

Meridian Planning and Zoning Meeting

September 1, 2016

Meeting of the Meridian Planning and Zoning Commission of Septmber 1, 2016, was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by Chairman Steven Yearsley.

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

Members Absent: Commissioner Gregory Wilson.

Others Present: Michelle Hill, Andrea Poque, Sonya Waters, Bill Parsons, Josh Beach and Dean Willis.

Item 1: Roll-Call Attendance:

Roll-call

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

Yearsley: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. At this time I'd like to call to order the regularly scheduled meeting of the Meridian Planning and Zoning Commission meeting for the hearing date of Thursday, September 1st, 2016, and let's begin with roll call.

Item 2: Adoption of the Agenda

Yearsley: Thank you. Next item on the agenda is the adoption of the agenda. We have no changes to the agenda, so I would entertain a motion to adopt the agenda as presented.

McCarvel: So moved.

Fitzgerald: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Item 3: Consent Agenda

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

B. Approve Minutes of August 18, 2016 Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting Minutes

Yearsley: Next item on the agenda is the Consent Agenda and on that we have to approve the minutes of the August 4th, 2016, Planning and Zoning Commission meeting and to approve the minutes of the August 18th, 2016, Planning and Zoning meeting. If there is no changes or comments to those, I would entertain a motion to approve the Consent Agenda.

Fitzgerald: Mr. Chairman?

Yearsley: Commissioner Fitzgerald.

Fitzgerald: I would move that we approve the Consent Agenda as presented.

McCarvel: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR YES. ONE ABSENT.

Yearsley: Before we move onto the next phase of this, I would like to explain the hearing process. So, we are going -- on the agenda we are going to open each item one at a time. We will start off with the staff report. The staff will present their findings regarding how the -- the items adhere to our Comprehensive Plan and Uniform Development Code with staff recommendations. The staff will have their chance to present their recommendations. The applicant will have an opportunity to come forward to present their case for approval of their application and to respond to any of the staff's comments. The applicant will have up to 15 minutes to do so. After that we will open this up to the public testimony. There is a sign-up sheet in the back for anybody wishing to testify. Any person wishing to come forward will be allowed three minutes. If they are speaking for a larger group, like an HOA or if there is a show of hands, they will be given up to ten minutes. After the public has had a chance to testify, we will ask the applicant to come back and have an opportunity to respond to the applicant's -- or the public testimony and they will be given up to ten minutes to do so. At that point we will close the public hearing and the Commission will have an opportunity to discuss and deliberate and, hopefully, be able to make a recommendation to City Council.

Item 4: Action Items

A. Public Hearing Continued and Re-Noticed for September 1, 2016 for Laurels Townhouses (H-2016-0065) by

Northside Management Located at 2116 S Accolade Avenue

- 1. Request: Rezone of approximately 1.87 acres of land from the TN-R zoning district to the R-15 zoning district**
- 2. Request: Preliminary Plat Consisting of 20 Building Lots and Eight (8) Common Lots on 1.38 Acres of Land in the TNR Zoning District**

Yearsley: So, with that I would like to open the public hearing for continued and re-noticed application from file number H-2016-0065 with Laurels Townhomes and let's begin with the staff report.

Allen: Thank you, Chairman, Members of the Commission. The applications before you are a request for a rezone, a preliminary plat, and a development agreement modification. The last of which does not require Commission action. This site consists of 1.38 acres of land. It's zoned TN&R and it's located at 2116 South Accolade Avenue, which is south of East Overland Road and west of South Eagle Road. Adjacent land use and zoning. To the north is vacant land zoned C-G. To the south are multi-family residential apartments, zoned R-15. To the east is developed common lot -- undeveloped common lot, zoned TN-R and multi-family residential apartments, zoned R-40. And to the west are also multi-family residential apartments and vacant land, zoned R-15. This property was annexed back in 2006 with an R-15 zoning district and a development agreement was required as a provision of an annexation, along with the Kenai Subdivision. A modification of the agreement was approved back in 2007, along with a rezone for R-15 to TN-R and a new preliminary plat for Gramercy Subdivision. The Comprehensive Plan future land use map designation for this site is mixed-use regional. The applicant has submitted a request to City Council for a modification to an existing development agreement to change the land use and building elevations from live-work units to solely living units. A rezone is 1.87 acres of land is proposed from the TN-R to the R-15 zoning district, consistent with the mixed-use regional future land use map designation. The rezone will facilitate the development of 20 townhomes. A preliminary plat is also proposed as shown that consists of 20 building lots and seven common lots on 1.38 acres of land in the proposed R-15 zoning district. A north-south local street is proposed along the east boundary of the site. You can see my pointer right there. And a public alley is proposed off the local street for access to homes. A north-south pedestrian pathway is proposed mid-block within the development and conceptual sample building elevations for the townhomes were submitted as shown on the right. The ones on the left are the live-work units that were previously proposed that are being changed. All structures are required to comply with the design standards listed in architectural standards manual. Written testimony has been received by the applicant Scott Noriyuki, who is in

agreement with the staff report. Staff is recommending approval with the conditions in the report. Staff will stand for any questions.

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

Noriyuki: Commission, Scott Noriyuki, Northside Management, 6810 Fairhill Place, Boise, Idaho. Staff did a great job of explaining everything. We formally agree with all conditions of approval and I will stand for any questions.

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

Noriyuki: Thank you.

Yearsley: We will wait here to see if anybody has signed up. So, I do not have anybody wishing to testify on this application. Is there anybody with -- that would like to testify? With that I don't think we need to bring the applicant forward to comment on his own comments, so at this time I would entertain a motion to close the public hearing for file number H-2016-0065.

Fitzgerald: So moved, Mr. Chairman.

Oliver: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Yearsley: Any comments or thoughts?

McCarvel: Mr. Chairman?

Yearsley: Commissioner McCarvel.

McCarvel: I am in -- in favor of this. I think the thought for this kind of development is good with all the different accesses out to the two major streets. I think it fits nicely back in there.

Yearsley: Thank you.

Fitzgerald: Mr. Chairman?

Yearsley: Commissioner Fitzgerald.

Fitzgerald: I agree. I think there is a ton of employment around that area. The live-work is not necessary in this -- I think in this location just because of the employment and commercial that's there, so I'm in agreement.

Yearsley: Thank you.

Oliver: Mr. Chairman?

Yearsley: Commissioner Oliver.

Oliver: I as well agree. I think it fits the area. It's a good design. It looks well and it fits in the area.

Yearsley: I also, too, and I think it gives it a -- you know, there is some homes there, there is a lot of apartments, so this kind of gives it a separate mix of housing out in that area and so I think it works. I think it will look really nice. So, I guess with that I would entertain a motion.

McCarvel: Mr. Chairman?

Yearsley: Commissioner McCarvel.

McCarvel: After considering all staff, applicant, and public testimony, I moved to recommend approval of file number H-2016-0065 as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of September 1, 2016, has presented.

Oliver: Second.

Yearsley: I have a motion and a second to approve file number H-2016-0065. All in favor say aye. Opposed? Motion carries. Thank you.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. ONE ABSENT.

B. Public Hearing for Hill's Century Farm Commercial (H-2016-0092) by Martin Hill Located 3625 E. Amity Road

1. Request: Preliminary Plat Approval Consisting of Twenty (20) Building Lots on 19.73 Acres of Land in a C-N Zoning District

Yearsley: Next item on the agenda is the public hearing for file number H-2016-0092, Hill Century Farm Commercial, and let's begin with the staff report.

Allen: Thank you, Chairman, Commissioners. The next application is for a preliminary plat. A development agreement modification is also proposed. However, it does not require Commission action. This site consists of 19.73

acres of land. It's zoned C-N and R-8 and located at 33625 East Amity Road at the southwest corner of East Amity Road and South Howry Lane. Adjacent land use and zoning. To the north is East Amity Road and agricultural land zoned RUT in Ada County. To the south is a future city park, a YMCA, library and elementary school, zoned C-N. To the east are rural residential agricultural properties zoned RUT in Ada County. And to the west is agricultural property. Future single family residential has been approved there, zoned R-8. A little history on this property. An amendment to the future land use map was approved last year to change the future land use map designation on his property in the larger area from low density residential to mixed-use neighborhood. The property was annexed with a C-N and R-8 zoning districts, with the requirement of a development agreement. A property boundary adjustment record of survey was later approved in 2015 and that was the map shown here on your left, the current configuration of the property. The Comprehensive Plan future land use designation is designated as mixed-use neighborhood. The applicant is requesting a modification to the development agreement to include a detailed site plan and modification of certain provisions of the agreement. Although that application does not require Commission action, I am going to go ahead and run through the applicant's request, just so that you're fully aware of everything that's being requested. The existing development agreement included a conceptual bubble plan for the mixed-use designated area that lists future possible uses and no site details. For this reason the development agreement required a detailed site plan to be submitted and approved prior to a plat application being submitted and any development occurring beyond the school and YMCA, park site to ensure development is consistent with the objectives and vision of the mixed-use neighborhood designation. A detailed plan for the first phase of the development is proposed as shown, which includes a medical clinic at the northeast corner of the site, with an assisted living facility immediately to the west on two building lots on six acres of land. Details are not shown for the 18 building lots surrounding these lots on the remaining 13.7 acres of the commercial area. The applicant anticipates that many of these lots will be consolidated as users are determined in the future and has included a list of possible uses, all allowed uses in the mixed-use neighborhood designation, and requests the development agreement not be required to be modified again in the future to include a more detailed site plan as required in the development agreement. To insure the site layout is consistent with that desired in mixed-use neighborhood designated areas, staff does recommend the development agreement is still required to be modified in the future to include a more detailed site plan for the remaining area, since none was ever submitted on this part. The applicant also proposes to delete Development Group Provision 5.1, which states the maximum building size should be limited to 20,000 square feet building footprint. Because the provision states should, rather than shall, and is not necessarily a requirement, but rather a recommendation, staff does not recommend deletion of this provision. However, staff has included a modification to the provision for clarification on that matter. Last, the applicant proposes a modification to provision 5.1-I, to require annexation area to be so divided prior to issuance of

