I have a motion and a second to close the public hearing. All in favor say aye. Opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Yearsley: So, anyone want to go first to comment?

Oliver: Mr. Chairman?

Yearsley: Commissioner Oliver.

Oliver: The reason why I asked him to go back and look at that is looking at the subdivision itself, is that there is one city in particular I am thinking of that's in the Treasure Valley that in the city itself most of the homes -- a majority of the homes are entry style homes, but it leaves nothing for those people that live in those homes to graduate to. What I like about the -- this particular subdivision is it had a place for the empty nesters where you don't have to take care of your lot and whatnot. It has a place for entry home where people just starting to get into a home and, then, also have the other half, particularly on large homes, a little bit more expensive, bigger lots. So, I like the diversity of the park. I like the entrance. I like the park that's there. I think it has some good amenities there that will be appropriate for that area.

Yearsley: Thank you.

Fitzgerald: Mr. Chairman?

Yearsley: Commissioner Fitzgerald.

Fitzgerald: And I absolutely agree. I think there is -- I know the zero lot line attached product has been successful across the street in Champion Park. I know that there was a -- there was an overload of need for that product typically with -- and it's kind of the same situation where you have some transition within the same community and you have families that live in the -- in the larger homes and, you know, grandparents living in the zero lot line attached product. I do think the slough adds a break point and I appreciate the applicant brought some buffer zones and agreed to the -- put some buffers up against both the county product and the other neighborhood product. I do like -- and I think the neighbors are going to be happy with the ability to get out to Ustick. I think that actually -- we are losing some of the -- I guess some of the ruralness of our neighborhoods in Meridian, but -- but I think in -- in getting out of the neighborhoods that are landlocked without roads it may be helpful in that situation so --

Yearsley: Thank you. I -- there was a common, you know, residents throughout here was it was too dense. Everyone looks at an R-15 as it's really huge. A lot

of homes. Which there are a significant number of homes, but if you look at it, break it down, he's running at six homes per acre and so, really, he's -- he's not much denser than a lot of the other subdivisions per se. He's just adding more open space instead of putting it into the lots is what -- typically how it kind of plays out. I like that -- the mix style of homes. I understand that the -- the one lots will -- you know, the R-15 homes will be close together. Some people may not like that, but there are a lot of people that don't want a lot of property -- a lot of land and like the home. So, I think it gives a mixed variety of homes. I also want to say -- you know, I don't -- you know -- how do I want to say this? I approved another subdivision very much similar like this in my backyard. I thought it looked good. And so I'm not trying to push something onto my neighbors that I wouldn't push onto myself. Just kind of explaining that, because we would have to work to get along with that, so -- I think it looks good and I think the conditions that he's asking for I think are appropriate and I would recommend them. So, if there is no other comments, I would entertain a motion.

Fitzgerald: Mr. Chairman?

Yearsley: Commissioner Fitzgerald.

Fitzgerald: After considering all staff, applicant, and public testimony, I move to recommend approval to the City Council of file number H-2016-0047 as represented in the staff report for the hearing date of May 19th with the following modifications: That we remove -- oh, thank you.

Yearsley: It's right there on the screen.

Fitzgerald: I know. I'm looking at it now. 1.1.2.C.3 on the out parcel -- access and delete condition 1.1.32.

McCarvel: Second.

Yearsley: I have a motion and a second to approve file number H-2016-0047. All in favor say aye. Opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Yearsley: At this time, if no one complains, I would like to take a five minute recess.

(Recess: 8:09 p.m. to 8:15 p.m.)

**Item 5: Other Items**

**A. Ten Mile Road Urban Renewal Plan - Review and Discuss Conformance with the City's Comprehensive Plan**

Yearsley: All right. We would like to call this meeting back to order. At this time we would like to turn the time over to Caleb to talk about the Ten Mile Urban Renewal Plan and discuss the conformance with the city Comprehensive Plan.

