

**Meridian Planning and Zoning Meeting**

**June 23, 2016**

Meeting of the Meridian Planning and Zoning Commission of June 23, 2016, was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by Chairman Steven Yearsley.

Members Present: Chairman Steven Yearsley, Commissioner Rhonda McCarvel, and Commissioner Patrick Oliver.

Members Absent: Commissioner Gregory Wilson and Commissioner Ryan Fitzgerald.

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

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

Roll-call

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

Yearsley: At this time I would like to call to order the regularly scheduled meeting for the Meridian Planning and Zoning Commission for the hearing date of June 23rd, 2016, and let's begin with the roll call.

**Item 2: Adoption of the Agenda.**

Yearsley: Thank you. At this time we have adoption of the agenda. There are a couple of changes I would like to make. On Action Item D, I would like to put it up as Action Item B and, then, move B to C and D. So, we move those -- that one up. With those changes can I get a motion to adopt the agenda as presented?

McCarvel: So moved.

Oliver: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIES: THREE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

**Item 3: Consent Agenda**

**A. Approve Minutes of June 2, 2016 Planning and Zoning**

## Commission Meeting

### **B. Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law for Approval: Starbucks Meridian Road (H-2016-0051) by Verdad Real Estate Located 1870 S. Meridian Road Request: Conditional Use Permit for a Drive-Thru Establishment Within 300 Feet of a Residential Use and Another Drive- Thru on 0.80 of an Acre in a C-G Zoning District**

Yearsley: Next item on the agenda is the Consent Agenda and on that is to approve the minutes of the June 2nd Planning and Zoning Commission meeting and the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law for the approval of Starbucks at Meridian Road, File No. H-2016-0051. If there are no changes or modifications I would entertain a motion to approve the Consent Agenda.

Oliver: Mr. Chairman?

Yearsley: Commissioner Oliver.

Oliver: I move to approve the Consent Agenda.

McCarvel: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIES: THREE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

### **Item 4: Update on Communities in Motion 2040 Development Checklist Prepared by COMPASS by Carl Miller**

Yearsley: Can you guys hear me back there? Okay. I didn't -- it doesn't sound like it's that loud, so I wanted to make sure you guys can hear me. Next item on the agenda is to -- Item No. 4, the update of Communities In Motion 2040, development checklist and let's begin with Bill.

Parsons: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission. I'd like to introduce to you Carl Miller. He's from COMPASS. If you recall or -- about two years ago COMPASS started weighing in and giving a development review checklist as part of their application review and so Carl is here this evening to really talk to you about whether there is any specific changes you would request of COMPASS to that checklist. Is there enough information on that checklist for you to make informed decisions on these planning applications that become -- that come before you? So, with that I will introduce Carl. He has a quick presentation, maybe a ten minute presentation, to go through to share how that

checklist came about and what -- what it's meant to do and how you can use it as a tool in your land use decisions. So, Carl.

Miller: Thank you, Bill.

Yearsley: Thank you.

Miller: Thank you, Commission. Thank you, Bill. Appreciate you having me on the agenda. My name is Carl Miller. I'm with COMPASS which I will tell you about in just a minute. I do work and reside in Meridian and work for COMPASS, which is a regional planning agency. So, first of all, I just want to tell you how excited I am that so many people came out to hear about the COMPASS development checklist. That's very exciting for me. If I can get this thing to work right. I'm going to go through this fairly quickly, because it looks like you have some more pressing matters on your hands for tonight and, to tell you the truth, I'm going to actually hope to listen more than I talk. I'd really like to get some feedback. Hopefully you have seen this checklist a few times over the last year or so and really want to make sure that we are fine tuning this thing so it's really a helpful tool for you. So, just really quickly about COMPASS. We are a regional transportation planning agency. We work in Ada and Canyon county. Most of the cities, highway districts and counties are members. You're represented on the COMPASS board by Mayor de Weerd. We do get regional -- we do get federal planning money for transportation projects, whether that's roads, bike lanes, sidewalks, buses, so forth. And one of the products that we come out with every few years is the regional long range transportation plan and we realize that -- that the federal money just isn't going to be enough for us to satisfy all the needs that we have as far as transportation in the valley and so we really made this a comprehensive and inclusive plan and really worked with all the -- all the stakeholders in the area to develop a plan that looks at the full transportation needs, as well as the future vision for our valley. But this valley -- this vision won't come to pass unless we really work together on this. Land use is, obviously, a key component of that, as well as the other eight elements that you see at the bottom, economic development, farmland, open space, community infrastructure, economic develop and housing and, really, all these things relate to transportation or are impacted by transportation. So, we really wanted to make sure that all these different needs were addressed in the plan. But, like I said, we really can't do it all with federal money and, really, this area is growing so much we won't be able to keep up. We really need to make sure that we bridge local and regional planning through the decisions that we make at the local level and so we developed this development checklist, which really provides all the -- the key goals and objectives of the long range plan and in a simple two page document and you get that on occasions for your -- for your public hearings, which indicates how well a particular proposal is meeting the objectives of the long range plan. I will go through it a little bit. It is very fact based. It's not subjective, it's not my opinion, it's not anybody's opinion, it's really how well does -- does different things meet the plan. It maintains authority with local agencies.

We are not trying to tell you how to make your decisions, we are just trying to provide you the best information that we can and, then, it represents each of those eight CIM, Communities In Motion, elements, so that way we have a well-rounded plan that speaks to many of the different quality of life things that we all really agree that are essential in this valley and, then, we did do a focus group about a year and a half ago. Commissioner Yearsley you were invited. I believe you had a conflict that day, so we went ahead, we developed this checklist and really we are at this point where we are saying is the thing working, is it giving you the information that you need. So, you have given us somewhat in frequently, although I think Meridian has had 28 development checklists sent to you by COMPASS over the last year and a half. We send these out on influential developments and we don't know which ones are going to be controversial or not, but we send these out whenever there is a subdivision that's has residential homes or an equivalent amount of commercial or industrial space or we will also send these out when a development accesses an arterial or an expressway. Even if it's not a huge development, if it's, you know, all along Eagle Road, you know, we can die a death of a thousand cuts if we get a lot of different developments that come in and want access or generating trips on a particular important key corridor. The third time we will send these checklists to you is if you ask. If your staff says, you know what, this would be really helpful -- this information would -- would help to satisfy some of the questions that you have, we would be happy to development this checklist for any particular proposal. So, I would like you to -- really now I want to hear back from you about -- hopefully you have seen this checklist, what's working, what's not, if you can just take 30 seconds, think of the last few controversial items you have had, think of some regional transportation -- you know, controversial items, you know, maybe a side yard setback, it maybe doesn't apply here, but, you know, a large development or one that's accessing a key corridor, something like that. Think of the few that you have had in the last few months and did this checklist provide you the type of information that you needed to address the controversial issues. Was the information useful? Was the information not useful and what is on the -- not on the checklist that should be. And now I know there is a lot of people here, so I won't take too much of your time, but I really would like some feedback from you at this point about what part of the checklist is working and what part is not. Do you have any questions at this point?

Yearsley: Are there any questions? Did you have a chance to review those checklists or --

McCarvel: I have no questions.

Yearsley: And I -- you know, I -- to be honest with you, I'm not sure if I have seen those before. Have we -- are they in the staff report, the checklist?

Watters: Chairman, they are not in the staff report. Sometimes we include a little blurb about it, but the report is in the public record for the project.

Yearsley: Okay. Okay. So, I can't really state a whole lot, because I haven't looked at them a whole -- a whole lot, to be honest with you, so --

Miller: That's -- that's good feedback, too.

Watters: Mr. Chairman, it is our intent -- staff has been discussing this and it is our intent to start including more of their analysis in our reports also, so, you will be seeing more of that in the future.

Yearsley: Okay. No. I think as we -- we start to grow regionally, I mean developments from one place will affect other areas and having a checklist and having -- providing that information I think is good for decision-making processes and understanding traffic and how the traffic affects and what other modes of transportation are available in those areas I think is very important. So, I think that checklist will be very helpful.

Oliver: Mr. Chairman?

Yearsley: Commissioner Oliver.

Oliver: I agree as well. I think that -- as Sonya pointed out, it would be helpful for us when we are going through and are looking at our packets and deciding what's going to be taking place at our meeting, to have a little bit more information that we can look at saying, oh, my gosh, what's the amount of traffic think that's going to bring and is it going to be able to handle that, you know, those kind of things. So, I think to have that there more often would help us make a good decision, so appreciate it.

Miller: Great.

Yearsley: Oh. Thank you. Anything else you had?

Miller: No. I just -- I would point out that we are -- so, we are going out to each of the planning and zoning commissions trying to get feedback from them. I spoke with Boise last week and got some really good feedback about how we can make this more useful and make it easier to integrate into staff reports. So, I will also be working with staff in the near future. I don't want to take up too much of your time, but I will say that I will leave the long range transportation plan. If you don't have a copy I will leave that will staff, so that you can look through that on your own time and if you have any questions about COMPASS or what we do or if you come across a checklist and have any questions, please, feel free to contact staff or myself and we would be happy to address those. So, thanks for your time tonight.

Yearsley: Thank you. So, before we go any further, I kind of want to explain how this process is going to go on the following items. We are going to open each application one at a time. We will start off with the staff report. The staff will present their findings on how the application adheres to the Comprehensive Plan and the Uniform Development Code and provide any staff recommendations. At that time the applicant will have an opportunity to come and present their case for approval to -- on the application and if there is any changes to the -- the staff -- staff report or the conditions they can present it at that time. The applicant will have up to 15 minutes to do so. After the applicant has had an opportunity to testify we will open it up to the public. In the back is a sign-up sheet for those wishing to testify. Those wishing to testify will be given up to three minutes to do so. If they are speaking for a larger group, if there is a show of hands and they are speaking for those people, they will be given up to ten minutes. However, those people who they are speaking for will not have an opportunity to speak. So, given the large amount of group we want to just make sure that that is clear. If they are speaking for an HOA or some organization they will be given up to ten minutes as well. After the applicant -- or the public testimony has had a chance - - everyone has had a chance to testify, we will have the applicant come back up and respond to the public testimony and to make comments on those. After the applicant -- and he will be given up to ten minutes to do so afterwards. After the applicant has had a chance we will close the public hearing and at that time the Planning and Zoning will make a -- or the Commission will make a -- will deliberate and decide and make -- hopefully make a recommendation to City Council.

**Item 5: Action Items**

**A. Public Hearing Continued from May 19, 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: So, with that I would like to open file number H-2016-0036, Gibson Amity Property and let's begin with the staff report.

Beach: Good evening, Chair, Commissioners. This is an application for annexation. The site consists of 5.864 acres of land, zoned RUT in Ada County and it's located at 357 East Amity Road. To the north of East Amity Road is a property zoned RUT in Ada County. To the east is vacant property zoned RUT also in Ada County. To the south is vacant land zoned R-4 and to the west is a proposed storage facility that is currently zoned light industrial. A little history on this property. Gravel mining operations were approved through Ada County. The Comprehensive Plan future land use map designation for the property is

mixed use, nonresidential. The applicant requests annexation and zoning, as I said, of 5.864 acres of land with a proposed I-L or light industrial zoning district, which is consistent with the mixed use nonresidential land use designation. The concept plan that was submitted depicts two industrial buildings, one approximately 16,500 square feet and the other 15,000 square feet and with associated site and landscape improvements. The three buildings that are currently located on the site that will remain and are proposed to operate as a contractor's yard. Cross-access is required to the property -- from the property to the east and to the west. Cross-access is only required to the property to the west if that property develops as something other than what is currently proposed as a storage facility. We did receive some comments from the highway district that I'd like to go over that I think are pertinent to the discussion, if I could -- staff recommends the applicant should be required to dedicate 48 feet of right of way from center line of Amity Road abutting the site. Amity Road is planned as a five lane arterial roadway in the Capital Improvement Plan and is impact fee eligible. As I said, these aren't -- these aren't planning staff comments, these are from the highway district, these three, so the second comment is the applicant should be required to widen Amity Road to 17 feet of pavement from center line with three feet -- three foot wide gravel shoulder abutting the site and the applicant should be required to construct a five foot wide concrete sidewalk a minimum of 41 feet from center line of Amity Road abutting the site. If sidewalk is placed in an easement the permanent right of way easement shall encompass the entire area between the right of way line and two foot behind the back edge of the sidewalk. So, having gone through those, staff's requirements, and -- which is in our pathways master plan, is that originally if you look at that -- the aerial photograph here, the pathway master plan intended that the pathway go along the Williams Lateral -- gas pipeline that goes approximately in this -- in this area here and the master plan was that that pathway run alongside that. With the development of that storage facility that pathway was pushed -- the multi-use pathway was pushed along the south side of Amity or the north side of the storage facilities and that's staff's proposal for this property as well, to get the multi-use pathway constructed along the south side of Amity along the north side of their property within that required landscape buffer that they will be required to put in upon development. So, the -- both of the uses that they are proposing there, the outdoor storage and the contractor's yard are -- require a specific use and there are specific requirements of both of those and the applicant would be required to meet all of those and one of those would be that the facility would be required to use a screened fencing material to screen the contractor's yard from the adjacent properties. So, staff recommends a minimum 20 foot wide driveway with a minimum five foot wide pathway slash sidewalk be provided from the proposed site to the property to the east and this will enhance interconnectivity between the site and future development of the adjacent property to the east. As I said, that is currently a gravel pit or a gravel mine, but upon development staff would like to see some interconnectivity between the parcels. A 25 foot landscape buffer is required along East Amity Road. The landscape buffer is required to be landscaped in accordance with the UDC and the unimproved right of way

adjacent to Amity Road must be landscaped. All parking lot landscaping must also comply with the UDC. As I mentioned, the multi-use pathway would go along the south side of Amity or the north side of this parcel. One of the main concerns from the applicant, at least as far as I understand, is that this -- with annexation staff is requiring that this -- these structures are currently on the site and meet our current architectural standards. Because this is annexation we -- we can and are requiring that they meet the current standards. They are steel structures right now and so they would not meet our current standards and so upon annexation and the certificate of zoning compliance they would be required to make some improvements to those structures. The Watkins Drain lies within the boundaries of the proposed annexation and there is a 50 foot easement from center line of the drain in both directions as you see here on the -- on the photograph approximately in this location. So, there is a very wide easement there, but, as I mentioned, the Williams Pipeline goes through this property, so they don't allow much construction over that, so staff is not opposed to the contractor's yard, but there needs to be some improvements made to the -- to the structure and there will be some improvements required to make that use something that we could allow. The applicant did provide written comments on the staff report with certain concerns that I'm sure she will address those. With that staff is recommending approval of the staff -- of the annexation with those conditions and I will stand for any questions you have.

Yearsley: Thank you. Are there any questions? No? Would the applicant like to come forward.

