

Meridian Planning and Zoning Meeting

August 18, 2016

Meeting of the Meridian Planning and Zoning Commission of August 18, 2016, was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by Chairman Steven Yearsley.

Members Present: Commissioner Ryan Fitzgerald, Commissioner Rhonda McCarvel, Commissioner Gregory Wilson.

Members Absent: Chairman Steven Yearsley and Commissioner Patrick Oliver.

Others Present: Jaycee Holman, Ted Baird, Caleb Hood, Sonya Waters, Bill Parsons, Josh Beach and Dean Willis.

Item 1: Roll-Call Attendance:

Roll-call

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

Fitzgerald: Good evening, ladies and gentleman. At this time I'd like to call to order the regularly scheduled meeting of the Meridian Planning and Zoning Commission for the date of August 18th and let's begin with roll call.

Item 2: Adoption of the Agenda

Fitzgerald: Thank you, Ma'am. First up on the agenda is the adoption of the agenda and we have no changes. So, I will entertain a motion.

McCarvel: Mr. Chairman, I move that we adopt the agenda as presented.

Wilson: Second.

Fitzgerald: All those in favor? Thank you.

MOTION CARRIED: THREE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Item 3: Consent Agenda

- A. Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law for Approval for CentrePoint Storage (H-2016-0069) by Chad Olsen Located 1/4 Mile North of E. Ustick Road and West of N. Eagle Road Request: Conditional Use Permit Approval for a Self-Service Storage Facility on 18.7 Acres of Land in the C-G Zoning District**

B. Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law for Approval for Harmony Hills Assisted Living (H-2016-0063) by Derk Pardoe Located at 1521 and 1529 S. Tech Lane Request: Conditional Use Permit for an Assisted Living Facility on 1.72 Acres in a C-G Zoning District

Fitzgerald: As we move down we have -- excuse me. Losing my mind. We have the Consent Agenda that includes Findings of Fact and -- I am losing my mind. Thank you. And Conclusion of Law for CentrePoint Storage and Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law for approval of Harmony Hills Assisted Living and we will move the adoption of the minutes until the next meeting. Are there any questions or changes or actions?

McCarvel: Mr. Chairman?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner McCarvel.

McCarvel: I move that we adopt the Consent Agenda.

Wilson: Second.

Fitzgerald: All those in favor?

MOTION CARRIED: THREE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Fitzgerald: Before we go onto the next time I kind of want to explain the process we do here at Planning and Zoning Commission before we get started. We will open each item in order. We will start with the staff report. They will present their findings regarding whether the items adhere to the Comprehensive Plan and Uniform Development Code with the staff recommendation. After staff has completed their presentation the applicant will come forward to present their case for approval. Their application. And, then, respond to any staff comments. The applicant will have up to 15 minutes to do so. After they complete their presentation we will open it up for public comment. Every person will have three minutes to make their presentation. If you're speaking on behalf of an HOA or a larger group, we will give you up to ten minutes to make that presentation, but we'd ask that the HOA -- people that they are presenting for don't also come up and restate what has already been stated. After the audience has a chance to testify, we will invite the applicant to come back up and close testimony and we will allow the Commission to deliberate. So, hopefully, we can move this thing forward and we have got kind of a large agenda tonight.

Item 4: Action Items

**A. Public Hearing For Silverwater South (H-2016-0082) by
Trilogy Development Located at South of E. Victory Road
and West of S. Locust Grove Road Recommend Approval**

- 1. Request: Preliminary Plat** Consisting of 48 Building
lots and 4 (Four) Common Lots on 12.08 Acres of
Land in an R-8 Zoning District

Fitzgerald: So, I will get started and hand it over to Sonya to kick it off.

Watters: Thank you, Chairman, Members of the Commission. The first application before you tonight is a request for a preliminary plat. This site consists of 12.08 acres of land, zoned R-8, located south of East Victory Road and west of South Locust Grove Road. Adjacent land use and zoning. This site is surrounded by existing and future single family residential homes, zoned R-8. The Comprehensive Plan map designation -- approximately half of the property is designated mixed-use neighborhood with a neighborhood center overlay and the other half is medium density residential. A little history. This property was annexed with a development agreement and a preliminary plat back in 2006 as part of the Tanana Valley Subdivision. In 2007 a new preliminary plat was approved for Cavanaugh Subdivision, which included the subject property. Several time extensions have been approved for the plat. Since approval of the preliminary plat individual parcels have been sold off and are now under many different ownerships and are being developed separately, rather than as a single master planned project as intended. The subject developer is developing all the property north of the Ridenbaugh Canal and east of Standing Timber Way. Because the previous preliminary plat depicted all of the site amenities for the overall development north and south of the canal to be provided on the north side of the canal, staff didn't feel it was reasonable to require this development to provide all of the amenities for the overall subdivision. Therefore, with the last time extension staff recommended that the remainder of the property be resubdivided and meet current development standards. So, that is why this preliminary plat is before you tonight. The applicant is now proposing a new preliminary plat consisting of 48 building lots and four common area lots on 12.08 acres of land in the R-8 zoning district, basically in the same configuration as the previous preliminary plat. The minimum lot size is 6,827 square feet, with the average lot size being 8,698 square feet. The proposed density is 3.971 dwelling units per acre, consistent with the medium density residential future land use map designation, but below the density desired in the mixed use neighborhood designated areas. Access is proposed via internal local streets within the development. The applicant is proposing .44 of an acre or 3.65 percent of qualified open space consisting of a 50-by-100 plus area -- open space area, six foot wide parkways and micropath lots and a pathway as a site amenity. In the overall development, which encompasses 54.14 acres of land, a total of 7.38 acres or 13.63 percent of qualified open space and a gazebo, basketball court, pathways and a tot lot, will be provided as amenities for Silverwater that's north

of the Ridenbaugh Canal. The applicant is requesting that the overall common area is allowed to count toward that required with this development and staff is amenable to his request. Conceptual building elevations were submitted as shown for the future homes within this development. Building materials appear to consist of a mix of horizontal lap siding and vertical board and batten siding with stone veneer and brick accents. Written testimony has been received from Scott Wonders, the applicant's representative, in agreement with the staff report. Staff is recommending approval with the conditions contained in Exhibit B of the staff report. Staff will stand for any questions.

Fitzgerald: Any questions of staff? Would the applicant like to come forward?

Wonders: Good evening. Scott Wonders with JUB, 250 South Beechwood in Boise. 83709. I'm here representing the applicant. I don't have too much to add. Sonya did a great job of kind of introducing this. It was part of the original Cavanaugh Subdivision, so this preliminary plat for the southern portion is pretty much identical to the original plat. Again, it was divided during the downturn. It was divided up into like a ton of owners and so this is all -- basically now that Silverwater is all under one ownership and so we are just kind of been consolidating that. We do have 13.6 percent open space and all the amenities are being provided in the previous three phases. Those have all been completed and recorded. The last phase three, which is the one previous to -- south will be the next one that we actually build next year if approved. But phase three, which is the previous one, was just finished about a month ago and they are in the process of finalizing the landscaping and putting in all the amenities that were in that phase and other than that I'm just here to answer any questions that you guys might have.

Fitzgerald: Commissioners, any questions?

McCarvel: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Fitzgerald: Commissioner McCarvel.

McCarvel: My question involved the amenities are -- it's already in or will be by the time --

Wonders: Yeah. I can't -- that phase, which was phase three, which is immediately north of this one -- so, yes, basically, right there. That's actually been built and recorded and the roads are all in, so I think they are just finalizing some of the landscaping and, then, they will be putting in those amenities. So, that will be completed before we start this -- this southern phase.

McCarvel: Okay.

Fitzgerald: Any additional questions? Thank you, sir.

Wonders: Thank you.

Fitzgerald: I'm going to open it up to public testimony. I have Nancy Buckley. Come up and state your name and your address for the record, ma'am.

Buckley: My name is Nancy Buckley and it's 3181 South Novara in Meridian. 83642. My biggest concern is the overdevelopment that's happening in Meridian. I know growth is great for the city. It is. But there is just too much happening and there is not schools to support all these homes that are going in. There is not roads to support them and that's really my biggest concern. I'm not against the growth and I'm not really against these homes. I just think that the planning commission needs to take a look at the future farther ahead at what -- what is happening here. We moved here because it was quiet, you know, and a very nice place to live. Now it's becoming overwhelming and the traffic is atrocious already. When these homes go in it's going to be even worse. My concern is when we lived in Illinois the same thing happened to us and kids ended up going to split session school. I have no children. I didn't there. But some kids would go to school at 6:00 in the morning. The other ones would get home at 6:00 at night. And I don't think that's fair to the children. But that's really my main concern. That and I was wondering are there impact fees charged to each lot for these homes? That's my question. Because we paid like 3,500 dollars in 1993 to cover schools and roads and we had no children, but that's what each lot was supposed to pay and we don't have a problem. If you can afford a home you can afford impact fees, because, otherwise, it's all going to come to the taxpayers and our taxes are just going to keep going up, up, up. And the only other concern I have is police and fire. Are we hiring more police to cover? Because we don't see the police in our subdivision anymore. We used to see them once a week maybe, now we never see them unless we have to call them for something. So, that's kind of my concern, too. But that's really the only problem that I really have. So, thank you very much.

Fitzgerald: Thank you, ma'am. Mr. Buckley, would you like to come and speak? Okay. I have John Schilling. Okay. I don't have anyone else that's signed up to testify on this application. Is there anyone else in the audience that wants to testify? Okay. If not, would the applicant like to come to close?

Wonders: I don't really have anything further to add. I mean we do pay -- they do pay when they submit for building permits, obviously, for that and, then, ACHD does collect for impact fees, but other than that I don't really have anything further to add, unless you have any other questions.

Fitzgerald: Any other questions for staff or the applicant? Thank you very much.

Wonders: Thank you.

Baird: Mr. Chair? I can answer Mrs. Buckley's question about the police and the fire and fill in some details about the city's impact fees.

Fitzgerald: Would appreciate it.

Baird: Currently the state doesn't provide -- does not provide for impact fees for schools. That's something that is being looked at, but that's something for the school district to advocate. The city does collect impact fees on each building permit, as mentioned, for parks, fire, and police capital improvements. As part of those impact of those impact fees we have to plan out ten years in advance for what we will need to keep up with this growth, how many additional police officers, how many additional firefighters, additional equipment, that type of thing. So, the planning is going on within the city for the -- for the items that we have control over. Unfortunately, schools and roads -- schools are the West Ada and the roads is Ada County Highway District.

Fitzgerald: Thank you, sir. I would entertain a motion to close the public hearing.

Wilson: Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner Wilson.

Wilson: I move we close the public hearing.

McCarvel: Second.

Fitzgerald: I have a motion to close the public hearing on Silverado South, H-2016-0082. All those in favor say aye.

MOTION CARRIED: THREE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Fitzgerald: Okay. We have a -- it is properly before the Commission. Comments? Thoughts?

McCarvel: Mr. Chairman?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner McCarvel.

McCarvel: I really don't see an issue with the current plat that's in front of us. I think it looks good. It, obviously, flows in with the rest of what's around it and I think it's good that they are coordinating this now altogether.

Fitzgerald: Commissioner Wilson?

Wilson: Mr. Chair, I agree. I have driven by this area many times and kind of seen an empty space and now that I kind of see what's being filled -- I mean it

looks good. That being said, I as a resident of the city am also concerned about schools and transportation, but, obviously, our purview is whether it fits with the Comprehensive Plan and city code. So, along those lines I will be voting in favor of this.

Fitzgerald: I would tend to agree with both of their comments. I think we have a job to do to provide counsel to City Council. We make recommendations based on what our code says, not based on all the pieces. They get to decide on that and that -- you elect them to do that. So, we provide them guidance and -- from there, so -- but I would agree. I think -- this is in-fill. It's something that was planned a long time ago that I think is good to finalize under one ownership and under one master planned plat and I appreciate the staff's work to get it all back to where it's workable now, so I'm also in favor. So, with that I will entertain a motion from --

McCarvel: Mr. Chairman?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner McCarvel.

McCarvel: After considering all staff, applicant and public testimony, I move to recommend approval to the City Council of file number H-2016-0082 as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of August 18th, 2016.

Wilson: Second.

Fitzgerald: All those in favor say aye. Opposed? Thank you very much.

MOTION CARRIED: THREE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

B. Public Hearing for Silverwater North (H-2016-0083) by
Trilogy Development Located at South Side of E. Victory
Road and West of S. Locust Grove Road

- 1. Request: Preliminary Plat** Consisting of 13 Building
Lots and 1 (One) Common Lot on 4.12 Acres of Land
in an R-8 Zoning District

Fitzgerald: Okay. We will open the public hearing on Silverwater North, file number H-2016-0083 and we will start with the staff report.

Watters: Thank you, Chair. The next application is also a preliminary plat. It is within the same development area, just north of the previous project. This site consists of 4.12 acres of land. It's zoned R-8 and is located on the south side of East Victory Road, west of South Locust Grove Road. This site is surrounded by existing and future single-family residential homes, zoned R-8 and RUT and a church zoned L-O. The Comprehensive Plan future land use map designation is

mixed-use neighborhood with a neighborhood center overlay. This -- as I said, this property was also originally part of the subdivision development. This property was intended to develop with a public school. Since that time the school district has decided that they don't need a school in this location and it was included as one large lot in Silverwater Subdivision No. 3. As part of that subdivision the road Mesa Way here was platted. The road along the south here of these lots and also a landscape street buffer along Victory. So, the proposed plat consists of 13 building lots and one common area lot on 4.12 acres of land in the R-8 district. The minimum lot size is 8,295 square feet, with an average lot size of 11,218 square feet. The proposed density is 3.16 dwelling units per acre, which is below that desired in the mixed-use neighborhood designated area. However, because the future land use map designation locations are conceptual and medium density residential designation exists to the south, staff does deem the proposed plat is in substantial compliance with the Comprehensive Plan. This development is proposed on the plat from East Spring Lloyd Street. That's the road along the south boundary of the plat. Some internal local streets proposed to be constructed with phase three of Silverstone -- excuse me -- Silverwater Subdivision by way of South Mesa Road via East Victory Road or by the internal local streets from South Standing Timber Way, which exists to the west of this property and is a collector street. Parkways are proposed along internal streets. Because this development is below five acres in size, qualified open space and site amenities are not required. However, as with the previous development, there is open space and site amenities in excess of UDC standards for the overall Silverwater development. Conceptual building elevations were submitted for the future homes within this development. They do match those that you previously saw for the development to the south. Building materials appear to consist of a mix of horizontal lap siding and vertical board and batten siding, with stone veneer and brick accents. Written testimony was received from Scott Wonders, the applicant's representative, in agreement with the staff report. Staff is recommending approval with the conditions in the report. Staff will stand for any questions.

Fitzgerald: Any questions for Sonya? Thanks, Ma'am. Would the applicant like to come forward.

Wonders: Again, Scott Wonders. JUB. 250 South Beechwood in Boise. 83709. For the record. Again, it's the same -- pretty much the same as the previous one. Unfortunately, we couldn't submit it as one preliminary plat, since they weren't contiguous, so these were just split up into two separate preliminary plats. So, that's why there is two separate applications. As you can see on this exhibit on the preliminary plat, just directly to the south is phase three that I spoke about on the last application. You can see the open space park with the amenities directly across the street from this proposed phase. This was actually proposed originally back in 2006 as a school site, but the school district decided this is not something that they want to develop on. So, we are just converting it into two

cul-de-sacs and, again, we are in agreement with the staff report and I'm here to answer any questions you might have.

Fitzgerald: Any questions for Mr. Wonders? Thank you, sir.

Wonders: Thank you.