Hood: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission. Bruce Chatterton, my boss, community development director, is also here to answer any questions you may have on this project. We have kind of jointly been working on this with the consultant Phil Kushlan, who did most of the heavy lifting and putting the plan and the existing conditions report together on behalf of the urban renewal agency and the city. So, in accordance with Idaho Code Title 50, Chapter 20, the Meridian Planning and Zoning Commission is being asked to review and, then, if you concur find that the submitted Ten Mile Road Urban Renewal District is consistent with the city's Comprehensive Plan. In anticipation of that you do have the next item on your agenda is a resolution. So, we have kind of made that assumption for you, but it is -- or just right now an assumption for you, but it is just right now an assumption. I kind of want to walk you through the plan and even back up and talk a little about what an urban renewal district is and does and the reason we might want to have one. So, I have reviewed this, but I don't want you to just take my word for it, so let's run through, again, why -- why we are looking at an urban renewal district, establishing one, and what they do. So, typically don't try to read PowerPoint slides to you, but this one is probably a good one, why would we want to establish an urban renewal district. We have very few tools in the tool box to finance public related infrastructure and so this is one of those few tools that we do have in our tool box that the legislature gives to cities to put, again, public infrastructure in place, particularly in areas that are underdeveloped or have developed some time ago and need some rehabilitation. So, in that second one the purpose -- the second bullet there, which is kind of hidden, in this case it really is more economic development than remediation of a downtown area. We do have an urban renewal area already in the downtown area. It actually goes from I-84 to Cherry Lane and from about 6th to 6th on the east and west sides. This one is more for economic development. Bruce and the consultant used a but for reason. So, we haven't seen anything out here since 2007 when the interchange opened. If you would ask me back then how long, I would have lost the bet, because I would have thought by now we would have seen something happen at this interchange. So, the natural forces -- the market haven't -- something is stuck there and so this is the but for. If we don't do anything but for this development won't occur is kind of the assumption with this. So, I'm going to quickly run through this and I do know that Bill kind of shows you some of these same slides a couple few weeks ago just to kind of give you the prep that this was coming. So, I'm not going to spend a whole bunch of time, but the study area -- let me back up to the first slide real quick. We originally had talked internally just about what should

the geographical boundaries be of this and we started out with the Ten Mile Specific Area Plan, which goes all the way to the county line. You can see the -- the eastern boundary of the plan here and it goes out, excuse me, to the railroad tracks and, then, down, basically, to Overland -- a little bit south of Overland and, then, again, over to the county line. And we took that kind of as a starting point and we said that's too big, that doesn't seem appropriate. We scaled it back and we actually -- the study area did go all the way up to Franklin and the edge of the urban renewal district. After going through the eligibility report, which was the second step, it was determined that some of those outer portions that I was just hovering over were not eligible, so we removed them from what you see today as the proposed urban renewal district area. We have a project that already has preliminary and final plat approval on one side and, then, the two other parcels are still in the county, which makes it a little bit difficult to include them, so, again, they were -- they were chosen to come out of the -- the district. The board, again, concurred with the eligibility report and forwarded onto City Council, the City Council has donthat and, then, on -- in late April the plan was -- was submitted to the City Council and, then, on May 3rd they referred it to you and the taxing entities for -- for review. The taxing entities, obviously, play a little bit different role than you do. They don't need to find that it's consistent with the city's Comprehensive Plan. That's not their charge. The taxing entity though -- and I just wanted to run though them real quick. It includes the school district, Ada County, and Ada County EMS, the City of Meridian, the cemetery district. ACHD. CWI. Library district. Mosquito abatement. And Western Ada Recreation District. The school district by statute is exempt. So, there will be no change to them. They will realize any additional value received from the -- from both the public and the private invested on these properties after the assessor gets to them and say, wow, these improvements -- so, the property is the valuable -- the city -- excuse me. The school district continues to keep that difference in the levy -- or not the levy rate, but the difference in the value that is assessed on the properties, but all those other ones that I just mentioned are basically held at today's whatever the value was January 1st of -- '17 or '16? 2017? So, they will be capped at that rate. So, whatever they are getting per property now is what they will get for the life of this district until it's established. So, again, they kind of get -- they get stunted for some time until the district is closed and, then, they will realize the difference in the property values. So, there will be a windfall, basically, at the end of this. The values, obviously, will go up -- well, hopefully will go up as private development is had, but I did just want to point out that the school district is not part of that. And, then, again, we are here tonight determining that the plan is consistent with the city's Comprehensive Plan. So, the City Council, then, will hold a hearing on June 14th and, again, there is an assumption here, but the City Council will adopt the plan and the revenue allocation area. So, generally what is -- what is an urban renewal plan? It is a revenue allocation area that can exist for 20 years. It doesn't have to exist for 20 years, that's a cap. It's not a minimum. It's a maximum. The most recent numbers that the consultant will look at -- and, again, it's based on some assumptions here. The -- the public investment and the private investment,