Thompson: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission, my name is Tamara Thompson. I'm with The Land Group at 462 East Shore Drive in Eagle. We have read the staff report and we do have a couple concerns. Most of them deal with timing. The -- I will just go through the conditions in order. Condition 1.1.1C is the property to the east, a cross-access to that property. It currently is a gravel pit. It operates under a conditional use permit in Ada County and we would just like to modify that condition, so it is a reciprocal cross-access agreement and it will be granted when the property is annexed to City of Meridian and is developed as a compatible use. Currently if the trucking operation just decided they wanted to use our access and we were giving that cross-access, they could just start trucking on through the site with that cross-access and I think it's appropriate that it is something that it's compatible, not a -- not a gravel trucking operation. So, just to restate that, reciprocal cross-access to the west will be granted when the property is annexed to the City of Meridian and is developed as a compatible use. The second one is the cross-access to the west. Currently the conditions of approval for the Citadel is that they don't provide cross-access unless it is developed as something other than a mini storage or a storage facility and we are asking for that same language that -- so, we are asking for the change to state reciprocal cross-access to the west will be granted if the property is not developed as a storage facility. Then 1.1.1D and E, due to the offsite utility infrastructure improvements, we are asking that the landscape buffer and the ten

foot pathway, that those be provided within six months of those being completed. We would hate to go out and do those improvements now and, then, have the -- the water and sewer line go through and -- I believe the water line should be in this summer, but the sewer line is still out there and I'm not -- I'm not sure it's a hundred percent certain where that's going to locate. So, it's just a timing issue. We will do it, we would just like some -- some leeway on that timing. 1.1.1H and 2.1.2 deals with the connection to the sewer and water and we -- we will make those connections and we request that utility stubs be provided to the property as those are going in, so we don't have to cut into the road secondary. 1.1.1K. This is the one that Josh mentioned about the CZC. Currently the property is sitting vacant. The conditional use permit was for the gravel operation and this used to be part of that, but the property was split and so this would require a CU with the county in order to occupy it and with the utilities going in made sense to annex to the city at this point and to get on city services. We would like some leeway from bringing the current buildings up to -- the existing buildings up to current standards. Right now the buildings are over 130 feet from Amity in the I-L zone. A building setback is 35 feet, so we are three and a half to four times further back than -- than what's required. So, we are asking for some leeway on that, that the buildings -- the buildings are set back. We will do the landscape buffer and the pathway along the fronts and we can add some extra trees to buffer those in the short term, so that those buildings can be occupied and, then, as redevelopment occurs, then, they -- any new construction would have to go through and meet the design review standards. And I'm almost done. Let's see. The other deal with the ACHD approval, the 7.1.2, the widening improvements to Amity, that those will occur after the utility construction is complete. So, again, just the timing. And there was a staff -- city -- the city is recommending a ten foot multi-use pathway -- multi-use pathway and ACHD has a five foot concrete sidewalk and I just wanted to confirm with staff that that -- that the city's ten foot would supersede that, that both of those wouldn't be required, that just the ten foot multi-use pathway. And with that I will stand for questions and we respectfully request your approval tonight with our modification.

Yearsley: Thank you. Are there any questions?

McCarvel: Mr. Chairman?

Yearsley: Commissioner McCarvel.

McCarvel: What would you have to do to those buildings to bring them up to code?

Thompson: Commissioner McCarvel, I -- I believe quite a bit would have to happen to those. The one is a metal building and I brought some pictures if you would like to see what those look like.

McCarvel: Okay. So, you have to redo the entire exterior?

Beach: Tamara, I can pull up a Google Earth shot if that would be --

Thompson: Do you have this one?

Beach: I don't have that photograph, no.

Thompson: Josh, if you would bring up just the site plan, the aerial, I can kind of show that.

Beach: Yes.

Thompson: So, the building that is diagonal on the east side of the property, that is a pre-manufactured home that is -- that is used for an office building. That one would be the first to go, but we would like to use it in the short term and, then, the larger warehouse on the west side of the property -- that one. There we go. That one is fairly nice. It's a newer building, but it still doesn't meet code -- or meet the design review standards. So, some what I would call ginger bread would need to be added to that. But, again, they are not right up on the street and I think we could do some alternative compliance with some landscaping in that -- in our landscape buffer that we will be installing first off. We are not asking for any relief from that condition, just the timing to do it after the utilities are installed.

McCarvel: Just the landscape is all you're asking for relief on -- you're asking for total relief on the exterior of this building; right?

Thompson: In the short term, yes. Those will be demolished.

McCarvel: Timing on that one.

Thompson: Timing -- well, once it's redeveloped those will eventually get demolished and a new building with the concept plan that we submitted would go there and the new building would be to design review standards.

Yearsley: Do you have an idea when that would happen? The redevelopment.

Thompson: Right. So, I don't -- I don't know that we know that offhand.

Yearsley: I just -- are we looking five, ten, 15, 30 years? I mean -- because if we are looking 30 years out for redevelopment, I don't want something like this to sit like that for that long.

Thompson: Sorry. My client tells me probably more in the two to five year range.

Yearsley: Okay. Any other questions? Sorry. I have -- on your item 1.1. -- or 1.1.1C, I have a concern with compatible use. To what are we assuming is a compatible use? Because that could be broad range and trying to figure -- because that word is pretty vague and so I want to make sure we have something nailed down. Does that make sense?

Thompson: It does make sense. Compatible use is vague and it's subjective.

Yearsley: Yeah.

Thompson: So, I guess we could say that not a trucking operation, something that's -- that's more in the light industrial.

Yearsley: Okay.

Thompson: But definitely not a trucking operation.

Yearsley: Not a gravel pit operation.

Thompson: Yes.

Yearsley: Okay.

Parsons: Mr. Chairman, if I could elaborate on that condition a little bit? The idea behind this is that we don't want to lose our opportunity in the future when these properties redevelop. The applicant isn't required to build a driveway or anything to that effect at this time, merely just saying, hey, there is an easement in place, so that way when these adjacent properties redevelop -- meaning the gravel mine to the east redevelops, we can say we have had an easement here, now you're coming in with annexation and redevelopment, we want you to reciprocate that and both these parties work together and construct that driveway so that we can restrict access to Amity, which is an arterial roadway. That's the idea behind this condition. I don't see where that -- that hurts this project to at least grant an easement. It doesn't mean they have to build it, just saying we have that in place for future connectivity and that's really what we are trying to achieve here, because we don't have a timeline for that area. As you know, water is coming down there sometime this summer. Sewer may or may not happen. That's exactly what we talked about when Citadel came through. The city's trying to negotiate some easements to get the trunk line run through the property to the north and, then, they are working with the Citadel self storage facility to get an easement across their property, so they can be extended for properties to the south. So, we know where that trunk line is going to fall. We just have to get all the parties to the table to agree to that and as part of that larger annexation of that 14 -- 1,300 plus acres we did a year or so ago, that was a condition in the DA that annexation is contingent upon utilities coming to this property -- to these properties. If they don't -- it's in their DA that says the city will

make every attempt to get utilities there, but there is no guarantee and so that's -- that's something that we talked about with the applicant at great length at our preapplication meetings, that this is kind of in limbo land right now and so it's hard for staff to track these conditions and protect the interest of the city without knowing -- having all those public pieces in place, so these DA provisions that are up on the screen are staff's best stabs at protecting that area for future development.

Yearsley: Thank you.

McCarvel: Mr. Chairman?

Yearsley: Yes.

McCarvel: One question. Bill -- so, in going forward in our discussions later, is what's in the staff recommendation -- I mean everything is predicated -- this -- nothing gets annexed until technically the utilities are there anyway; right? I mean --

Parsons: That's not necessarily true.

McCarvel: Okay. So --

Parsons: Right now the properties that -- the Citadel property and all the other 1,300 acres is currently annexed --

McCarvel: Okay.

Parsons: -- into the city. There is no guarantee on sewer being there. Yet. That's spelled out in those agreements. And so this is one of those gray areas where people are hoping that it happens. I'm sure the city will do everything in its power to make it happen, but, again, it's -- there is no guarantee here.

McCarvel: Okay.

Yearsley: I do agree that if you grant an easement they have an opportunity to use that. The wording here is not an unreasonable request that, you know, they can grant the easement when it's redeveloped. If you wouldn't mind staying, I have one other question for you. On that 1.1.1K, I am concerned about that one. This is the time that we would like to bring those buildings up to code. However, I understand -- I don't know if the other staff is, but -- and I don't know -- I want to ask staff about that, too, is could we put a condition on there that they have to bring them up to code within two years? Or redevelop within -- because I don't want to -- like I said, I don't want that to sit there for two years -- you know, for a lot of time, so --

Thompson: Thirty years.

Yearsley: Yeah. Or even five to six years, because that area is going to growth pretty fast once we get utilities -- assuming utilities get there. And, you know, I would like to have that done sooner -- either brought up to code or redeveloped sooner, rather than later, and so I would -- you know, my thought would be at least give a two to three year reprieve or something to that effect, but at that point in time they either have to bring it up to code or redevelop is what my -- my feeling is. And I had a question for staff. Is that reasonable, because that puts the burden on you to track that time and I would like maybe you to weigh in on what your thoughts are.

Parsons: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission, we sat down with the applicant prior to their requesting their continuance and we asked for a phasing plan, basically. Give us a plan and tell us how you're going to phase these improvements and that didn't occur. To me that makes me feel more comfortable. At least we have something attached to the development agreement in phase one, we are going to get sidewalk or we are going to get landscape improvements. Phase two we are going to get building lots or whatever. The design use standards in phase two. Phase three it's got to redevelop. I don't know how it could be structured, but that's the direction that we provided to the applicant before they even brought this to you during the application tonight. To me that's certainly the cleaner way for us to do it and certainly I think we could structure something like that in the DA if that's something you want to do. That's within your purview. Keep in mind we don't condition annexations. Our bite at the apple is this development agreement. This is the time that we ask for things that we think should happen on this site and that's why we did require this. We did -- you can see from the aerial that the site has been vacant for a while, underdeveloped. Services aren't available. So, at least we were trying -- if you're going to come into the city to take advantage of what the city has to offer, then, we certainly want you to meet our code. Again, you could structure it that way. If you want it all done within two years, we could have that added to the DA. Two years of annexation. They do that. Or you can tie it to whenever sewer is available or something like that and that we know when they come in to connect to the sewer and water we are going to say, whoa, time out, what about CZC and design review application for the rest of this work. So, I think we can structure around that one, too. There is flexibility here for you.

Yearsley: Okay. I appreciate that, so -- and I guess are you okay with something to that effect?

Thompson: Yeah. Chairman Yearsley, I -- I think that's -- that's appropriate. I understand your concerns on that, that you can't just have it open-ended. I think Bill's comment about tying it to utilities is appropriate. Not knowing exactly when those utilities are going to be completed --

Yearsley: Uh-huh.

Thompson: -- that, you know, two years after utilities are installed these buildings have to come up to code, but in the -- in the meantime, in the short term, we do have well and septic that we could get somebody in there and operating --

Yearsley: Okay.

Thompson: -- and make those frontage improvements.

Yearsley: Okay.

Oliver: Mr. Chairman?

Yearsley: Commissioner Oliver.

Oliver: If you could go back, Josh, to the aerial map of the site one more time, just so I can clarification. So, looking at -- on my left is the office and your plan is to just take that out?

Thompson: Commission Oliver, the -- the plan is that the -- the larger building, the one to the west, that's a fairly new and nice warehouse storage facility. It's got some really nice equipment in there with some hoists and stuff. So, the -- the plan would be that that could be brought up to design review code and those other buildings that are on the east side, those are -- those would be demolished and new buildings put in their place.

Oliver: And that demolish -- when would that be after you take ownership of --

Thompson: Well, that is what -- what we were talking about on the timing, is that if we could state in the -- and modify the condition that it's either those be brought up to design review standards or demolished and a new building go in their place within two years after sewer is available.

Oliver: Okay. Thank you.

Yearsley: One other quick question. It looks like there was a telephone -- or a communication tower there. Is that planning to go away? I wondered if that's what it was, but -- okay. Any other questions? Just -- let's get them out now, because I don't think we are going to have any public testimony, so -- thank you. I do not have anybody signed up to testify. Is there anybody wanting to testify on this application? So, with that I don't think we need to ask the applicant to come forward again. So, I would entertain a motion to close public hearing on file number H-2016-0036.

Oliver: Mr. Chairman?

Yearsley: Commissioner Oliver.

Oliver: I move to close the public hearing on 2016-0036.

McCarvel: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIES: THREE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Yearsley: This is kind of a challenging site, trying to figure out what future needs are going to be there, what future is going to happen, and how this is all going to work out. I understand staff wanting these things done. I do think it does make some sense to hold off on some of the improvements until after water and sewer are in place. I -- to be honest with you, I am really concerned about the building and the timing of those to be done. I'm kind of curious to see what your thoughts are on the -- on this -- this project.

McCarvel: Mr. Chairman?

Yearsley: Commissioner McCarvel.

McCarvel: I will just go down the list here. I think the first one was the reciprocal access. I think that makes sense, if there is -- I mean there is going to be no access to the storage unit, so that has the legal verbiage it needs. If that becomes something else, then, they need to reciprocate. And as well as the cross-access to the truck -- until that becomes something else, then, they do need to have that in the plan that they will have to make cross-access as soon as that develops. Let's see. The landscape buffer pathway, 1.1.1D and E, I think, you know, that makes sense to do, you know, just shortly after the sewer and water are completed and I think -- they had a question and that's supposed to be a ten foot, not a five foot concrete path; right?

Yearsley: I think -- I think what it is is that a ten foot multi-use pathway will -- on the 7.13 -- or 7.1.3, is that the one you're talking about?

McCarvel: Yes.

Yearsley: Yeah. I think the ten foot pathway will satisfy ACHD's five foot concrete --

McCarvel: Right. But I think she was asking that they don't have to do both.

Yearsley: Yeah.

McCarvel: But I think at the time of the sewer and water is fine. Obviously, it can't connect to sewer and water before it's available.

Yearsley: Right.

McCarvel: And I agree, those buildings -- I think they need to come up to code just real quick when --

Yearsley: Okay.

McCarvel: -- after sewer and water is there. If you have any suggestions on how quick that needs to be, but, I agree, I think that whole area is going to just boom the minute those -- that infrastructure is there.

Yearsley: Okay. And I'm -- you know, the applicant had recommended two years. You know, they are talking two years for sewer. I'm -- I'm okay with six months after sewer --

McCarvel: Yeah.

Yearsley: -- is available. That gives them, essentially, two and a half years to plan and budget. I agree. I would like to have the condition on that 1.1K is that the tower gets removed immediately after annexation, just because I think that's -- that's a bigger eye sore than the other items.

McCarvel: Yeah. I agree, Mr. Chairman. If nobody is using that take it down.

Yearsley: Yeah. And I think the other conditions are -- yeah, I think are -- are appropriate as well.

McCarvel: Uh-huh.

Yearsley: Okay. So, are we all kind of in agreement with that? I guess with that I would entertain a motion.

McCarvel: Okay. I do have one question. So, in the staff report did those -- reading it word for word, were they applicable in the staff report for a motion or do I need to go off of the revised --

Yearsley: You will need to basically --

McCarvel: Include this e-mail --

Yearsley: -- with these modifications.

McCarvel: Yeah.

Yearsley: Yeah.

McCarvel: Okay.

Yearsley: And I guess the question on one -- 7.1.3 -- do you have that one? Just -- I guess --

Beach: Would you like to see that text?

Yearsley: Yeah. I guess the way I understand the clarification -- okay. So, we probably need to make sure that -- and I guess you're assuming the thinking that I'm assuming, that the ten foot pathway would oversee the five foot concrete, so you don't have to do both, you can do the ten foot pathway. Is that correct?

Beach: That's correct. The highway district requires that five foot pathway, but because we have a -- we have kind of altered our multi-use pathway plan to have that go along there, it doesn't make sense to have both of those and there is no reason to require that. So, yes, potentially multi-use pathway would be in place of.

Yearsley: Okay. So, we will need to modify that one as well.

McCarvel: Okay.

Yearsley: Okay. Good luck.

McCarvel: Mr. Chairman?

Yearsley: Commissioner McCarvel.

McCarvel: After considering all staff, applicant, and public testimony, I move to recommend approval of file number H-2016-0036 as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of May 5, 2016, with the following modifications: Accept the wording on e-mail of May 12th as presented in the public report for 1.1.1C. That reciprocal access be granted if the property to the west and east change. 1.1.1D and E, that the timing of that pathway be within six months after the sewer and water completion. 1.1.1H and 2.1.2, connect the water and sewer when it's available. And 1.1.1K, that these buildings come up to code with design review within six months of sewer and water and that the tower be removed upon annexation and 7.1.13, confirm that the ten foot multi-use path is the only one required.

Beach: Commissioner McCarvel?

McCarvel: Yes.

Beach: Real quick. I will say that that's not a staff requirement, so --

McCarvel: Okay.

Beach: -- that's -- that's from the highway district, so we can't technically modify that condition, but you can have the applicant work with Ada County Highway District to insure that they are both not required.

McCarvel: Okay.

Beach: Which I think is a work around for that.

McCarvel: Okay. So, the proper wording of 7.1.3 is that the applicant work with ACHD to make sure our ten foot pathway is acceptable for their five foot concrete sidewalk.

Yearsley: Okay. And -- and I just ask for a clarification. On the reciprocal cross-access easement to the east will be granted upon annexation to the city and is developed as a -- she has got compatible use. Do we want to change that to a nongravel pit operation?

McCarvel: Yes. I think the -- yeah.

Yearsley: Okay. Any comments?