Fitzgerald: Mr. and Mrs. Buckley, would you like to speak again? Because you're signed up -- if you want to -- ma'am. State your name and address for the record again.

Buckley: Nancy Buckley. 3181 South Navaro. Meridian. 83642. My problem is that we are right -- our house is right behind there and all of these cars going in and out are going to impact us. That's the problem. But I understand it's -- ACHD is the one that put Mesa through, so that gave us even more traffic than we already had. But our bedroom is in the back side there and every car that comes and goes we are going to hear it. So, that's the only thing that -- that's the only thing that's bothering me about the whole thing. Thank you.

Fitzgerald: Mr. Schilling, would you like to speak? Thank you. Scott, do you have any comments? Okay. I don't have anyone else signed up to testify. Anyone else? Okay. With that I would entertain a motion to close this public hearing.

Wilson: Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner Wilson.

Wilson: I move we close the public hearing on H-2016-0083.

McCarvel: Second.

Fitzgerald: All those in favor say aye.

MOTION CARRIED: THREE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Fitzgerald: Thoughts? Mr. Wilson.

Wilson: I mean to kind of add on to my thoughts on the -- you know, the community we just approved to the south of this, I mean I think -- I think it looks good. I think if you look across the street the houses that are going to be built there fit with that neighborhood. The two cul-de-sacs I can't help but think there is going to be a high -- you know, with those amenities and those two cul-de-sacs, I mean it's going to be a nice place to raise a family and I think it's a good project.

McCarvel: Mr. Chairman?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner McCarvel.

McCarvel: I'm in agreement. I liked it when -- I mean, obviously, these plans have come in and they are way below the density that they could have done. I think it's a good use of the land that's there and it will -- I think in the long run, obviously, it would be better than the open ground that's been there.

Fitzgerald: And, Nancy, your -- I think -- Mrs. Buckley, to your point, I think Mesa isn't part of this application. It's cut off from this and it's -- and it's already been approved and so I -- I have a tendency to want to move forward to get this thing tied together, so there is amenities for the property and there -- the HOA can all work together to make it a nice community and so in that regard I would be in favor as well. So, with that any thoughts or motion?

Wilson: Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner Wilson.

Wilson: After considering all staff, applicant, and public testimony, I would move to recommend approval to City Council of file number H-2016-0083 as presented in the staff report.

McCarvel: Second.

Fitzgerald: Any comments or thoughts? All those in favor? Opposed? Okay. Thank you. Congratulations.

MOTION CARRIED: THREE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

- C. Public Hearing for Little Creek Subdivision (H-2016-0076) by David Alexander Located 1470 N. Locust Grove Road**
- 1. Request: Annexation and Zoning** of Seventeen (17) Acres of Land with an R-40 Zoning District
 - 2. Request: Conditional Use Permit** for a Multi-Family Development Consisting of 204 Dwelling Units in an R-40 Zoning District
 - 3. Request: Preliminary Plat** Approval Consisting of Fifty-One (51) Building Lots and Three (3) Common Lots on 15.85 Acres of Land

Fitzgerald: Okay. We will move on to -- and we will open the public hearing for Little Creek Subdivision, which is H-2016-0076 and we will start with Sonya and the staff report.

Watters: Thank you, Chairman, Commissioners. The next applications are a request for annexation and zoning, conditional use permit and preliminary plat. This site consist of 17 acres of land. It's zoned R-40. Located at 1470 North Locust Grove Road, which is at the southeast corner of North Locust Grove and East Wilson Lane. Adjacent land uses and zoning. To the north are commercial businesses zoned C-G. To the east is a multi-family residential four-plex development, zoned R-40. To the south is vacant, undeveloped property and an ACHD storm drainage facility zoned C-G and L-O respectively. And to the west are single family residential attached homes in Locust Grove Place, zoned R-40 and a wrecking yard zoned C-2 in Ada County. This property was previously platted as lots in Pleasant Valley Subdivision. The Comprehensive Plan future land use map designation is high density residential. The applicant is proposing to annex 17 acres of land with an R-40 zoning district, consistent with the high density residential future land use map designation for the site. The proposed zoning and multi-family residential use of the property is consistent with the multi-family residential property to the east, which is also zoned R-40 and is a duplex -- or excuse me -- a four-plex development and provides a transition between the commercial uses to the north and the future of mixed use development to the south on Pine Ridge. A conditional use permit is requested for a multi-family residential development consisting of 51 four-plex structures containing a total of 200 -- 204 dwelling units in a proposed R-40 zoning district. A gross density of 12.87 units per acre, with a net density of 16.68 units per acre is proposed, which falls within the density desired in medium high density residential designated areas of eight to 15 units per acre, which is below that of the 15 plus units per acre desired in high density residential designated areas. The proposed density will require approval of a step down in density from high density residential to medium high density residential by City Council. The Comprehensive Plan does allow for one step in either direction in density without an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan if approved by Council. The units consists of a mix of two and three bedroom units. Parking is provided on the site in excess of UDC standards. One building elevation -- oops, I didn't get it in here. One building elevation was submitted for the multi-family structures. Staff is recommending additional building types with a mix of colors and materials are provided for variety within the development as set forth in our architectural standards manual. A preliminary plat is proposed consisting of 51 building lots and three common area lots on 15.85 acres of land. Excuse me. A phasing plan was submitted as shown that shows two phases of development, starting at the eastern portion of the site. The plat submitted with this application depicts two accesses via Wilson Lane and -- let's see. That was the original plan there. At the north boundary with no access via Locust Grove and because congestion is currently a problem at this intersection for traffic accessing Locust Grove via Wilson, ACHD's traffic engineers determined a full access via Locust Grove Road would help to improve

the situation, rather than having all the traffic flowing through Wilson. A traffic impact study was submitted to ACHD for this project and was reviewed as part of their staff report. A revised plat was submitted based on ACHD requirements is as shown there. Staff supports the proposed access as shown on the revised plat if Council approves a waiver to UDC 11-3A-3 for an access via an arterial street. City code currently requires if access is available via a local street, such as Wilson, that access be taken from the local street. However, it does allow for Council to approve a waiver for access to collector arterial streets in certain situations. A 25 foot wide landscape buffer is required along Locust Grove Road. A total 3.07 acres or 19.36 percent of qualified open space and site amenities consisting of half the street buffer along Locust Grove, a 20 foot wide linear open space area along Wilson Lane. A common area where the clubhouse, swimming pool, and tot lot is located and miscellaneous open grassy areas that are a minimum of 20 by 20 feet in area, are proposed within this development, which complies with UDC standards. A ten foot wide multi-use pathway is also proposed in accord with the master pathways plan along the Settlers Canal. This is a copy of the landscape plan, but it has not been revised per the preliminary plat with the accesses that were shown on the revised plat. Because there is an existing common area -- that's the east boundary of this site in the adjacent multi-family development and that is -- let's see here. Right in this location right here. Staff is recommending the open space, which is shown as a dog park right here, along the south sides of Lots 20 and 21 be relocated to the north side of those lots, which will provide a view corridor to the existing common area, instead of walling it off with buildings. The Settlers Canal and Jackson Drain exist along the south boundary of the site within this green area here. Because it is a large facility, the applicant requests a waiver to the UDC from City Council that requires a waterway to be piped in order to allow it to remain open and not be piped. Written testimony has been received from Greg Ramp from Air Incorporated, a business that exists down the street here from this site. He opposes the project based on the traffic concerns at the Wilson Lane and Locust Grove intersection. However, he says that if Wilson Lane is extended to the east and connects to a north-south road between Fairview and Pine as planned prior to development of this site, that he would not be opposed to the project. Scott Wonders, the applicant's representative, also submitted written testimony. He is in agreement with the staff report. Staff will -- is recommending approval with conditions and will stand for any questions.

Fitzgerald: Any questions for Sonya? Sonya, I do have one. In regards to possibly on the access from ACHD onto Locust Grove, about possibly limiting that access -- because it's full access right now; correct? The access -- the internal access to Locust Grove is full access, not right-in, right-out?

Watters: Chairman, yes. They are requiring a full access via Locust Grove.

Fitzgerald: Can we recommend that it be right-in, right-out?

Watters: You certainly may.

Fitzgerald: Okay.

McCarvel: Mr. Chairman?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner McCarvel.

McCarvel: Sonya, do you know how soon that is on the books to have that street -- the north-south and the access down to Pine?

Watters: Chairman, Commission McCarvel, that is dependent on the Pine Bridge Development, when that goes forth, and that's -- that's been in process for probably the last ten years or so. We have been having recent discussions with them about development of the property, but I have no time frame.

McCarvel: Okay.

Fitzgerald: And one last question, Sonya. You're shifting those -- the access to the -- or a sideline to that eastern boundary. Which would -- is that a four-plex or would you drop them all to the south or just two of them?

Watters: Chairman, just two of them. Right now there is a dog park open space area shown right here. Staff is recommending it in between these lots right here.

Fitzgerald: That makes sense. Thank you, ma'am. Any other questions for staff at this time? Would the applicant like to come forward? Mr. Wonders, it's just --

Wonders: It's my night.

Fitzgerald: It is.

Wonders: Scott Wonders. JUB. 250 South Beechwood Avenue in Boise. 83709. Here representing the applicant on this project. We do have the architect and landscape architect and the developer here should there be any other questions. I will try to tackle everything as we go through. Again, we are requesting annexation. This is currently in the county. A rezone to R-40. A conditional use permit for the multi-family and a preliminary plat. It does consist of 204 units and 51 buildings. A couple things. We are providing roughly 19 percent open space, which is a little bit over what is required. That's about a 3.1 acres or 3.07 to be exact. We are at -- 2.76 is required. A big thing as we go through this is parking. I know a lot of these projects are always at issue with parking. The required parking spaces in this development is 408 and we are actually providing 482. So, we have an additional -- do the math there. Seventy-four additional lots there or spaces. We do have a significant amount of amenities that we are including in this, including two gazebos, a swimming pool and

clubhouse, which is approximately 5,800 square feet in size that includes exercise room and -- and kind of a meeting area. We have walking trails throughout. As mentioned we do have the dog park along the east boundary and we recently eliminated a little bit of parking on the revised preliminary plat when we redid the amenities, which I will go through in a minute just below the clubhouse and we are adding a tot lot in that area. To go over the dog park, what we would propose is to move the four building cluster down adjacent to the parking and actually put the dog park on the north side of those buildings. So, it's still in line with that open space to the east, but I think that would be a little bit easier. That would be our request. Along the southern boundary we are along the Jackson Drain and we also have the Settlers Lateral that runs along that as well. We are proposing to do the ten foot pathway as was discussed along the Jackson Drain, which is part of the regional pathway plan for the City of Meridian, but we are requesting the waiver to not tile the Jackson Drain. I don't know if you have seen it, but it's like 15 or 20 feet deep and our property line only goes to the center of it. So, it would be difficult to tile it anyhow without having the ownership. We are tiling the Settlers Lateral, so we are not requesting the waiver to tile the Settlers, because we are going to be piping that as part of this development. Going through the staff report, we are in -- I should say 95 percent in agreement with the staff report. The only one condition that we are requesting be removed is under 1.1.1D and that is requesting that multiple building types be provided. The developer is proposing -- and we actually have a fly through I'm going to show here in a minute that kind of demonstrates -- it's a 3-D rendering of the project and it will kind of show what they are planning on. The building product has no rear sides. It's -- it's got a front entrance on every side, so there is four units and each one has an individual -- individual entrance on every side. So, there is no rear or -- there is, basically, no rear sides and there is windows on every side and what they propose in exchange for not doing -- they have three -- or color palettes and building material types that deviate and change the look of the -- of the product. So, that's just a condition that we are requesting modification to. Other than the dog park location, which we -- I clarified earlier. We are requested to put in 20 bike racks or 20 spaces in bike racks. We are in agreement with that. The other requirement was for a safe location for a school bus pick up and we can work with the school district and the busing company to figure out where that is and provide maybe a wider area for the kids to stay in, so they are not staying in the street. Let's see. I guess that's it as far as the conditions. Going back to ACHD, last week we got an ACHD staff report, all the initial conversations in regards to traffic, and we are all well aware of what the traffic is on Locust Grove and Wilson. When we had our neighborhood meeting really there was a DMV representative that came to both. I almost ended up having two neighborhood meetings just because of the timing and their concern was pass through the commercial area, which, unfortunately, we don't really have control over, but, you know, we were really dictated to having two entrances off -- two entrances off of Wilson Lane and that's what ACHD required, because they didn't want it off of the arterial, which is Locust Grove. Last week we got the condition that because of the intersection and the left-turn movements off of

Wilson onto Locust Grove going south, that they would suggest putting the entrance in at the existing location. There is an existing driveway approach where we actually placed it and so that's -- we kind of had to jump through some hoops over the last few days to get this site plan updated. So, we are keeping the original entrance off of Wilson that's further east and, then, putting in the one on -- on Locust Grove and to get to the left turn, right turn movement I think the idea behind that from ACHD to alleviate the stacking on Wilson for left turns. So, limiting that to the right-in, right-out might counteract what ACHD was proposing in addition to move that location. We are required in the ACHD staff report as well to dedicated an additional 11 feet along Locust Grove for a future widening. So, that -- that will actually go to seven lanes and that may become turn restricted at that time, but at this point ACHD would like to keep that as a full access. And that's -- I don't know if you can run it? This is just a -- probably a two or three minute video kind of showing the residents. So, this is Wilson Lane going eastbound to the entrance that we still have on Wilson Lane. And, then, this, obviously, is turning into -- from the Wilson Lane south end of the main development and as you can see, you can see the clubhouse there on the right and the landscaping, I was told to say, this landscaping is pretty much identical to what the landscape plan indicates and so what you see here is actually what's going to be planted. Obviously maybe a few years down the road. So, this is going back to the west on the internal street that runs parallel to Wilson Lane and you can kind of see the building types and how they are -- the color schemes and the way they are oriented, kind of break up that -- and here in a minute you will see the clubhouse and the pool area that are going to be constructed in the first phase. That's another point that we wanted to make, that with the first phase we will be building the clubhouse and the pool. And then -- so, this is going back to the east, kind of on the southern internal road. We are providing a number -- it's about 200. I can double check through the staff report. There is going to be a lot of covered parking as well. So, that's a picture of the -- kind of the rear view of the clubhouse with the pool. And, then, just get to the south, that green area, that's going to be the tot lot area. And you kind of get a view of the front of the clubhouse.

Fitzgerald: While we are watching can I ask you question? Is it appropriate to have this tied to the development agreement? I mean is it something that you can do?

Baird: Mr. Chair, Members of the Commission, the development agreement needs to be in print form so it can be recorded with the county. So, I would suggest that you encourage the developer to provide some sort of a printout that captures the essence of what you have just seen if that's your desire.

Fitzgerald: Thank you, sir.

Wonders: So, I don't have anything further to add. I do have -- I could show the different elevations with the different color schemes if you wanted to see them. I

do have them available, but I only have them in hard copy. But you kind of got the concept with that rendering that they put together. I'm here to answer any other further questions that you might have or stand for any --

Fitzgerald: Are there any additional questions for the applicant?

McCarvel: I have one.

Fitzgerald: Commissioner McCarvel.

McCarvel: Okay. Trying not to get dizzy going through the -- going through the video there. They are the same footprint, but have different outsides and they are offset, so the buildings don't look the same going down --

Wonders: Yeah. As you can see they are all staggered and, then, some are oriented 90 degrees from others and, then, they have three different color palettes that they use to break that up as well and, then, again, I guess they call it a pinwheel design. I'm not an architect. But basically -- so, the concept is is that every side is a front feature, so you don't get a rear -- rear view, so it makes the building look -- there is no, you know, rear side.