any single family residential building permits, but would allow commercial development to proceed with building permits that require subdivision of the property prior to issuance of certificate of occupancy permits beyond those required for the development of the school and the YMCA and the park site. Because the development agreement requires detailed site plan approve through modification to the agreement and because details haven't yet been provided for the 13.7 acres of the commercial area, staff does not recommend modification of this provision. However, staff is amenable to modifying the provision as follows: The annexation area shall be subdivided prior to issuance of any building permits beyond those required for the development of the school, YMCA, and park sight as shown on the concept development plan and the assisted living facility and medical clinic shown on the detailed site plan approved with this application. So, that is just a review of the development agreement modification. Next the applicant's preliminary plat, it consists of 20 building lots and two common area lots as shown on 19.73 acres of land in a C-N zoning district. The boundary of the plat does not include all the area included in parcel as shown on the record of survey. So, this is parcel two on the record of survey and their plat stops right here at this red line here. This area right here shown in red is a 171 foot wide strip of land zoned R-8 along the west boundary. It is not included. Because this will create a remnant parcel that's not legal to build on, staff does recommend that this area is included in the boundaries of the proposed plat. This area is to be included in a preliminary plat in the future with rest of the residential property to the west when it develops. It's the intent of the applicant, as you can see here when this residential property here develops, to include that portion at that time. However, not -- so that a remnant parcel isn't left staff is asking that it be cleared within the boundary of this plat. It does not necessarily need to be final platted, as long as the applicant gets around to filing it with this part that would be fine. A driveway access is proposed via East Amity Road. You can see right here where my pointer is at. And another driveway access is proposed via a South Hillsdale Avenue, which is currently Howry Lane, but will be named Hillsdale in the future. It will be a future collector street. A local street, South Tavistock Way, is also proposed for access in this location here via Amity in the future and, then, another local street Hill Park Street along the south boundary of the site is also proposed to be at Hillsdale Avenue. Because the UDC requires access to be provided via local streets when available, the proposed direct lot access via Amity and Hillsdale will require Council approval of a waiver. A cross-access ingress-egress easement is required between lots in the proposed subdivision. A 25 foot wide landscape street buffer is required along Amity. A 20 foot wide buffer is required along Hillsdale and a ten foot wide by buffer is required along local streets, Tavistock and Hill Park Street. Conceptual building elevations were submitted as shown for future retail office and professional service buildings on the left and assisted living memory care facility as shown on the right. All structures are required to comply with the design standards listed in the architectural standards manual. Written testimony has been received from Mike Wardle, the applicant's representative, in response to the staff report and I will let the applicant go over his comments with you. Staff is recommending approval

with the conditions with the request that a comment is added for the Parks Department under Section 6 in Exhibit B of the staff report that the Parks Department desires East Hill Park Street to have on-street parking on the south side of the street adjacent to the city park. Staff will stand for any questions.

Yearsley: Are there any questions? I actually have a couple -- just a couple. Are they proposing to -- and maybe I should ask this of Mike Wardle, but to do all the frontage improvements first or are they just going to do in -- for those first two lots; do you know?

Allen: Chairman, as a requirement of the subdivision plat all the street buffers adjacent to streets are required to be in --

Yearsley: Okay.

Allen: -- as a subdivision improvement.

Yearsley: Okay. Thank you. Any other questions? With that would the applicant like to come forward.

Wardle: Mr. Chairman, Commission Members, Mike Wardle, Brighton Corporation, 12601 West Explorer Drive in Boise. Sonya, if you could pull up my slide presentation, I'm going to -- there we go. Just a brief run through before I discuss the conditions of approval that Sonya addressed. This first schematic is the very, very simple bullet -- or bubble plat that was submitted with the original annexation and zoning application. I did note that the final action taken by the Council did slightly change the zoning at that point, so that black hatched line delineates the R-8 and C-N zones. I'm not smart enough to run -- okay. Turning around and looking to the south just for an update. This aerial photograph was taken in April at the time when the Hillside Elementary School was under construction, but, obviously, has been completed and is now being used for the first time. Shortly -- well, within the next few months it's anticipated that the YMCA complex immediately to the north that we are common joining with that elementary school will begin construction. So, the red oval is the area that we are discussing this evening within the C-N zone and, then, the yellowish gold oval is the future R-8 zoned property that will be forthcoming in a few months. It kind of specifically shows that same area. A little bit more definition in terms of a boundary. I would just make a notation relative to the home -- Marty and Dixie Harris home in the northeast portion of this slide that there is a specific condition that I will refer to in a bit concerning that. Next slide, please. Now, putting the concept together showing, again, the YMCA-Hillside Elementary School complex and the Hill Park that the city would be constructing -- and I don't have a date on that, but this complex would be coming together over the next few months and year or so, so that -- that area will be richly benefited from public and private facilities combined and, of course, it does show on -- the next slide gets a little bit more specific to the items Sonya identified as our detailed plan at this

point being the clinic at the northeast corner, the assisted living. The two arrows show the points of access that the Council will be requested to waive to the collector -- Hillsdale on the right, Amity, the arterial to the north, those two access points have been approved by ACHD. They have not formally submitted their staff report, but I believe they communicated that to staff and I actually forwarded ACHD's concurrence e-mail some time ago. Another slide, please. This -- I just wanted to show the juxtaposition of the school and YMCA and park facilities that are directly south of Hill Park Street, the east-west street that basically serves to front door both projects, the commercial to the north and these community facilities to the south, and I believe -- okay. One other item -- and I'm going to just let this one rest for a moment while I take you through the conditions, because there is a specific request that I have proposed. I learned something a little bit from Sonya's presentation. Apparently -- the item five, the DA modification elements are really probably not something that -- well, you won't be making any recommendation, so unless you have questions to the comments I would just wait until we get to the City Council and just take you to page three of the handout that was provided. I hope that you have that. Color coded to assist in the sense that anything and really -- we are not asking for any changes. We conclude with a few comments on some of those. The first point on page three under the Planning Division site specific conditions of approval, refer back to the slide that Sonya showed you where the red outlined portion to the rest that is zoned R-8 -- there you go. We did not include it, because -- yes, we can include it if we are required to do so, but it will not be final platted, it would just simply show up on a -- on a map. But my concern is sometimes you get something on a drawing it becomes part of a project that it doesn't really relate to and causes confusion in future applications. So, from my perspective under condition 1.1.1, items A and B and, then, the next condition down, Item A, all relate to that same question and it's my belief that it does not change any of the issues by removing that parcel or that portion of the parcel from the plat, because it is zoned R-8. So, I have requested deletion of those particular items on page three. On page four I'm going to retract my request to delete condition 1.2.4. That was kind of a peak of frustration, because I had -- was not aware that the code had been changed and there was now a new process that requires -- that there is a process that we can deal with the irrigation laterals. We will deal with that at the final plat stage of this action. So, we can just go ahead and assume that 1.2.4 stays, because, frankly, nobody has the ability at this point to waive or delete it. It's a -- it's a requirement that we will deal with in due course. On page six -- and that's why I wanted to go back, Sonya, if you would, to that last slide that I had up that showed the water mains -- yes. There you go. Thank you. Condition 2.1.1 talks about, you know, the extension of the sewer and looped water around the -- I have added a word there -- looped water mains to provide service to the park, YMCA, Hillsdale Elementary School, and Hills Century Farm Subdivision. All of those water mains will be installed -- the solid lines will be installed and we will end up with looping systems for not only this project, but also the Hill Century Farm residential project to the south, the YMCA and school complex -- all of those will be in a dual looped system. We will also extend -- because we will be