paying back the infrastructure that will be constructed -- we are looking at about 16 year -- 15, 16 year close out of this district. Again, we don't -- we don't have a crystal ball. Can't go longer than 20. We are hoping for a dozen or less I think is kind of the goal, but a lot of the numbers you see in the plan are very conservative. We have kind of played -- I don't want to say the worst case scenario, but we definitely didn't want a pie in the sky thinking this was all going to develop and we have, you know, millions and millions and millions of dollars investment here in the first two or three years. So, it may take some time, but -- but, again, the idea is to get in and get out. So, urban renewal provides the agency -- in this case that's the Meridian Development Corporation with a process and a basic framework within which to consider and proceed with a specific project and I have another slide, I think it's my next one and we will talk about some of those anticipated projects. And maintain some flexibility. So, in the plan it talks about, again, a general -- some general things that the funds in this urban renewal district can be used for and, then, there is a list and, then, amendments are pretty limited as well, so this can't -- you can't extend it. In years there is a 20 year cap. You can do slight geographical amendments to the area, but it can't be more than ten percent, so you're pretty limited there. So, here is the site I was talking about and this is all in the -- in the plan itself. These are the projects right now that the development community has said this is probably what we could like to have be eligible for that tax increment financing or the reimbursement for the public infrastructure. So, it's mostly roadways. What you see is roadways and associated improvements. So, roundabouts, signals, street lights, the internal roadway network, including the sewer and water infrastructure and storm drain facilities that are pretty typical of that. A couple of exceptions are the -- that aren't roadway related are the -- the waterways that go through the site, so tiling those or making them amenities and putting pathways adjacent to them would also be eligible. So, again, anything that's in the public realm is kind of what we are envisioning here to be what those funds would be used for and you can see here -- and this isn't an exact cost, but -- and they are 2016 dollars, but roughly 23 million dollars worth of infrastructure improvements in this 307 acre -- 305 acre, something like that, area. So, that is -- that's in a nutshell what the -- the plan is and essentially does. I do want to run through now how that compares with our comp plan. And you should have a memo in your packet. I'm working off of page two here a little bit. I'm also -- I cited about -- yeah, not about -- exactly six policies from the Comprehensive Plan that I thought furthered or made the two documents come into alignment. Just to be honest, there aren't a whole lot of policies that talk about this type of thing. There is nothing in our comp plan that says go out and make these types of plans. There is nothing in the plan, though, that says you shouldn't either. It's sort of silent on this type of a project, but there are some things where we are furthering again some policies -- and I'm not going to read them to you, because you have them in your packet on page two. But I do want to just go through the plan, because that was a little more beefy than the two page memo and just call out some of the things that the plan says itself that I believe further the Comprehensive Plan. So, on page two of the urban renewal district plan -- I'm