McCarvel: Okay. You got every other -- there will be every other one. This is what it really looks like from the front?

Wonders: Correct. Yes.

McCarvel: So, it does look different, even though it's the same.

Fitzgerald: Mr. Wonders, can you provide the -- the copies you have to -- so staff has it at least?

Wonders: Absolutely.

Fitzgerald: And, then, my question -- are you comfortable with the dog park -- I mean shifting the cluster, you're okay with moving all four of those down?

Wonders: Correct.

Fitzgerald: Okay. And are you okay with that? Okay.

McCarvel: Yeah. So, you want the dog park north of Lots 20 and 19?

Wonders: I believe that's correct. So, it would be just south of that parking street and, then, it will kind of tie in the city just south of that park in the street to kind of tie in again -- actually, it would probably look better, because, then, it will tie in

with the open space across the street and the tot lot, so it will kind of be all centralized. So, we don't have any issue with doing that.

Fitzgerald: Any additional questions? Thank you very much.

Wonders: Thank you.

Fitzgerald; So, I only have John Peterson signed up, but he doesn't want to testify. Has that changed, Mr. Peterson? Please come up to the podium and state your name and address, please, sir.

McCarvel: He said he doesn't want to testify.

Fitzgerald: Oh, you don't want to -- oh, I thought you said you did. Is there anyone else that would like to testify on this application? Seeing none, I would entertain a motion to close the public hearing.

McCarvel: Mr. Chairman?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner McCarvel.

McCarvel: I move that we close the public hearing on H-2016-0076.

Wilson: Second.

Fitzgerald: All those in favor signify that saying aye.

MOTION CARRIED: THREE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Fitzgerald: Okay. What is the will of the Commission? Your thoughts?

McCarvel: Mr. Chairman?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner McCarvel.

McCarvel: I like the overall concept and I think I would be okay with not having to show different floor plans, just because they do look different and okay with, you know, the other dog park and the waiver on the canal to the south, but I wish there was a different answer to that traffic right now, because without all these -- that is just a nightmare getting out at -- trying to take a left out of there and I just -- I don't -- I guess ACHD has given their recommendation. I think this would be better having it out onto the Locust Grove.

Fitzgerald: I think I will comment -- I agree with you. I think -- I'm okay with the pinwheel concept, as long as the applicant provides the color palettes and those things that can go into a development agreement with staff. I think that they are

going to limit the traffic by putting up concrete in the middle sometime. I mean it's going to be the Eagle Road fix I would guess. So, if we limit access, even though I would like to, to right-in, right-out and it may have defeated the purpose of the two accesses, which I understand, so --

Wilson: Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner Wilson.

Wilson: I think they are going to -- I know there is a cone barrier there, so you're talking about them extending that.

Fitzgerald: I think -- well, the ones they have right now is the pylons that everybody runs over.

Wilson: Oh, that's right. Yeah.

Fitzgerald: So, I think the answer is probably going to be what Eagle Road turns into, which is concrete and U-turn access and whatever -- whatever that is. But it will be very limited of who can turn left.

McCarvel: Yeah. I think we just -- with what ACHD has proposed and with the road going in that will connect down to Pine, that will give a lot of relief on it, which I think is needed there already. But overall I think the project looks good.

Wilson: Mr. Chair, I would agree. I mean if -- you know. I mean I think to the -- to the east there there are other apartments. I think there is -- and I know this area well. I think there is -- there is family. There is duplexes over there. So, I think it fits with the neighborhood. This is, obviously, a very nice development, open space amenities, a dog park, so -- but, yeah, the traffic is a concern and --

McCarvel: Yeah.

Wilson: Yeah.

McCarvel: Yeah. I think overall -- I mean it is the perfect place for the high density, knowing the surrounding areas. It's just the roads are going to have to catch up with that traffic. Hopefully sooner than later.

Fitzgerald: And I -- I mean I agree with both your comments. I think it's -- the location is perfect for housing for -- additional commercial that it will eventually be at Pine Bridge, but I mean Scentsy is not very far away and there is multiple property -- you know, work -- I mean there is multiple locations that are down Pine. I would hate to limit this development until a north-south access becomes available. I think that's -- that's a little Draconian if you will, but -- so I -- I'm okay

with leaving the full access onto Locust Grove. I think the staff -- that was their guidance and I will --

McCarvel: Okay.

Fitzgerald: -- take Sonya's recommendation. But that would be my thoughts. I think the dog park shift is a good one. I am okay with the pinwheel of color palettes and I would go with the recommendation to not tile the drain.

McCarvel: Okay.

Fitzgerald: Any additional thoughts?

McCarvel: Mr. Chairman?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner McCarvel.

McCarvel: After considering all staff, applicant, and public testimony, I move to recommend approval to the City Council a file number H-2016-0076, as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of August 18th, 2016, with the following modifications: Grant the condition 1.1.1D is waived and the developer can use the floor plans as shown with the varying colors and 90 degree offset. That the dog park be located north of Lots 20 and 19 and shift the remainder down and that we approve the waiver on not tiling canal to the south.

Wilson: Second.

Fitzgerald: I have a motion and a second. All those in favor?

Watters: Mr. Chair, excuse me.

Fitzgerald: Yes, Sonya.

Watters: The motion regarding the lots -- I believe you said 19 and 20 to have the dog park above?

McCarvel: The four --

Watters: Was it your intention to just shift all four of these to the south? Because Lot 20 is one of these on the south end.

McCarvel: Oh. Yeah.

Watters: Just a clarification on that.

McCarvel: Yeah. I think the developer requested all four of those go south.

Watters: Thank you.

McCarvel: So, what lots do you want in the motion then?

Watters: Just to the north of the proposal --

McCarvel: North of the four --

Watters: Right.

Fitzgerald: Do we feel comfortable that everybody understands the motion?

Watters: Yes.

Fitzgerald: Okay. The second or --

Wilson: I re-second second.

Fitzgerald: Okay. All those in favor say aye.

MOTION CARRIED: THREE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Fitzgerald: Okay. Congratulations, Scott.

Wonders: Thank you.

D. Public Hearing for Knightsbridge Subdivision (H-2016-0088) by Schultz Development Located 3870 E. Victory Road

- 1. Request: Annexation and Zoning** of 5.15 Acres of Land with an R-4 Zoning District
- 2. Request: Preliminary Plat** Approval Consisting of Seventeen (17) Building Lots and Two (2) Common Lots on 5.15 Acres of Land in the R-4 Zoning District

Fitzgerald: Okay. Moving on to -- we will open the public hearing on the Knightsbridge Subdivision, file number H-2016-0088 and we will start with the staff report. We are going to the bullpen for Mr. Beach.

Wilson: Our middle reliever.

Beach: Good evening, Chair, Commissioners. As you said, this is an application for both annexation and zoning and for preliminary plat. This site consists of 5.15

acres of land. It's currently zoned RUT in Ada County and is located at 3870 East Victory Road. To the north we have single family residential properties in the Sutherland Farm Subdivision, which is zoned R-4. East we have single family residential property zoned RUT in Ada County. To the south we have East Victory Road and single family residential property zoned RUT also in Ada county. And to the west we have single family residential zones -- zoned property, zoned RUT in Ada county. There is no history on this property. As I said, this is an annexation. The Comprehensive Plan future land use map designation for the property is medium density residential. The applicant has applied for annexation and zoning, as I said, of approximately 5.15 acres of land with an R-4 zoning designation. Staff believes the proposed zoning and density is consistent with the vision of the Comprehensive Plan. The proposed plat consist of 17 building lots and two common lots on 5.15 acres of land. The R-4 zoning district is proposed for the development. The development proposes a gross density of 3.3 dwelling units an acre and the average lot size is a little over 9,000 square feet. There is an existing single-family home on the site that will be demolished as part of this project and the home must be removed prior to obtaining the city engineer's signature on the final plat. Vehicular access is proposed for this site via an extension to South Proud Way. Just for reference south is to the right here. So, south -- the stub street here on the -- on Proud Way from the Sutherland Farm Subdivision. Have direct access to East Victory Road down here -- or to the south or on the -- the left side of the screen. All streets depicted on the plat are public. A total of 40 feet right of way is proposed for South Terry Drive, which is the street here, and with 33 feet between the back of curb and a total of 50 foot right of way is proposed for South Proud Way with 36 feet between the back of curbs. The master street map indicates a roundabout located at the intersection of South Terry Drive and East Victory Road, which is here. ACHD has indicated that they are in support of removing this from the master street map, but in order to do so the applicant is going to request that from the ACHD commission at a hearing to be scheduled at some time in the future. ACHD is requiring that the applicant construct South Proud Way as one half of a 36 foot street section with curb, gutter and a five foot concrete sidewalk within 50 feet of right away, plus 12 feet of additional payment beyond the center line and 33 foot wide gravel shoulder beyond the existing terminated roadway to the Proud Way slash Moon Dipper Street intersection. So, currently there is kind of a half of the street -- I will go back here to the aerial views so you can kind of see what's going on. So, if you look here, a portion of the road was constructed with the Sutherland Farms Subdivision here on the west side of the street. The applicant would be responsible for paving half of the street there and a half a street down, if that makes sense, to connect with what they are proposing as the Moon Dipper -- Moon Dipper Street that runs east and west. A 25 foot wide street buffer is required along East Victory Road, which is considered an arterial street, and is required to be landscaped in accord with the standards listed in UDC. The buffer shown on the landscape plan meets the requirements of the UDC. However, because there are single -- single family common lots -- lots had to be placed along the interior edge in accord with UDC.

The plat doesn't differentiate between the common lot for the 25 foot landscape buffer and the buildable lot. Our current code would require that the fencing be installed here, thus, making the open space and the current owner open space for the development being along Victory Road and required to comply with the qualified open space and site amenity requirements listed in the UDC, which requires a minimum of ten percent qualified open space and one site amenity for a development of this size based on the area of the preliminary plat, like I said, is 5.15 acres, a minimum of 0.51 acres of qualified usable open space is required to be proposed and open space in this development consists of eight foot parkways along Terry Drive and two passive open space lots, which are greater than 50 by 100 that include the required street buffer adjacent to Victory Road. As noted above, staff is concerned about the location of the proposed open space for the development. The majority of the proposed open space is adjacent to an arterial roadway that will be widened and will become busier with future development in the area. The applicant is proposing a landscape buffer along East Victory Road and as I mentioned there is some fencing requirements that will require any -- use of that to be on the other side of the fence adjacent to East Victory Road. In addition to the open space provided for this development, the applicant requests this property be allowed to be included in the open space and site amenities calculations for the Sutherland Farm development and that the qualified open space and site amenities for the overall development be considered to cover this portion of the site as well. A total of 13.24 acres or 11.3 percent qualified open space has already been constructed within the Sutherland Farm development with the following site amenities: A quarter mile pathway along the Ridenbaugh Canal. An approximately 5.9 acre park. A 2.5 acre park, a tot lot, a gazebo, swing set and horseshoe pits. The applicant has discussed incorporating the subject property into the Sutherland Farm HOA. However, the official agreement has not yet been agreed with the HOA to do so. The applicant is proposing to provide -- calling a future amenity within the Sutherland Farm existing 5.9 acre park and the condition for the applicant was to provide details of that prior to this evening's hearing. I'm not sure if the applicant has that information for us yet. I e-mailed him earlier this afternoon and he said that they had not decided what type of amenity they would obtaining, nor has he finalized the agreement with the HOA to include that in their development. Secondly, because the applicant is proposing to include in the Sutherland Farm HOA and be subject to their CC&Rs, staff supports the applicant's request provided that those things take place, that they are included in the HOA and be -- provide that amenity. If that does not happen staff recommends the plat is revised to provide the full ten percent qualified open space and one site amenity on their site and if an agreement cannot be reached between the two parties staff recommends that the applicant bifurcate the landscape buffer from the passive open space, which are Lot 1, Block 1, and Lot 7, Block 3. Include a more central open space lot and -- with one for the Knightsbridge community and so we can use that as their open space and amenity. The applicant intends to contribute detached single family homes and he submitted -- just for references sake, this is the outline of the Sutherland Farm Subdivision. The applicant did something similar with a recent

project called Bancroft Square where they have now reached an agreement to include that within the Sutherland Farm Subdivision and this is the site that we are talking about now that they are proposing to do something similar with, just for reference sake. Here are the elevations. The conceptual elevations proposed by the applicant. Building materials consist of a mix of horizontal lap siding, board and batten with stone accents. Staff is supportive of the proposed elevations. Written testimony was received by Matthew Schultz, the applicant's representative in agreement with the staff report and as well as comments from Trevor and Katherine Grubbs. Staff is recommending approval of the application and I will stand for any questions you have.

Fitzgerald: We have questions for Josh?

McCarvel: No.

Fitzgerald: Josh, one question. In regards -- can you put the road back up that -- in regards -- was that a Snoopy back in the day? Like what was -- is there going to be a roundabout or a -- kind of a planter in the middle of this thing when it's all built out?

Beach: You're referring to the --

Fitzgerald: No. Back in Sutherland Farms attachment, back in the -- so, what -- is that -- it's going to be a giant opening; right? Is there going to be a planter in the middle of that road when it's all said and done or is it just going to be kind of a -- I mean where Proud Way comes down and it matches up with Maxi Drive, is that -- was that a turnaround of what was -- why was it half built or -- I guess that's the question.

Beach: If you look at the -- the property here, we wanted to provide a stub street and I guess for them -- I'm not sure the full history, but it seems to make sense that if they were going to do that that they would do it on a shared property line, so that they would be only responsible for building half of that road at the time. It eventually comes into what they are calling Moon Dipper --

Fitzgerald: Yeah.

Beach: -- as well as a stub street to this property to the -- to the west.

Fitzgerald: Okay.

Beach: But there is nothing -- there is no planter in the middle, it's just a normal street section.

Fitzgerald: Got it. Okay. Thank you. No further questions? Would the applicant like to come forward?

Schultz: Matt Schultz. 8421 South Ten Mile Road in Meridian here on behalf of the application. I have a few little exhibits I want to show that I didn't have prepared in time for the -- yeah. If you could -- if you could put up that overall, please, Josh. The one that I gave you that showed the overall.

Beach: Now we are up there, so I have to turn this off to get back to --

Schultz: Sorry about that.