constructing the new Hillsdale Avenue north from the YMCA site to Amity Road, we will install a 12 inch main there. We are simply requesting that we not be required to construct a 12 inch water main between those that forms a third loop, because there will be a development on the north side of -- of Amity in the future and at this point the school district owns that property for a high school. Whether they build it or not I can't say, but they own it and they have done some planning on that. It's our belief that that water main does not serve us or make any -- doesn't provide any additional security because of the dual looping that we have as noted down into the Century Farm Subdivision back to Eagle Road. So, I'm simply requesting that we delete the requirement along the frontage of Amity for that 12 inch water main. Would appreciate your consideration of that. 2.2.3 was a simple wording change. That's the thing that we have actually -- the City Council has approved in two recent applications for us and that is that the easements for all of these utilities need to be submitted, reviewed and approved prior to signature of the final plat by the city engineer, not prior to development plan approval, because that simply can delay the process unduly. So, it's a simple language change that the City Council has already concurred with in the past. Next page. Page seven. This is simply a statement -- because there are some farm buildings and so forth that are on the property that we are simply saying that existing structures within the bounds of the plat or right of way that are required to be removed be -- do so, but some of those facilities lay to the west in property that won't be developed until that R-8 goes in the future. So, we just don't want to have to take out any structures before their time. 2.2.9. This is simply an acknowledgement that commercial property is different from residential. You can build more than one commercial structure on a lot and so it's appropriate for residential to have everything including the plat recorded prior to applying for building permits, but in this particular case, since you can construct commercial on this parcel without the subdivision being completed, we simply asking to change the word building to occupancy and, actually, this has been done in a couple of earlier applications that we have brought forth through the Council -- Commission and the Council. And, then, finally, in 2.2.11, it's an issue that we have found interesting. I know staff has been very cooperative, but we get to a point where homes are constructed, occupancy permits are requested, but some of the landscape and fencing items that are common area facilities have not yet been completed, so it's up to staff to determine whether or not they would be able to -- be willing to grant an occupancy permit for a residential structure if those things aren't done, but they are bonded for. They had to be bonded for in order to secure -- you know, to sell that parcel for the lot. So, we have added that language -- we actually did this with the City Council about two weeks ago. Just to note that rather than have to do some negotiation with staff, if the bonding is in place, which it must be, then, we believe that even if the fencing and the common area improvements are not totally done, that there is no reason not to issue the occupancy permit. The city is covered. There is no liability. So, those are the only changes that I would propose, given the fact that item five at the very beginning on pages one, two and into page three are

development agreement considerations for the Council. I hope I haven't confused, but I would be happy to answer questions to unconfuse if I did.

Yearsley: Thank you. Are there any questions?

Fitzgerald: Mr. Chairman?

Yearsley: Commissioner Fitzgerald.

Fitzgerald: Mr. Wardle, in regards to the remnant parcel, what's your plan for -- it's not in the original R-8 plat and if you don't want it in this plat, where do you want it -- where do you want it to go or how do you want it to be handled in planning? My concern is that it gets -- it's just out there and, then, there is -- it's kind of a remnant parcel that we don't know how to deal with later on.

Wardle: We actually have concepts for three different types of residential, because that parcel is R-8, it does have -- we have got concepts that we are working on currently. It will be platted with that proposal. So, everything that's coming up to this north-south street, Tavistock as it's called, that will incorporate that parcel, that remnant. So, it will be a part of a preliminary plat that will be coming to the Commission within a few months.

Fitzgerald: Thank you.

Wardle: I would just restate, Mr. Chairman, that it can be added to the preliminary plat. It doesn't hurt necessarily, but it has the potential to confuse if it's part of a preliminary plat versus being handled when it's taken up with the zoned property consistent with it. So, that's the reason. Thank you.

Yearsley: Any other questions? I actually have a couple and some of this maybe Sonya can help me with. The 2.2.3, didn't we go through this a couple of weeks ago about -- another applicant asked for this same -- I believe very similar comment and I'm not exactly sure -- I think at that time we didn't allow that and I'm kind of curious to what staff is thinking on that.

Allen: Chairman, I don't recall.

Yearsley: It's been a while, so I --

Allen: Yeah. And, I'm sorry, but we -- we got the applicant's response this afternoon and I was not able to catch up with the staff member that wrote these conditions, so I really don't have a response --

Yearsley: Okay.

Allen: -- to address those. I can, of course, make contact with him before Council and get that squared away.

Yearsley: Okay. Well, I would I assume the same thing with 2.1.1, since that is a Public Works comment, we would -- we would need Public Works to make that decision or is that --

Allen: That's correct. Everything under section two.

Yearsley: Okay.

Parson: Mr. Chairman, if I may interject here.

Yearsley: Absolutely.

Parsons: Our department put together a committee called Development Services Advisory Committee and the one question -- the one condition we can't answer tonight is the looping of the water system. That's going to require someone from Public Works to tell us if it would still work with that line not being included, because when we accept an application we have them provide AutoCAD drawings and our Public Works Department models the development based off of the AutoCAD drawing that we got. So, if their AutoCAD drawing show that line being as part of the development and we need to get AutoCAD drawings that don't include that water line to see if they still have the fire flows per our requirements. So, we can't handle that. As Sonya stated, those are things that we have to answer before City Council and we are more than willing to do that. The other condition, 2.2.3, if you could refresh my memory on that. Is that in relation to getting building permits ahead of the platting?

Yearsley: Yes.

Parsons: Well, we had a de sec meeting yesterday and I was in that room with Mr. Freckleton at that time and he has agreed to allow some of those things to change, so --

Yearsley: Okay.

Parsons: -- Public Works is amenable to some of that happening prior to signature on the plat and that was communicated to the de sec group yesterday and representation from Brighton Corporation was at that table. So, I think, again, we will follow up with Mr. Freckleton, but I think that's something staff would be amenable to --

Yearsley: Okay.

Parsons: -- and you have the power to make that recommendation that Council support that or allow it to go forward as is and let Council make that change.

Yearsley: Okay.

Parsons: Now, the 2.1.11 -- refresh my memory on that one. Is that the building permits?

Yearsley: That's to be bonded --

Parsons: Oh. And that's another clarification that we had at the de sec meeting. So, our code gives the developer flexibility in getting occupancy permits for commercial and residential developments. We don't give temporary occupancy for single family homes, but we do give temporary occupancies to commercial developments. So, again, this is something that we have had quite a bit of discussion with the development community and we will look at that on a case-by-case basis. They can get occupancy as long as there is bonding in place for the amenities, the fencing, and, of course, the landscaping. So, we have the ability to do that and so, again, I think we have that covered as well to address the applicant's concerns. So, I can help you with the -- we can help you with a lot of those, it's just that looping of the water system that we can't help you with this evening.

Yearsley: Okay.

Wardle: Mr. Chairman, may I just add a comment?

Yearsley: Absolutely.

Wardle: Two items where the -- just the simple language additions that I noted -- actually, the Council in recent approvals has already dealt with those and I believe with the meeting that -- that we talked about yesterday, some of those things are clean-up items that will be clarified. As to the water line, the actual application we did submit the AutoCAD files. The plan does not show the water line connection along Amity Road. It shows up to Amity on the east side and from Amity south to the YMCA and across the south boundary of that commercial site. So, I'm sure by City Council that there will be the modeling issue to note whether there is the need or not.

Yearsley: Okay.

Wardle: So, I think we are fine. It's just -- it will come out in due course.

Yearsley: Okay. All right. That's good. Any other comments? So, my guess is speak now forever hold your peace, to be honest with you, so -- thank you.

Wardle: Thank you.

Yearsley: I do not have anybody signed up to testify on this application. Is there anybody wanting to testify on this application? So, with that I would entertain a motion to close the public hearing on file number H-2016-0092.

Fitzgerald: So moved, Mr. Chairman.

McCarvel: Second.

Yearsley: I have a motion and a second to close the public hearing on file number H-2016-0092. All in favor say aye. Opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Yearsley: We have a lot to go over. Any comments or questions?

Fitzgerald: Mr. Chairman?

Yearsley: Mr. Fitzgerald.

Fitzgerald: I'm excited -- everybody's excited for this area of the -- I think the south is going to be very cool when it's all said and done. I think Brighton is master planning it very well. I appreciate the staff's efforts. I'm a little bit concerned about the remnant parcel being there, not being handled and being left out there. And that's my only concern. I understand the points that have been brought up and kind of how we can get the applicant a little bit of leeway. I do understand that the city has some challenges when we have -- we leave parcels that are not platted and hope they get platted later. That being said, I also understand not having -- taking down buildings we don't need to right at this second. So, that's my only concern. I like the project. I think it's going to be great. I know what they are building in Paramount right now it's -- it's going to look nice. It looks like this is very similar to this project. And so I think it's -- it's a good project. Again, it will be very complementary to what's getting built to the south. That's the one piece is just that parcel for me.

Yearsley: Thank you. I agree. I understand that they are talking about coming in a couple of months to plat that piece, but my concern is there is a lot can happen in a couple of months and I would hate to have that be left out there and, then, kind of be a no man's land. So, I have a tendency to agree. With regards to most -- most of the others, they -- they seem amenable. You know, the one I think with the water line at this point I would recommend we leave it in until we have comments from staff.