Oliver: Mr. Chairman?

Yearsley: Commissioner Oliver.

Oliver: I second.

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

MOTION CARRIES: THREE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

**D. Public Hearing For Touchmark Cottage Units (H-2016-0058) By Touchmark At Meadow Lake Village Located at S. Of E Franklin Road and E of S Eagle Road on the N Side of E Putter Lane and E of S Touchmark**

- 1. Request: Modification to the Concept Plan Approved with the Conditional Use Permit (CUP-**

**99-039) to Remove the Alley Access for Seven (7)  
of the Single-Family Residential Units**

Yearsley: Next we are going to open up the public hearing for file number H-2016-0058 for Touchmark Cottage Units and let's begin with the staff report.

Watters: Thank you, Chairman, Members of the Commission. The next application before you -- excuse me. Did you say H-2016-0058?

Yearsley: Yes, I did.

Watters: Okay. Thank you. Sorry. That application is a request for a conditional use permit modification. The site consists of 1.76 acres of land, zoned L-O, located south of East Franklin Road and east of South Eagle Road, on the north side of East Putter Lane and there is a vicinity map showing exactly where the property is located. Adjacent land use and zoning. To the north is vacant and undeveloped property, zoned L-O. To the east are single family residential homes in the Touchmark Meadow Lake Village development, zoned L-O. To the south is open space and recreational area for Meadow Lake Village, zoned L-O and to the west is vacant, undeveloped property zoned L-O. This property was annexed back in 2001 and included in the planned development for the Touchmark Living Center's development, which included a mix of office, retail, single family residential, and multi-family residential uses in the L-O district. The applicant is proposing to modify the conditional use permit planned development to remove the alley that was depicted on the conceptual development plan for access to seven of the single family residential homes. You can see here on the top left picture this is the alley right here that they are requesting to remove. These homes would be accessed from the front via Putter Lane. On-street parking, as well as a small parking lot across the street at the recreation area can accommodate additional parking for guests if needed beyond that provided on each lot. This is the proposed concept plan without the alley. Shows their driveway accesses. A property boundary adjustment for this property has been tentatively approved by staff. Final approval is required prior to submittal of any building permits for the proposed structures. Written testimony was received from Tamara Thompson, the applicant's representative, in agreement with the staff report. Staff is recommending approval. Stand for any questions.

Yearsley: Thank you. Are there any questions? If not, would the applicant like to come forward?

Thompson: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission, my name is Tamara Thompson. I'm with The Land Group, 462 East Shore Drive in Eagle. First of all, thank you for the change in the agenda. I appreciate getting back to back and I will make this short and sweet. We have read the staff report. We agree with the conditions and the findings and I will stand for questions.

Yearsley: Thank you. Are there any questions? No? Thank you.

Thompson: Thank you.

Yearsley: I have no one signed up for this application. Is there anyone wanting to testify on this application? With that are there any other comments before we close the public hearing? At that point I would entertain a motion to close the public hearing for file number H-2016-0058.

Oliver: Mr. Chairman?

Yearsley: Commissioner Oliver.

Oliver: I move to close the public hearing on H-2016-0058.

McCarvel: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIES: THREE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Yearsley: Any comments?

McCarvel: Mr. Chairman?

Yearsley: Commissioner McCarvel.

McCarvel: I think it makes sense if they want to take that alley out. It would add to the green space I'm sure and all the area out there, I think it would probably make sense for them, as well as give them access to the additional parking across the street for visitors.

Yearsley: I think you're right. Okay.

Oliver: Mr. Chairman?

Yearsley: Commissioner Oliver.

Oliver: I agree as well. I think that it will give a better look to the community out there. I have driven through that, seen a lot of it, and I think it looks very nice to have the -- to take that away I think would improve it as well, so I'm for it.

Yearsley: Thank you. So, with that I would entertain a motion.

McCarvel: Mr. Chairman?

Yearsley: Commissioner McCarvel.

McCarvel: After considering all staff, applicant, and public testimony I move to approve file number H-2016-0058 as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of June 23rd, 2016.

Oliver: Second.

Yearsley: I have a motion and a second to approve file number H-2016-0058. All in favor say aye. Opposed? Motion carries. Thank you.

MOTION CARRIES: THREE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

**B. Public Hearing for Pope's Garden (H-2016-0006 REVISED) by Iron Mountain Real Estate. Located at 2662 E Magic View Drive**

- 1. Request: Amendment to the Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map to Change the Land Use Designation on 5.28 Acres of Land from Office to Medium High Density Residential**
- 2. Request: Annexation and Zoning of 5.28 Acres of Land from the RUT to the R-15 Zoning District**
- 3. Request: Preliminary Plat Approval consisting of (Nineteen) 19 Building Lots, (Four) 4 Common Lots and (One) 1 Other Lot on 5.28 Acres of Land in the R-15 Zoning District.**
- 4. Request: Conditional Use Permit Approval for a MultiFamily Development Consisting of 76 Dwelling Units in the R-15 Zoning District**

Yearsley: So, the one we are all waiting for. I will ask -- there is a lot of people here and I promise anybody who wants to testify will have opportunity to testify. I would appreciate keeping the noise down, clapping -- let's have this a professional meeting. Let the applicant present his case. We will let the people talk and let's just be nice. And so with that I would enter -- sorry. I would like to open file number H-2016-0006 for Pope's Garden and let's begin with the staff report.

Watters: Thank you, Chairman Yearsley, Members of the Commission. The applications before you with this application are a request for annexation and a

Comprehensive Plan map amendment, a conditional use permit, and a preliminary plat. This site consists of 5.28 acres of land. It's zoned RUT in Ada County and is located 2662 East Magic View Drive. Adjacent land use and zoning. To the north are rural residential homes in Greenhill Estates, zoned R-1 in Ada County. To the east is rural residential property with a home, also zoned RUT in Ada County. It is designated office on the future land use map. To the south is East Magic View Drive and two rural residential properties zoned RUT in Ada County, designated as commercial on the future land use map. And to the west are single family attached homes that are in the development process for Waverly Place, zoned R-8. This property was previously platted as Lot 5 in the amended Magic View Subdivision. The Commission reviewed a previous development application for this property back in March that was recommended for denial to City Council. Since that time the ACHD commission made a decision to not require right of way to be dedicated for the extension of Hickory Way on the west boundary of this site. Based on that decision the application revised the plat to remove the street and I will just show here this is a -- excuse me -- this is the Comprehensive Plan future land use map requested change. The map on your left there is the previous preliminary plat that you reviewed. Based on testimony at the Commission hearing the applicant revised the plat to remove the street. Based on testimony on the Commission public hearing, the applicant also removed the 11 units in three structures along the north boundary of the site and converted this area to common area, with a structure housing a property management office and a fitness facility to provide more of a transition and buffer to rural residential properties to the north. Because the applicant, as well as staff, felt these changes were significant, the applicant requested the project be remanded back to the Commission for a review of the revised plans and new recommendation to City Council. The Comprehensive Plan future land use map designation for this site is currently office, as you can see there on the top map. The applicant is proposing to amend the map contained in the Comprehensive Plan to change the land use designation on 5.28 acres of land from office to medium high density residential. Annexation and zoning of the property is also requested with an R-15 zoning district consistent with the proposed future land use map designation of medium high density residential. A conditional use permit is requested for a multi-family development in a proposed R-15 district. The revised plat on your right there depicts 19 four-plex structures with a total of 76 dwelling units. This is three fewer units than the previous plat. The proposed R-15 zoning district will accommodate the proposed multi-family development with a gross density of 14.39 dwelling units per acre. The proposed R-15 zoning provides a transition, zoning, and use from the west from Waverly Place Subdivision with attached single family residential homes in R-8 zoning and, further to the west from Woodbridge Subdivision was single family residential detached homes in R-4 zoning and from the north from Greenhill Estates Subdivision with single family detached homes in R-1 zoning in Ada County, designated on the future land use map as low density residential. This is a transition to future office and commercial uses to the east and south of Magic View Drive. The revised preliminary plat consists of 19 building lots, four

common area lots, and one other lot. There is an existing home and accessory structures on this site that are required to be removed prior to city engineer's signature on the final plat. The proposed plat depicts access for the development via two access points on each Magic View Drive. Point those out with my pointer here on the map. The section of Magic View west of South Wells Street, which is this street that comes up here, is designated as a local street and the section of Magic View East of Wells Street is designated as a collector street. Access is required to be approved by Council on the collector street, as our UDC does restrict access to collectors when local access is available. A minimum of ten percent or .53 of an acre of qualified open space is required in accord with UDC standards. A total of 21.5 percent or 1.13 acres is proposed. A minimum of five qualified site amenities are required with this development. The applicant proposes a tot lot with children's play equipment, a hardscaped plaza area with seating. Three 50 foot by 100 foot open grassy areas and a fitness facility as amenities in accord with UDC standards. The unopened right of way at the north -- excuse me -- northwest boundary of this site for Hickory Way was previously provided to be extended from the south from Autumn Way and that is this street right here that you can see -- is now required to be improved by the developer with a minimum 20 foot wide pedestrian, bicycle, and emergency access. One concept building elevation was submitted for the proposed four-plex structures on the site in four different color schemes. Building materials consist of horizontal and vertical lap siding with stone veneer accents and architectural shingles. These elevations are conceptual only and not approved with this application. Compliance with the design standards contained in the architectural standards manual is required, which require more variety between structures. And this is a copy of the proposed landscape plan that has been revised with the revised plat. As you can see there is a lot of landscaping throughout the site, but especially along this north boundary. Staff also recommended as a condition of approval that the applicant provide a more dense landscape buffer adjacent to this existing rural residential property here that would allow trees to touch at maturity. So, the application is in agreement with that. Written testimony has been received. A petition with 53 signatures from neighbors requesting the Commission deny the proposed development based on objections to the changes to the future land use map from office to medium high density residential. They prefer the office designation to remain over the medium high density. Reasons for objection are the development doesn't provide adequate transition from the R-1 neighborhood to the north. Increased traffic caused by medium high density residential development and the impact to surrounding residential areas. Walter Faling also submitted written testimony objecting to the development due to traffic concerns, accessing Locust Grove through Woodbridge Subdivision, and supports the future land use map designation remaining office. Staff is recommending approval with the conditions in the staff report per the requirements in the development agreement contained in the staff report. Staff will stand for any questions.

Yearsley: Thank you. Are there any questions? With that would the applicant like to come forward? Please state your name and address for the record.

Amar: Yes, sir. Good evening Commissioners. My name is Kevin Amar. My address is 1548 West Cayuse Creek Drive in Meridian. I'm here tonight to represent Pope's Gardens. We were here before in March with an understanding that ACHD was requiring an additional connection to Greenhill Estates. Subsequent to that meeting, both from efforts from the neighbors, as well as our - - Kent Brown, our planner, ACHD has removed that requirement from connecting into Greenhill Estates, thus allowing us to redesign this project and creating -- creating a more compatible use. I'm going to go through some of those changes initially and, then, we can talk about the project specifically. When this was presented before we met the UDC standards -- and met all those standards. However, now we are able to -- from that point we reduced the total number of units that we were presenting before. We also reduced the number of buildings that we were presenting. We increased the amenities that we were requesting and we also increased the open space that we were able to do. So, essentially, what we did is took where that road was going to be, we didn't add any more units. In fact, we eliminated some units and, then, we added that entire area into open space for the community. We also added a community leasing office, as well as a fitness facility that is for use of the residents within this -- this neighborhood. Just to create that feeling where people are going to live and enjoy and have the amenities within the subdivision that they need. As we are looking at the open space and looking at the area that we want people to gather, also trying to be compatible with the neighbors, we did locate the fitness facility on that boundary line, although that's going to be a single story fitness facility, so it won't be intrusive to those neighbors, but we also located the area, the playground structures, the sitting area, the plaza -- we located those further to the south in that -- somehow I should be able to point with this. Well --

Yearsley: You need to pick a color.

Amar: Uh-huh. Thank you. So, we located the -- there is a tot -- I swear I picked a color. I will try a different color. Anyway --

Watters: Kevin, we have been having problems with that. I'm sorry.

Amar: What's that?

Watters: We have been having problems with that board.

Amar: Well, we will just go through it. So, we -- we located the tot lot, as well as the plaza and the active open spaces, the places where we anticipate people to gather between the -- in the center of the entire project. We understand that this is an area of transition between what is low density residential in Ada County, as well as additional residential ground that is in the city of Meridian. However, we

also know that this is an area that is going to transition into a much higher use than what even we are proposing here and we will go through that this evening. We have heard that some of the concerns for not wanting this project is compatibility, as well as traffic, and with this new proposal we have increased compatibility, meaning on the northern boundary of our project we -- we are from -- no closer than 40 feet to the property line with our first building, up to 130 feet from the property line to the first building. In addition to that, along our northern boundary we will be placing a three foot berm and on top of that berm a six foot fence. So, we have got a nine foot total barrier similar to what they have done on the office buildings further to the east, but increasing the amount parking or as close as we can get to the parking as shown in the slide later on. Sonya, how do I flip through the PowerPoint? I can't do that either?

Watters: Which slide would you like?

Amar: You just start with the first one and I will tell you next. Do you have this one?

Watters: Just a moment.

Amar: So -- sorry. We will just keep going through this. As we mentioned, the area that we are in in the city's Comprehensive Plan that we are asking to change, we are also asking for a CUP for this project, understanding that any -- any commercial -- or, I'm sorry, multi-family project requires a CUP in the City of Meridian. So, in this area it is currently a very intense future land use map. It's designated for light office, as well as commercial. Multi-family homes is a less intense use than either one of those items on the spectrum of uses and so in an effort to have that transition not only providing the buffer space between the areas of Greenhill and our project, it also provides that transition from the neighboring property to the west. We do have the support specifically of one of the neighbors, the Eberts in the Greenhill Estates, because they view this now as increased space that they don't have to worry about cars, office buildings, or any other views that they might have within this project. Sonya, could you go to the next slide. This was the previous map that did have buildings along the west, as well as the basketball court and other things. The new map -- Sonya, go to the next slide, please. The new map does have the leasing office, as well as the business facility, but we have removed the basketball court altogether, because that pounding of the basketball we understand could be disruptive and increase the open space in the tot lot and the plaza and moved all those locations further to the south away from those neighbors and really center it to the entire project. We also understand and agree with the staff report that the intensity of trees along the boundary that

-- our eastern boundary needs to be increased, so at the time of full grow out that those canopies will -- the trees will touch in the canopies and we are in agreement with that. Sonya, the next slide, please.

Maybe the next one.

Watters: I'm not sure what it's doing, Kevin. It doesn't --

Amar: Within the comprehensive land map we evaluated some of the other businesses that are within this area. We choose this site as we discussed before because of the employment centers that are within this area. There really is no multi-family housing to -- to accommodate this area. We have got St. Luke's. We have got all the medical offices. You have got hotels. You have got all of Silverado and Golden -- El Dorado. Silverstone. As well as Scentsy and all those campuses along that area that -- that need this type of product. The influx of people in this area is massive during the day when people are driving to work. With the thought of this project this will allow people to live near where they also work and live in an area that really is harmonious with the surrounding areas and provides the amenities that -- that people enjoy living next to. These are not low income housing by any means. The rents are going to be pretty significant. We charge about a dollar a square foot, which is higher or as high as the average -- sorry. It's above average rents for the area, just because of what we are providing. Are we --

Watters: We are going.

Amar: We are working on it? Okay. Well, if we can go -- go to the next slide.

Watters: It will switch slides now if you press the arrow, Kevin.