Beach: So, are you talking about the --

Schultz: Yeah. Right there. Yeah. Thanks. All right. Well, thanks for having me tonight. As Josh said, we were here before you fairly recently on a -- kind of a similar deal in that we were adjacent to Sutherland Farm over on Bancroft Square over there on Eagle Road. We successfully got R-8 approved -- 33 lots on five acres. Somehow we got into the HOA. They liked us. We are paying Bancroft Square, like 15,000 to come in. We are subject to their ACC guidelines and that's the Berkeley homes and used that amenity -- they actually approached us and said you're going to use our amenity anyways, there is a big central park that everybody kind of uses there in the middle of that 5.90 acres. Why don't you join our HOA and pay the dues. We worked through that, which is kind of amazing, because every homeowner has a vote and you have to get two-thirds majority to get in and that got accomplished very recently. It took a little while to work through the details, but it got done successfully. We are kind of approaching this one in the same way, except have about half as many lots on the same acreage. We are planning for R-4, instead of R-8. Not that it's better or worse, it's just different because of the different location, it was more appropriate for R-4 in this area on the south coming off of Victory and our neighbors versus R-8 over on Eagle where the neighbors are a little bit different. So, we -- we could have maybe applied for R-8. Your comp plan says medium density, which would allow for an R-8, however, we felt R-4 was appropriate. We left a few lots on the table, but we felt it was the best fit for that area. So, we would ask for 2.3 to the acre overall Sullivan Farm is 3.1. Very similar and average size. Good size lots. R-4 is considered low density. Usually that's a pretty easy fit. In this case there is a few little details I'm going to talk about concerning open space. We did meet the open space regulation of ten percent. We are not asking for any waivers or special things with that. We meet it with some passive open space in the front and with our park strips. However, if you jump back and look at this map you're looking at here now, you can see that, hey, it's been put in the middle, maybe we should -- we have chosen to do an extra impressive front entry and, then, join the HOA, contribute monetarily to a regional facility. They haven't decided what they want to build yet. It will be a combination of Bancroft funds, our funds and, then, more funds from the HOA to build something else within that park that they haven't determined yet and that's why I wasn't able to bring any details on that yet. But preliminarily we have at

least this looks good, we need to work through a few details. Other than that we want to meet their HOA. Build the same size home that the regular Sutherland Farm builds, which is a -- their minimum say 1,600 in 2002 and we are willing to just do that. Those pictures that you saw were taken from Sutherland Farm. We want to match that and be subject to their ACC guidelines. We want to be a good neighbor. We want to be part of them and so far it sounds like we are going to be able to do that. But for some reason that goes off the rails -- if you could switch over to this other one, see if it comes in the right way. Is there like an on button? Or am I just not seeing it? There it is. There it is right in front of me. So, north is up. First of all, on this road entry it has to line up with Terry Lane across the way, so that dictates where the entry road is. And then ACHD wanted a stub street on Moon Dipper east and west and, then, we connect into Proud Way, make it a full street, where it was a half street split right on the property line, which was a little bit awkward, but we are going to make it right with ours and working with our neighbor to the side to be able to get the utilities and to get the sewer in the proper corridor into our property, because you have sewer on side of the road and water on the other and both need to get into our site. So, we are working through that right now with them and that seems to be working out. But this is an alternative that would move that open space -- the same amount of open space with a 25 foot landscape buffer, which is standard, and just going to flip it, you know, in the middle and make it more central, put a little amenity, if we can't get the -- this approved, which is what we have submitted. We have submitted that, which is a substantial 80 foot -- 75 foot landscape buffer where 25 is required, so it's a very substantial entry, felt that that would be a greater entry statement and meet your code. There is nothing wrong with it. We meet the two percent. It's just if you were going to put in an amenity in there, probably wouldn't feel quite right and that's what staff has said and we would concur, because this is going to be a passive area. Certainly meets code and that's why we are going with the amenity, that -- anywhere from five and 20 acres you require one amenity. We are 5.1, so we are required to have an amenity. We are going to contribute roughly 8,500 we propose to the HOA, which would pay for a decent little amenity. We would give it to the Sutherland Farm HOA and put it more centrally located to the overall site. So, hopefully, this meets with your approval. We don't usually work with HOAs like this, but it's worked out well and I'm proud to say that we worked out the other one and we see this one working out the same. So, with that we would stand for your approval.

Fitzgerald: Any questions of the applicant? Thank you, sir, very much.

Schultz: Thanks.

Fitzgerald: Josh, real quick question for you. Would you be amenable to moving that through the central corridor if that was -- and is there a time frame that we would have on this or is that tied to final plat?

Beach: Chair, Commissioners, I think that some of that has to do with your comfort level on what you think the reason -- the reason why staff wanted kind of the details hammered out prior to coming to hearing, so that you could see what they were proposing and, again, it's up to you whether or not you're comfortable moving this forward without seeing what that amenity is. Discussing with staff here, we are comfortable with his proposal for the development if the agreement is amended to go into the HOA. We think that that -- that open space -- and we would like to -- based on your comfort level tie that -- to that in the DA if that -- if this doesn't work out with the HOA and the amenity. But, yeah, I don't see any problem necessarily with his proposal or the amenity, it's just that we haven't seen what that is, so I'm a little uncomfortable.

Fitzgerald: Bill.

Parsons: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission, you are correct, the intent would be -- I don't anticipate the applicant submitting a final plat until they have reached that agreement with the HOA and so if he didn't do that, as Josh pointed out, we definitely want to get that revised exhibit in the DA, so that we have a clear understanding of what that open space looks like with the future final plat. So, that really is the expectation is if they get a concurrence from the HOA we envision him coming in with what you're seeing tonight. If it isn't, then, we envision a final plan that comes in with the open space moving into the internal portion of the development and him including that amenity within -- within the boundaries of this plat and that's how the DA is structured right now. So, all -- I think for your purview tonight I would just ask the applicant to maybe e-mail us that exhibit, so that we can move it forward if you're choosing to move this on to City Council this evening, that we would include that as an exhibit in -- in the development agreement.

Fitzgerald: Thank you very much. You guys comfortable with that? Okay. With that I will check to see -- the audience. Matt Schultz, would you like to -- oh, you are Matt. Sorry, man. I have several folks who do not wish to testify. I will just go down the list. So, Donna Reese? Annie Bollar? Okay. William Bollar same thing, sir? Okay. I have Robert Seiver. No? Okay. Is there anyone who does wish to testify on this application but didn't sign up? Can you approach, sir, we can chat about it.

Bollar: I live directly across the street --

Fitzgerald: Can you state your name and your address for the --

Bollar: Okay. William Bollar. 3815 East Hickory Road.

Fitzgerald: Thanks.

Bollar: Been out there for 30 years. Seen a lot of development. We know we can't stop it, more or less. I want to know about the well and sewer. Private well. Community well.

Fitzgerald: Okay. I will have the applicant --

Bollar: Okay. Sewer. Community sewer. Septic. Okay. Because there is no sewer out there; right?

Fitzgerald: I believe, sir, there is sewer coming across the property to the west. I believe. And so -- and I will have the applicant address that when he comes back up to comment.

Bollar: Okay. And I'd like to know about the house that exists there right now on the property. A nice house. Are they tearing that down?

Fitzgerald: They are required to move the property -- or remove that house --

Bollar: Okay.

Fitzgerald: -- before development.

Bollar: Also we run a daycare across the street. Might be an impact on that, too. Like I say, I'm not against the development, I just want that to be on record. Okay? So, there is a lot of traffic of people dropping off their kids and we are directly across -- I'm on the corner of Victory and Terry, so -- been out there 30 years. Okay?

Fitzgerald: Appreciate it. Thank you very much, sir. Is there anyone else who wishes to testify? Matt, do you want to come back up and close?

Schultz: Thanks. Matt Schultz again. Thanks. The site is to be provided with water and sewer. It's already in on our boundary. Sutherland Farm will extend it. In fact, the city wants us to put a dry line in Victory to serve future properties to the south when the connection is made further to the west. We drain to the north, but regionally the property has an order that -- so, we are responsible to put that in, even though we are not going to use it, so that's one of the conditions of our development. We will put full frontage water and sewer and the existing well will be abandoned in accordance with the Department of Water Resources regulations and the septic will be abandoned and the house, we hate to say, is just in a really bad spot. We might end up picking it up and moving it and using it someplace else. Worst case scenario we will have to get rid of it, obviously. We are not sure where it's going yet, though. Whether it's going -- and tearing it down or we are going to try to salvage it. We are not sure. As far as traffic and all that, yeah, Victory is an arterial. We are actually giving -- or ACHD wants another 23 feet on top of the 25 they have for a 48 foot half. So, it will be almost

a hundred foot wide right of way there, probably five lanes at build out. We are not building it now, but at some point in the future -- you know how ACHD works, you know, they come in after and widen things like ten years later. So, they are reserving that corridor with our plat and I -- actually, I didn't read the fine print on the ACHD staff report, I didn't know I had to go to a hearing to get that roundabout out of there. I'm not sure how a roundabout got on their master plan, but -- but it did. So, I got to go to a hearing and get that removed and it will be easy, there is no reason for it, you know, but I guess talking to ACHD previously about it, they put them in for placeholders regionally. You know, if there are collectors there it might make sense to reserved that, but in this case it certainly doesn't. So, that roundabout would take out Mr. Bollar's house if they wanted that and probably some of our lots, too, but it's just not necessary in that location. So, we are confident we will get that removed. So, I appreciate your time.

Fitzgerald: Thank you, sir. Any questions for the applicant?

Schultz: Thanks.

Fitzgerald: I would entertain a motion to close the public hearing.

McCarvel: Mr. Chairman?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner McCarvel.

McCarvel: I move we close the public hearing on H-2016-0088.

Wilson: Second.

Fitzgerald: All those in favor say aye?

MOTION CARRIED: THREE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Fitzgerald: What is the will of the Commission?

McCarvel: Mr. Chairman?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner McCarvel.

McCarvel: I think the R-4 looks great. It, obviously, fits in with the surrounding and, hopefully, that will help him get in with Sutherland Farms HOA and I kind of like the idea of a nice big welcoming entrance. If I were going to have one of those lots that would be nice to pull into, but I think it does -- definitely would get - - we would need to tie it into -- but that's only okay if he gets into the HOA. If not I'm thinking -- I mean -- pardon me, but I think this was kind of just an afterthought. I think if you had open space that you had to put in here I don't think you put it just behind the first lot I think you want to see something else and

we would want to see those amenities -- what amenities you had planned if that HOA plan falls through.

Wilson: I agree. I like the way it looks and I also agree with the Commissioner about sort of that -- if they don't -- you know, aren't accepted into the HOA maybe having that alternative plan.

Fitzgerald: Yeah.

Wilson: I'd like to hear what you have to say.

Fitzgerald: And could we put that up just so we could look at it again? Yes. It's already in the record. Thanks, sir. And I definitely want to put it in the DA, so it gives the ability -- Commissioner McCarvel, do you want it to come back to us if it is a matter of -- it does not get into the -- they don't get into the HOA?

McCarvel: I think either to us or the staff would have -- at least it would need their okay one way or the other. I mean -- because just to slap a green space up here -- I mean --

Fitzgerald: Yeah.

McCarvel: -- I just -- number one, I don't think that's where it would go. If you could put it farther back in and it needs to show something but just have the dog park.

Wilson: Does staff have -- well, yeah. And does staff have a recommendation in terms of process, what might be --

Fitzgerald: In the form of a motion?

Wilson: Yeah.

Beach: I think it becomes tough to dial this back and maybe step back after we have already given approval and Council's already made their approval of the preliminary plat. Now, it could change in the final plat, but once the preliminary plat is recorded that way and been approved, I don't know that there is a way that we can make them put the open space someplace else. I don't know if Bill has got a different opinion.

Parsons: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission, Code gives us flexibility between the preliminary plat and a final plat. So, in that -- under that specific section of our ordinance they are allowed to shift their common open space to a different location in a development, as long as they maintain that same amount. They can reduce it, they can increase it -- or maintain the same amount. So, we have that flexibility already to look at this with a future final plan application. I

don't see this being much of a substantial change from what you're seeing tonight. It's -- it's, basically, doing exactly what staff has conditioned in the staff report.

Fitzgerald: Yes.

Parsons: We said plat common lots for a street buffer and, then, if you can't get in with the HOA, then, we expect to have open space central within this development, so that we don't have kids playing along Victory Road in the future when it gets widened. We want that amenity internal -- the open space and that amenity internal to the development and so that's what I think he's trying to show you that, yes, he's recognized that DA provision and that's how he's -- this is how he's going to comply with the DA provision that we have -- as it's currently written in our staff report and Josh can certainly pull that up for you and have you read that and see if that gives you any assurances that it doesn't need to come back to the Commission for -- for approval.

Fitzgerald: And I would feel comfortable giving staff the leeway to make that happen within the DA, as long as we include in our motion that the applicant is required to get this to the staff to be included in the DA --

McCarvel: Right.

Fitzgerald: -- if they are not included in the Sutherland Farm HOA.

McCarvel: Okay.

Fitzgerald: Okay.

McCarvel: Mr. Chairman?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner McCarvel.

McCarvel: After considering all staff, application, and public testimony, I move to recommend approval to the City Council of file number H-2016-0088 as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of August 18th, 2016, with the following modifications -- I'm sorry, Bill, is it already in the staff report that that's a condition?

Parsons: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission, it is, but you can just say and attach an exhibit to go along with that DA.

McCarvel: Okay.

Parsons: As shown at the hearing.

McCarvel: With the modification that it's approved as long as the plan goes forward to be attached to the Sutherland Farms HOA and that the -- if that does not happen that they work with staff before the final plat to redirect the amenities.

Wilson: Second.

Beach: Was it your intent -- I didn't hear. Did you intend to have the exhibit attached to the DA that you showed on the overhead projector?

McCarvel: Yes.

Beach: Okay. Just wanted to clarify that.

Wilson: Second.

Fitzgerald: I have a motion and a second. All those in favor signify by saying aye.

MOTION CARRIED: THREE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

E. Public Hearing for Paisley Meadows (H-2016-0089) by Hayden Homes Idaho, LLC Located at 2180 East Amity Road

1. Request: Preliminary Plat Consisting of 75 Building Lots and Six (6) Common Lots on 20.18 Acres of Land in an R-4 Zoning District

Fitzgerald: Okay. Thanks, Matt. Appreciate it. Okay. Moving on through our agenda. I would like to -- or I would open the public hearing on Paisley Meadows, application H-2016-0089 and we will come back to Josh for the staff report.

Wilson: Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner Wilson.

Wilson: Before we begin this I just want to disclose that I am a resident of Bellingham Park. I have consulted with the city's attorney about a conflict. They have indicated that I don't have one. I feel like -- considering our role as a recommending body to City Council about whether this, you know, fits with the Comprehensive Plan and city code, that I can be objective in that role.

Fitzgerald: Commissioner McCarvel, do you have any issues?

McCarvel: No.

Fitzgerald: That's an open conversation.

McCarvel: Yes. I don't have a problem.

Fitzgerald: I have no problem. So, thank you for the disclosure, sir. And, Josh, would you like to proceed, sir.