Fitzgerald: Agreed.

Yearsley: And the Council can reflect upon that one, so -- so, I think it looks good.

McCarvel: Mr. Chairman?

Yearsley: Commissioner McCarvel.

McCarvel: Yeah. I agree. I think we can okay off on 2.2.3, 2.2.9, 2.2.11. It sounds like those are all issues that we have worked through and I think -- I'm in agreement of 2.2.5 I think -- staying in there. I think -- I think that section should be in there -- I mean just for bookkeeping and stuff.

Yearsley: Right.

McCarvel: And, then, 2.1.1 we can -- I think as long as they have got it ironed out prior to Council, it makes sense. Okay. 1.1.1 was the R-8, though; right?

Yearsley: Yes.

McCarvel: So, 2.2.5 --

Yearsley: And that was the one that leaves the -- leaves the -- or the buildings on the property, was 2.2.5?

McCarvel: Yeah.

Yearsley: Yeah. Okay. Any comments, Commissioner Oliver?

Oliver: Yeah, I do have just one comment. Is that -- considering that there is going to be a lot more commercial put into the section, I think that the first two pieces they are putting in are essential and I feel like having the medical care right next to the senior -- is a -- is a good start for that corner and I think it will work perfect to start as a stepping stone to other public works around the retail. I agree also with all the comments that the other commissioners said about the changes.

Yearsley: Okay. Well, this will be a big one. So, at this point I would be -- entertain a motion.

Fitzgerald: I'm going to leave it to the professor over here.

McCarvel: Okay. Well, let me --

Yearsley: And don't forget on the staff report it talks about the other recommendation for the --

Fitzgerald: Apartment complex?

McCarvel: Yeah. It's included with their recommendations. So -- okay. 2.2.5 with the extra buildings in there --

Yearsley: Well, what is underlined is what needs to be added.

McCarvel: Okay.

Yearsley: And at this point we have this document here, you can just -- my thinking is we can just say we agree with --

McCarvel: The numbers?

Yearsley: Yeah.

McCarvel: Okay. So, yes on 2.2.5 I guess. Are you -- I guess are you okay with that, staff?

Allen: I just -- excuse me. I just wanted to clarify something. If we are concerned about the existing home being required to be torn down before they are necessarily ready to do that, an option would be to have that platted in say the last phase -- final platted and, then, that would remain until such time as that -- that portion is final platted and, then, prior to signature it would need to be removed. So, if the applicant does not include this in a final plat, but, rather, would like to include it with the development to the west, require -- and hopefully this makes sense what I'm trying to say. Per the staff report, if you require that remnant parcel to be included in the preliminary plat at this time, it won't necessarily require that that structure needs to be removed right away, just prior to signature on the final plat in the phase in which it is located. The applicant did not submit a phasing plan for this development, but that is -- that is something that could happen.

Yearsley: So, what you're saying is -- is he can leave the buildings there without having to modify 2.2.5. Is that what I'm hearing?

Allen: Yeah. Because it requires them to be removed prior to signature on the final plat.

Yearsley: And so if it's just not part of the final plat, then, they can stay.

Allen: This is a preliminary plat that's before you, so it can certainly be phased.

Yearsley: Okay.

McCarvel: So, we don't need to include 2.2.5 in the motion.

Yearsley: Okay. I like that. So, I guess the one question I did ask -- are you okay with just saying yes to those conditions on the numbers, instead of having to read everything out?

Allen: Like I said, I would feel more comfortable speaking with Public Works before any -- agreeing with anything on Section 2. But, yes, numbers are fine on the rest.

Yearsley: Okay.

McCarvel: All right. Mr. Chairman?

Yearsley: Commissioner McCarvel.

McCarvel: After considering all staff, applicant, and public testimony, I move to recommend approval of file number H-2016-0092 as presented in the staff report for the hearing of September 1st, 2016, with the following modifications: To specifically include staff's recommendation as read earlier as part of the staff report. To leave in Section 1.1.1 as recommended by staff. To move forward with applicants request on 2.1.1 --

Yearsley: No, we talked about --

McCarvel: As long as -- after -- I'm sorry. After staff has had consult with Public Works and the AutoCAD drawings are available for discussion prior to Council. And to grant 2.2.3, 2.2.9, 2.2.11 as discussed.

Yearsley: And, then, also the staff recommendations for the parking.

McCarvel: Yes. I think I said that right at the beginning.

Yearsley: Okay.

McCarvel: Yes. To include the staff -- specific recommendation as read in with conditions with the request that a comment -- let's see. Is added for the Parks Department under Section 6 in Exhibit B of the staff report. That the Parks Department desires East Parkhill Street to have on-street parking on the south side of the street adjacent to the city park.

Yearsley: Okay.

Oliver: Second.

Yearsley: I have a motion and a second. Is there any discussion?

Fitzgerald: Mr. Chairman, just to clarify. So, we are making recommendation on 2.1.1? I just want to make sure so I'm clear.

Yearsley: I guess that's your -- Commissioner McCarvel, your recommendation on that? You said to include --

McCarvel: Recommendation to allow staff to work with Public Works prior to City Council.

Fitzgerald: Got it.

Yearsley: Okay. All right.

Allen: And may I clarify? Excuse me. If Public Works is in agreement with the requested changes are you stating that the Commission is in recommendation of those?

McCarvel: Yes.

Allen: As requested by the applicant? Okay. Thank you.

Yearsley: All right. With that I have a motion and a second. All in favor say aye. Opposed? Motion carries. Thank you.

MOTION CARRIES: FOUR AYES. ONE ABSENT.

C. Public Hearing for Maddyn Village (H-2016-0075) by A Team Land Consultants Located West Side of N. Meridian Road, South of E. Ustick Road, North of W. Sedgewick Drive

- 1. Request: Annexation and Zoning of Approximately 10.398 Acres from the RUT Zoning District to the R-8 Zoning District (Approximately 6.874 Acres) to the R-15 Zoning District (Approximately 3.524 Acres)**
- 2. Request: Preliminary Plat Approval Consisting of TwentyNine (29) Single-Family Residential Lots, Ten (10) MultiFamily Residential Lots and Five (5) Common Lots on Approximately 10.398 Acres in the Proposed R-8 and R-15 Zoning Districts**
- 3. Request: Conditional Use Permit for a Multi-Family Development Consisting of Forty-Eight (48) Dwelling Units in the Proposed R-15 Zoning**

Districts

Yearsley: All right. The one we have all been waiting for. Next on the agenda is for file number H-2016-0075, Maddyn Village and let's begin with the staff report.

Beach: Good evening, Chair, Commissioners. As you said, this is an application for Maddyn Village, an application for annexation and zoning, preliminary plat, and for a conditional use permit. The site consists of approximately 10.4 acres of land. It is currently zoned RUT, located at 2975 and 3001 North Meridian Road. To the north we have Parkview Christian Church and Spring Creek Assisted Living Facility, which are both zoned L-O. To the east we have North Meridian Road and single-family residential property, zoned R-8 and R-4. To the south is single family residential properties in the Salisbury Lane Subdivision, which is zoned R-4 and to the west are single family residential properties in Parkway Subdivision, also zoned R-4. There is a little history on this property. As I said, it's currently zoned RUT in Ada County. They are applying for annexation, so that's when the history would start at the City of Meridian. The Comprehensive Plan future land use map designation for this parcel is medium density residential. The applicant is proposing to develop this 10.4 acre site with 29 single-family residential lots, ten multi-family residential lots and five common lots. The R-15 portion of the site consists of approximately 3.5 acres and will have a gross density of 13.7 dwelling unit to the acre. So, the R-15 portion is the portion here with the multi-family. So, this portion here -- it kind of wraps around these existing homes that will remain as part of the subdivision, if you're following my mouse here. So, this -- this portion here is all the R-15 multi-family portion. The R-15 portion of the site consists of three and a half acres and will have a gross density of 13.7 dwelling units to the acre. The R-8 portion of the site consists of 6.9 acres and will have a gross density of 4.2 dwelling units to the acre. The overall gross density within the proposed project is 7.4 dwelling units to the acre, which falls within the density range for the medium density residential land use designation, which is between three and eight dwelling units per acre. The project is subject to specific use standards for multi-family developments as set forth in the UDC. There are two -- as I said, there are two existing homes and associated outbuildings on the site that are proposed to remain on Lot 16 and 31 of Block 1. All existing structures that are proposed remain with the subdivision of the property must comply with the setback standards of the R-8 district or be removed prior to city engineer's signature on the final plat. Additionally, staff recommends that the existing homes connect to city utilities and terminate their access to North Meridian Road with the first phase of development and since the existing homes will no longer have access to North Meridian Road, the property owner will have to coordinate with the city's addressing specialist to obtain a new street address for both of those homes. There is an existing outbuilding on Lot 31, which is this lot here that would look into the required street yard setback with the subdividing of the property. The UDC restricts detached accessory dwellings from being located in this setback and the applicant is requesting that the City Council allow the accessory building