Amar: All right. If we look at the area look, then, we look at some of the compatibility next to other parts of Greenhill and we looked into Woodbridge and that portion that is adjacent to Greenhill, those two story homes are built 20 feet from the property line next to the one acre lots in Greenhill. If we look to the office building further to the Mountain West Bank or ATM branch further to the east, that parking is actually within five feet of the fence line of Greenhill. We have open space a minimum of 40 feet away to these first buildings and the majority of the size -- there is 130 feet until the first building and there are no windows, front doors -- or there are some side windows on the buildings themselves. But we have situated the buildings, so all of those active areas, the entrances and the exits -- thank you -- will not be looking upon the neighbors, they are looking internal to the project. So, if we looked in this -- in this project, the lower right-hand illustration is the -- the Mountain West Bank and it shows that that area that is adjacent to and there are pictures that are showing the fence line that is adjacent to Greenhill and you can see parking is within five feet of that. The building is actually within about 40 feet of that -- of that property line. This will be an additional hundred feet away, really the first building. There are two buildings that are closer. And, then, if you look in the bottom left-hand corner, that is the -- the homes that are adjacent to Greenhill, many are two story, they are within 20 feet of that property line. So, our transition is much greater and provides a more compatible -- more compatible project. Next slide,

Sonya, and we will talk about traffic. So, as we look at traffic studies and we had this done by a traffic engineer, this wasn't done by us, this isn't -- the traffic study was not required for this project, although in the interest of disclosing and finding out what was really going to happen, we commissioned a traffic study. The traffic on our multi-family project -- in order to incorporate and calculate those trips, is just over five vehicle trips per day per unit. On a residential it's a little over nine vehicle trips per day per unit. On office buildings it's 11 vehicle trips per day per unit. And on medical dental office it's 36 vehicle trips per day per unit and those are all people that are traveling in. So, the proposed use and the argument that traffic will be increased more than an office building because of this project, is just not true. There is much more traffic in an office setting, especially if we get into medical office settings than any of the multi-family will ever have and our intensity of traffic is much less during those peak hours. In the peak hours we have very few people relative to office buildings coming and going. In the peak hour in office buildings those people are coming to and going home from work. So, our traffic with this project is much less than any other use that is being contemplated. Sonya, could you go to the next slide? I'm sorry. The next one. This is a project not far from here. It's in Windstone Place just off of Wells Street. Currently -- this is a four acre site and about a third of it -- maybe two-thirds of, sorry. Two-thirds of it built out and about third of it is still left to be constructed. There are six dentists in this location. There is a real estate office. There is some other cosmetic type offices in this area and currently this project, according to ACHD calculations, at build out will be almost 900 vehicle trips per day. We are under 400 vehicle trips per day. I need to make sure that's right. And so -- and that's with just a four acre site versus -- versus an over five acre site and our vehicle trips are much, much less. Sonya, the next slide, please. As we went and searched on Google maps on how to get to these various items from areas in -- so, Chief Joseph Elementary, Meridian Greens Subdivision, Thousand Springs Subdivision, we searched to an address in that Windstone office complex. Google maps takes us right through Woodbridge Subdivision. So, again, if people are traveling to the dentist, if they are traveling to the bank, if they are traveling to the BSU campus, and they are living in that area, they are driving through Woodbridge Subdivision with much more intense use of traffic than will be this -- this apartment complex. We know that transition is hard for people and change is hard for people. But we also know from the compatibility spectrum residential is more compatible as residential than office and commercial is compatible with residential and most areas that is the transition that is provided, they want some low density, medium density to high density to office to an intense use commercial. That's what we are proposing here. Other projects that have recently been approved, speaking specifically of Regency -- I'm sorry. There are three story and four story buildings -- and this was just approved by the city on their last plat, right adjacent to Redfeather Subdivision. We are so much more compatible to this and I know that the neighbors here are going to say, yeah, I don't care, because I don't live there. The reality is our compatibility is greater than office buildings. Our compatibility helps the neighborhood. It provides something that the city did not have there that allows

people to work -- live where they work and it also allows that transition that it is a good neighbor as -- as illustrated by the Eberts who are now in support of this project, whereas before they were not, because this provides a better transition. We appreciate your time and we ask for your approval and I will answer any questions.

Yearsley: Thank you. Are there any questions?

McCarvel: Mr. Chairman?

Yearsley: Commissioner McCarvel.

McCarvel: What's the number of parking spots now per unit and covered and noncompacts and that kind of stuff?

Amar: So, compact we -- sorry, Commissioner Yearsley and Commissioner McCarvel. We don't have any compact spaces currently contemplated. We have one covered space per unit and we have 2.25 spaces per unit overall.

McCarvel: Okay. So, any visitor parking at all?

Amar: Yes, because that would be -- so, the requirement for parking is two spaces per -- per unit, so, yeah, we have a number of spaces simply for visitors. Excess parking if you will.

Yearsley: Any other questions? Thank you.

Amar: Thank you.

Yearsley: So, I have multiple sheets here. Trying to go through them all -- we do have all this information. It goes in the record and so your names and stuff are in there. However, I would just like to open it up to the public at this point. Is there anyone who would like to go first? Please. And, please, state your name and address for the record.

Overton: My name is John Overton. 1922 East Bowstring in Woodbridge Subdivision. Good evening, Commissioners, city staff. Several weeks ago we did this. We thought it was done. We are going to go back over some of the high points, because even though the applicant has come to you tonight and told you there is changes, those changes are worse now than they were before. When we originally talked about this we talked about zoning. The application was being explained to us as being a good transition. It was an R-15 and we were looking directly at that R-8 next door. Somehow we forgot to look at the R-1 and the R-4. Somehow we forgot to think that there was a reason the comprehensive map said L-O and R-8. R-15 is the biggest reason we fear this development is because no matter how nice they say it's going to be, with this

narrow view of how transition is being used, we have no reason to believe that you won't go one lot to the east and have application for an R-40 high density, if all we are doing is looking at the single lot and saying that's a good transition. Furthermore, if this is approved as an R-15 we have a real fear, because it is the hot selling number right now, that we are going to have more R-15s spread throughout this end of Woodbridge -- or next to Woodbridge and back up to Greenhill Estates. And I should say for the record, I did grow up in Greenhill Estates and I will talk a little bit about history. I used to park at Wells and Magic View and it was a dead end drive. My best friend lived there. Those roads have not changed in 35 years. They are still the same narrow roads. They have asphalt on them -- they did change. They asphalted the dirt. It's still a very narrow road that runs off to a runoff for snow and ice. But there have been no changes to prepare this whole area for development. It's developed one five acre parcel at a time. There has been no master plan. There has been no re-engineering to make this safe from a traffic safety perspective at any point in time. None. Let's talk about traffic. We are talking about a square mile of ground surrounded by roads with speed limits of 40 and 50 miles an hour with I-84 running through it. There is only one road that goes all the way through that square mile it happens to run through Woodbridge. It's the only road that goes east to west. It cuts through Woodbridge, splits up, comes back out to Magic View express way. Now, we get cut-through traffic every day. We have looked at the different ways to deal with this. The police have been out, they have put radar trailers out. The only solution is a massive reconstruction and engineering effort, a serious look at trying to fix this. Building issues like this, medium density, you're not helping it and I will go on to why I don't believe for two seconds most of that traffic study what was just giving to you. So, it's a big question when you face reengineering for the future is by putting a medium density residential project next to us, the moment we connect -- or the only change that was made when we connected our phase two of Woodbridge to Magic View was stop signs. Nothing else just now. There was no other change. Any future development to the east of Woodbridge will have an increase effect on our subdivision to further hamper the problems we have got that make this area unique is the fact that when you go out -- let's say you go out to the east -- let's say everybody went out to Eagle Road. Well, ACHD controls all the roads until you get to Eagle. Now you're dealing with ITD. Now you have two different entities that meet at St. Luke's Lane and ITD. Or, excuse me, Eagle Road. Let's add a little bit more of the mix, because we don't have enough traffic issues right now, so let's talk about one the highest average daily traffic counts in the Valley, comes off Eagle Road, one of the highest in entire valley -- the highest daily traffic count right now is just down the road in Fairview and Eagle. But the highest numbers are the ones coming off of Eagle Road. So, let's couple it with one more thing, because this is -- this isn't enough fun yet, let's have the fact that we have got St. Luke's Hospital right there and it is the most reset signal in the city due to all the ambulances that dispatch out of the hospital and come back in transporting patients. I'm not going to complain for one minute about what their job is, but every time they come through with their Optacon system running, they

reset that signal, backing the traffic on St. Luke's Lane up further and further. It is what it is and we deal with that currently today. So, let's talk about a little bit of history and what we do now and one of the biggest differences between the traffic study that says there is going to be fewer trips and reality. Many of us live in Woodbridge now and possibly people that live in Greenhill. We take a walk in the evenings and on weekends and several of us even nicknamed it the hotel loop, because with it being light office and the R-8 development, in the evenings there is very little traffic, but on the weekends there is, again, very little traffic. So, it's a nice place. It's an amenity. But we can walk around that area. You put a high or medium density residential project in there, two things happen. First is we are going to have round the clock traffic. They are going to be coming out -- they are going to be going to gymnastics, maybe the police department, the dog park, the speedway, City Hall, Winco, Home Depot, Flying Pie Pizzeria. Did I mention that every single one of those entities they are going to come through Woodbridge to get to? They are going to be driving through our city -- or through our subdivision more often than many of these doctors' trips that they are talking about. We don't have an on ramp and off ramp at Locust Grove and the interstate. A lot of people coming to these doctors' offices, both are destinations and you have to remember that. We are talking a destination. Someone is going for an appointment. This medium density residential development is a generator. They generate traffic out of that. They are not a destination. That's where they live. They go to work. They go to school. They go to the market. They go for entertainment. They are driving out at all different times seven days a week. One of the things we have always liked about the light office and the fact it was R-8, is the fact that when most of that traffic comes through our kids are in school Monday through Friday. We do have to face it in the summer, but in the evenings and on the weekends those medical offices are closed and we are not having to deal with all that traffic. Sure it happens during the day, but if there was a preference, that's when we want it. We don't want it 24 hours a day coming through there. Now, I have heard property rights mentioned. Not so much tonight as it was last time we were in front of you and I know it's a very big issue when it gets in front of the City Council. We want to mention it, because we think it's important. We understand the rights of a property owner to develop the property the way he wants to, but we want it on the record that this development affects several hundred other property owners who have made the single largest purchase of their lives in this community, in this city, and they are the ones -- we are the ones left to pick up the pieces left behind by this and any subsequent R-15 medium density development. Now, further on that, when we talk about traffic and you talk about apartments, you guys are seeing apartments come through this city like crazy. I see the developments coming in. They are all over the place. Within a mile there is several approved medium and high density residential apartments. They are the hot ticket right now. We get it. But none of those push traffic back through a subdivision. They are usually designed so that when the -- or when the apartment complex dumps traffic back on a road, it's dumping it on a collector street feeding into an arterial. Magic View is a collection. Eagle Road, the other roads, they are arterials. Every single road

within the Woodbridge Subdivision -- and this is directly from ACHD from Justin Lucas -- every single road is designated as a local residential street. By approving this R-15 you would be pushing -- knowingly pushing more traffic from this residential project back through another residential subdivision and increasing that traffic flow. When we look at development -- and we have had several meeting within our subdivision, just in Woodbridge -- we are not anti-development. We believe in what the Mayor said. We believe in the medical corridor. It's one of the things that drew us to this area. I have got my in-laws living with me. They need those medical offices and take advantage of all the other medical offices that get built. That was a huge advantage to us. They go for walks within our subdivision. They have to deal with the increased traffic. We are not against the development. What we are against is changing the zoning. It was done for a reason. We should stick to what the comprehensive map says, respect it, deny this application for a rezone, stick to the L-O, stick to the R-8, with the Comprehensive Plan. It was a good move by the city. It's still a good move. It's still the right decision and we think it should be respected. I stand for any questions.

Yearsley: Any questions? Thank you. If we can, please. I understand the emotions are high. If we can kind of keep the clapping down so we can get through this quicker, we would appreciate it. Is there anybody else that would like to testify?

Voorhees: My name is Jim Voorhees. I live at 208 South Ravenswood Drive in Greenhill Estates. I'm the president of Greenhill Estates Homeowners Association. I have turned into Sonya yesterday a petition saying -- a petition to deny Pope's Garden's rezoning from Ada County to the R-15 in the City of Meridian and visited with her for a few minutes and she was very helpful. She explained to me about R-2, R-4, R-8, and now R-15 and we have a petition that we sent to you and there is 64 signatures on it. All of us vehemently opposed to this residential development with 74 units in it. If you multiply it times four people you're talking 300. We have 74 homes in our 74 acre subdivision. Thank you for not allowing the road to go through our subdivision. We really appreciate that. We appreciate the three foot berm and the six foot fence and only having the little fitness building backed up there. We do appreciate that. But we don't need to change the whole -- the whole concept of where Woodbridge and Greenhill Estates have acre and half acre lots and the zoning that is already in place, let's leave it in place, please. We don't need to add that and to have all the traffic go through Woodbridge, go out onto Eagle Road and we appreciate you considering that.

Yearsley: Thank you.

Voorhees: Thank you.

Yearsley: Okay. You had your hand up first, so -- please.

Rockrohr: First of all, thank you for having us. We appreciate that and we will try to keep it quick. My name is Mary Rockrohr. I live at 2715 East Autumn Way in the Greenhill Estates. Most of my concerns have already been addressed. One area -- obviously, R-1, which is what Greenhill is, abutting up to an R-15, which is what Pope's Garden is going to be. I don't see that, despite their changes, which were a little bit better, but still it's -- it's not right at all. The transition is not there and I won't even speak of the Howell's, whose is the property just east of the development, which it is five acres with one building, and they have suddenly all these buildings right on their property line. There is no transition there whatsoever. The other areas that we would be commenting about would be the amenities that Pope's Garden talks about. They were saying that they do have the tot area, which is good. They have some open grass area. That's good also. They do have a very small building, less than 300 square feet, that's going to be part leasing office and may contain workout equipment. But that's it. As far as the high rent apartment complex, I don't see it. There is no pool. There is no clubhouse. There is no real big open space. The open space they have will be for the dog and I'm sure the dog will appreciate that area, as long as somebody cleans up after those dogs. But these people that are going to be in this -- in this project, will eventually seek out the pool at Woodbridge that Woodbridge Homeowners are paying for and you can be guaranteed that any of the kids that are visiting at Pope's Gardens or happen to reside there, aren't going to consider that at all. Those are the ones who will take the opportunity to wait to get into what they have, which is a very nice pool, but they aren't paying for it. The other areas that need to be addressed definitely is when this project goes for sale. Each one of these units are going to be sold separately. They are going to have different owners -- landowners for each one of these. Right now they will probably have one management company managing it. But as soon as you get several owners in there that cannot agree on a management company or don't particularly care about what a management company is doing -- or they will amend the CC&Rs and possibly get several different management companies in. Now suddenly you're going to have competition between management companies and if within a couple years the rents get a little bit soft, you're going to have a major competition with a lack of concern for the particular property that we are talking about. The corridor of Eagle Road is so beautiful coming off the freeway. The office complexes are great. They are concerned about their appearance. If down the road where you have different management companies coming in and possibly arguing with each other, they may not consider that at all. They may let that laps. Just try and get the rents in there and appease their landlord. The one other area would obviously be the noise as was addressed. And I take it that's my notice to quit. Anyways, thank you very much for your time.

Yearsley: Thank you. Okay. Gentleman in the --

Barber: Commissioners and staff, thank you. My name is Kelly Barber. I'm at 2482 East Autumn Way in Greenwood. Appreciate the time. I think, basically, I think Mr. Overton covered about everything most of us say. I think it was fantastic. I just want to -- not give you any of the factual stuff, but kind of take -- I think some of the big picture approach that concerns me a little bit about the developer and the representatives in the meetings that we have had and, you know, I think he mentioned emotions are kind of high. I have to say this has been a pretty low emotion meeting for the most part, whether it has been at the neighborhood meetings or here, I have been really impressed with everyone's professionalism really. Especially when we have folks that have lived there for a long period of time, but I just think the sense that I get from the developer is this notion that mistakes were made previously when -- when Woodbridge was developed and maybe there were some mistakes about the way we should have thought about traffic back then or maybe mistakes were made or -- you know, at the time the Comprehensive Plan was put together and the future uses were designated and so you have a couple bad choices and we think ours is the least bad of all those. So, we have got a bunch of problems, let's just do something that's not quite as bad as it could be and I just feel like all the things that we stand and this beautiful City Hall here and all the things that the Mayor has put out there in the articles that we all read about what a great place to live Meridian is and in my job every day I see people who are coming in that we are recruiting, coming in from other places all over the country just to live in this community because of this community and I think do we really have to be stuck with the least bad choice when we have these kind of things in front of us and so in the conversations I have had with people in our neighborhood over in Greenhill Estates -- and, again, this is -- the traffic doesn't affect me directly, it affects the Woodbridge folks and that's why I'm still here, I could just as easily be home now, because it doesn't affect me anymore. It's not right in my backyard. I'm not one of those properties that abuts up against it, but we all want that area to be developed in a way that's good for the city, that's good for the community, and that will ultimately be representative of what our community can be and I think the good things that I have heard in the conversations with neighbors is, to echo Mr. Overton's comments, people are saying, yeah, we should develop this. Let's figure out a way to do it. We have a lot of open space in there now, some of it can't be built on, so let's just -- maybe there is some things we can do with that. Maybe we can turn it into a park, maybe we can turn it into some other uses, so I don't think we are stuck in this conundrum where we just have to do something right now and I think the wisdom I think from this Commission and the last time around, I think kind of bore that out. So, I would just hope that we could have a bigger perspective on this, not get caught in the moment. Someone at the ACHD hearing brought this up and I thought it was a good example, without using specific city names, like this person did, there have been other communities in our area that have felt desperate and had to make decisions like this, because they didn't feel like they had options. We have options. We are in a good place and I think we should act like -- act like we have those options, not act like we are in a situation where there is desperation. What we are seeing here is a lot of

esthetic changes that I think are nice, but they haven't addressed the real core problem of what we really want to do with this area and the traffic that is still a huge issue and hasn't been resolved. So, thanks for your time.