Beach: Very good. This is an application for preliminary plat. The site consists of 20.18 acres of land. It's currently zoned R-4. Located at 2180 East Amity Road. To the north, as has been said, are residential properties in the Bellingham Park Subdivision, which are zoned R-8. To the east are rural residential or agricultural properties zoned RUT within Ada county. To the south is East Amity Road and the rural residential or agricultural property zoned RUT also in Ada county. And to the west are single family residential properties in the Estancia Subdivision, which are currently zoned R-4. Some history on this -- on this property. In 2006 the property was granted annexation and zoning and a preliminary plat for 62 single family lots and nine common lots on the same acreage for what was called the Cotswold Village Subdivision. In 2008 the final -- the property was granted final plat approval for 19 single family residential lots and seven common lots on 6.7 acres of land, which subsequently it expired. The Comprehensive Plan future land use map designation for this property is low density residential. The proposed plat consists of 75 building lots and six common lots, which I believe due to some changes since the application was submitted it has been reduced to four common lots, instead of the prior mentioned six. So, 75 building lots and four common lots. The plat is proposed to develop in -- in two phases. So, the site plan -- as you see here this has since been revised and I neglected to -- the revised plan in here that shows a street coming here, instead of what is shown as a common lot in a pedestrian pathway. There was an issue with the block length here that has been -- since been revised and this is what it looks like now. This is the phasing plan. So, if you see this dashed line here this is phase one and towards Victory this is phase two. The property is designated low density residential on the Comprehensive Plan future land use map. Low density residential areas are anticipated to contain single family residences at densities up to three dwelling units per acre. The proposed preliminary plat includes 75 residential building lots on the dimension of 20.18 acres of -- of land for a gross density of 3.72 dwelling units per acre. The gross density is slightly above the density outlined in the Comprehensive Plan. That is consistent with the maximum density requirements of the R-4 zoning district, which is right in these, because this piece has already been annexed and given a zoning designation, so just to insure that the project is in line with -- and it is. The average lot size within the development is 8,480 square feet. The applicant indicated in the application that the minimum home size for the development would be 1,200 square feet. However, in subsequent discussions with the applicant they are aware that the minimum lot size for this -- minimum

home says -- I should say for properties within the R-4 zoning designation is 1,400 square feet. So, that will be what they will be held to. There is an existing home and outbuildings on the site and the home is proposed to be removed, as well as the outbuildings. The development is required to comply with the dimension standards listed in UDC for the R-4 district and staff has reviewed that and found that they are in compliance with those standards. ACHD did not require a traffic impact statement for -- for this development. Access to the site is currently divided via -- currently provided via East Amity Road, which is considered an arterial street. The access will be terminated with the development of the proposed subdivision. The plat as submitted does not depict direct lot access and is not in accord with the -- with the UDC access being proposed from South Rangewood Way on the north here and from -- from the west via East Melwood Street, which are both local residential streets. Just so -- to be aware, I did receive an e-mail from a staff planner at the Ada County Highway District in regards to this application. They had indicated their support in maintaining the access to -- to Amity Road strictly for construction purposes of the development, which will be terminated upon development of phase two, so that you're aware of that. East Melwood Street and South Rangewood Way are stubbed to the site and the applicant is proposing to stub to the property to the east and staff is supportive of that, which is -- which is proposed for this development. A 25 foot wide street buffer measured from the back of curb is required along East Amity Road, a residential -- which is clearly a residential arterial street per UDC Table 11-2-A5 and shall be landscaped in accord with the standards of the UDC. The applicant has proposed a 35 foot, plus or minus, wide buffer to be located along the arterial street there. A ten foot wide compacted gravel shoulder meeting the construction terms of the transportation authority and landscaping, which is lawn or vegetative ground cover is required along East Amity Road in accord with the UDC. A minimum of ten percent qualified open space is required to be provided for this development, based on the area of the preliminary plat, which is approximately 20.18 acres. A minimum of 2.01 acres of qualified open space is required to be provided. A total of 10.01 percent qualified open space is proposed, consisting of half the street buffer along East Amity Road, a micropath lot, a drainage lot, and internal common open space areas, which comply with the requirement. And just so that -- as an aside, the applicant is also proposing two pedestrian connections to the proposed sidewalk along Amity Road that will extend from these cul-de-sacs on the south. The open space proposed, the applicant indicates will be benches, a tot lot, and some amenities for -- it's not technically considered a dog park, but they are going to have some amenities for pet owners as well on their common lot. Staff is recommending approval of the application. Because homes on lots that back up to East Amity Road will be visible, staff is also recommending that the rear or sides of those structures incorporate articulation through changes in material, color, modulation and architectural elements, both horizontal and vertical, to break up any monotonous wall plains and roof lines. Did receive written testimony from Kathy Martin, Todd Woodward, Miranda Carson, Jerri Teibel, Kathleen Mercer, John Walker, Clarissa Amos, Katherine Steinhauser and at

about 5:00 o'clock this afternoon I received an additional e-mail from -- pardon me -- Bill Manning, which I'm giving you a copy of. As I said, staff is recommending approval and I will stand for any questions you have.

Fitzgerald: Thanks, sir. Is there any questions for Josh? Thank you, sir. Would the applicant like to come forward. Please state your name and your address for us.

Erickson: Mr. Chair, Members of the Commission, I'm Ross Erickson with Erickson Civil. 6213 North Cloverdale Road in Boise. Here tonight representing the applicant. First off, thanks, Josh, for the concise staff report and presentation. Certainly appreciate your efforts. We agree with staff that the proposed development is consistent with the surrounding areas. We are proposing 75 single family detached units on just over 20 acres. The development directly to the west is Estancia, which is also zoned R-4, which is consistent with our zone. To the north is Bellingham, which is R-8, and, then, to the northeast would be Messina Meadows, which is also R-8. The RUT parcel directly to the east is, obviously, not within the city, but the parcel directly to the east of that parcel is also zoned R-8. So, we feel that we have got a good -- a good I guess mesh of meld with the surrounding developments with regards to the zone and the use for the proposed plat. The access to the site was, basically, predetermined for us. We have got stub streets at the north and stub streets at the west from Melwood Street. Direct access to Amity Road will not be allowed, nor requested and the reason being is that, number one, it won't work for ACHD. Number two, we just don't need the additional access to Amity Road and it doesn't fit with the city's codes. So, that's not being requested. Josh was correct that we did talk with ACHD about a temporary construction access to Amity. The intent would be to minimize construction traffic on the local streets per the residents to the east -- or to the west and to the north and that's something that we would be open to if -- if the Commission thought that would be a good idea. How that would work is it would -- it would be utilized in the initial phase of development and, then, upon construction of the frontage improvements along Amity Road, obviously, that temporary access would need to be removed, so we can build our landscape buffer and fencing and -- and do our improvements to Amity Road. The interior streets are 34 feet wide. They accommodate parking on both sides. They will include detached sidewalks with eight foot planter strips with trees and grass and sprinklers. At the northeast corner we have reserved a common lot for an ACHD storm drain facility. The portion of that lot that is not encumbered by the storm drain pond would be landscaped to the extent that ACHD would permit -- include trees and shrubs and grass and irrigation and things. In the central portion of the development is where the -- there is a larger open space that will include a tot lot and we are also going to put a pet station, if you will, that will include some refuse bags and a disposal container for pet owners that are walking their dogs that -- that may need to use that. We are also proposing to put some benches in that area for

sitting. We have got a two block connection -- can you see what I'm pointing at when I touch the screen?

Fitzgerald: Pick a color.

Erickson: Okay. Oh, pick a color? We will do that connection there that will include a pathway with landscaping on both sides and as Josh pointed out, we have got pedestrian connections from the terminus points of those bulb outs to Amity Road for pedestrian connectivity. The city requires a 20 foot wide landscape buffer along arterial roadways. We are actually proposing a 37 foot buffer along Amity and the reason for that is to have a little bit better setback for the homes that will be located along Amity, just to get a little bit further away from the road and provide a little bit better buffer at that location. That pretty much sums it up. With that I will stand for questions. We have reviewed the staff report and we are in agreeance with all the conditions that are included therein, so -- yeah. I would stand for questions.

Fitzgerald: Any questions for the applicant? Thank you very much.

Erickson: Thanks.

Fitzgerald: Okay. I have several people signed up to testify tonight, so I'm just going to go down the list and go from there. Crystal Dickerson. Please state your name and your address for us, ma'am.

Dickerson: Crystal Dickerson. 1889 East Brentwood Drive. I'm a resident in Bellingham Park and -- I'm a resident of Bellingham Park and the main concern for me is that there is no access point to Amity for 75 homes. There are multiple children in Estancia, as well as Bellingham Park, where these people are going to be driving to get to their properties. Just from Locust Grove to Rangewood I estimated about 38, 40 students just in that area. In addition to that, there is also a pool and a park right there on Wrightwood Drive, which would be one of the main access points. That's very concerning, especially during the summertime with all of the kids going to and from the pool and the park. Another concern is that our school district or elementary school is Sienna and it is within walking distance. There is no busing. So, we are going to have multiple children going to and from school on bikes, on scooters, walking, which is also another concern if we are going to bring in 75 more homes. There is four entrances off of Amity between Locust Grove and -- and Eagle Road, but there are ten entrances between -- on Locust Grove in between Victory and Amity. So, I'm not sure why there is not going to be an access point off of Amity for this subdivision. If they can put 75 homes in to the original proposed 62, I think they can put a road in to keep the other subdivision safe and our children safe and keep the traffic down. We already have an issue with speeding cars on Wrightwood Drive, as well as on Rangewood. You know, they are just access points and people just zoom through and so that's a major concern for me.

Fitzgerald: Amy Shinsel.

Shinsel: Amy Shinsel. 1867 East Wrightwood Drive. I actually live next door to Crystal and I would agree that we have a major speeding issue there and to increase the traffic that much is only going to make that worse. My biggest question is why a traffic impact study was not done. I think that the findings would show that it's -- it's needed and if it was done at the exit, then, it is also very necessary. Also I'm concerned about the amenities. We have a pool in Bellingham Park. We have an ongoing issue with neighborhoods that are close by that don't have similar amenities, constantly trying to use ours. We pay for those. We maintain those. Add in another community that doesn't contribute to that will only make that problem worse as well. So, I am also concerned about their amenities and what their intentions are there. If it's just a park, if it's a gazebo -- I'm curious exactly what they plan to do that's going to be incentive enough to keep them from coming to our neighborhood and using all of that. Also a speed and traffic study of some kind was done a couple of months ago and I'm sure there is a record of that somewhere with the county and I think you would see that -- I want to say it was less than ten cars that we missed being eligible for speed bumps on that main drive on -- on Wrightwood Drive and so, again, I'm curious why a traffic impact study wasn't done considering an additional 75 homes and how that would affect the traffic on that road, especially with the high density of children that Crystal mentioned just in that area. Thanks.

Fitzgerald: Jared Perry. And entourage.

Perry: Jared Perry. 4690 South Glenmere, Meridian. We are in the Estancia Subdivision. We are actually representing the HOA board and I'm deferring it to John Walker.

Walker: John Walker. 4592 South Glenmere Way in Meridian, Idaho.

Fitzgerald: Thank you.

Griffin: Earl Griffin. 1920 East Daulby Street, also in Estancia Subdivision.

Walker: Hi, Commissioners. Not to beat a dead horse here, you're going to hear a lot about -- from us of what you have heard from them. Essentially, traffic is what we are -- our biggest concern and not having access from Amity into the subdivision. As Mr. Baird alluded a little earlier, it's not, you know, your guys' area as far as building the roadways. ACHD -- it's a back-and-forth battle, but we do decide where the homes go and when they go in. So, you know, my question to that is is that in line with city growth, as far as where we are putting these homes and how we are putting them in and access to the homes. The staff mentioned that Melwood would be to access mode. It's not a through street from anywhere in the neighborhood. It actually dead ends in the middle of the

neighborhood, so anyone coming into our neighborhood would have to come in from Locust Grove and go around through Adelaide and/or Daulby Street and connect onto Glenmere Street to, then, go on Melwood into the new subdivision. That's a lot of traffic cruising through the neighborhood. In addition, Melwood -- or, excuse me, Glenmere from the south is going to probably take the bulk of the traffic for our neighborhood, as well as Wrightwood through our neighboring north neighborhood. So, all that traffic is mentioned -- you guys mentioned through several of these it seems like a good place to raise a family, so I assume that you have families, you would be concerned about your children, too. At 75 cars -- or 75 homes averaging probably two cars per home, coming and going at least twice a day, that's 300 vehicles passing through there every -- every day. If we missed it by ten cars for speed bumps, we are definitely going to need it now. I appreciate them saying, hey, we will put a construction entrance there for that. That -- you know, noise pollution was a big concern of ours, but at the same time, you know, they started phase one in the north to move south and I think initially that's just because that's where the roadways were and they thought that maybe they could appease some people by putting a construction bridge through there during construction, but to say that once construction is done and we have 75 homes and another 150 vehicles cruising through our neighborhood, that's what our biggest concern is and as my personal opinion I don't feel like this flows with the neighborhood as you all approved the first Silverwater application based on the flow of the plat with the neighboring neighborhoods, I would have to disagree with this -- with this situation. I'm going to pass it onto to Earl and ask if he has anything he would like to add.

Griffin: Yeah, Commissioners. I would -- I would agree with John. I live right on the corner of Glenmere and Daulby. There is a drainage in the street there and that's pretty much a straight through. There was a study done, because several of the neighbors in that corner complained about the speeding. There is no stop signs on any of the corners. I have watched cars coming through there and bottom out coming through so quickly. Almost had several accidents there. I guarantee if we have 200 more cars a day going through there it's going to cause issues. We have got nothing but children in all the homes along Glenmere. They play out in the street. The park is on Melwood on the backside. They are constantly walking over there to go to the park. I don't disagree with putting in the homes, I think it's a great idea. I think the growth is something we can't stop, but I do think we need to think about traffic and I understand we can't control everything, but we can control some things and we need to think about the flow of traffic of how things are going to be. We really don't want Meridian PD having to come out here and work a fatal on one of our children in the street. Thank you.

Fitzgerald: Thanks, gentlemen. Mario Whitlock. No? I have two Whitlocks. Is there multiple Whitlocks in the room? Okay. Clarissa Amos.

Amos: Hi. I'm Clarissa Amos. I live at 4417 South Mitman Way. I'm also on the board for our HOA. I have talked with Josh Beach and Ada County Highway Division a lot. Well, him not too much, but Ada County Highway Division a lot over the last two years over the speeding issue, because I'm right at the corner of Mitman and Wrightwood, so right around the roundabout. The speeding issue has been a problem for the last two years. I did have a speed test -- or speed -- my gosh. The study done in January. The peak hour was 83 and I guess the policy is 800. They said that we only had at the average 24 miles per hour speed coming in, which is -- I'm sure because they see the strips. On a regular basis I hear people shift coming through my house and I'm right at the entrance and, you know, there is no reason for that. We do have a lot of kids that are playing on the roundabout, that travel over to the park and the pool and everything and, you know, we have had a lot of neighbors express concern over the potential of them getting hit, which was why I was advocating to have speed bumps put in, but we didn't quality. I know that I spoke with John Wasson with Ada County Highway Division Wednesday, yesterday, and he talked with planning and, then, called me back and let me know that I know -- I think the 2017 White Oak -- or was it White Bark across -- I just went brain-dead up here. White Bark on the south side of Amity plans to expand on the north side and, then, they will share entrance with Paisley Meadows. But until then we have to deal with the traffic coming through Wrightwood and it's not just that they are right there, they have to come in from our main entrance, go all the way through our subdivision and our subdivision on Wrightwood, it goes to Bellingham Park, it goes to Estancia. We have Tuscany in the back. So, we already have a lot of through traffic and with all of that -- I mean the increase of the 75 homes and -- we have a huge concern for the speeding and the safety of our children. I don't know what else to say. Kind of tongue tied now.

Fitzgerald: It happens to me constantly. So -- oh. And that was the other thing. I didn't know until I looked at the packet for their proposed plans. They only notified homeowners within 300 feet of the address, but it affects everybody from the entrance of Bellingham Park all the way down to Rangewood and none of us knew about it. It was only I think ten people in attendance for that meeting. I mean it seems a little sneaky. So, I would add -- and on top of the -- I know they are having a construction entrance on Amity, but I would also like to see that we have no construction signs posted at our entrances, so that we don't have to deal with the constant construction coming all the way from Locust Grove down to Rangewood on a daily basis for an unlimited known time. That was my beep; right?

Fitzgerald: Thank you. I'm going to try this one. Okay. Is it Corey Cleaver? Or Cleveland? No? Annie Moore. Thank you, ma'am. Please state your name and your address, please, ma'am.

Moore: My name is Annie Moore. I live at 4398 South Rangewood Way, Meridian, Idaho. I have a very huge problem with this. I am literally next door.