to remain on the property in its current location. Staff recommends that the structure be removed with the development of the first phase, unless approved to remain by Council. I just wanted to make sure you're aware of that. But it's not -- you can see the formal phasing plan. The applicant has indicated that the multi-family portion of the site will be phase one and the single-family portion will be phase two. As I said this, this portion here that I'm kind of outlining is -- is phase one. Access is proposed for the site via one access to North Meridian Road for the multi-family portion of the project and it will be an extension of an existing -- an existing driveway and the single-family portion will be provided from the subdivision to the south, which is the Salisbury Lane Subdivision via a stub street that currently exists to the property. ACHD has approved the connection to North Meridian Road for this portion of the project and some correspondence there from the highway district they have indicated that they are -- they are warning -- or in discussions with the applicant on the exact location of -- of that access and maybe the applicant can address that a little bit further as part of his presentation. So, having said that, Council will also have to approve the access -- direct access to North Meridian Road. So, if Council does not approve the access to North Meridian Road, the applicant will have to redesign the project so that the multi-family portion would take access through what they are calling their single-family portion in some way, shape or form. The applicant is proposing one common driveway in the project. The common driveway should comply with the standards listed in the UDC, unless limited by a significant geographic feature or separated by a minimum of five foot wide landscape common -- common lot. All properties taking access from -- that front the common drive are required to take access. So, the proposed common drive is here, so these lots would have to either provide a five foot landscape strip or take access from that common driveway. A 25 foot wide street buffer is required along North Meridian Road, which is considered an arterial street and it's required to be landscaped in accord with the UDC, which requires a mixture of trees and shrubs. The buffer width along North Meridian Road should be measured from the back of curb or the ultimate curb location as determined by the Ada County Highway District. A minimum of ten percent of qualified open space is required to be provided for this development and based on the area of the preliminary plat, which is approximately 10.4 acres, a minimum of 1.04 acres of qualified open space is required to be provided as set forth in the UDC. The applicant is proposing that approximately 1.59 acres or 15.3 percent qualified open space for the development, which consists of half the street buffer along North Meridian Road and an internal pathway that connects the multi-family portion of the site to the single family portion. A micropath lot and internal common open space, which appear to comply with the requirement. Based on the area of the preliminary plat, city code requires that a minimum of one qualified amenity to be provided. The applicant proposes to provide a bocce ball court, internal pathways, and gazebo or plaza, a community garden and an internal grassy area, which is at least 50 feet by 100 feet in the area in accord with the UDC. The applicant has submitted some conceptual building elevations. This is the multi-family portion and the rest is single family homes that we have included here. Building material

consists of a mix of board and batten siding, horizontal and vertical lap siding, stone veneer, corbels and architectural shingles. Staff believes the proposed elevations comply with the architectural standards manual and the design standards set forth in the UDC. Did receive written testimony from a neighbor Ted Williams, as well as the applicant's representative Steve Arnold. With that staff is recommending approval of the project and I will stand for any questions.

Yearsley: Thank you. Are there any questions?

Oliver: Mr. Chairman?

Yearsley: Commissioner Oliver.

Oliver: If I could just ask a quick questions, Josh, if I could. They are in the midst right now of widening that intersection on Meridian and Ustick. Will that impact that subdivision to where it will be one as well there or will that be closer to Ustick to where they are widening that?

Beach: The staff report from the highway district has indicated that that is already at it's -- it's already been constructed to where it needs to be, so they are not asking for any additional right of way for this length. So, it shouldn't impact.

Oliver: Okay. Thank you.

Parsons: Mr. Chairman? Just for clarification on that. Additional right of way isn't required, but with that rebuilding of the intersection it will extend past the front of this property, so there will be some impacts to this -- to the frontage of this property.

Oliver: That helps a lot. Thank you.

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

Arnold: Chairman, Members of the Commission, for the record my name is Steve Arnold. I'm with A-Team Land Consultants. 1785 Whisper Cove, Boise. 83709. I think staff did a great job covering overall. Let me see if I can't hit some of the questions that came up, along with some of the visioning that we had putting this project together. When you're dealing with two existing homes there is several challenges that go into laying this out and I will get into that, but the read off -- we did dedicate right of way and we have been working with the highway district to the expansion of the roadway and the location of the driveway we are currently working with the district. We may end up shifting it a little bit south, but that's not going to impact the site layout whatsoever. And as I stated, the right of way has been dedicated and the buffer and the whole sites been designed around the expansion of the roadway. Going to some of the buildings.

These are -- on the multi-family -- you have seen these before. You have seen me present these -- the pinwheel type design where each of the entrance -- each side of the building has its own entrance where we don't have any one person living above the other and we have strategically placed those south adjacent to the residential portion. We had one four-plex building that's adjacent to a single family to the south. Those are the majority of the styles of the buildings that we are doing. The eight-plex building it's a little bit different. We have four down and four above, but we have tried to model the same architectural styles that we are doing on the four-plex units. So, that the nice thing about putting the other four-plexes -- which is the pinwheel design south is they, blend very well with single family and we put these adjacent to our single family homes there, too. Single family buildings will be in the range of 1,500 up to probably 2,300 square feet, which is very compatible with the adjacent uses. One thing to note here, too, the developer of this project is also the homeowner of the five acres, which is -- I will call it the Ida Sweet, her old home. So, they are planning to build there and they are also the homeowner. He will be the builder of the multi-family, along with the builder for the single-family. So, our developer in this case has got quite a bit of interest in building a nice product. And as presented earlier tonight, you can see that we are adding additional open space, additional amenities to the project to help enhance and make this a nice subdivision. One of the challenges that we face was we have got two fairly large homes that are up along Meridian Road and we looked at doing office along Meridian Road, but the -- there is quite a bit of higher demand for the multi-family, so that was kind of the natural dividing point that everything east of the single-family homes we were going to do a separate product type, then, everything that was west of the single-family homes and, then, tie in the single family homes to the new single family home to the west, because that blended well with the neighborhood. We are providing a pathway from this site to future connect to the church site north of us, so we are constrained by the church there. We only had one stub straight into this development, into the backside of this from the subdivision to the south. There wasn't anything stubbed east -- or, excuse me, west -- from the west east to us, so we are constrained with that six acres to just one access point. We did look at also connecting the single -- the multi-family with a drive aisle going west to the single family, but we understood that there was concerns with the neighbors to the south and the perceived additional traffic that we would have on that. Because we were able to work with the highway district and split the traffic patterns, we took the multi-family east to Meridian and, then, combined all the single-family west and south through the existing sub. Traffic volumes -- and to give you an idea for the traffic on the road to the south, Cedric Drive, it's got approximately 352 trips per day on it, you know, we are going to add approximately 290. The threshold for these roads are between 1,000 and 2,000 vehicle trips per day. So, the additional traffic, although it's not welcomed, it is well within ACHD's threshold and, as stated earlier, ACHD has reviewed this and has approved the site plan. Some of the things that -- other thoughts that went into our development. We located the park very central. We added the community garden as one of the amenities. We are finding that those are often

used and well utilized and also central we have the gazebo and bocce ball court and all this is going to be shared between the multi-family and the single family uses. One thing to note, too, is -- and we are asking that the shop remain and I think staff has left that fairly open. The shop to the south to the house, it's an outbuilding that is in the setback that needs to not be in, but we are -- we found it difficult to try to lay this out any other way to make it fit and that's one of the constraints that you get when you're laying out a subdivision with existing homes on it, is making everything fit and work well and smoothly on it. There are going to be two separate HOAs, one for the single-family and one for the multi-family and as staff has suggested, we will -- but they are currently connected to -- existing homes are connected to city services, but I envision that we will have to modify those connections to take the infrastructure, the sewer and water, to the west. We have read through all of the staff conditions, the ACHD conditions, and we are in compliance with all those. So, that being said, I will stand for any questions.

Yearsley: Thank you. Are there any questions? No? Thank you. I have quite a few people here signed up and this does go to the record. There is just enough that -- I apologize, I don't want to slaughter your names, so I'm going to open it up to anyone wishing to testify please raise your hand. This gentleman in the front, he had his hand up first. Yes. You. If you want to come forward and testify. And, please, state your name and address for the record.