Yearsley: Thank you. The gentleman in the green.

Sodine: Good evening. Thanks for inviting us over. My name is Ian Sodine and I live at 2663 East Autumn Way, Greenhill Estates. I am one of the properties that this development will back right up against. My first comment is on the berms. So, if you go to the bank at 5:00 -- to the berm and the fence for the parking lot -- there is another five feet on the other side of that berm before you get to the main irrigation ditch path for the water district. And, then, the property from the people and if you really took it into real measurements there is probably 20 feet or 25 feet. I like that they are going to put a berm in, but a berm means that it's centered. Who is taking care of the back side of the fence that butts right up against my property line and the irrigation district, running through there. So, I'm concerned about the water and making sure that I don't have run off or flow issues because they are changing the landscape and how that's going to manage water that runs through that property, then, my second is on the traffic. I appreciate that the road will not punch through, but Ada County decided that we would still have a walking path and Woodbridge has a walking path. Well, they have a sidewalk, but people still love to come into Greenhill Estates. It's a one mile loop. It's just a really nice country setting. A lot of dogs. A lot of folks. In the wintertime it becomes incredibly hazardous, because we have no sidewalks and we have no lights, so the residents in Greenhill Estates all wear flashing lights or reflective clothing. People out of Woodbridge maybe not so much. Now that they have got an apartment complex showing up it just adds to my difficulty driving of hours with my work schedule to come in and out and making sure that I don't actually have somebody walking at 5:00 in the morning or 7:00 or 8:00 at night and I'm not sure what it will bring, but I know you won't walk around that apartment complex for a mile. So, I see them still coming into my subdivision and, then, that's going to add to look at this or look at that. I'm not sure they are all thieves. I have done a lot of renting when I was in the Navy, but apartments always seem to bring some element and I'd like to minimize that if possible. Thanks very much.

Yearsley: Thank you. The gentleman in the back. Either one.

Stefan: Mr. Chairman, Commissioners. John Stefan. 566 South Thornwood Way and I'm in the Woodbridge Subdivision. I will try to be pretty succinct. I think a lot of stuff has already been summed up here by Mr. Overton specifically, kind of hit most of my bullet points anyway. But if I could just mention -- if I can do this in like three -- three points really here. The first one is what I would call predictability and what I mean by that is that there is a great number of residents here, Woodbridge and Greenhill, who purchased our homes and we -- you know, we saw the Meridian -- the city master plan and we took that in good faith that

this is how this area was going to be developed and which is one of the things that made the Woodbridge Subdivision specifically a very desirable place to live. There is accessibility, because we do connect out to Locust Grove, we do connect to Eagle Road, but in real life no one tends to really go on Eagle Road unless -- if they can avoid it at any cost. So, Woodbridge is the cut through to get to where they want to go for the most part, especially if they are moving east. In any case, there is probably a lot of people here tonight that may not have purchased their home had they known that there was going to be changes to this plan or if the plan had shown high density or medium high density and otherwise. So, I just kind of want to point that out first of all, it's about predictability and what the city's plan has been and with everybody moving in I think predictably -- predictability going forward is still an incredibly important thing to have and so that future residents can come in and they can understand what the long range vision for the tenth fastest growing city in the United States, you know, is going to do. So, the next one is the word just precedent and it's -- honestly, I think the design and their revised design is a lot more obtrusive than the -- than the original. It still I don't believe has a great transition from R-15 with an R-1 on the subdivision right on the other side. However, approval of a zone change like this sets a precedent that will culminate in two years, in five years. That precedent means that we do one, then, it's going to be awfully hard to say -- to deny another one if another R-15 wants to go next door or if it's something even higher density wants to come in as far as residential and creates the final kind of problem here, which you heard strongly or numerous times, so I won't hammer on it, but it's the traffic flow and in all of this, looking at how this would set a precedent and this area is going to be developed and it's going to grow, there have been no solutions and the one thing I have not heard is a lot of -- there is a lot of people talking about traffic, there is a lot of people -- but, honestly, there has been no solutions presented. ACHD doesn't have them. The city doesn't have them. No one -- the developer, no one is putting them forward and that, obviously, as you're seeing, is one of the main concerns. Again, we have to stop meeting like this, so I thank you guys for your time.

Yearsley: Thank you. Gentlemen over on this side. Try and mix it up a little bit.

Sharp: I'm Dale Sharp. 2170 East Springwood Drive, Greenhill Estates. I'm opposed to any zone change. This has been zoned that way forever, ever since I have been there. That's ten years and there is other people here it's been longer. And to make this high density up against our established residents that we have, family residents, one acre and half acres, both Woodbridge and Greenhill Estates. As far as traffic concerns, I'm not affected like Woodbridge is, but I see traffic safety concerns in my neighborhood all the time. Sometimes I think the police department has their headquarters over at Foothill Estates, which is right across Franklin from where I live. I live right on the corner of Wetherby and Springwood and I see police going in that Foothills Estates all the time. So, I think, well, maybe they moved their headquarters from over here to over there. And another thing, there is few instances that I have -- I have been a victim of

and I have seen other people be a victim of. People have traversed my east property line, which is an acre, all the way across to Springwood coming from -- on the north side to the south side. And another time somebody took out the neighbor's mailbox at Franklin to come around over by my property -- the ruts were that deep and, then, they went around and hit the fence of my neighbor and took it out and that's where he was when the police came and the police came and knocked on my door and I said knock it off -- it was about 2:00 o'clock in the morning and I didn't know who it was. But I know the policeman. So, anyway, we were friends with his folks. He said, well, get your shoes on, I want to show you something. So, I went out there and they were that deep where the guy had gone through there and, then, went over and met the -- took out the neighbor's fence. Another time a couple came around and went down west and before you turn the corner they hit the house on the -- went over their lawn, hit the house on the corner and damaged their house, their fireplace, they had to replace all that. Another time I had --

De Weerd: If you can wrap it up quickly, please. Your time is up.

Sharp: Another time a young fellow -- it was wintertime, he was going a little faster even than weather would permit and he zeroed in on our neighbor's and my mailbox, which is across the street, and he threw a direct strike. Anyway, we had to resurrect that -- he did pay for the -- for that. Then there is -- I'm aware of two of our neighbors that had been broken into just recently and so, you know, there is lots that goes on traffic safety and if you put it all -- a dwelling for what is being proposed here, we are going to have issues that -- not only traffic, but safety and as far as another -- any access, we don't need an emergency access -- another one from Hickory over to -- from Greenhill Estates to Woodbridge. We have got a --

Yearsley: Sir.

Sharp: -- pedestrian path --

Yearsley: I'm sorry, but your time is up. We need to end it quickly, please.

Sharp: Okay. Just a second. We only have -- we only have one down -- and just about straight across from where I live over on Autumn Way and -- and as far as access, the police are going to Woodbridge or they are going to come around Locust Grove, to Franklin, and come into Greenhill. And as far as the fire department or ambulance, they are going to come down Franklin, turn on Locust Grove, go down to Woodbridge, or they are going to come straight down and come into -- to Greenhill Estates or they can come from the hospital over there. So, I think all these arguments for this is nil. Thank you.

Yearsley: Thank you. The gentleman over here in the blue.

Peterson: Hi. My name is Ron Peterson. I live at 503 South Thornwood Way in Meridian, Idaho, in Woodbridge Subdivision. You have heard a lot about the traffic, a lot about property values. I believe that everybody has -- or should have a right to develop as they see fit. I do not believe that this is harmonious with our development and the other development around us. And particularly where I live -- we are at the end of Woodbridge Street where it turns left. We have had three cars hit my front yard. We have had tire tracks through our yard. We have had our mailbox knocked down. So, traffic is really a big issue. I have an eight year old daughter and in the evenings we will go and we walk and we walk to the pool and increasing traffic in the evening hours is really a big concern of ours. Property values being the second. So, hope you take them into consideration and thank you for your time.

Yearsley: Thank you. The lady up front.

Smith: Hello. My name is Katie Smith. Thank you for your time. I live in the Woodbridge Subdivision. My address is 496 South Thornwood Way, which is the corner of Bowstring and Thornwood Way, which is the second -- there is two 90 degree turns from off Bowstring. The second 90 degree turn is my house. I bought my house about eight months ago. It was my dream house for my family. Our first house. We have a beautiful, large lot. I have three young children ages eight, five and three. However, sadly, I feel as a mother that I can never let them play outside. Even when I'm with them, which is always, I feel like I have to hold their hands for their protection. There is constant traffic throughout the day, especially at night during rush hour, but even during the day there is constant traffic. I feel there has been times just backing out of my driveway where I have almost been hit by people zooming around the corner. The visibility is very low and the people treat it like a highway, they speed right through there. I just -- as a mom I fear for the children in this neighborhood, especially with the development the traffic will only get worse. Many of the driveways in our area are slanted, balls can easily roll down them and children will chase them and I would hate for my children or any children in our neighborhood to get seriously injured or worse if safety issues are not resolved. Thank you.

Yearsley: Thank you. The lady in the back.

Somazzi: Hi. My name is Lorrie Somazzi. I live at 1896 East Bowstring Street. Although the changes are better I think that before, we still have to take into consideration where Magic View changes into Wells Drive. If you put two areas to get out of the subdivision, if you have ever droven on Magic View where Wells turns, the visibility is very poor. That stop sign, if you want to check with the city, how many times they replace it every winter, because I swear if there is any snow on the road that stop sign on the corner of Wells and Magic View gets taken out on a regular basis. It's -- like John said -- John Overton said, it needs to be redeveloped, that road, for the development. I also am speaking from a

person who was in a city that is the fastest -- one of the fastest growing cities in the U.S., but it's scary -- we have a hospital that we have built -- which St. Luke's Boise is considering potentially moving stuff out to Meridian if they can't build and we are going to run into the same problem in Meridian, that we are going to lose our healthcare that we rezone healthcare stuff across the street, because they have a Meridian campus where we need to. I also -- the fact that there is no ability when you leave our subdivision on Locust Grove to put a light there, because of how close we are to Watertower needs to be considered, because if you're getting more and more traffic through that area and there is no ability -- I challenge you to come there at 8:00 o'clock in the morning when there is rush hour traffic or 5:00 o'clock in the evening and make a left-hand turn safely. It's not -- it's easier, actually, to drive around than risk your life and for those reasons I'm against it. Thank you.

Yearsley: Thank you. How about the lady standing up? She tried to come up earlier, so --

Jones: I'm Kathryn Jones. 435 South Truss, Woodbridge, and I have looked at the same traffic generators that our developer has looked at. Those are meant to be guidelines. They are not meant for all situations. Woodbridge is in a very special location. If you have driven through there you will know that we are a beautiful, green oasis in the middle of a bustling area between Locust Grove and Eagle Road. The problem is Woodbridge Drive and our street become a cut through. The people that cut through do not care about the speed limits that we have set, 25 miles an hour. My elderly mother, 89 years old, decided that she could go to get her lab test by herself. Well, she went out on our streets and should have been able to access St. Luke's Driveway and get over for her medical test. While she was driving the speed limit she was cut off by someone passing her on one of our streets. That was dangerous. The other thing. I received a phone call today, as a matter of fact, asking if I would support St. Luke's Boise accessing Jefferson Street. The medical -- the medical community needs a way to grow and to grow sensibly. We need those areas to remain light medical office. We do not need more traffic. The other thing is the traffic study was looking at traffic going

-- I'm sorry, I'm mixing this up a little bit. But it did not look at the traffic that will be going west, going to Winco, to Home Depot, to their dog park, to the -- to the parks over there. You can tell I'm emotional and I'm older, I don't have children, but I would hate to sacrifice one of our beautiful Woodbridge Children for a short-sighted vision. Now, I know you are all intelligent people and I hope that you will look at all the parameters and not just look at a developer that wants to make money. We need -- we need to plan to remain as it is, the zoning to remain as it is and I'm hoping that you will do that for us. Thank you.

Yearsley: Thank you. The gentleman in the front.

Vance: Hello, Members. My name is Ronald L. Vance. I live at 2621 East Autumn Way in Greenhill Estates and as you can see by a map there I live right across the fence, smack in the middle, between Ian and Bill. I have a few concerns about this proposed change. The traffic, obviously, doesn't affect me, because of the -- we stopped the Hickory Way item. But a berm -- a three foot high berm on disturbed land with a fence on it, is going to be a windbreak maybe. More like it's going to be blown over by some of the high winds we have had, unless they have got some really long posts that go down into undisturbed land. The other concerns -- one is the fact that the commercial would be more than likely a five day a week, Monday through Friday, daylight only. The apartments are going to be 24/7 noise and in my nearly 70 years I have noticed one thing about apartments and that is they deteriorate to the point where in many cases they turn out to be eyesores, they turn out to be generators of vandals. The criminal element moves in. The values drop in the neighborhood. The major concern that I have is that I live in a nice country type of an atmosphere now and even if the fence was to withstand the wind, it wouldn't withstand the -- the kids jumping over the fence and vandalizing the property. The -- the other factor, really, that I mentioned a minute ago was the 24/7 noise that's going to be generated by the -- the neighborhood and the music being blared 24/7 and I know there are ordinances against it, but that doesn't stop it. And I agree this plan is better than the previous plan, but it's still a change from what we expected when we moved into this property and I oppose the zoning change and the whole option -- dentist office, medical office, they would be open during the day, we wouldn't have any problems at night at all. Thank you.

Yearsley: Thank you. The lady in the back. You.

Fox: I'm Celeste Fox. 582 South Woodhaven, Meridian, in Woodbridge. Good evening, Commissioners. I'm really impressed with the thought and care that went into creating Meridian's Comprehensive Plan. This document seeks to encourage health and well-being of community and to evaluate the impact of growth in all land use decisions for existing, as well as future residents. We don't understand why P&Z staff recommended approval for this project in their staff report. The city's emphasis high density housing in this location is trying to fit a square peg in a round hole. We understand the housing to accommodate medical offices and businesses should be in areas that make sense and this does not. In the Comprehensive Plan examples for apartments showed direct road access, not one that requires driving through a single family subdivision. This is about trust. When I bought my house in 2003 we trusted that offices would be our neighbors. Office is defined as opportunities for low impact business areas. P&Z staff report doesn't consider Woodbridge or Greenhill Estates. It's like we don't exist. But we do exist and we need to be cared about. Woodbridge is a wonderful combination of varying size and price of homes that allows families to move up to larger homes or retirees to down size without having to leave the community. We consider Woodbridge a model for what

Meridian is looking for. I'm asking you to, please, see us, see our unique setting and what the overall impact that rezoning would have to us. Thank you.

Yearsley: Thank you. The gentleman here in the front.