What used to be this beautiful cornfield that I like to look out onto is now turning into a subdivision. Not super pumped about that. I know I can't stop that. I have a huge problem with the entrance being on Rangewood. Right now Wrightwood is the only entrance to Bellingham Park. Estancia has two entrances. Tuscany has three or four entrances. But Wrightwood is the only connection for Bellingham Park. So, this -- Wrightwood is actually connecting -- will be -- currently connects four subdivisions. This will be the fifth one coming in. Whereas other places around this city have smaller concerns that leave a main road and, then, subdivisions or streets off of that main road. Officially Wrightwood is a residential street. There are houses that face Rangewood. There is a basketball court outdoor -- or basketball hoop out there where kids play. This is also where the pool is and two major parks for Bellingham Park. If you create all of this traffic without leaving an entrance on Amity, emergency vehicles not only have to do the travel down Wrightwood and continue all the way through to get to the very back end of this new subdivision on Amity or they have to travel through Estancia, that's going to delay time anyway, that's going to make emergency vehicles speeding through our neighborhoods to get to help. If I was living in the very back corner next to Amity I would be livid that it took them that long to get there. I also was a renter on Mitman in Bellingham Park right across the street from Clarissa and I can attest to the fact that people fly in through that neighborhood at 40 miles an hour. We have screeching tires. We have heard shifting gears. We have heard everything. It's ridiculous how fast they go. There are no stop signs. There are no speed bumps. There are no nothing. And this is not just coming into Bellingham, this is coming into Estancia. Nobody travels down the road to the other entrances, they only go through Wrightwood and that's where five subdivisions will now be coming down. You guys got to consider something on Amity, because having that many cars come through one place -- in addition to impacting Locust Grove even more, it's -- I waited in a 20 car back up today to travel down Locust Grove three times for cars turning in and out of there. School buses and everything else. It took me 15 minutes to drive a quarter of a mile. That is only going to get worse with another 300 cars in and out of there all day long. Thank you.

Fitzgerald: Thank you, ma'am. John Walker. Okay. Thanks, John. Ross Branson. Okay. Thank you. Rhonda Walker. Okay. Katherine Steinhauser. No? Michael Thompson. Sir.

Thompson: Michael Thompson. 4668 South Glenmere Way. I apologize. I have a little bit of a dry mouth waiting here for so long. So, in 2014 moved to Estancia and had beautiful views of the mountains and everything else, right? And we moved there for two reasons. One, because of Sienna. My daughter is autistic and we had a choice to move to various locations after my company went public and the reality is that this, it's one of the better schools there. So, I like the area booming. It's great for business, so on and so forth. Here is the problem. 2015, September 15th, actually, I asked Ada County to do a study -- traffic study. Here is the reason why. I have eight video cameras at my house pointing on the

street because of the field I'm in. Reality is simple math can tell how fast people are going. I offered to give them 15 clips in a four day period, the people going back and forth on the road in excess of the speed limit. They came out, they went ahead put out a little sign and also went ahead and did a -- I guess a radar gun that registers stuff. They said there is no need for anything. There is no solution to the problem. What I found in my career is that we typically react to anomalies and overact; right? Someone getting hit by a car is an anomaly. Low probability, high impact event. But when we talk about making money, adding a few extra homes and the entrance, right, we typically ignore anomalies. That's so low risk, you know, we don't need to worry about it, because money is on the way. Bottom line is my autistic daughter has problems. She just learned how to walk, you know, here this year. So, when she's walking she can go certain places. We watch her like a hawk. But she just got a bike, you know, she's getting ready to go to a special new school that we just built down the road. Congratulations on that by the way. And I'm worried for her. I'm worried for her, because she doesn't have the capacity to advocate for herself or be fully aware of the situation and by increasing the number of cars that are going to be present on this road, one thing is going to occur, right? Risk. The risk dimension is going to change. How do I mitigate my child's risk with no entrance; right? What's -- you know, these are things I don't have the math to right now. But I do know that increased cars does increase the risk. Which means I'm going to have to go ahead and reduce how much time she can spend by herself out front. You know, the Perrys live next door, they have a couple kids, they play, we try to watch them, but kids are kids. I know for a fact that people speed. Can't do anything about it. At the end of the day if we have to make concessions to have the construction to go through the -- from Amity into the development, there is a problem with that. You've already said that can't be done. Thank you.

Fitzgerald: I have an Earl -- and I can't read your last name? Thank you, sir. Pete Nelson. Mr. Nelson, if you would state your name and your address for the record, please.

Nelson: Sure. My name is Peter Nelson at 1803 East Wrightwood Drive. 83642. I appreciate the opportunity to -- to express some concern this evening and I echo what my neighbors have said. All of us on Wrightwood Drive are very concerned, because it is the main entrance in and out of almost every place around us. But I also want to lift up the emergency egress. It is blatantly ignored in this. If something happens in the south end of this 20 acre lot, everything has to come through a very circuitous route, delay emergency folks, fire, EMS, et cetera, and the solution is very simple. An egress on Amity Road would make it very very easy for folks to get in and out, especially for -- for kids to get to the two new schools, but for public safety and public concern about fire, police, and emergency vehicles coming in and out. It just makes sense and if I had a chance I would love to present to the highway department saying why in the world won't you do a study and why in the world do you say we don't need an access there,

because I think it's just common sense to have an access on Amity Road. Thank you.

Fitzgerald: Laura Dahl.

Dahl: Could I use this right here?

Fitzgerald: Yes, ma'am.

Dahl: Overhead?

Fitzgerald: Josh, can you set that up for her?

Dahl: So, I'm Laura Dahl. 4358 South Mitman Way. Thanks for taking time to listen to me. So, I have a rudimentary drawing of how many neighborhood entrances are on Locust Grove, which is here and, then, how many neighborhood entrances run along Amity, which is here. So, approximately, what, two, four, six, eight, ten -- ten-ish along Locust Grove between Amity and Victory and we only have three neighborhood entrances between Eagle and Locust Grove. I just think it's a poor design. I'm not sure why planning would not agree to put an entrance off of Amity. If you look at the amount of homes, 882, you will see an asterisk by some of them and they were a guess. I didn't know the exact amount of homes. So, I put an asterisk. Probably Tuscany -- the Lakes is a little higher than a hundred homes coming out of there. That is a major entrance to Tuscany here. That's quite a bit of traffic right there in between Victory and Amity and where you're adding 75 more homes of traffic coming out on Locust Grove, where we could have a simple solution of routing it off of Amity instead and not coming through Bellingham Park. I just think it's a bad design. I also feel like the notification was poor. Now, mind you the closest exit, if it does come through Rangewood, would be out Bellingham Park. You're also going to have people peeling out through Tuscany; right? So, they can come out and they can go -- their quickest exit would be off through Bellingham Park down Wrightwood. Yet they could also go right around the curb and weed through Tuscany. Those people were not notified of this hearing and I'm not sure of any other hearings. I assume the posting and the notification was by code, but this -- this -- if this entrance is put in off of Rangewood, it will affect those homeowners tremendously, as well as Bellingham Park and I would say don't put it -- don't make the entrance off Rangewood, make it off of Amity, you know. If it comes down to money and safety, I would pick, you know, spending more money on safety; right? So, that's all I had to say.

Fitzgerald: Thank you, ma'am, very much. Russ Damyan? Maybe butchered that horribly. I apologize.

Damyan: Russ Damyan. 1819 East Wrightwood, Meridian, Idaho. 83642. I live across the street from the pool and also I contacted the sheriff's department

multiple times about speeding. Everybody's talking about speeding, speeding, speeding and it is correct. On Monday -- on Sunday I came home from a teen's camp and the police department already put a meter over on -- working with Fisher, Russ Fisher, and on Monday I was cleaning my trailer and I'm seeing a car driving 45 miles an hour in our subdivision and that's not acceptable. I'm looking at the meter and I'm seeing 45 miles an hour. I was shocked. And you guys going to be putting another subdivision, 75 more homes, that's going to be crazy, crazy busy, not acceptable. Also we have guests come over all the time on Sundays and the kids -- family has eight, ten kids. They always like to run across the street and play at the park and multiple times I'm looking across the street, across -- in my window across the street and I'm seeing a car flying by and a child wasn't getting hit. That's not acceptable. I moved into the subdivision from Caldwell when I was buying a house and I like the subdivision, because it is quiet. It was really nice. Everyone is being friendly. Being said with a speed issue, that's a big problem, because on Wrightwood -- and there is a park and there is a swimming pool -- there is a swimming pool and that on right -- if we are going to be adding another subdivision in there, there is going to be big traffic and there is a lot of kids that are running across the street back and forth and hopefully nobody is not going to be hit. If someone is going to be hit from a child, then, you guys will be happy, but right now nobody cares and also I contacted ACHD -- actually, they were at the party and they said they are going to be putting another meter out sometime soon. I'm not sure when they are going to be putting it out. They said within a couple of weeks. So, I ask the HOA to contact them again, make sure they put it up and make sure they test how many cars are going to be passing by that, so they can take action for that. Thank you.

Fitzgerald: Is there anyone else who would like to testify that isn't signed up on the list? Josh, real quick, can you talk about code in regards to notification, just so that's on the record and everyone understands distance from the property and those kinds of things, so we can --

Beach: The city code requires us to notify property owners within 300 feet of the subject property. We did do that. So, it meets the minimum -- meets the minimum requirements. We also put the posting on the website and it's also in the paper. So, there are multiple ways that we notify the neighborhood of what's going on with these developments.

Fitzgerald: Thank you, sir. No, ma'am. Sorry. If the applicant would like to come and close?

Erickson: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission, Ross Erickson again representing the applicant. I tried to keep some good notes here, I will, hopefully, respond to some of the -- the comments that the neighbors had made. We have got the right map up here to address the first comment. As we look at the overall plan for this area, ACHD's plan for this is to actually construct a connection

through the parcel to the east to align with the newly constructed approach at Marsala that comes out of White Bark, which if you look at the aerial perspective it -- it makes sense and, then, basically, what happens would be -- yeah. Exactly. Right where the cursor is there. There would be an approach that would connect into that RUT piece and that, then, would connect to Melwood, which would be stubbed to the east of our property to provide additional connection to Amity for the Paisley Meadows Subdivision. So, there will be additional point of connection to Amity at some point, it's just going to be timed with development and that's out of our control as far as when that will happen. We have a number of approaches. The minor arterial street -- the goal of ACHD and the cities is to try to minimize the amount of -- of access points, instead of increasing them, and for a minor arterial ACHD's policy is to not allow local streets to connect to arterial roadways and in addition to that, the spacing between Glenmere and Marcala is actually less than -- it's like about 1,240 feet and the spacing for our driveway approaches on a minor arterial street needs to be a minimum of 660 feet. So, it physically will not fit between those two approaches, even if we wanted to put it in and still meet ACHD's policy. So, hopefully, that addresses that there would be an additional connection made to Amity at a point in the future, which will distribute trips differently once that connection is made, as opposed to just, you know, using the Novara connection to the east and the Rangewood connection to the north. A traffic impact study was not required by ACHD. Their threshold is a hundred units. We are at 75. So, it's not something that they required of us, so we didn't do one. The first neighbor asked about the amenities and I will just clarify what those are again. We have an open space located kind of centrally that will include a tot lot. We are also going to include some -- like a pet station that includes a -- a refuse container and some bags for pet owners, as well as a seating area. We have also got some pedestrian connections out to Amity that will provide some good circulation for folks that want to go on walks and things and get out to the front without having to go through the Estancia Subdivision. With regards to traffic, we are sensitive to traffic. It's always an issue. I think it's one of those things where the neighbors are on the right course with enforcement in getting with the sheriff and talking to ACHD about perhaps what can be done on that street. It sounds like it's something that they may need to address at some point. But I think it's kind of -- I don't know, it's just something that sounds to me like they are on the right course as far as trying to fix that. Noise pollution was brought up. Our work hours for development will be in accordance with the city's code and we are not going to do anything outside of that with regards to work hours that would create, you know, undue noise burden on any of the neighbors. I think Josh explained the noticing. We weren't trying to be, you know, sneaky or undermine anybody, we just -- you know, we got the list from the city and we mailed it out like we were supposed to and had our meeting. So, I think we kind of did our due diligence there. There was a mention about construction -- no construction traffic signs at Glenmere at the Amity entrance and, then, also at -- what's the other street? At Wrightwood at the Locust Grove entrance. I think that's something that we could certainly do and basically both signs would be, you know, installed at the

same time as the construction access will go in and when the construction access was removed, then, those signs would, obviously, be removed, because we would need to get access to our property, because we could no longer have the temporary access. But we would be open to that, if that's something that the Commission wanted to impose on us. With regards to EMS, I believe all the -- the service providers have reviewed the plat and I don't think there were any special concerns notified with regards to response times or, you know, access getting to the end of the project. So, I don't think there is anything that's too out of the ordinary there. I think that hits most of the -- most of the highlights. Do you guy have any additional questions for me?

Fitzgerald: Any additional questions for the applicant? Thank you very much.

Erickson: Thank you.

Fitzgerald: And, Josh, just to be clear, there is not an emergency access bollard and grasscrete access required off of Amity; correct?

Beach: No. The fire department did not require that.

Fitzgerald: Thank you, sir. With that I would entertain a motion to close the public hearing on --

Wilson: Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Yes, sir. Commissioner Wilson.

Wilson: I move we close the public hearing on H-2016-0089.

McCarvel: Second.

Fitzgerald: All those in favor say aye. Okay. Thank you very much.

MOTION CARRIED: THREE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Fitzgerald: You want to take a shot, Commissioner McCarvel, or do you want to -- Mr. Wilson, you want to start?

McCarvel: You know, I think it, obviously, fits in with the zoning. I -- I wish there was another -- I mean with ACHD's plan to have another street, I know they have got their codes in how traffic best flows, having fewer entrances to the main arterial streets, I think the answer to this is really enforcement of current laws and getting help from the police and having the traffic obey the traffic laws that are already there and I know growth is hard and just -- I mean there is going to be another -- there will be an access to Amity out another way. It's just not on this area.

Fitzgerald: Commissioner Wilson.

Wilson: Mr. Chair, traffic is an issue in this area. I mean there is no doubt about it and there is no doubt that the residents -- my neighbors in the area are addressing that. It's also clear that there is going to be an Amity entrance to that -- that development, you know, that section development that's occurring to the south -- the north of Amity, but it's going to occur in this parcel. You know, it's a conundrum, because some of the remedies to traffic that were being discussed, like road bumps, happen if this -- you know, with these 75 additional houses and I don't know all the details of that, but, you know, if these 75 additional houses occur, some of those remedies that the neighbors are working with ACHD might be possible. On the other hand, if there is an Amity entrance that's premature and, again, not with what ACHD is planning on doing, so -- I mean that's kind of a clear conundrum. But, again, within the scope of what we are making a recommendation to City Council on, I mean it's clear this fits with the Comprehensive Plan and I think in terms of what could develop there, I mean this is a good development.

Fitzgerald: And I -- I tend to agree. I know this is not -- this is not an easy one. It's -- it's difficult. I know very personal situations that come into it. It's an R-4. It's a low density and I think with the zoning it could be R-8. And so I think that density wise it's a good -- it's a good project in that regard. It matches up to lot lines to Estancia to the west, and I think they try to match up. I think, hopefully, the community -- I mean, obviously, you guys are involved. We talked to ACHD about the speed bumps, talked to them about possibly adding some stop signs at some of those locations, because that's -- but to limit this development because of -- only because of that is -- it meets our code and it meets the develop -- or meets our future land use map and so for us the recommendation -- it makes sense to me. It's difficult, because ACHD has -- and our code don't allow us to add an access there, because that's not in the plan and so we have Fire and -- Fire and Police tell us what to do in regards to emergency accesses and what they need and so they have access in four different -- or will be three different locations. So, they feel comfortable that they can get to houses in that neighborhood with relative speed and so my -- this one is hard, because development comes to your neighborhood and it's not easy and so I -- I understand the concerns. But I think in looking at the plan and -- and how it matches up with our city code and development -- future land use map, I think it matches pretty well, so --

McCarvel: Mr. Chairman?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner McCarvel.

McCarvel: I do think we want to add the provision for the signs of no construction traffic through the existing subs, that they use the designated construction entrance off Amity.