Grossman: My name is Mike Grossman and I'm at 3056 Northwest 3rd Street, Meridian, Idaho. And I will apologize first, because I have no legal background, no government background, and this is new to me. So, if I stick my foot in my mouth I apologize in advance. I would like to state that I would not even be here tonight if it was not for the multi-family proposal. I'm in an R-4. Most people on the west side of Meridian Road are R-4 and they want to take it to an R-15. So, they want to go from a low density to a high density is my understanding. I would also like to say -- and, once again, I'm not familiar with the procedure, so if I overstep my bounds I apologize, but we have not had very much communication with the developer. He has sent out a letter. We had a meeting at the builder's house, which is where the outbuilding is occupied and I asked to have a plat map at that time and said, no, that he would e-mail. So, several of us signed up for that e-mail and to my knowledge, talking with some of my neighbors and myself, that e-mail or no further communication had happened. So, when we got this information just recently there has been changes from what the original proposal was and that is basically to increase in both areas. Now, the single family was a very small increase, but it was an increase and the multi-family is just outside the box. When you take in consideration what someone has already brought up about the highway, I don't know if any of you live over there, but they are pulling houses out of there right now at the corner of Meridian and Ustick and that road system -- I'm not sure how long it will take, but are going to change that from Meridian Road clear to Cherry Lane. They are also going to increase from Ustick to Linder. While some of that might alleviate the traffic, but at current time -- and

I'm sorry I do not understand, I could not -- I read all 31 pages of this and I'm not the best at reading. My wife is sitting back there nodding her head yes. But I cannot see the completion date about -- with ACHD -- and I probably apologize, I didn't do my due diligence -- I probably got three minutes, but I do have the head of our household -- or homeowners association member here Trent Clemmons and he is let me -- if it's all right with you, to continue on as representation of Parkway Subdivision.

Yearsley: So, just for that deal, those people who were in Parkway Subdivision, you are speaking on behalf of them and that they will not be allowed to testify and if they are in agreement with that, then, we will let you have the seven more minutes.

Grossman: Well, to my knowledge Trent is the only one here, so you can ask him. He's the actual president.

Yearsley: Okay. So, we will give him -- he was in agreement and so we will give him seven more minutes.

Grossman: So, to go through this -- and, once again, I reiterate that I would not probably be standing in front of you had it not been for what I consider -- and sorry for my poor verbiage, but somehow when I got into this process -- my wife works for a commercial developer and she's just kind of shaking her head looking at me, but it seems like to me -- and I'm not trying to be rude here, but it seems like the developer is in the old days, because I'm an old-timer that when you went to buy an automobile and you would go in and you would ask for a price and they would come back with a, no, no and you go back and forth and back and forth. So, I hope that's not what the developer is doing. You probably have not seen that, but it seems like to me somewhat there is a bait and switch on some of the information that we have been given as to where we are moving forward and I will go through this real quick -- and I don't know -- I have tried -- do you want a page number of where I'm referring to? Would that help? Or would you want me just to go on or how would you like me to proceed real quick?

Yearsley: If you want to specify at least the -- the --

Grossman: The section?

Yearsley: The section number. Yeah.

Grossman: Okay.

Yearsley: Yeah.

Grossman: Okay. So, the first -- sorry. Okay.

Yearsley: Go ahead.

Grossman: The first section number is 3.07.02 and insured will provide safe routes and access to schools, parks, and other communities. Under, once again, the construction currently, if this is going to be approved soon, which I don't get, I would like it to be tabled until the construction or a continuance no matter which way the Council votes, but that is not a safe environment. There is a home -- and I think it's for -- I have not researched it, but it is on the left side by a horse pasture and the home I think is for mentally challenged young people. The bus stops there, which I don't care, but it becomes a real problem currently. Going forward when they improve the lanes it's not -- there is sometimes 30 minutes to get those poor kids off and get them to their hands -- the caretakers. Meantime, people break the law, they are now passing and it could cause a dangerous accident and I'm not sure that it hasn't. Section 3.07.02, once again, the construction is horrible and the timing of this proposal is -- is not good, if I'm reading this right. The car count survey that was stated in this goes clear back to 2014 and, as we all know, Meridian has drastically changed in that period. So, I would propose a new car count before there is a decision made. On section I believe 11-2A-2, I'm not quite sure -- and maybe this is why I was never a mathematician, but I do not believe the spaces that they are stating for the multi-complex, R-15 high density, is adequate. With a mathematician -- mathematical where they came up with 96 spaces, but they are going to put in an extra five. Now, that's allotting two cars per occupant of a multi, which is probably something they have researched. But my question is to you, do these people never have any company? Do they never have any teenage drivers? If you go down a little bit farther on Meridian Road and you look at Aaron Valley and you look at the private road any Saturday, Friday night, that road is packed with cars, because there is not enough places for them to park in that complex, to the point I think it jeopardizes and hinders emergency vehicles. I promise I'm trying to get through this. I'm not sure why -- and I know some of my neighbors will be against me on this, but I'm not sure why we are having just a pathway, instead of an actual access for the single-families through the multi-complex, other than the builder owning a home there, and Mr. Sweet my understanding was still there, maybe somebody else is, with those two existing homes will basically have no impact traffic wise. Absolutely none. So, my question is why is it for them to propose to have no problems traffic wise and, yet, for us as neighbors and people across the street, people to the other subdivision, which is, to my understanding if I read properly, which is an R-4 also, why should we have to deal with that situation? And staff I believe recommended -- and, I'm sorry here, I'm not seeing a reference. I think it's under 7.21. No. That's the square footage. I apologize. It's a reference to the outbuilding existing. It seems somewhat ironic that that belongs to a builder of one of the -- that's going to build in that subdivision and I may be wrong on this, but if I read this correctly, the single family will not be allowed to have exterior buildings, but yet that location will be able to. And it's coming out of there from Mr. Sweet, whose plans have changed. Anyway, I appreciate your time. I hope that we will take into that

consideration and because of the multi-problems, I would ask you to either deny or at the least have a continuance until the construction is addressed. I thank you and have a good evening.

Yearsley: Thank you. Who wants to be next? The gentleman in the back. Name and address, please, for the record.

Tucker: Hello. My name is Todd Tucker. Address 2857 North Fairglen Avenue here in Meridian, Idaho. I would -- I guess full disclosure, I am a city planner for Boise City, so I will just put that on the record, but I am in full support of this project. The density -- the density is what this area needs. We are at a very closest intersection of two arterial roadways. That's generally where we want to see density is at -- on arterial roadways. We are also very close to a large regional park. We are also very close to services where people need to -- to buy things and so this is the perfect place to have a higher density. If you look at the project overall, yes, they are asking for what's considered medium density residential up -- up front and lower density towards the existing single-family residential properties. The overall project there is only seven units per acre, which I would not consider that to be even medium density. In Boise City we would consider that to be low density, to have less than eight units per acre. So, the density might actually -- could even be higher I think. As far as the design of the buildings, they are great. As Mr. Arnold stated, we are seeing quite a bit of these throughout the Treasure Valley. It's a great design. It puts windows on all sides. It puts doors on all sides. And so we got a nice presence on the street where you have got doors and windows and eyes on the street, which is very -- very good in the planning world. We like to see that. The single-family residential is putting like yards to like yards. Mostly we have backyards matching backyards and it's about a 1.5 to one ratio, which is very good as far as matching those -- those yards and the density there. It's got good landscaping. It's got great access. I think, you know, some of the concerns about traffic, local roads, ACHD allows up to 2,000 vehicle trips and you're not even going to get to a thousand, even with this development and with the widening of Meridian Road it can accommodate that traffic. I am in support of the project for a little bit of a selfish reason, I think with density comes transit and I'd like to see transit in this area. Meridian doesn't have really good transit. Like I said, I live very close to this. I work in Boise. I'd like to see a bus system. We are never going to get transit out in this area unless we have higher density. Ustick Road is a great road to support transit. This is a great project. Very close to Ustick Road where if we get a lot of -- if we get more people in this area we are going to get a higher likelihood of getting transit in this area and I think that's going to be a benefit not only for Meridian, but for the valley as a whole. And so that will conclude my -- my comments, but just on the whole I would like to say that I support this project, it has a lot of good planning concepts behind it, and I think the design is very well laid out and I support this project. Thanks.

Yearsley: Thank you. The gentleman in the back. You, with the bald head. I would say that, because I'm getting there close to you as well, so --

Lewis: No offense taken. Thank you very much. My name is Jim Lewis and my address for the record is 101 West Sedgewick Drive in Meridian. 83646. So, I am in the Salisbury Lane Subdivision. I will try and keep my comments brief and they are kind of more general. I have several concerns about this project. Number one, obviously, it has been addressed in regard to the traffic on -- you know, I live in the cul-de-sac that is very close to Meridian Road off Sedgewick and, obviously, with increased traffic through there that is a concern with this stub road coming through from the single family. I also do have concerns about this overall project becoming more of a rental community. Salisbury Lane, while, obviously, there is -- there are rental houses within the subdivision, there -- we still have a large number of owner-occupied residences. I think if you look at the size of the -- of the plots and, you know, it being so close to multi -- multi-residential, I think that those are -- kind of lend themselves to being a rental type community after a couple years. If you look at the subdivisions further south of me, I think pretty much there are -- a considerable portion are owner-occupied, which is -- you know, affects the character of the area, which we would like to retain. So, that being said, kind of the second component is the two existing houses on there. I think my one concern is whether the developer at some point is going to come back and request a variance or to try and put additional properties on that. It seems very -- kind of an odd mix of three different components of housing here, so I have some concerns about what the future of that may look like. And, then, in terms of the -- the multi-family residential, you know, what a lot of communities are trying to do is develop what are so-called lifestyle communities that are -- that appeal a lot to Millennials, which is, obviously, an increasing demographic. You know, a lot of Millennial renters statistically look for amenities, such as a swimming pool, such as athletic facilities. This complex, on the other hand, offers a community garden, a gazebo, and a bocce ball court, none of which are likely to be used in any sort of, you know, extensive manner whatsoever. Let's be honest here, it's just to meet the minimum requirements for open space and amenities, but it's not going to do anything to encourage long-term renters or long-term individuals within this complex. Finally, I think the big question mark is in regard to what happens on Meridian Road, because this access road and, of course the, ACHD project, will it be restriction to right turns only, because that is so close to the Ustick and Meridian Road intersection? ACHD could very well come back and say that that would be a right turn only, in which case those residents would, then, have problem accessing areas north for the commercial districts or in terms of coming back from any commute pattern. Thank you for your time.