Ballard: Chairman Yearsley, Commissioner Oliver, Commissioner McCarvel, my name is David Ballard. I reside at 2482 East Springwood. It's the corner of Hickory and Springwood just off of Franklin. I'm in Greenhill Estates. The area to the south is landlocked, the undeveloped lots. Through no fault of our own. But they are landlocked. But there is tremendous pressure to develop this. There is other places in the city with the same concerns. We are going to develop these in-fills if you will. Let me suggest that an alternate route could be developed to become like a frontage road along the freeway and at Bentley and Locust Grove where there is a stoplight. There is a way to get into those lots, albeit round about, but you need access to Locust Grove. I think that would release some pressure off of Woodbridge. I have heard a lot of comments tonight about please go back to the board to restructure some roads, restructure how you get there, build the road, but give some thought about coming off of Bentley on the stoplight and getting to these areas with new roads. Appreciate your time.

Yearsley: Thank you. The lady in the back.

Stoffle: Didn't think this was every going to happen. Thank you. My name is Andrea Stoffle and I live at 669 South Crosstimber Avenue in Woodbridge. We moved into Woodbridge in 2004. We have also -- we have owned two homes in Woodbridge. We moved up, like Celeste was saying, from a smaller home to a larger home, because we loved the community, we love the close-knit, tight community that it is. My concerns that I have with the development such as this is -- my number one is the overcrowding of schools that we already have in this area. My son's class had 34 students at one time for one teacher, which I feel is extremely high. Adding a property such as this with high density housing is going to create more overcrowding for schools that already exist with overcrowding. Our main residential street that comes through on Woodbridge drive has a sidewalk only on the north side of the road, which means anyone living on the south side of Woodbridge Drive has to cross one of the main streets that people are coming through in our subdivision, which includes all the children that have to catch the bus, which is currently -- we have one stop in one part of the subdivision and one stop in the other. At both of those stops we have approximately 40 kids get on the bus each time getting on or off in the morning and, then, afternoon. I don't let my kids go to the bus by themselves, because we have to cross Woodbridge Drive and I have had times in the morning where I can't even cross the street. The cars will not stop. Usually it's cars that I recognize that live in there that will actually stop and waive me through, but probably when my kids are in high school I will be walking them to the bus every day just with the impact of how many cars come through during the peak. The

other thing I wanted to mention in the map that you have on here, we have several areas within a mile that are already zoned R-15 or R-40. To the north of the Mormon church we have an extremely large apartment development getting ready to be put in where they have leveled out the land and they are just waiting for it to make sure before they can build on it. That's going to have over 300 apartments and all of those units are going to have immediate access onto a main arterial road with no cutting through anybody's subdivision. Another parcel just came up for sale in the last two weeks on the southwest corner of Franklin and Locust Grove that's also -- the seller is pushing for multi-use family housing. And, again, that's another area that's given immediate access to Franklin or Locust Grove when those developments get in. So, within a mile of us they are not going to bother us. It's not going to influence are neighborhood at all. My biggest concern overall is just the kids and the traffic, the type of traffic this is going to -- this is going to create 24 hours a day, versus what others have said, 8:00 to 5:00. On the weekend I feel safe letting my kids go out to the common area to play and don't feel like I have to worry about them getting hit by a car. But, like I said, during the day during business hours they are pretty much not out, even though they are eight and ten. That's it. Thank you.

Yearsley: Thank you. Right here in the middle.

Ketlinski: Good evening. I'm Kelly Ketlinski. I live at 2586 East Autumn Way in the Greenhill Estates and I just reiterate the comments that have already been made and I will not go over them again. I will add to the last speaker's comments that the transmittal from the school district, her point that the school -- this -- even this development will have an impact on the local -- on the schools that are right by there and that is in your -- in the staff report. Also I want to point out in the traffic study that was commissioned by the developer -- I believe he said they pay for the traffic study, that from Thompson was number 12/2015, he says in summary, Daniel Thompson, that is the engineer, in summary the traffic from this site will primarily travel east to Eagle Road and should not adversely impact the neighborhood to the west and I don't know what that is based on. The last time we were here we heard testimony from one of the residents of Woodbridge saying that there was a loaded dump truck that came through the neighborhood, rather than -- it was 200 feet from Eagle Road and it came through Woodbridge, rather than go to Eagle Road to avoid that. My other -- I guess I just really just wanted to reiterate that as has been brought up, other apartments in the area do have more direct access to collectors and arterials. The transition that was discussed -- or the buffer that was discussed, the development said that the homes in Woodbridge are like 120 feet from the property and they are two stories, but this one is going to be significantly farther in places, but if you look at the density it's much different, it's R-4 in Woodbridge, which even going way back to when it was developed, R-4, the overall density of Woodbridge is less than R-4, because they have so many open spaces. That's kind of how they developed that area. So, the density is a lot less than it will be in this -- even though it's a bigger buffer, the density is just completely different. Parking is an

issue. I lived in an apartment when I graduated from college. I had three roommates, we all had cars, it was a two bedroom apartment, and to say that 2.5 parking spaces is going to be adequate in an apartment complex, they say that they are at the maximum, that the City of Meridian had a maximum of parking spaces in apartment complexes, because they want to encourage people to ride their bikes and walk, which is a wonderful goal. Not real realistic. And I guess the -- my -- going back to what Carl Miller said from COMPASS, death by a thousand cuts, it kind of seems appropriate for this situation. This is one development in this area that will, as has been discussed, leads to more development. We need to figure out a remedy for this before those thousand cuts start and I guess a few of them already have with some development that's in there, but let's fix this before it becomes a real problem. Thank you.

Yearsley: Thank you. This gentleman right here in the front.

Elhe: Good evening. Hi. Kevin Elhe and I live at 738 South Tiburon in Woodbridge. I want to quickly talk about a different complex called Heron Village. I'm sure you're aware of Heron Village. It's on -- it's off of Meridian Road off of Blue Heron. Blue Heron is a little dead end road and they built a large apartment complex right there and it's next to Blue Heron Road and it is a retirement condos, probably, I don't know, 30 units maybe. Well, my mother happens to live there and ten years ago she bought that condo and she's very happy and everybody in that area is basically elderly and so they have walking paths up and down Blue Heron, because it's a dead end road. Well, Heron Village moved in, they are a large complex. It's a nice looking complex, actually. They have actual garages, they have carports, they have visitor parking. Well, unfortunately, it's not enough. They are parking up and down the dead end road, Blue Heron, on both sides of the road, all day, all night, all the time and there was no access -- trying to come up from Meridian Road out of that is a joke, so -- now they are piled up. It used to just be the retirees, now it's -- I'm not sure, probably because other people live in there. Also in that -- also you're talking about the area -- they are also seeing many kids going through there that have sketchy characters who live there, having their junky cars down the dead end. They are afraid to now walk up and down there -- that road and, then, my mom is like good -- like trying to sell my condo. Nobody is going to buy this thing. It's a joke right now. So, that's a little more extreme than what we are talking about over here, but we will have people coming from the apartment complex into our Woodbridge area, they will be jumping the fence in the pool. We all know that. It actually happens today, even though we are pretty landlocked from other neighborhoods. I don't know who these people are, but I saw them at 9:30 at night, I saw two kids in there and turns out their parents dropped them off so they could jump the fence and swim in our pool and so it's shocking to me, but that was a -- that's a true story. And so I'm a little nervous about the apartment dwellers. You have nice families moving in, however, it's unpredictable. These are renters. They are not -- not homeowners. It's a different element. We all know that. And, again, based on my mom's story, who lives next to this brand new complex, right, they

figured it's got to bring in some good quality people, unfortunately, there is pretty scary people there and I don't want them going through the neighborhood and -- I mean to be honest, the concern for me -- and also the property value, but the last time I was here I mentioned if this gets okayed and they are going to build this development, I will move the Eagle. I said that last time. Still goes. I think it's a - - you know, building a small town outside the entrance to your -- your neighborhood is, you know, two to three hundred people in Idaho is a town by the way, so -- there is a lot --

De Weerd: If you could wrap it up, please, I would appreciate it.

Elhe: Yeah. I know. Thank you. That's all I had to talk about. You can't always -- I'm not going to say you can't always trust them, you can't always believe or -- what these developers are telling you. This whole thing on parking and all and their best case scenario -- it's not true. It just doesn't work out for the most part. Thank you.

Yearsley: Thank you. The gentleman in the back.

Belliston: I'm Brent Belliston. I live at 25 Autumn Way in Greenhill. I would just remind you of the -- the decisions we were going through last March and everything that was presented there. What all the developers have presented tonight really hasn't changed the basis of what each of you voted unanimously in March. Some of the primary considerations of course as we talk about traffic for Greenhill -- excuse me -- through Woodbridge. It wasn't a good transition. That was one of your primary decisions and you felt very strongly that a manager of one unit managing different owners apartments would not be feasible, you said that never would work. So, I just remind you of that wonderful decision you made last March and hope you reflect on the decisions of why you made that same basis. We don't feel anything that the developers have presented tonight really changes the essence of the main reason why it was rejected last time. Thank you.

Yearsley: Thank you. The gentleman in the yellow.

Tebow: Good evening. Hi. My name is Roger Tebow. I own the approximately 4.9 acres that's just south of the proposed development and I'm in a little different position than most of the people that have spoken here tonight and they have covered a lot of the points that I might make about the -- what I feel is an inappropriate scar on what the city's original plan had been, medical or office corridor adjoining the housing that's there now. Recently I had one of the -- a major realtor from this area who stopped by with -- and introduced us to a client that happened to be from Salt Lake and so we were -- they were talking about looking for something to develop medical office on and when I mentioned -- or they knew about the apartments, because I guess they have been checking into properties there locally and so they were aware of it, but they were dismayed that

a project like this would even be -- would be being considered when the city had appropriated this area -- or designated I might say for usage of office space, light office, medical office. I think commercial is mentioned, but I haven't really heard about much commercial unless it was incidental to the office usage, so any commercial that might go if you're a doctor's office and you're selling anything from your office that might be considered commercial, but as far as any commercial development per se I haven't heard of any and I just appreciate all the comments that the good folks have made here, many of them whom I have met recently in the last couple of years and I appreciate your time and the ability to present my comments. Thank you very much.

Yearsley: Thank you. This lady in the back.

Nanney: Good evening. My name is Gloria Nanney and I live at 763 South Thornwood Way. We have been here about ten years now and we came, like many retired people, to be near our son and our grandchildren. We live -- I would call it on the Eagle side of the canal and Bowstring and Thornwood Way are the two major streets that take people from the medical area to Locust Grove and I have been thinking lately about the safety of the children who live in this neighborhood. We have talked briefly about them. Where we live on the Eagle side of the canal there are about 56 to 60 small children who live in that part of Woodbridge. Most of them are in elementary school. Some are in middle school and some are not yet in school and as I see them on their bicycles and scooters scooting all around the neighborhood and see the traffic that we have now, it's very concerning to me. But when I think of the increase of traffic that will come through this development, not just on Monday through Friday, but seven days a week and not from 8:00 in the morning until 5:00, but much later. It's very dangerous and very and very concerning and I want you to think about that. Think about the safety of these young children. Thank you.

Yearsley: Thank you. The gentleman in the back.

Andrews: Thank you. Excuse me. Larry Andrews. 2330 East Autumn Way, a 40 plus year resident of Greenhill Estates. I have been through several of these, obviously, the concept of transition has always made sense and I admit R-1 to R-15 is a transition, but I don't think that's what we bought into. My understanding as a neighbor that the R-8 just to the west of this development is single family patio homes. So, to me it kind of redefines what transitional means to put that kind of density in the middle of a residential slash office area. That's really all I wanted to say. Thank you.

Yearsley: Thank you. Anybody else? Thank you. Are -- are you going to speak as the applicant or as a -- you can come forward.

Brown: For the record Ken Brown. 3161 East Springwood, Meridian, Idaho. When we submitted this application we asked for the comp plan amendment and

it's been discussed many times, but at the time that was put there the L-O zone allowed for residential. The Waverly Place Subdivision is an example of that. L-O -- and if I understand it correctly, wouldn't allow the R-8 that these people are very happy with. It wouldn't allow that. That's a recent change to your ordinance where you have removed from the L-O the -- that use. It is the only zone that the City of Meridian has that allows for and, in fact, in our pre-app meeting one of the comments from staff was we could submit for a request to change the L-O or we could do a comp plan amendment. Most of the zones -- most of the office zones that we deal with the many cities throughout the valley, we are allowed to do residential in those zones. The reason that you always ask for a concept, even with that first hearing that you had tonight, was so that you understand why you're annexing and what you're getting and so I think with -- if we had a different site plan and we had units up tight against Greenhill Estates and weren't putting in a berm and a buffer, your staff report -- there was a number of discussions about the berm. They are asking for a retaining wall to be placed there and then -- so, it's kind of a half of a berm and, then, a fence to be put on top. The other part that I wanted to speak to is that across the street from us on Magic View, those commercial zones do allow for residential and those -- those are possibilities. You have a difficult decision. Difficult because of how Woodbridge has developed. When I testified before the highway district -- and believe helped make the connection go away, when Woodbridge went in it was at an end of a dead end road being Locust Grove. When Jabil came in the city petitioned the applicants to build that bridge or the overpass and that totally changed the dynamics of what we are seeing in this areas. So, yes, people do want to go to the east as it fluctuates on what Eagle Road is. I live one house off of Eagle Road in the Greenhill Estates Subdivision. Many times instead of driving through my own neighborhood to go to Winco or to Home Depot, I go out onto Eagle Road, because there is less traffic. It's like water, you -- you flow -- you flow according to what has the least resistance. You have many stop signs and turns. Getting onto Locust Grove as they are discussing, those things come up. I know I need to wrap up, but it actually is faster for me to go on the interstate -- not all the time, but on certain times and specifically usually in the evening after the rush traffic, if you will, and the day to day traffic is gone, I can go very easily to Winco and to Home Depot and those areas on Meridian Road. That you.

Yearsley: Thank you. The gentleman in the back.

Fox: My name is Gene Fox. I live at 582 South Woodhaven. My wife and I have lived there for 12 years now. I had very eloquent statements to present to you, but I'm not going to. However, I would like to speak to what the last gentleman spoke to. Waverly Place -- and I was part of the group that spoke in favor of Waverly Place. They had to have approval. They had to have approval here at P&Z to get a zoning change and they had to have approval of the City Council to get a zoning change. They couldn't just go in there and build. Now, if this group was doing an R-5 project, I would probably stand before you and speak in favor of it also, but I cannot. So, thank you very much.

Yearsley: Thank you. Is there anybody else? Thank you. Would the applicant like to come forward?

Amar: Good evening. Again for the record my name is Kevin Amar. Do I need to restate my address?

Yearsley: Please. If you would.