Fitzgerald: Agreed. And I do -- and, Josh, is there a requirement -- we put the construction entrance into a motion to that as part of the -- it's -- okay. And I appreciate the -- the applicant working to put that in place. I think it will be invaluable to start the construction piece, so --

Beach: Chair, Commissioners, just -- just as you're making that motion maybe you want to make it clear that -- that, obviously, once that landscape buffer is constructed, which in this case it's likely to be in phase two, that that construction entrance would, then, go away and, then, the construction would, then, go through the existing streets, not through that Amity entrance. And so whenever that -- whenever that time period occurs.

Fitzgerald: Does that make sense?

McCarvel: Yeah. Mr. Chairman, I think -- I have a question I guess for staff. Is that landscape going to be finished at the beginning or the end of phase two?

Beach: So, this is not annexation, this is a preliminary plat. Typical with annexation we would require that the landscape buffer be installed with phase one. That's not something we can require at this point, because it's already been annexed into the city and we don't have that negotiating tool anymore, so that's part of phase two. Now, the applicant can agree to do it with phase one if they want to. I don't know that that makes sense in this case, because they are asking to have a --

McCarvel: It's got to be at the end or the beginning -- would the landscape be finished at the beginning or the end of phase two?

Beach: That's something you can ask the applicant.

McCarvel: Okay.

Beach: Yeah.

Parsons: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission, let's be clear that when we are talking a construction entrance into the development and it's meant for the installation of the roads, the water and sewer, as the developer -- as the process finishes up, then, the home builders come and they have to come in and start dropping off the building materials to start constructing the homes. So, I think that construction entrance is meant to be only for the subdivision improvements, it's not for -- not during the construction of the physical homes on the site. So, that's something that we need to probably take into consideration as well.

Fitzgerald: So, this is a final plat and, yeah, when we start pulling building permits that construction entrance is gone.

Parsons: That's the way the application -- the applicant has explained it to me this evening and I don't -- I'm not sure if that's how ACHD intended that to work as well.

Fitzgerald: Could we -- so, we need to reopen the public hearing and have the applicant come and explain this?

McCarvel: I think so.

Fitzgerald: Okay.

McCarvel: Mr. Chairman?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner McCarvel.

McCarvel: I -- I move that we reopen the public hearing to address our question regarding construction on Item No. H-2016-0089.

Wilson: Second.

Fitzgerald: All those in favor of opening the public hearing to hear about the construction entrance?

MOTION CARRIED: THREE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Fitzgerald: Ross, can you come and discuss that specific issue only, please?

Erickson: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission, Ross Erickson again. The initial intent of the -- the construction entrance concession was for development-related construction. Semis. Lowboys. Earth movers. Diggers. Dozers. Trackhoes. Heavy equipment. Big stuff. Not the guy with his pickup truck or his -- you know, your Toyota Camry that is a framer or something, you know. So, that was our initial intent. I suppose if -- if the Commission, you know, would prefer that we actually construct some sort of a temporary gravel access for home builder traffic as well, I think we could consider that. But as I mentioned, the intent was for heavy equipment, to keep the -- the big stuff off of the neighbors' local streets. But the guys that are driving the -- the conventional small passenger vehicles and pickup trucks would take access through the local streets just like everybody else. And I guess we would be open to -- you know, if it's something that's a deal breaker for us that we would need to provide a -- you know, a gravel access in until that landscape buffer was built, then, we could certainly do that, but --

Fitzgerald: What's your schedule for the landscape buffer off of Amity?

Erickson: So, that landscape buffer will not be required to be built in phase one; is that correct, Josh?

Beach: That is the understanding that we currently have; correct.

Erickson: That is a good thing for the temporary access, because that means it could remain open for the construction traffic for phase two without having to be rebuilt. So, the time frame would be -- you know, phase one would probably start in the spring and depending upon how quickly the lots get taken up, we may -- phase two will start, you know, before all the lots are sold in phase one, so it may be later in the year, it may even be the following year, depending on how -- how quickly the lots are sold, so --

Fitzgerald: And Josh or Bill, is there a -- is there a way to lay that out? Say we wanted to maintain a construction entrance through phase one -- because it's already going to be there. Is that -- is there something we need to -- something we need to follow in regards to compliance or --

Beach: I think that -- if it's something that you feel like you wanted to do to have them -- I mean there is probably a way to do that, so that there is a way to keep that access open for the framers or the construction crews going in there and maybe have a condition that they can't have -- it has to be removed prior to any signature on a final plat, you know, with the understanding that that's not going to remain that way. It will go away as soon as it's recorded now that -- in my mind that's how that would make sense, with the recording of the final plat for phase two, that that be removed.

Erickson: Right. And it's important to note also that, you know, when we say phase one is built out and we go in to build phase two, we end for the heavy equipment access, we are using this temporary access that we have been discussing. So, with the infrastructure construction in phase two, that temporary access is going to be removed, because we will be constructing the landscape buffer through there. So, at that point, you know, the signs need to come down and we need to be able to allow the home builders to be able to access the project, you know, be at the local streets.

Fitzgerald: So, signature on final plat for phase two, is that --

Erickson: For phase two.

Beach: Or you could say prior to the construction of the landscape buffer for phase two, which would deal with theoretically the end of the --

Fitzgerald: Does that make sense?

Erickson: That would be acceptable, yeah.

McCarvel: Okay.

Fitzgerald: Thanks, Ross. Anymore questions for the applicant?

Baird: Mr. Chair, procedural --

Fitzgerald: Yes, sir. Thank you.

Baird: -- issue. With the reopening of the hearing and the taking of the new testimony, there is a new issue on the table.

Fitzgerald: Okay.

Baird: I would recommend that you allow individuals in the audience to testify for the purpose only of the information that was just provided with the intent that it looks like you're heading in -- in the direction of specifying the -- and extending as long as possible that temporary construction entrance. Or temporary access.

Fitzgerald: Thank you for the guidance. With that being said, is there anybody that wants to testify specifically on the emergency road access. I will start to the right. The construction access. I'm sorry. Construction access. Please. And that's the only issue we are going to allow testimony on. Please state your name again for --

Thompson: Michael Thompson. 4668 South Glenmere Way, Meridian.

Fitzgerald: Thank you, sir.

Thompson: So, just want to say thank you for your working with us and all that and you're not a bad guy and, you know, hopefully, everyone can respect you for what you're doing. All right? So, with that said, I just want to say thank you. On this matter, the construction entrance, I think there needs to be clarity on -- on what the issue is from start to finish, because what I just heard is that for phase one or phase one of this construction effort, right, your terms and conditions -- conditions associated with what type of vehicles can come -- access the construction site; right? So, the majority of the problems I have, like -- and we saw this in portions of Tuscany and other areas were being built is -- you know, it's not the big trucks you have to worry about, it's the small trucks not properly loading up their gear, doing things that are violating, you know, probably something else somewhere, but the majority of the traffic -- my Land Rover has had six nails in them, you know, and it happens correlated around the time construction is going on. No one pays for that but me. Again, I think it's a good

solution, but is -- are there any assurances that we can get around making sure that our vehicles will be going through this construction entrance and not just the large backhoes, you know, so on and so forth? Because it sounds like there is a little bit of conflict in the information there.

Fitzgerald: We will clarify that.

Thompson: Okay. And one more question. Is code for mailing out addresses from the address on Amity, which it doesn't have the entrance, so there is a funny Amity address or is it from the property line?

Baird: Mr. Chair, that issue has already been discussed.

Thompson: Okay. Thank you.

Fitzgerald: Ma'am.

Dickerson: Crystal Dickerson. 1889 East Wrightwood Drive. So, the issue I have is, okay, they want to use the temporary construction entrance for the big equipment. That's great. But it's still going to bring the traffic -- the painters that drop paint in the middle of the road that my neighbor drove through that she ended up having to pay for it, because who are we going to talk to? It's the roofers that fly through there. It's in all of the construction people that are working on the homes. My husband works for a big construction company. I do know that those access points are easily moved for construction and if it's going to be a temporary issue -- I mean I want to know how temporary. Through phase one doesn't -- it doesn't cut it. There is still going to be the traffic through these two. It's still going to be the -- the painter that's running late to work that could possibly hit my kid. That's a big issue. We need to make sure that those access points are there through the end of construction, whether it, you know, is with his timeline landscaping or not and he doesn't live there. So, I'm sure he doesn't care. We who live there and have kids do care and to where it is a walking distance school zone, we are still going to have all of those kids walking to and from school, riding their bikes to and from school, riding their scooters to and from school, having the painters and the roofers, the framers and the sheetrockers dodging our kids, that's an issue. That temporary access needs to be there through the end of phase two, however long that is going to be, and if it's a temporary one, I don't -- that they are going to allowed to be there, I don't know why it can't be permanent if it's going to be temporary. Thank you.

Fitzgerald: Thanks, ma'am. Anyone else that wants to speak? Yes, ma'am.

Moore: Annie Moore. 4398 Rangewood Way, Meridian, Idaho. I am in the construction field, so I am acutely aware of construction access. Unfortunately, as many signs as you want to put up there, I can guarantee you that not everyone is going to pay attention to them. You can say no construction access

and people will still find a way to get down there. Deliveries will be made. Everything will happen unless there is absolutely no access to the construction zone for that point. So, you need to leave Rangewood and Melwood closed off completely and have only one access from the temporary access through Amity. Also another thing I'd like the Council to consider is we already know that there is now going to be a connection to Amity through the new White Bark Subdivision. Why can we not make that connection now as a part of this phase, put that in. We would no longer need temporary access to Amity, they can contribute -- they can bring all construction traffic through the entrance that everyone keeps saying we are now going to have through Amity and, then, eventually through the phasing connect the other streets. They have that anyway open right now. It's going to be there anyways, why not start off now and avoid all of this?

Fitzgerald: Thanks, ma'am. Ross, do you have anything to close, sir? Oh, sorry. One more. Is there someone else who wants to testify? Oh, sorry, ma'am. I apologize.

Dahl: Laura Dahl. 4358 South Mitman. I would agree with Annie, you know, why don't we go ahead and put the road into Amity out there to reduce traffic and all. But if that doesn't work, I didn't quite understand either the wording of maybe, probably, can we, as far as the temporary access. Phase one, phase two, I wasn't quite sure what you guys were talking about or the timelines, but what it sounded to me was like, okay, and once phase one is done we are going to close it up. So, you can sell your homes and your landscape will be done, but yet now the traffic's going to come through Bellingham Park. So, that didn't sit well with me; right? So, why don't they just leave it open until it's done and construct that area last, as opposed to closing it halfway through or when they are done with phase one and leaving it open? Why is our neighborhood going to have to take the brunt of the traffic for their phase two? Why don't they take the brunt of the traffic and finish that around that area and leave it open?

Fitzgerald: Thank you, ma'am. Anyone else wish to testify on this issue? Yes, sir.

Walker: Don Walker. 4592 South Glenmere Way. And, you know, I think a lot of us do appreciate the -- the temporary construction inlet, but even my greatest concern would be, you know, if it's only for heavy vehicles and not the carpenters and the roofers and the painters, you know, the -- the 150 cars going through there are going to be residents of that neighborhood. They might go a little slower because they live there and that's their community. These are coming in to do a job for a day or a week, they don't care. They're going to -- they are going to speed if they are late for work, like I mentioned. Not to mention that typically those people -- you know, blue collar workers or whatever, they're showing up at the job site at the same time the kids are getting picked up by buses. So, it's just going to be -- they are going to be crossing paths inevitably. You can't stop it. It's going to happen. So, as far as, you know, temporary for

heavy equipment, I have a problem with that. I would like to see it for all construction, home building and heavy equipment through the -- all of phase one and the majority of phase two. I mean that's what -- I don't understand why that isn't the last thing done, the landscaping. It has to be important on Amity it can't be done last, because on the Tuscany side just east of that, that new -- that last phase of theirs, that's pretty much the last thing they did was the -- the landscaping right there on Amity. So, I don't see why it couldn't be done here either. Thank you.

Fitzgerald: Okay. Last call.

Parsons: Mr. Chairman?

Fitzgerald: Yes, sir.

Parsons: I think we have some solutions. I'm over here trying to think how we can try to accommodate both the neighborhood and the applicant. I think there is a couple ways we can handle it. One, the applicant can change their phasing plan and maybe go north-south, have the first phase kind of bifurcate the property north-south, bringing that road in and, then, that way they can keep all of their construction, all of their equipment on the other -- the east half of the property and still work towards the east of that property. That could work. The other thing that they could do is under our codes they are allowed to put up surety for improvements. So, that's typically how it works. When we get into bad weather and landscaping and those things can't go in, the developer has the option to put up money to -- to basically guarantee the construction of those -- the landscaping and those amenities. So, if we were able to work with the applicant, maybe we can hold surety until the last home is developed in the site, keeping that access open, and at that time we hold that surety guaranteeing that once a portion of that landscaping was complete he would do those improvements, we would give him money back and, then, that way we would have less impact on the adjacent neighbors. So, we have some tools here. I think it just needs to fine tune, one, the phasing plan, so that we have the least amount of impact in the neighborhood and, then, two, stall or delay those -- the Amity Road improvements, with a surety insuring -- again, preserving the neighborhood, so construction traffic can continue to take their temporary access through Amity Road. But I think we -- I think that's the solution here is we just have to have a revised phasing plan or at least the applicant can come up with something different to maintain that construction access onto Amity and, then, delay a portion of that Amity Road landscape buffer to a surety process and we will have to monitor it through our database system that we have in place and notify our building department. But there -- there may be some options there.

Fitzgerald: Thank you. Sir, please, come --

Erickson: Once again, Ross Erickson. Are we clear as mud yet?

Fitzgerald: Yes, sir.

Erickson: The concern I have is that I believe that when ACHD suggested the construction entrance, they are referring to development related equipment and I guess what I don't want to do is -- is commit to something that ACHD will not allow us to do. So, you know, what I'm envisioning here is a full functioning access that -- how are you going to stop people from inside the development living there from using this access when it's not being intended to be used. So, if there is any way that we could -- you know, when developing or in this condition that we could include something there, like to the extent that ACHD will permit perhaps, because what I don't want to do is get us in a position where our hands are tied and we are basically -- we are conditioned to do something that we physically can't do based on what ACHD requires. So, if we could add that, if it's a condition -- I mean it's going to allow us to do whatever we can -- we want to -- we want to minimize construction traffic on local streets. That's the whole idea. But we don't want to commit to something that we can't do and, then, be stuck.

Fitzgerald: And what's your thoughts on reversing the phasing?

Erickson: The challenge with revising the phasing is sewer is coming from the north and all of our drainage is going to the northeast for the entire development. So, it was strategically planned to start at that end in order to basically bring the drainage and utility infrastructures south from the north. But with regards to Bill's suggestion about sureties and -- you know, if ACHD will allow us to leave a temporary access open, we are more than willing to -- to post a surety for that remaining landscaping to get phase two recorded and get in there and build houses and use that access, but I just -- what I don't want to commit to is saying that we are going to do that and, then, ACHD says, no, just that was intended for heavy equipment and development related traffic, not home builders and, then, we are stuck.

Fitzgerald: Commissioner McCarvel.

McCarvel: Your phase two, it's kind of hard to see, but that's like two-thirds of the way down this --

Erickson: Yeah. It's just south of the --

McCarvel: You have about 25, 26 lots there in phase two, so the bulk of it would be in phase one.

Erickson: That's correct.

Fitzgerald: Any additional questions for the applicant? Thank you very much.

Erickson: Thank you.