Yearsley: Thank you. Who wants to be next? Please. Come forward. Name and address for the record.

Hitchcock: Clay Hitchcock. 93 West Sedgewick and some of the thunder has already been taken out of some of my comments, but I'm going to jump on what Jim just got through saying there and one of -- I'm going to start off -- one of the first things that I'm going to say is I think the traffic study of 352 a day versus 290 -- I would challenge where those numbers came from. It just doesn't seem -- in terms of today's world, it just seems like more than that to me. The other thing -- there has been a total lack of communication between the developer and the residents around the area. The only thing I received and I feel real inadequate doing here -- I had a little three-by-five card that came over from the city planning, but it wasn't even this complete plan that I saw here. So, you know, I had my magnifying glass and I was looking at it. I tried to navigate your website, but I couldn't find the details there either. So, the traffic that's going to be coming down through -- through Sedgewick from the residential areas there, in terms of the number of residential areas there versus how many are down on our street, you know, I can see a significant increase in traffic going through there and there has already been two points brought up about, you know, we are waiting what's going on with the Meridian project versus now kind of integrating that into what this project is going to do in terms of people turning out and turning right on Meridian if they are going down to the freeway or, you know, trying to get on Ustick, which I don't see any access to Ustick for these people that are here. So, as far as doing this development for future transit projects, I think you got a little ways to wait on something like that. Thank you.

Yearsley: Thank you. Anybody else? Please. Come forward. Name and address for the record, please.

Carver: My name is John Carver. I live at 730 West Claire, which is at the end of Sedgewick. Sedgewick is virtually one of two little roads that I can use to get in. Indian Rocks and Sedgewick are the only way that I can get into where I -- which is called Vallencourt at the end of that. I have heard nothing from anybody. Now, they may not think that I -- first of all, this is -- I mean it's a stone's throw away from my house and, secondly, nobody bothered to tell us what was going on. So, I heard about this tonight, so I'm unprepared. There is a perfectly good park across the street, by the way. You don't need bocce balls and you don't need gazebos. As was mentioned earlier, that's part of a smokescreen. We have a lovely little gazebo in our neighborhood, too. I think I have seen three people use it in nine years. They are not used. This thousand cars that ACHD has come up with, how on earth did they come up with that kind of a number? How do they determine that's safe? Has anybody stopped to think about all the kids that live in that neighborhood? There are any number of kids that are on -- just on the edges of these cul-de-sacs these gentlemen were talking about. I drive very, very slowly when I go down that street, because I know there are kids and I know how kids act. The biggest problem I have with all of this -- two of them. One is you cannot access this from Ustick. Why not? That would take a lot of the pressure off of Sedgewick for starters. But they might lose a lot doing that. And multi -- multi-families, are we talking low

income? What are we talking about here? We just -- the term is 48 dwelling units of what sort? And where is the money coming from? Is HUD involved in this? Because I heard that HUD is cutting out of a whole lot of these programs and if they do where is the money going to come from to finish those projects? And to have just one access. This is all directed to -- to make it easy on the folks that live in those two houses now, as was mentioned earlier. They are giving up nothing and they are making a ton of money doing this. They could take a road and put it right between their houses and go right on back in. But, again, they might lose a lot that they could sell. This is very convenient for them, but they are not thinking of the rest of us and when I bought my house nine years ago, about 20 minutes before the market fell apart, I paid a hell of a lot of money for that house and I'm nowhere close to getting it back. You do this -- you allow this to happen in its present form -- I don't mind houses back there, but this multi-family stuff and only one ingress and egress -- what does the fire department say about that by the way? I will stand for any questions.

Yearsley: Thank you.

Carver: Thank you for your time.

Yearsley: Anybody else? Name and address for the record, please.

Drouillard: Jeanette Drouillard of 166 West Sedgewick. Some of the things I'm going to say have already been said. The first concern is the multiplexes out on Meridian Road. Originally we were told at the first meeting they would be four, not eight, which seems to be overstated. Our next concern is how many parking places per unit are there going to be? How many guest parking? How many extra cars per unit? Sometimes there is three or four cars per unit. So, where are all these people going to park? They can't park on Meridian Road. Are they going to come over and park along -- into Sedgewick? That is a big concern of ours. And, then, also I was told that -- I don't know how soon this will happen, but that they will be coming onto Meridian Road, but they will have to turn right, they will not be able to go left, excuse me, and so those people that really want to go left will probably turn into Sedgewick, go into our first cul-de-sac, turn around, go back out and go left. That is a real concern, because we are already overloaded on Sedgewick. On Sedgewick we have 40 houses. We have a subdivision behind us, which is Salisbury -- what's it called? Yes. And there are 60 homes back there. They use Sedgewick and they have an alternative to use Indian Rock, which I have talked to many people that live in that subdivision, they do not like to go out Indian Rock, because they have four dips in the road to slow them down. It is a higher profile of cars lined up on the street and so I would say out of the 60 houses probably 40 to 45 use Sedgewick to get to Meridian Road. Our road, other than the third party or, you know, company, doesn't have a lot of cars on the road and we do have a speeding problem down Sedgewick. We have the 60 homes behind us, the 40 in our subdivision, and now they are going to add 29 houses coming out of this new subdivision, so that is 60 cars a day

more just on Sedgewick and our other concern is why is -- is there only one outlet for that subdivision? All of those homes are going to have to come out on one road and it just seems like the impact is going to be tremendous on Sedgewick and just trying to get out on Meridian Road, even if it is four lanes, it is going to be a tremendous impact on the people. There is houses, there is -- you know, living in the subdivision all the UPS and all these --

Yearsley: Your time is up. If you could wrap it up, please, I would appreciate it.

Drouillard: Okay. Thank you.

Yearsley: Thank you. Anybody else that would like to testify? Please come forward.

Simunich: I am Joe Simunich and I live at 2715 Venable Avenue. I have lived in that area for 47 years and most of these subdivision projects there is no address made to the irrigation. It's just left to the developer to do what he wants. So, I don't know -- there is some pipe there along -- in the front of this subdivision there is a lateral that goes south, the lateral goes north and there is also a measuring weir and I don't know if this is going to be reconstructed by the developer or Ada County Highway District when Meridian Road widens there from Ustick south. Can you -- can someone answer that for me?

Yearsley: When we have the applicant come back after everyone's talked I will have him answer that question, because at this point I can't answer that question, so we will have him answer that question for you when he comes back up.

Simunich: I just want to reiterate that these -- some of these developers do what they want. For instance, about two years ago at 9:00 o'clock Nampa- Meridian Irrigation called me and said there is water coming out behind a lot on Indian Rocks Street, 150 inches of water, nobody knows where it's coming from, because Nampa-Meridian has no control on the laterals and the developer that did Indian Rocks did not close off the pipe. Somebody figured they needed to irrigate, they closed off a box and the water came out behind Indian Rock Street. So, it's important that we take a look at irrigation in the subdivisions. Thank you very much.

Yearsley: Thank you. Is there anybody else that would like to testify? Please.

Thomas: Good evening. My name is Nick Thomas. I reside at 2975 North Meridian Road. The second house in question. And I appreciate the time you have given us all to come here tonight. I -- I would like to appreciate those that have commented so far. They are passionate and that's great. I want to live in this house for a long time and I want people that are passionate about where they live surrounded by me. And I realize this isn't a perfect project. Nothing's

perfect. It's what the developer has put together with what was left. This could become a strip mall, it could become all kinds of things. I appreciate that it's a place for me to live with my wife and kids and we can enjoy the neighborhood together and I like what's planned. I appreciate the concern of the traffic. I drive up and down Meridian Road every day. Imagine right now how it is to get access on without -- with just a private driveway. With ACHD helping out and with the requirements here, it's going to be great for the community. I only have one request, because I am the second in question with the detached garage, I'd like to keep it -- I'd like to have a variance for it. My wife and kids and I would love to get a boat someday and park it in the garage. If I tear it down I spend the money building another garage and never buy the boat. So, that's selfish on my part. But I appreciate your time. Thank you.