Amar: My address is 1548 West Cayuse Creek Drive in Meridian. We have heard lots of testimony and a few items I would like to address and talk about this project specifically as it relates to a few things. Traffic. The change in what we are presenting tonight versus what we presented back in March and why that change makes this project better and what the impacts of this project will be versus -- versus other uses within this. Let's talk about first this project versus what was presented back in March and we have heard that there hasn't been much change. Here is what we did change. We have eliminated an access point onto Greenhill, so there will be no traffic going through Greenhill at this point. There may be some foot traffic as a requirement from ACHD, but there will be no vehicular traffic cutting through to Greenhill from this project. We have also eliminated a number of units. We have fewer units in this project and this proposal than we did back in March. We have completely eliminated any living units along the northern boundary, that boundary that is adjacent to Greenhill. We have also increased amenities and we have increased open space. The open space on this project is 1.84 acres on a 5.2 acre project. So, it's over 30 percent of this project is actually open space. That is a large amount of open space for any development, whether it's single family residential or multi-family residential. We did that, because we want to create a nice project. We want to create something that people that live in and stay in and have places to go and create, understanding that people will come and go. Now, let's talk about traffic. We have heard that traffic will be more in the evening hours with this project than others. That may be true. But 75 percent of his traffic, according to a traffic study -- and that's all we have to go off of -- will go east to Eagle Road. Some traffic will go west. Currently those residents in Woodbridge and other areas use these public roads to go east or west, depending on the area that they need to travel. We see through the traffic study that -- that people will travel -- 75 percent of those a.m. and p.m. peak hour trips will go to -- they will go to the east to Eagle Road. This slide illustrates that. There are daily a.m. trips 107 vehicle trips in the a.m. hours. I'm sorry. Eight trips will go -- daily there is 107 trips that will go to the west, 323 trips that will go to the east. In the a.m. it says there is eight trips, in the p.m. it says there are -- I'm sorry. A.m. there is eight trips that go to the west, 25 trips that go to the east. When we did a real world study of Windstone we went and talked to those -- those people that are in there. Currently the dentist see about 500 people a day. Between -- I'm sorry. Two hundred and fifty people a day. Five hundred vehicle trips -- or six dentists. They can all see about 50 people, although they are not always maximized. The

office in there sees about 300 people a day. Office projects have greater intense use of -- of people traveling than homes. Let's look at compatibility. If we can look at our next slide here. So, we went out and took some photos -- this is standing on the property -- on the subject property where we desire to build the -- the multi-family project and this is standing at about the nearest location within the project looking back to the north, looking at the houses that abut us this is, obviously, a high berm or a fence and this illustrates that vision that those people are going to see without additional landscaping from the project. Jeremy, the next slide. This is standing at the location of what was going to be a connecting street to Greenhill and looking back to the south at the project and we -- you can see the tops of those roofs and see what -- what that vision is going to look like from that street in Greenhill. So, we talked about compatibility and we talked what we tried to do. We are -- we are trying to be a good neighbor. We understand that change is difficult for everybody. We understand that with additional -- with additional development comes additional traffic, but also with additional development comes the improvements necessary to make those roads better. This project will require to improve both Magic View, as well as Wells on the portion that our property fronts. We have located our access points -- if you can go to the site plan. We have located our access points, understanding that we need to get approval for the eastern access point, because we are accessing a collector, but we use that as our main access point. That will be our visually enhanced main access point with an island trying to bring people in there, trying to bring people into the collector. We need a secondary access point, so there is one on Magic View -- it's a smaller, more narrow access point trying to keep people on the access to the collector. We have heard some of the neighbors say people drive on the collector to an arterial. We agree with that. That's what we are trying to do with this project. People will go to the collector, hopefully, and off the arterial. I live in a subdivision that is right next to an apartment complex. It's a much larger apartment complex than this. We had lots and lots of neighbors that were up in arms that this was going to change the area and, really, it hasn't affected us much at all. But what it's done is it's created a really nice project next to our subdivision, next to our homes. I know many people that live there, they come to my house, nobody has stolen anything from me. It's a really, really great project. With this project we know it can be the same. We are creating the amenities that are necessary to create that high value project. We really appreciate your time tonight and with that I would stand for any questions.

Yearsley: Thank you. Are there any questions? I have one. And I don't know if you know it or not, how was that 75-25 -- is that off of statistics? How was that created? I mean to estimate the differences between the two -- which way they are going to go? Did you have an idea of that?

Amar: Understanding I'm not a traffic engineer, but I will try to interpret what I have learned over the years. Traffic studies are different, because they are a projection of what's going to happen in the future. What they use -- history and they use where traffic patterns and travel is going to go from the past and that's

why we have statistics like 5.62 units. That also allows them to say where are people going to travel from this project? Are people going to go to the freeway? Are they going to go to shopping centers and how -- what's the easiest way to get there. There is certain times of the day that certainly Eagle Road is really congested. Eagle Road works phenomenally for what it is. It's a major collector through our -- arterial, rather, through our city and you can get on and off it into our city very quickly. So, that is simply generated from statistics and how things - - how things work throughout the --

Yearsley: Okay. So, there were a couple of comments that I have from -- can you address the property management company and if you have a berm with a fence on it how will the berm on the back side be maintained. I think those were the two questions that I don't know have been really addressed.

Amar: Yes. So, Commissioner Yearsley -- Chairman Yearsley, the property management company -- we have done a number of these projects. We do write in the CC&Rs that one property management company has to be used. Granted, that can be changed, but it requires a super majority. We can go further and require in a development agreement that a single property management company has to be used. Our reason for that is projects are maintained better when there is one property management company. As far as ownership, we have sold projects like this to one ownership group and we have sold projects like this to multiple ownerships. This project isn't for sale yet, because, quite frankly, we don't have a project, so it's hard to sell anything. But we know whether it's one ownership or multiple ownership or multiple ownerships, there is things within the CC&Rs that will require maintenance, there is things within the dues that require a fee to maintain some of the items within the subdivision. The property management company has to be one property management company only. Now, all the residents can get together and change from property management company A -- or rather the owners from property management A to B, but it still has to be maintained by one property management company.

Yearsley: Okay.

Amar: So, we have done that a couple of ways in the past. One of the most successful ways was -- so, let me give you the two options. Either we give the ground to those neighbors, if that's something that they want to take behind the fence and it's deeded to them free and clear, or we maintain it as a common area and it has to be maintained on a regular basis, just like any other common area within the subdivision. We know it will be behind a fence. We will have to provide access to that, but it's something that has to be maintained like -- like any other common area. It will be grassed and it will have probably a fescue on it versus a lower cut grass, but it's still something that's not going to be a weedy area, simply because it needs to look nice for the -- for the project.

Yearsley: Okay. And, then, in looking at this property did you consider commercial office space?

Amar: We did. And here is what we came up with on commercial office spaces. Windstone, which is a project which we talked about, has sat since 2006, I believe, and if you want to build an office space in there you can still go buy an office lot within that project. This project -- this area is designed for future office, medical and other things. There is so much land out here that it will be years and years before all of this develops into office and medical. I know some of the neighbors would love that. It would be really helpful. But we know that there is a definite requirement for housing in this area. We picked this area for housing knowing that we are next to neighbors, knowing that we are next to Woodbridge, knowing that we need to do something to address compatibility, but doing it because there is a definite demand for this. They have mentioned other projects in the area. There is a project off of Locust Grove next to the LDS church. It's 16 buildings. It's 60 units. That still will not meet the demand for this area. There is people that work here currently that they have to drive here, they have to commute. The influx of people from the p.m. hours who are in this area to the a.m. hours is in the tens of thousands. Meaning people are driving through this area to work. Well, if we can capture some of those people and get them to live here, then, that's going to reduce traffic and that's one of the largest considerations that we have in building an apartment -- or a project like this in this area.

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

Oliver: Mr. Chairman?

Yearsley: Commissioner Oliver.

Oliver: Just a couple real quick. Just -- there is an application process that goes on when someone comes in to rent one of these apartments. If each independent owner would have his own application process that would be as though you had like eight owners?

Amar: No, sir. So, the purpose of having a single property management company is to uniformize that application process. So, if one owner, maybe he owns the building outright, so he doesn't have to get full rent and another owner, maybe he has a mortgage on his, so he has to get full rents, because he needs to pay his mortgage, we don't want the battle between property -- or between building owners to see who can lower the rent the most in order to get that tenant. We also don't want the battle of one property owner requires one security deposit versus a different property owner requiring a different security deposit. All of that is uniform. Is for the entire project and that's part of what that property manager will do and that's part of what we set up in the CC&Rs that you cannot require one rent versus requiring a different rent. We go for a market rent and

we -- all the building owners would have to vote on it and agree to it and that market rent will rule the day on what is going to be asked for. The background checks the same thing. The security deposits the same thing. All of those items would be uniform throughout the project.

Oliver: And what did you foresee as the average cost per month per each apartment?

Amar: So, we projected these will be about 950 dollars a month per apartment.

Oliver: That's for a one bedroom?

Amar: It's a two bedroom. But one unit. Yes.

Oliver: Okay. Thank you.

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

Amar: Thank you.

Yearsley: At this time I would entertain a motion to close the public hearing on CUP -- or on -- I'm sorry -- H-2016-0006.

Oliver: Mr. Chairman?

Yearsley: Commissioner Oliver.

Oliver: I'd like to move to close the agenda on H-2016-0006.

McCarvel: Second.

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

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

Yearsley: Well, I guess it's time for us to weigh all of our options and to come up with a decision. Anybody want to go first on this?

Oliver: Mr. Chairman?

Yearsley: Commissioner Oliver.

Oliver: This is another really a tough one, especially since it seems it was just not too long ago we talked about this. One comment I want to make is that when my wife and I first got married we were renters. We had no place to go. And I

notice that somebody made a remark about calling criminal element in apartments, I felt like that's hopefully not me. I needed a place to start out and that was a good place for us to start was in a rental. So, it gave us an opportunity. I live in a community -- you know, a small subdivision where I have renters up and down the block in homes. Renters are everywhere. They need a place to live, just like the rest of us. We all can't afford an acre or a half an acre lot, sometimes we are just in the movement to where we need to have to be stationed here for a while and, then, to move on. But to think of it as all of those people being criminal elements because they need an apartment I think is wrong thinking, in my opinion. I took a little offense to that, because, like I say, I was a renter. Fortunately I was able to buy a house and move on. But I look at this and think that this is -- this is a much better presentation than we saw previously. I do like the buffer by Greenhill. It's much nicer looking. I like the little pathway going through. I like the green area in the center. I think it looks much nicer. My -- my gut tells me that this can work and it will probably work, but I have to go back to what I said in making my motion in March, that it's a big jump to go from office to R-15. So, I'm still conflicted right now and I'd like to hear what everybody else has to say about it.

McCarvel: Mr. Chairman?

Yearsley: Commissioner McCarvel.

McCarvel: I think in and of itself it is a better plan if it was somewhere else. I just think -- I go back to the mindset of what we dealt with last time and how many of those issues have been addressed and how many haven't and one of the biggest things for me was abiding by the integrity of the current zone that this is just too big of a jump in zones. It's still -- I used the term last time it's still just a landlocked area with issues and I think a rezone like this at this time does not relieve those issues. I think there might be a time maybe -- I mean if -- as the rest of this gets developed and streets get fixed and things happen, I just don't think it's -- I think you can make a traffic study -- it's just like marketing surveys, you can make those numbers say what you want and be viewed from a lot of different angles. I mean common sense says to me people will still avoid Eagle if they have to go west of there. And I think the traffic, obviously, is -- can be dealt with better from 8:00 to 5:00 than it can be all the time. I just -- I think a rezone is appropriate when it adds to the area and not adds -- instead of adding to the issues of the area. I think maybe at some point this could be done, but I think at this time there is -- the other issues are still in play.

Yearsley: Thank you. You know, I do like the layout of this new configuration and I think it looks much better and it does make it better. But adding 60 feet of property the entire length makes a big difference. Like I said -- and I agree with the other commissioners is -- is I don't think that the overall issues are being addressed and I don't know if -- you know, I struggle with that, because I do agree with Commissioner Oliver that -- I think that this could work, but, you know,

that comment was -- is that, you know, it will be years before office -- you know, commercial is developed out here, but they said the same thing with your -- your roadway. Oh, it will never be -- be developed and now we are looking at the situation that we are in as -- is we have got traffic issues, because someone didn't have the forethought to -- to think about this in the future. Still like this as a medical corridor area. I think it's appropriate and I think it's a -- a better way to -- place to put this and I think the apartments could be better placed elsewhere. I understand the comments that they are looking for generators for apartments and that, but I think this area is just too -- too constricted. And, then, after we make a motion on this project I would like to talk with the three of you. Several of the people have made comments to this and I have also thought of it, too, is there is no -- there is nothing how to fix these problems and I think we should make a request to the Mayor and Council to send a letter to ACHD requesting a study of this area to figure out what -- what the issues are and how to address the issues long term, instead of trying to just hodgepodge it right now and look at it later and wish we would have done something different, so -- but I do agree, I don't know if this is appropriate place or appropriate time for apartments in this location. So, if there no other comments, I would entertain a motion. I think we are all kind of on the -- the same page.

McCarvel: Mr. Chairman?

Yearsley: Commissioner McCarvel.

McCarvel: After considering staff, applicant and public testimony, I move to deny file number H-2016-0006, as recommended by the Commission and presented on the hearing date of May 17th, 2016, for the following reasons: Maintaining the integrity of the current plan and addressing traffic issues in this area while we still -- and before any -- any zoning changes happen.

Oliver: Mr. Chairman?

Yearsley: Mr. Oliver.

Oliver: Would that -- would that be May or would the June --

McCarvel: Oh. Sorry. June 23rd.

Yearsley: Oh, yeah. June 23rd.

Oliver: All right. Second.

Yearsley: I have a motion and a second to deny file number H-2016-0006. All in favor say aye. Oppose? Motion carries.

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

Yearsley: And I will ask legal really quickly to request the Mayor and Council to send a letter. Do we have to do that by motion or can we just direct staff to write that letter if we so choose?

Pogue: You can direct staff to do that.

Yearsley: Okay. Okay. So, I guess what were your thoughts on asking ACHD to do a study of this area to address access and traffic?

McCarvel: Mr. Chairman?

Yearsley: Commissioner McCarvel.

McCarvel: I agree. I think -- I mean there is a lot of land here and there is a lot of potential and --

Pogue: Excuse me. Could you keep your comments to yourselves or exit the chambers. Thank you.

McCarvel: This is prime land right off the interstate, but it comes with some inherent issues, just because of the need to flow traffic on Eagle and I think some future plan needs to be made of roads and access over to Locust Grove, since that has become such a major artery, I do think it's time, you know, for those issues to be addressed so developers can move on.

Yearsley: Okay.

Oliver: I agree.

Yearsley: Thank you. So, I think it's in agreement then. So, if you wouldn't mind requesting the Mayor and Council to send a letter to ACHD to look at this area for traffic and access we would appreciate it. And at this time I think we will take a break.

(Recess: 8:58 p.m. to 9:05 p.m.)

**C. Public Hearing for Bancroft Square (H-2016-0055) by Schultz Development Located 2750 S. Eagle Road**

- 1. Request: Rezone of 6.54 Acres of Land from the R-4 to the R-8 Zoning District**
- 2. Request: Preliminary Plat Approval Consisting of ThirtyThree (33) Building Lots and Five (5)**

**Common Area Lots on 5.41 Acres of Land in the  
Proposed R-8 Zoning District**

**3. Request: Modification to the Conditional Use  
Permit/Planned Development (CUP-02-005) to  
Change the Approved Use from Office/Multi-  
Family to Single Family Residential**

Yearsley: So, we would like to get started and reconvene this meeting. Thanks for your patience and determination to stick this out. I applaud you. At this time we would like to open the public hearing for file number H-2016-0055 at Bancroft Square and let's begin with the staff report.

Watters: Chairman, give me just a moment here.

Yearsley: Absolutely.