just going to read you a couple paragraphs here, so, please, just bear with me. The proposed redevelopment of the project area as described in this plan conforms to the City of Meridian Comprehensive Plan as amended and adopted by the City Council. The project area is part of the Ten Mile Interchange Specific Area Plan within the Comprehensive Plan. The application of the Comprehensive Plan is contained in the eligible report, included as attachment six. Development activities within the project area are to conform with the Comprehensive Plan. Right -- page two of this document says this plan is based on the city's Comprehensive Plan and it's a -- part of it is -- you know, the attachment on -- in the eligibility report on attachment six. So, a lot of the assumptions also -- this roadway layout for instance are based on the Ten Mile specific area plan roadway network, as well as the developments that Planning and Zoning Commission and the City Council have reviewed and approved over the past five, six, seven years and they are entitlements, so as you know, when a project comes through we got to make the finding that it's consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. Well, this plan is based on those projects, which were consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, so, therefore, kind of connecting some of the dots there, so a lot of the assumptions of how this is going to develop is based on the developer's plan for the entitlements they have. So, just a couple more snippets out of the plan itself. So, just a couple of the major goals in this plan. The elimination of environmental deficiencies on a project area, including, among others, adequate public improvements, including certain streets and -- streets and improvements to public utilities, including water and sewer improvements and fire protection systems, street lights, other public improvements, including public buildings and facilities, removal, burying or relocation of overhead utilities, extension of electrical distribution lines and transformers. Improvement of irrigation and drainage ditches and laterals. Improvement storm drain facilities and environmental remediation of Brownfield sites. So, again, that's an idea of the projects that are eligible. Anybody that wants to use these funds for a project in that realm will need to bring a proposal to the urban renewal district or the urban renewal agency and get approval and a document is drafted that says, yep, you can do this and we will reimburse you for these costs, not those, or all of them or whatever that deal is, but a deal is struck basically between anyone that's in -- within this geographical boundary and their project and the board itself. Another purpose was here as the strengthening of the economic base of the project area and the community by installation of needed site improvements to stimulate new private development, providing employment and economic growth. This is a targeted area for growth in the city's Comprehensive Plan. I have highlighted that in the memo and there were some other things that are on pages three and four of the plan itself. On page 22 it talks about uses permitted in the project area. Just to read from the plan again: The proposed land uses and permitted land uses in the project area for all land, public and private, are described in attachment four and it does on to say: The agency intends to rely on the overall land use designations and zoning classifications of the City of Meridian as depicted in attachment -- or on attachment four as set forth in the city Comprehensive Plan, including the future

land use map and zoning classifications. So, again, right there in the plan it says this plan and all future development -- it's -- it's -- it's going to be based on city zoning and future land use map. Just a couple more things in the plan I thought were good to highlight. So, attachment four, which was just mentioned in the section I read, includes both the Comprehensive -- Comprehensive Plan future land use map, as well as the zoning map. So, again, elements of the Comprehensive Plan imbedded right into the body of the plan itself and, then, finally in the eligibility report that was done prior to even developing the plan, there is a section called Ten Mile Interchange Specific Area Plan. It talks about that plan being developed and adopted by the City Council on June 19th, 2007, the plan remains in effect and is intended to guide development decisions within the study area. A map of the Ten Mile Interchange Specific Area Plan is provided below. So, again, I'm not trying to be a broken record here, but the several times in the plan that talks about the city's plans for the -- for the area in our Comprehensive Plan. One final thing in the analysis of the study area -- there is no page numbers, so I apologize for that, but in the analysis section of the study area in the eligibility report it says: The Ten Mile Interchange Specific Area Plan provides a clearly articulated vision for a high density mixed use development pattern in this area that would capitalize on the access and utility investments already made by public entities. To date, however, while some planning has been done to -- has been done consistently with the plan, little progress has been made to implement the vision. The plan calls for substantial investment in public infrastructure, but the market to date has proven incapable of supporting the capital costs. So, again, that's all within the plan that you all were provided links to so, again, staff has reviewed both the Comprehensive Plan and this plan and we find that it is consistent and in accord with the city's Comprehensive Plan and with that I would stand for any questions. Or Bruce I'm sure, too.

Chatterton: Well, I think Caleb handled it very well and I think very thoroughly. Thank you first off for taking the time to -- for an item which is a little unusual for this body, but it really emphasizes the P in the P&Z, the planning part of it and appreciate your -- your review of this item. It's very important to us, by the way. Without going into too much detail, the financials we are looking at, when this is all said and done several hundred million dollars of private investment and we hope to have several hundred jobs coming from this. So, really, a new employment center for the city. We need to be in better balance than we are. We have some of the -- some of the best quality residential and retail and services in the state of Idaho. We need more employment and that's really what this -- this effort is all about.