Fitzgerald: Bill, I think I'm okay with the phasing currently, but if we could do -- I think it's allowing that surety to be put in place to make sure that we have a -- some type of a mechanism to insure it gets done and, then, tie into final -- to signature on final plat on phase two. I know it doesn't cover it all, but it gives -- it gives the majority -- it's the majority -- two-thirds of the houses. It does give a little bit of relief to the neighbors, which I understand -- understand their concerns. Does that give us the ability to do that? To put a signature on phase two and the surety to close the access when -- when it's done?

Parsons: Chairman, Members of the Commission, I think that would work. The other option you have on the table tonight is to continue the project out, allow us to contact ACHD to see what they would allow and come back in two weeks and give you some assurances on what they would allow for that construction entrance. I mean that's your -- the other option, why try to work something this evening when you have it within your purview to continue this out and get more information.

McCarvel: Mr. Chairman?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner McCarvel.

McCarvel: I move to close the public hearing for the second time on H-2016-0089.

Wilson: Second.

Fitzgerald: All those in favor by saying aye.

MOTION CARRIED: THREE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Fitzgerald: Okay. Thoughts, Commissioners?

McCarvel: Mr. Chairman?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner McCarvel.

McCarvel: I have to admit my first thought was that construction traffic meant all construction traffic, not just the construction of the -- the loaders and stuff coming through there, but because I -- you know, living in the construction zones and I realize -- I mean paint and nails and everything, that does become an issue and so if we can mitigate that I think that would be helpful and I think just requesting it during the phase one -- because when you start looking at phase two it's not just the landscape down there, but you're looking at not being able to build on those lots down there, because that's going to -- those lots get closed off. That closes

off to Amity. So, you -- I mean I don't think it's fair to ask them not to be able to build on those lots until that's done. So, I think -- I mean phase two that would only be 26 homes that would have potentially construction traffic going out the other road to Amity. That's --

Fitzgerald: Your thoughts.

McCarvel: -- I guess that's my thoughts.

Fitzgerald: Commissioner Wilson.

Wilson: I guess -- so -- I mean I guess I would be open to continuing. I don't know if -- I don't know if that's necessary. If we can't get there -- I mean we are trying to go down a route -- we are mitigating construction traffic. Can we get there by continuing, anymore answers from ACHD to kind of where we were trying to get, kind of that hundred percent solution or are we going to be back here in two weeks kind of where we are at and I would like to hear your thoughts on that.

Fitzgerald: To be totally honest, I think we will be exactly in the same conversation we are tonight.

McCarvel: Uh-huh.

Fitzgerald: I get a sense on where we are headed. I don't -- I mean I -- honestly, ACHD has given the applicant and the staff direction and they are amenable to a temporary access, which I think we are going to direct how to use it. So, I -- again, I think we are doing our best to try to help the community with the issues that they presented. We can't cut access to a property that the applicant doesn't own, which is to the east. That's not an option. We can't direct that that road be built, because we don't know what's going to be built there. So, I appreciate that, but -- I mean I would love to be able to master plan some things, but that doesn't -- isn't in our purview right now. That's a county piece of property and it's not in this application. So, we are dealing with that application right now. And so my thought is I would -- I think if we continue it I think we are back in the same conversation in two weeks that we are now. But I will -- I will give you all the judgment on how we proceed. But I think we -- the phase two line is pretty generous. It's two-thirds of the subdivision and I think we can make it work to give as much relief to the community surrounding it as we can.

McCarvel: Yeah. Mr. Chairman, I say even if we had information from ACHD -- I mean I don't know that you're going to hang -- I don't know that it would stop it anyway. I did want to comment -- and correct me if I'm wrong, but I thought I -- I did want to address one of the comments about, you know, making that road out to Amity now instead of in the next subdivision, I think the method in the

madness there I think it was lining it up with the street that's already existing across from Amity. Did I hear that right, Josh? Yeah.

Beach: That's correct. There is a street here that theoretically the street would line up with White Bark, so --

McCarvel: Yeah. I think that's the reason on the -- doing it then instead of now.

Fitzgerald: Commissioner Wilson?

Wilson: Well, I mean bottom line there is going to be an Amity entrance. The problem with the way this is developing and the fact that this parcel doesn't go all the way out and -- because it is still county property to the -- to the east means that, yeah, I mean what we have before us is what we have and I think we have done our best to mitigate that construction traffic and I hope the community continues to handle their traffic problem, you know, that --

Fitzgerald: Yeah.

Wilson: -- pursue with ACHD handling the traffic problem.

McCarvel: I guess -- Mr. Chairman, I guess I feel like, you know, we can't -- we can do the best we can here, but we can't control every speeder and we can't control every pickup that might come through with a nail. I mean you can't control people that break the rules. So, the effort there needs to come from the police department.

Wilson: And that being said, we are not the final place. I mean we are a recommending body. I think the --

Fitzgerald: Absolutely.

Wilson: -- the neighbors -- neighbors can go to the -- you know, to the City Council, their elected City Councilors and also express their concerns with this project and I would encourage them to do so.

Fitzgerald: Absolutely.

McCarvel: Uh-huh.

Fitzgerald: So, do we have a general consensus?

McCarvel: I think so.

Fitzgerald: Okay.

McCarvel: Okay. Mr. Chairman?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner McCarvel.

McCarvel: After considering all staff, applicant, and public testimony, I move to recommend approval to the City Council of file number H-2016-0089 as presented in the staff report for the hearing of August 18th, 2016, with the following modifications: That pending ACHD allowing, that signs for no construction vehicles be posted and that construction vehicles use the access to Amity for as long as it is possible and possibly coinciding with the recording of phase two and the landscape being done. Is that --

Fitzgerald: The landscape surety being put in place.

McCarvel: And the landscape surety being put in place, but that entrance probably needs to be closed to coincide with the recording of phase two.

Wilson: Second.

McCarvel: Does that get you there, Josh?

Fitzgerald: Does that --

Beach: I think that will get us there. I think that -- I think we can make that work.

Wilson: Second.

Baird: Mr. Chair, and Members, if the maker of the motion might consider adding to that to recommend that the applicant have specifics for the City Council on the exact location of that temporary access and will have final information from ACHD as far as what they would allow, so that those issues could be presented to City Council.

Fitzgerald: Would the motion maker be amenable to that change?

McCarvel: Yes.

Fitzgerald: And the second --

Wilson: Second.

Beach: Would the motion maker also designate the location of the signs for no construction traffic?

McCarvel: I would say at the entrance of Wrightwood Drive and the entrance of Glenmere Way.

Beach: So, a sign here or a sign up here on Wrightwood?

McCarvel: Yeah. And Rangewood.

Fitzgerald: Three signs, so --

McCarvel: Yeah.

Beach: So, on the corner of Locust Grove and Wrightwood, the dead end of Rangewood, and the entrance to Estancia, which -- I'm not sure what the name of this street is here, but --

Fitzgerald: Are you still seconding, sir?

Wilson: Second.

Fitzgerald: Any further discussion? All those in favor say aye. Appreciate it. Thank you.

MOTION CARRIED: THREE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

F. Public Hearing for 2016 City Initiated Annexation (H-2016-0093) by City of Meridian

ACHD Properties - Generally Located Near the Northeast Corner of S. Eagle Road and E. Amity Road; SEC of N. Meridian Road and E. Carmel Drive; East side of N. Ten Mile Road, North of W. Ustick Road; 3955 E. Ustick Road; 2910 W. Franklin Road; and 6175 N. Linder Road

Idaho Power Properties - Located at 3275 E. Amity Road, 1635 S. Stoddard Road and 3539 N. Ten Mile Road

Blackrock Subdivision - Generally Located North of E. Lake Hazel Road, Between S. Locust Grove Road and S. Eagle Road City of Meridian Property - Located 3064 W. Malta Drive

- 1. Request: Annexation and Zoning** of Approximately 67.50 Acres of Land with R-4 (53.25 Acres), R-8 (11.64 Acres), R-15 (30.10 Acres) and C-C (2.61 Acres) Zoning Designations

Fitzgerald: Good Luck. Thank you, guys. Take this to the City Council or to ACHD and let your views be heard. Okay. So, last component on the agenda is

a city annexation of file number H-2016-0093. Hello, how is it going, sir? I thought Caleb was going to come see us. You don't want to do this? Come on, man.

McClure: You guys don't get to see me often enough, so -- good evening, Commission. I'm here today to discuss with you an application for a city initiated annexation. Last year City Council approved a small budget for this project. Part of this was a request to -- and direction for staff to do some map clean ups of enclaves and the other was to close the loop on a 2005 agreement for services and annexation. That agreement allowed the Black Rock Subdivision to develop in the county with city services, even though it was not contiguous at the time. So, this application is for a Category A annexation. All of these properties are now contiguous with city limits and they all have provided some type of consent. The Ada County Highway has six properties. Idaho Power has three properties. The City of Meridian has one property. And, then, there is the Black Rock Subdivision made up of approximately 49 properties. ACHD has indicated that they will not contest the annexation. Idaho Power has provided a signed consent agreement. The city is obviously supportive of this property being annexed and in terms of the Black Rock Subdivision -- I will put this on in a second. The Black Rock Subdivision was allowed to develop in the county with city services under an agreement that it would be annexed when it became contiguous. The agreement was recorded with the county, memorialized in the titles, and, then, listed in the CC&Rs for the Black Rock Subdivision. The Black Rock Subdivision also described meeting city standards for architectural features and things like that. With the development of Sky Mesa to the north Black Rock Subdivision became contiguous and, thus, eligible for annexation. It is also contiguous in the southwest corner as a result of this south Meridian annexation earlier this year. This area is also rapidly developing. There is subdivisions all around it. New YMCA. New regional park on Lake Hazel. And a number of development interests. Total acreage for this annexation is approximately 67 acres. Land use for these properties include low density residential, medium density residential, mixed use commercial, commercial and civic. The proposed use for these properties are all consistent with the future land map and include 53 acres of R-4, 11 acres of R-8 and 2.68 acres of C-C. For the ACHD, Idaho Power, and City of Meridian there are no real impacts as a result of this annexation. While there may be some opportunities for expansion on a number of these properties, the Idaho Power and ACHD sites are all -- have existing facilities, mostly power substations and stormwater drainage ponds. The city's property is a small pathway connection between Heroes Park and Ten Mile. In terms of service and impacts, utility, roads, schools and library services will remain unchanged. Fire service will remain the same, since Meridian Fire services Meridian Rural Fire, but that assessment will be removed off of the -- of the tax rolls. Trash service will remain with Republic, but there are some differences between the county and the city accounts. Police services will now be in Meridian, instead of Ada County Sheriff. Tonight city staff is requesting a recommendation for approval to City Council. It will, then, go to City Council for their consideration and, then,

depending on how this goes, we may be back next year for some additional map of cleanups. I do have some additional maps if you guys want to go through these one by one, but I will otherwise stand for questions.

Fitzgerald: Commissioners, do you have any questions?

McCarvel: No.

Baird: Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Yes.

Baird: I'd like to have Brian explain that you had a neighborhood meeting and you sent individual notices out to affected properties just so -- there is nobody here tonight, but I think it's important that you note for the record that an effort has been made to notify folks.

Fitzgerald: Thank you very much.

Beach: Definitely can do that. So, on -- I think -- I think May -- no. June 23rd we had an open house. We invited all the people of the Black Rock Subdivision to attend that if they had any questions regarding services, what the changes -- what the impacts would be. How code enforcement deals with things. At that meeting we had legal available, we had Republic Services there to answer any questions. We had code enforcement there if they had any questions. Only one person showed up. I believe -- I think his name was Tim Foster, but he was the HOA president at the time. As a result of that meeting and code enforcement agreed to attend their -- their annual subdivision meeting, which I think was a week or two later. In terms of the notifications -- so, the 300 rule, discussion about previous applications, it's a little bit different for this. When you -- there was a number -- so, we have properties all over the city, including the Black Rock Subdivision and so when you hit so many people we do an extra PSA and you don't -- you don't hit 300 radius for all these people, because there is just so many. I did, however, want the Black Rock residents to know that they were -- we were doing this tonight, so we sent out what legal decided should be called courtesy notifications to those stakeholders specifically, just so they would -- in case they didn't read it in the papers, basically.

Fitzgerald: Very good. Any additional questions for Brian? Do we need to take a look at the maps or are we --

Wilson: Weren't the maps in the --

McCarvel: Yeah, they were in the staff report.

Fitzgerald: They were in the staff report. So, Black Rock is the only major chunk. We are just talking about little substations and different things and --

McClure: Correct. Yes.

Fitzgerald: Okay. I think we are good. Thanks, Brian. Appreciate it. Is there anyone in the audience -- Caleb, do you want to come and talk to us? Is there anybody that would like to speak on this application? Okay.

McCarvel: Mr. Chairman?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner McCarvel.

McCarvel: I move that we close the public hearing on H-2016-0093.

Wilson: Second.

Fitzgerald: All those in favor say aye. Okay. Close the public hearing.

MOTION CARRIED: THREE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Fitzgerald: Thoughts? Comments? Yeas. Nays.

McCarvel: I'm in favor.

Fitzgerald: Commissioner Wilson?

Wilson: As am I.

Fitzgerald: I think it's great. I think it's great that the city is cleaning up random parcels. With that, Commissioner McCarvel.

McCarvel: Mr. Chairman. After considering all staff, applicant, and public testimony, I move to recommend approval to the City Council of file number H-2016-0093 as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of August 18th, 2016.

Wilson: Second.

Fitzgerald: All those in favor say aye. All opposed? Nobody?

MOTION CARRIED: THREE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Fitzgerald: Brian, thank you very much. Thanks for all the work you guys did. Caleb, thank you. We appreciate it greatly. And that being said, if there is nothing to come before the Commission, I would --

Wilson: There is another --

Fitzgerald: Oh, there is one other thing.

Wilson: You could cut it off.

Item 5: Other Items

**A. Ada County 2025 Comprehensive Plan Update
Information** by Brian McClure, City of Meridian Planning
Department

Fitzgerald: No, I was going to cut it off. Oh, Comp Plan amendment. Brian, you want to come back and talk to us again? I forgot there was a fifth item. I was just going to leave you hanging, man.

McClure: This is unheard of. I'm here twice tonight. So, this -- this next item is just a very minor update for you. Ada county is in the process of updating it's comprehensive plan. They are calling it Ada County 2025. Right now they are in the public comment period and if you would like to read that or provide any comment, they would certainly appreciate that. The city has been involved with that process and we have made several comments and phone calls, but wanted to let you be aware of that, too. I think their website is adacounty2025.com.

Fitzgerald: Is this a master plan or is it kind of a future land use --

McClure: It's a comprehensive plan.

Fitzgerald: Comprehensive. Okay.

McClure: So, their future land use map is a little bit different from ours. They don't have as many low density residential -- it's medium density residential and they only cover the areas that aren't within an area of city impact, so a lot of that is -- is the foothills, it's the BLM land, things like that. But they do have a future land use map.

Wilson: Is there an airstrip out there?

Fitzgerald: There is no airstrip. Is there an airstrip in --

Wilson: There is an area that -- it definitely makes things easier.

Fitzgerald: Any additional questions for Mr. McClure? No? Thank you, sir, very much.

McClure: Thank you.

McCarvel: Mr. Chairman?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner McCarvel.

McCarvel: I move we adjourn.

Wilson: Second.

Fitzgerald: All those in favor.

MOTION CARRIED: THREE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Fitzgerald: Thank you, God.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 8:53 P.M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS.)

APPROVED



RYAN FITZGERALD - ACTING CHAIRMAN

9 | 1 | 2016
DATE APPROVED

Steven Yearsley

ATTEST:

Michele Hill for

C. JAY COLES - CITY CLERK