Watters: All right. The next applications before you are a request for a rezone, preliminary plat, and conditional use permit modification. This site consists of 5.41 acres of land, zoned R-4. It's located at the southeast corner of South Eagle Road and East Easy Jet Drive at 2750 South Eagle Road. Adjacent land uses. To the north are offices, zoned L-O and single family attached patio homes, zoned R-8. To the south is a rural resident home and property zoned RUT in Ada County. To the east are single family residential in Sutherland Farms Subdivision, zoned R-4. And to the west is South Eagle Road and single family homes in Thousand Springs Subdivision, zoned R-4. The Comprehensive Plan future land use map designation for this property is mixed use community. This property was previously approved back in -- I believe it was 2002 as a planned development. A conditional use permit for a planned development for a mix of uses in this property consisting of commercial, office, multi-family and single family residential uses. A preliminary plat was also approved at that time and this property actually was planned to be the last two phases of development of that planned development subdivision. The applicant is proposing to rezone 6.54 acres of land from the R-4 to the R-8 zoning district for the development of 33 single family residential homes, with a density of 6.1 dwelling units per acre. A modification to the previously approved conditional permit planned development is requested to change the use approval for this property from multi-family residential and office to single family residential at a density desired in mixed use community designation areas. Although this property was zoned R-4 back in the day when we used to do planned unit developments we used to zone a property -- usually the whole development, but, then, we would allow use exceptions in the zone up to 20 percent of that area. This is one of those properties. It was zoned R-4, but it did designate this property developed with multi-family and residential and office uses. So, that's -- that's why it's zoned the way it is. A preliminary plat is proposed as shown, consisting of 33 building lots and five common area lots. Access is proposed at the north boundary via East Easy Jet Drive, which also stubs to the property to the south for future

interconnectivity. Access is also proposed to the east via South Nephrite Way. No access is proposed via Eagle Road and is prohibited. Landscape street buffers are required along Eagle and Easy Jet in accord with UDC standards. Landscaped parkways are proposed along internal streets with street trees, as shown in the bottom diagram there. A minimum of ten percent qualified open space is typically required to be provided, along with one site amenity for developments of this size. Because this property was originally included in the preliminary plat -- and, as I stated, for Sutherland Farm development and is included in the planned development, the applicant request this property is allowed to develop as originally intended as the last phase of the subdivision and a qualified open space and site amenities for the overall development, excuse me, be considered to cover this portion of the site as well. A total of 11.3 percent or 13.24 acres of qualified open space has already been provided with the Sutherland Farm development, along with site amenities consisting of a three-quarter mile long regional pathway along the Ridenbaugh Canal, a 5.9 acre park, a 2.5 acre park, tot lots, a gazebo, swing set and horseshoe pits. The applicant states that they have discussed incorporation the subject property into the homeowners association with the homeowners, but an official agreement has not yet been reached. Staff supports the applicant's request provided that the HOA agrees to allow this development to be incorporated in their homeowners association. If they do not staff recommends the plat is revised to provide the full ten percent qualified open space. It is currently at 7.9 or .43 of an acre is what is proposed. Conceptual building elevations for homes within this development have been submitted as shown with a variety of building materials. One and two story structures are proposed ranging in size from 1,200 square feet to 2,200 square feet, similar to the size of homes in Sutherland Downs Subdivision to the north. Because homes on lots that back up to or face South Eagle Road and East Easy Jet Drive are going to be highly visible, staff recommends the rear and/or sides of homes on lots that face or back up to these roadways incorporate articulation through changes in materials, color, modulation and architectural elements, horizontal and vertical, to break up monotonous wall plains and roof lines. Written testimony has been received on this application from Matt Schultz, the applicant's representative, in response to the staff report. From Mike and Annette Wheeler, Arnie and Kay Veers, Bill and Sally Riggs, James and Marsha Harris, Joann St. Charles and Robert Nelson, Kent and Mary Ellen Wheeler, Robert and Laurel Nielson, Tom Reynolds, Ken and Aileen Scalian -- all these folks stated that they are in favor of the proposed development, provided that the minimum open space and site amenity requirements are provided with this development or, in the alternative, that the development is included in the homeowners association for either Sutherland Farms or Sutherland Downs in order to help bear the cost of maintenance of those private common areas and also be subject to certain architectural design guidelines as determined appropriate for this development. Staff is recommending approve of the applicant's proposed rezone, preliminary plat, and conditional use permit modification with the conditions in the staff report. The conditions as written do match what is desired by the neighbors so far as either requiring the applicant to

provide ten percent open space or in lieu of that the HOA allowing them to join the homeowners association. So, I think we are all on the same page with that and staff will stand for any questions the Commission may have.

Yearsley: Thank you. Are there any questions? No? Would the applicant like to come forward.

Schultz: Thank you, Commissioners. Matt Schutz, 8421 South Ten Mile, Meridian. Here on behalf of Schultz Development and also Berkeley Building Company, who Joe Atalla was not able to be here, family vacation just happened to coincide with the hearing. But he is going to be the builder and buyer. I'm helping him with the project management and entitlement and construction management of the actual site itself. He will be the builder and those are his products that are in the package. We are excited to be here. It's not typical for me to do the last phase of a project that was started back in 2002, which this one is by Trevor Roberts. I put together this overall exhibit you see on your screen here and to be able to do all the measurements and you will kind of -- what happens when this is all finished? You knew there was a plan that was initially submitted in 2002 that -- that had predominately what you see here, except for Sutherland Downs, which has a two and a half acre park in the middle and originally, you know, half -- half what you see there and the other half was kind of a mystery box of future office slash multi-family and what we are showing as Bancroft Square had four light office lots and, I think the 5.4 C-C zone that's now a storage unit was just a -- more office at the time and that's -- Trevor Roberts' main goal was the three hundred and some residential lots, and the front was -- allowed him to provide some mixed use, get some flexibility in his lot design. Sutherland Down actually has lots that would not meet your R-8 code today. It has some 3,700 square foot lots in Sutherland Downs, that's just the mix that they had at the time. There is some duplex -- I call them duplex lots, but townhome lots with zero lot lines, those are the 3,700 and they are a zero lot line attached product right directly north in those lots that look a little narrower than ours, that's what those are and the rest of them are single story -- I think they are 50 foot wide lots. They are all single stories in there. It's a nice little community. Nice park. I think it turned out great. Since, then, the light office in the front was not a part of the original Sutherland Farms, it got done as light office. So, it took some of the demand away we think for light office on what we are proposing with that 3.3 acres there, it's a mix of basically medical and eye, dental offices is what it is in there. The storage unit has since went in. So, all we are left with is, essentially, the last phase, if you will, of Sutherland Park and we are coming in and trying to plug in nicely, get along with our neighbors. We had a neighborhood meeting. A lot of people showed up and we were kind of taken aback at first, like why don't you join our HOA, you're going to use the park anyway and like, okay, if you guys are inviting us maybe we will try. I mean that sounds like a good idea. Let's be one big happy family and pay dues. Let's get along. Let's see where this goes. We have made great progress with the HOA -- the actual board members themselves, as well as they have been

communicating with their members at large, the other three hundred and something -- actually, there are two HOA's out here. There is Sutherland Downs, which is 79 homes, that's a separate HOA from the Sutherland Farms, which is 254. We have actually been communicating with Sutherland Farms, the 254, which is kind of different, because we are not the same size lots; right? We are different. But we are getting along. You know, we are agreeing to their -- some architectural review of them. They have agreed to our need for some reduced home sizes, because their guidelines are a 2,000 square foot, two story, I believe, and, then, I think it's a 1,600 square foot single. So, we need a little bit of flexibility because of our lot -- our lots are just a different product. It wants to be just a little bit smaller than that and they have agreed to that. They have agreed to the smaller homes, which, wow, I mean that never happens, but we have done it. We have approached them about, hey, instead of losing one lot, because that's the difference on meeting the ten percent and doing a token little amenity, why not treat us -- which I believe is totally fair, as -- as one phase of an overall. There is massive portions of Sutherland Farms that have no open space, you know, and we have -- we do have more than the ten, but they won't let us count the buffer along Easy Jet, because it doesn't show up as a collector on ACHD's map, so it's a little bit unfair. We have over ten, but the qualified open space -- a little bit of a splitting hairs. So, we are slightly under, but to meet the exact definition we would have to lose one lot and give up a token amenity. We would rather contribute to the central amenities, work with our HOA and say, hey, what do you guys want to do, let us -- let us add to and we have made a pretty substantial offer in monetary to do that. It sounds like we are real close on inking a deal that their attorney is drafting up for us to come into their HOA. We would be dues paying members. We would be subject to their -- their ACC guidelines and just get along. So, I think this fits from our standpoint. We met code. The densities right there kind of splits the difference between the multi-family that wants to go there from a density standpoint, but it's still single family, so we kind of get along with the neighbors. It's just riding that line, you know, and it just works. I think it works, because Berkeley has this product and it works. It works because of the dimensions just barely work and for some reason it works. We know people are concerned about the future, what's going to happen south of us. We don't know. It's master planned. It's in the county now, but it's master planned and in the future makes use of commercial. That's what the comp plan says. What does that mean? That means multi-family, light office, or commercial. We don't know what. There is five different owners of those ten different parcels there. Are they all going to sell to one guy? Are they going to try to develop it piecemeal. We don't know. We're not involved in that. We just want to do this 5.4 acres and do our 33 lots. Berkeley Homes is actually located -- their office is right over the canal on Eagle, so they have a vested interest in doing a really good job right there by their office. Just -- it's worked out really well and better than I expected on the coordination with the HOA. Been really receptive. Of course, it's in negotiation. Yeah, there is still some give and take and -- but it's been -- it's been an easy -- a relatively give and take in terms of nobody has been really offended by the whole thing. Yeah, that sounds fair.

Okay. That sounds fair. And so we are kind of -- we are kind of meeting where it needs to be met, so we think we have got a good -- a good site. We concur with all staff's conditions of -- recommendations of approval, the conditions, which happen to match what the homeowners are writing in, which is really nice, and we got some tree lined streets, which Sutherland Farms doesn't have detached sidewalks in front of their homes. We are. We thought that was important to kind of open up that streetscape a little bit with -- with some -- with some trees between the curb and the sidewalk. There is an eight foot park strip. That was optional. It does count for some open space, but it is optional, although it does decrease a little bit of the usable depth of your lot, but we feel that it's a good -- it's a good look, it's a good feel, it will not make it feel as tight. It's kind of a design element that we intentionally put in there. There is a little pathway, the northwest corner, that connects up to Eagle. We did not want to put an access out there, even though ACHD would allow us to, which is amazing. It's far enough away from the intersection, but it's like, no, we don't want to be that close to that intersection. We would rather use the existing curb cut that we are calling Titanium right now. ACHD does want it to go through to the south, not -- I don't want to build it. ACHD requires a stub street to the south for future connectivity. That's just kind of the standard condition. You guys have ran into that in the last hearing it sounds like a little bit, but I don't think it's worthy of shipping out over. That's just what they require. We don't know what's going to happen down there. We really don't. But it is -- it is access to a -- a residential collector is how it was designed in 2002. It's access to a collector, to an arterial. So, it's a pretty direct route to not have to go through a bunch of residences to go out to Eagle. That's a saving grace for it that -- in the future. There is not going to be a big need to go back into that subdivision to get out to Eagle or back into this, so I think it works out good for -- you know, just -- the stars aligned I think, things fit, and if there is any other questions we will stand for them and hopefully you will vote for approval. Thanks.

Yearsley: Thank you. Are there any questions? No? Thank you. So, I have a lot of people signed up here, but I don't think half of them are here. So, instead of going through the list I will just ask is there anybody wanting to testify on this application? Please come forward.

Broussard: My name is Bonnie Broussard. I live at 2662 South Teddy Avenue in Sutherland Farms Subdivision and I just wanted to thank the developer and the builder, Sonya Watters, for working with the developers on this project and the planning commission for being receptive to this and I think it's a great fit for the community. You know what we went through with the last project that came through and we just really appreciate your consideration on this project and we look forward to working with the developers on this.

Yearsley: Thank you. Is there anybody else? Please, come forward.

Kuperus: My name is Fred Kuperus and I live at 3415 East Quin Drive in Sutherland Downs. Basically I -- you know, is a much better plan than what we were presented with the last time. The only question I have when -- there is a green space and it sounds like it's still a little bit up in the air as far as the green space. When you look at this block that's -- you know, the development that I see here -- I think he said it was seven percent. I don't know. I think that's what he said. And it has to be ten percent and there was a question of whether or not Sutherland Farms or Sutherland Downs was going to -- we have a park in our area. Is that going to be included in making up for the -- the shortage of green space in this development?

Yearsley: I think in the conditions of the report -- or the findings is they need to join the HOA and be part of the HOA or they need to provide the ten percent open space.

Kuperus: Now, what's the process for developing --

Yearsley: Please speak into the mike.

Kuperus: For being part of the HOA. How does -- you know, if they want to join Sutherland Farms, do they approach Sutherland Farms and say we want to be part of your HOA?

Yearsley: Yes. And that's kind of what he was stating is -- that they have been in negotiations with Sutherland Farm --

Kuperus: Sutherland Farms. Okay.

Yearsley: Yes.

Kuperus: It sounded like that it was also going to include Sutherland Downs and, man, I haven't heard one iota of that.

Yearsley: No. And I think he's made -- they have decided to try to go with Sutherland Farms --

Kuperus: Okay.

Yearsley: -- and to work with the HOA --

Kuperus: All right.

Yearsley: -- and not Sutherland Downs.

Kuperus: So, then, Sutherland Farms, if this is approved, is going to -- part of that -- their park -- this development can use their park?

Yearsley: Yes.

Kuperus: Okay.

Yearsley: Thank you. Anybody else? Please.

Nielson: My name is Robert Nielson. I live at 3508 East Quin Drive, Meridian. I would ask two things. First I ask that the Planning and Zoning recommend approval of the conditional use modification to change. As has been stated, what's being proposed here is so much better than what was proposed before and even though it is not what is in the City of Meridian's Comprehensive Plan we think especially with the odd shape of this lot and it being so close to the existing signal -- intersection on Eagle Drive, that this housing development makes a whole lot more sense than apartments and commercial uses. Second, I ask that the development agreement for Bancroft Square include the ten percent open space with an existing amenity. The open space amenities it mentions on the application letter are privately owned and maintained by the Sutherland Farm HOA or by the Sutherland Downs HOA. Bancroft Square has -- had not in their application formally applied to join Sutherland Farm HOA nor have they received approval to do so. Also the nearest amenity to -- to Bancroft Square is a two and a half acre park and gazebo owned and operated by the Sutherland Downs HOA, which has not been approached. It seems inappropriate to include privately owned and maintained open space and amenities in adjacent HOAs in meeting the requirements of Bancroft Square. An amenity in Bancroft Square is important to provide a gathering place for families in a subdivision and to help foster relationships between neighbors. That said, the staff's recommendation that they be allowed to go with the smaller amount of green space provided that they are approved to join the Sutherland Farm HOA seems to me to be a reasonable accommodation. Thank you.

Yearsley: Thank you. Anybody else who would like to testify? Thank you. Do you need to come -- okay. The applicant has said he doesn't need to come up and rebut three recommendations for approval, so -- so, at that point we won't ask him to come forward. So, at this point I would entertain a motion to close the public hearing on file number H-2016-0055.

Oliver: Mr. Chairman?

Yearsley: Commissioner Oliver.

Oliver: I move that we close the hearing on H-2016-0055.

McCarvel: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: THREE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Yearsley: Well, I have to tell you, it's a lot nicer to come to a Planning and Zoning meeting where the residents are in favor of the subdivision and I appreciate the applicant actually making the -- the steps trying to join the association. I think that shows a good faith of what they are trying to build and to be good neighbors. I still would have liked to have seen a little bit more office space on this lot, but I -- but, you know, at that point I'm -- I'm okay with the way it was. But, yeah, I still thought that the -- the east -- west should have been more office, but -- but apparently that's not a market that's high demand right now, so -- but, no, I think it's a great project and I think it lends well to the neighborhood, so I'm I favor.

Oliver: Mr. Chairman?

Yearsley: Commissioner Oliver.

Oliver: I would like to tell you when I heard the word Easy Jet I -- I just got this shiver up and down my spine. Oh, just don't want to do this again. So, when I saw that it was going to be homes and a buddy of mine that lives in Sutherland Downs says, yeah, it's homes, I'm happy with it, I thought, oh, it's a great relief and looking at the project I think it looks really, really good. The only problem I had is before looking at it, reading about it, is that where are they going to put the ten percent, you know, where is that going to go and seeing that you're going to be possibly in consideration to join the HOA for Sutherland Farms, I think that's perfect that -- and I think that makes everybody happy. Gives you a little bit of open space in your development as well, so I think it -- all the way around it's a good project.

McCarvel: Uh-huh. Mr. Chairman?

Yearsley: Commissioner McCarvel.

McCarvel: Yeah. I like the idea of single family residence there and especially I think what adds to the feel of open space there, although it may not be an acre park, it will be the tree lined sidewalks and stuff will give a feel of a little more elbow room and, as I said, it's probably going to use the parks anyway, so they might as well pay for them. I think that's great if they can work that out to be part of that HOA.

Yearsley: Great. Well, I guess with that I would entertain a motion.

McCarvel: Mr. Chairman?

By action of the Planning & Zoning Commission at its regular meeting held on the 7<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2016.

COMMISSIONER STEVEN YEARSLEY, CHAIRMAN

VOTED Yea

COMMISSIONER PATRICK OLIVER, VICE CHAIRMAN

VOTED Absent

COMMISSIONER RHONDA MCCARVEL

VOTED Absent

COMMISSIONER RYAN FITZGERALD

VOTED Yea

COMMISSIONER GREGORY WILSON

VOTED Yea

  
~~Steven Yearsley, Chairman~~  
Ryan Fitzgerald for:



Attest:

Machelle Hill  
~~Jaycee Holman, City Clerk~~  
Jacy Jones,

Copy served upon the Applicant, the Planning and Development Services divisions of the Community Development Department, the Public Works Department and the City Attorney.

By: Charlene Way Dated: 7-8-2016  
City Clerk's Office