Yearsley: Any comments?

Oliver: Yeah. I would direct mine to Caleb with -- go back to the map that you showed there, the development. Is Calnon in this picture? Is it at the top right-hand side?

Hood: Correct. Yep.

Oliver: Okay. Calnon is -- and, then, I notice that Brighton has started some streets and footing in that corner. Does that mean that they are actually going to start putting in foundations in buildings out there? Is that the -- what --

Chatterton: The -- Brighton Corporation is the -- one of the property owners and they are the one in the biggest hurry. So, they have undertaken some site prep activities at this point, which don't require a permit. Obviously, they are anticipating this effort going swimmingly and they will be able to move on with -- with a development there in the urban renewal district .

Oliver: So, is the idea that once it -- it looks like the streets are in. It was just a matter of now getting the buildings put together, but they have to wait until they have something to occupy them or are they going to start building?

Chatterton: Our understanding is that they are going to be moving ahead soon with the actual building permit process. Beyond that I don't have their time frame.

Oliver: Okay. And I was -- I guess I got my bubble popped after we went through the process of doing all this and making sure this was all ready to go, I expected within just a matter of months to start seeing things happen, especially some big box stores go in and it didn't, so I guess I'm looking -- is this what you're trying to tell us is let's jump start this and get it going.

Chatterton: That's correct.

Oliver: If it's possible.

Chatterton: That's correct. I mean really this area has frankly languished since 2007, the specific area plan. The nearly 40 million dollar interchange, so there is a substantial public investment at the local and state level and federal level. It's about time. And we think that this will help, too. Not only -- I think Caleb talked -- did a great job of describing consistency with the Comprehensive Plan, but with a specific area plan this incentive also helps us to get closer to that original vision of the Ten Mile plan. It becomes a carrot along with a regulatory stick that we have as well.

Oliver: Well, that's just, again, what we are doing is just finding that one thing that we might need to just tip the scales enough to start that first development, which will lead to others, but we need that little enticement to start that.

Chatterton: That's right.

Oliver: And that's what we are doing. Okay. Thank you.

Wilson: I had just a quick background question. So -- and first off, I will say I mean I was excited when I -- you know, saw -- looked at this specific area plan that was adopted in 2007 and, then, thought a lot of the proposals in it are very, very interesting. My question is, again, background. When was it decided to use the urban development -- the urban renewal district? When was it decided to bring that tool to bear?

Chatterton: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner, we have been looking at this actually for some time. We had noticed that that the -- we had Federin Developers owning a good part of the land out there, yet nothing was happening, so we began to think about how we could jump start it. Around that same time is when an opportunity came to recruit an employer and the two things really came together about -- about the same time.

Wilson: And one quick follow up. You know, the legislature is tackling this issue and have been. How did that affect -- because it's -- I think a lot of their proposals are going to be implemented here on July 1. How does it affect the process that Meridian is currently undergoing with the --

Chatterton: Well, Commissioner, our consultant Phil Kushlan, who is probably the expert's expert on urban renewal in the state of Idaho, feels that it's important to have this approved if it's going to be approved in -- in the month of June, but it's certainly not -- it wouldn't kill the project to have it done in July. And you're absolutely right, the legislature does amend or reform urban renewal from time to time. As Caleb said, we have to be careful with that, because it really is -- we are -- we don't have many tools in the tool kit for incentives for economic development. This is one of the few. So, you know, it certainly is a -- a sense or urgency to get it passed in June and, again, if that's what City Council decides to do.

Wilson: Thank you.

Fitzgerald: Mr. Chairman?

Yearsley: Mr. Fitzgerald.

Fitzgerald: Bruce, do you guys have a target of an employer that is to be named later that is coming based on this action or is that to -- it's not going to be released at this time?

Chatterton: Well, our economic development administrator has signed several nondisclosure agreements.

Fitzgerald: Okay.

Chatterton: So, I have heard -- it's kind of like saying, you know, are we getting a Costco, you know, there are certainly rumors out there that I hear from time to time. There are a couple of sort of unnamed draft picks, if you will. Users for this that when you have a development team that's experienced as at least one of the owners is out here and you see them moving with a sense of urgency, you know, you can believe that there are -- there are some potential tenants lined up.

Fitzgerald: And, then, secondly, is there a -- was there a reason you guys didn't go further west? Because I know there was a discussion probably back in -- in '07 to '09 at Shield's Sporting Goods and the Red Investment Group coming in and dropping a giant development in that -- on that side of the Ten Mile corridor. Is that -- was there was a reason we didn't go further to the west?

Chatterton: Love to see a Shields or something, you know, of that ilk. A full size Cabelo's for instance. You know, those are really destination developments. The western part -- absent someone -- really a user for west of Ten Mile, the northwest quadrant of the interchange, the land use pattern really is -- wasn't as conducive on the -- the study area that we have here there are, you know, really three or four property owners involved. It's a much more sort of consolidated land ownership pattern. The west side not so much. There is some entitlements over there for retail. Probably we would not want to do -- incentivize retail in Meridian. I think we -- you know, we have a pretty good track record of that coming to us anyway. What we really need is we say -- are employment centers. So, we just -- it was kind of a combination of not really having a user, someone to -- to have an agreement with and the fact that some -- there is some entitlements there that are maybe -- you know, we might have to change some entitlements on the west side.

Fitzgerald: Thank you.

Hood: I will -- if I can just add to that a little bit. I think at least in the conversations I have been a part of -- and we will see how this one goes, but there isn't anything -- if this is successful and there is interest on the other side or south of the freeway or in other areas of the city, we could do another one. So, it's not -- we are one and done; right? We have got one downtown. Yes, we will have to comply with any new statutes that are out there, but there could potentially be more of -- you know, I'm not saying we are in the game of doing this all the time, but just potentially it makes sense, we may look at it again. So, you know, doing Ten Mile number two.

Chatterton: Yeah. We don't do these lightly. You saw from the process we really need to bring a lot of folks along with us on this journey. Make sure that everyone understands that we are using this precious tool in an appropriate manner and do it very deliberately. So, yes, we could -- certainly there is the

potential for additional districts. We certainly wouldn't want to scare folks that perhaps don't think as highly of urban renewal and we are going crazy with this.

**B. Resolution No. 16-1141: Finding that the Ten Mile Road Urban Renewal Plan is in Conformance with the City of Meridian Comprehensive Plan**

Yearsley: Any questions? And I think I'm -- you know, as Caleb talked I think it sounds good and, you know, it does meet the intent of the -- that. Just for clarification from Legal, we are here to adopt or approve --

Pogue: Your motion will be to approve the resolution.

Yearsley: Okay. So, with that I would entertain a motion?

Wilson: Mr. Chairman?

Yearsley: Mr. Wilson.

Wilson: I move we adopt a resolution -- resolution number 16-1141.

Yearsley: And that was to approve?

Wilson: That was to approve.

Yearsley: Okay.

Wilson: I'm sorry. Not adopt.

Yearsley: I have a motion and a second to approve resolution number 16-1141. All in favor say aye. Opposed? Motion carried.

**MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.**

Yearsley: I would entertain one last motion.

McCarvel: Mr. Chairman?

Yearsley: Commissioner McCarvel.

McCarvel: I move we adjourn the meeting.

Oliver: Second.

Yearsley: I have a motion and a second to adjourn. All in favor say aye. Opposed?

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Yearsley: We stand adjourned.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 8:44 P.M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS.)

APPROVED

\_\_\_\_\_  
STEVEN YEARSLEY - CHAIRMAN

\_\_\_\_\_|\_\_\_\_\_|\_\_\_\_\_  
DATE APPROVED

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
JACY JONES - CITY CLERK