Yearsley: Thank you. Into the microphone. No. No. We have got to get it on record, so -- sorry. Name and address for the record, please.

Brown: Wayne Brown. 2858 Springwater. And I did mark, no, I didn't want to speak, but --

Yearsley: No, you're more than welcome to speak.

Brown: However, I heard some things tonight that kind of disturbed me. So, I will make it very brief. Everybody talks about Sedgewick. Well, I live on Spring Water. There are four houses on Spring Water and the total impact is going to come right out past by my house. We have lived there since 2002 and did I know that there was a stub street when I bought there? Yes, I did. Did I think that I would be impacted like this development? No, I did not. However, I think when it comes down to economics, as this gentleman said, my house is going to be worth about half, because nobody wants to buy it, because there is 97 cars going by my house every day. Thank you.

Yearsley: Thank you. Please.

Enzler: Good evening. My name's Kyle Enzler. I'm at 3001 North Meridian Road. So, I'm the big, bad developer, builder, but I'm also the homeowner and a little bit of background. We actually searched out this project, because as a builder we build custom homes and we don't build spec homes, we don't build production homes. Everybody we build for is a friend or somebody that's personally referred and we have a lot people coming to us -- in this particular area there is not a second home -- there is Corey Barton and there is older homes, but there is not a second home option. So, there are -- a lot of our friends are moving out to Bainbridge and Paramount and Eagle and other places and they were looking for a community and a product that was nice that they could stay in the area, they could stay by the park, and we were part of that, my wife and I, we have three kids. So, obviously, in planning this we -- all of the comments that were made tonight I appreciate. Obviously, as a father we have

the same concerns, thinking about traffic and kids and our little kids on bikes and everything else and we went into this with that in mind of how could we plan a really nice community that we could live in and I was thinking back when I was 14, I -- one of my first jobs was a development my father did years ago and I -- I was out there shoveling dirt and what I liked about it was it was a mixed-use project, it had multi-family, it had nice residential homes and as I got older one of my first jobs I could actually afford the -- to live on that site. I actually moved into one of the apartments. So, these apartments that we are building, as talked about, they are a pinwheel design, which if you know about the construction of them, they cost more money to build. There is a lot more cost that goes into it. There is granite in there. Our price point for our rents are higher. We are trying to attract people that want to stay there. Say with the homes, you know, they are -- in fact, we -- where we had our community meeting we invited everybody to our house, because that's the kind of community we are trying to create. So, we are super excited about this -- this project, to be able to use the existing houses, which were built in the '90s, they are not tearer downer houses, they are -- they are houses that, you know, are worth keeping and -- and I feel like staff has done a great job in recommending how we can meet the requirements -- as you can see the extra open space that we did, the extra amenities we did were because we care about living here on site in this project and so I appreciate your time. Thank you.

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

Steiger: My name is Janice Steiger and I own a home at 2881 North Spring Water. That just borders the -- what we have here and the only thing that I want to say about it is everybody has said a lot of stuff. I am opposed to it. I just think it's -- a development of that size needs to have more accesses out of what they are developing, instead of going through other neighborhoods and everywhere else. They need to have access off of Ustick. Meridian Road where they are coming -- where the multi-family is going to be coming out is a two lane right now. I know that they are going to expand that to a four-lane. I'm not sure when. I know it's on the plan. But at the very least should it not wait until it is four lane, so all that traffic can have somewhere to come out on. This is really close to Ustick and you can't get in and out of there and if you bring all that development - - wait until there is the infrastructure to support the traffic and don't go through everybody else's subdivision, make more accesses to Ustick or Meridian Road and wait for infrastructure to support it.

Yearsley: Thank you. Anybody else? Thank you. Would the applicant like to come forward?

Arnold: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission, for the record again, Steve Arnold, A-Team Land Consultants. I will try to address as quickly as I can the majority of the concerns. Again, the number one that came up that I hear

repeatedly is the traffic and the traffic generation number that I got, that's from ACHD, the 2010 traffic count. I did send that to staff and show that comes directly off of their information, the 352 trips per day on Sedgewood Drive, and, again, we are adding 290. The traffic counts you essentially assume ten trips per household. We have got 27 new, but we are adding the two existing homes, so that's how I come up with the 290. The site is constrained. There was only one stub street provided into it -- into the back portion and we have got development that occurred west of the site with no stub to us and we got development that is -- that has occurred north of us without a connection. My fear is if -- and we didn't connect the multi-family to the single-family for a planning purpose. We were trying to keep, you know, the two separate uses -- the traffic separated and not increase potential additional traffic onto Sedgewick Drive, because we knew there was a concern there with the traffic. We did however -- and as a staff recommendation and we agreed with it -- we -- we did provide pedestrian connectivity to the north. So, we do have a pedestrian pathway that will get future pedestrians to the -- to the church or to the playing fields there and/or north to the -- to the park site and so there was a lot of thought that went into how this site was laid out, how we can best make the uses compatible and try to keep like uses next to like uses with the single family and the existing and, then, then, multi-family out closer to the arterial, as stated earlier tonight, you know, in hopes that we can have eventually density that would support transit in the future. There has been several comments about the changes in the plan, they are a bait and switch that's occurred. If anything has occurred we have gone down with -- working with staff on the density that we originally proposed. We have lost multi-family units and we have lost single family units and I apologize for anyone that I had -- did not e-mail the site plans to. I do have my e-mail on all the notifications and the public -- the neighborhood request. I have replied to everyone that -- you know, that responds to me. I have done this enough -- you guys have seen me here enough that I'm not going to bury my head and not reply to neighborhood concerns, so I apologize to any neighborhood that -- or neighbor that we did not get information to. Another issue came up about irrigation and you wanted me to address that. Our intent is -- when we develop this -- any pipes we -- any irrigation canals we pipe to and through. There has been an issue that I believe Mr. Simunich brought up about some flooding that had occurred. This property, because of the subdivision to the west of us, was -- they did not account for the tail water of our two five acres irrigating. So, there has been a problem with these two existing five acres when they irrigate there is flooding going on. Well, as a part of our development when we develop this site, we are going to provide pressure irrigation and all of that will be cleared up with -- with our development. So, there has been an irrigation issue out there that will be cleaned up as we develop. The driveway that's being proposed -- we have been working with ACHD and that's going to be a full access, so left-in, left-out, right-in, right-out. And, again, we wanted to keep traffic separated just for the concerns that we are hearing tonight. So, I think I have addressed the majority of the issues. If I have missed any I would certainly stand for questions.

Yearsley: So, a couple of them was -- is this going to be a HUD home -- dealing with any HUD or urban -- a HUD project or is it not?

Arnold: Mr. Chairman, these rents are going to be anywhere in that 975 to 1,000 plus. This is not a planned low-income subsidized housing. These are -- these are high end units. You can't put these types of -- you can't afford to build these type of units without getting the rent back and the intent is -- just as you heard talk about tonight is to get the high rents and to keep qualified people into the subdivision, so -- into the multi-family. And as it relates to the value of the single family homes, you know, we definitely see those as being in the mid 250s to 300, whereas that will actually help the comps for the residential neighborhood around us. So, they will increase with value. I don't see any issue with anyone losing value because of our subdivision.

Yearsley: I know you mentioned it earlier, but the parking spots, per code how much is required and how much are you providing?

Arnold: Mr. Chairman, two per unit, which would be 96. Parking -- I have a hard time saying this in front of a Boise city person, although he's gone. In Boise city we drop down to 1.24 or 1.5 and that's a problem. I mean I have had issues. But we have also -- where we can keep it two units of parking, it's plenty adequate and we are providing -- we have got 48 units. We are required to do 96. We are providing 101.

Yearsley: Okay. And, then, the other one was talking about a transition from R-4 to R-15. Can you kind of talk to that just a little bit? I think it was specifically to the -- to the west of your property.

Arnold: I believe the R-4 is to the south of us. So, our lots -- the R-4 to the west and R-4 to the south, we are putting the R-8, which we believe, you know, between the R-4 and, then, the office north of us, is the natural planning progression of densities as you get closer to the arterials. So, our R-4 -- or, excuse me, our R-8 is in the back adjacent to the other residential densities and we are putting the R-15, the higher density, up near Meridian Road and the arterial. So, we are creating kind of a natural barrier with the existing homes and the density adjacent to the arterial and, then, lessening the density as you come closer to the existing single family homes.

Yearsley: Okay. And that's -- that's exactly what I wanted to make sure that we understood. Any other questions?

Fitzgerald: Mr. Chairman?

Yearsley: Commissioner Fitzgerald.

Fitzgerald: Steve, the two eight-plexes are the ones to the north of the existing home and, then, the ones like to the east of the existing -- of the other existing home?

Arnold: That's correct. They are away from the -- those are -- I know that they are going to be similar architectural styles. We have combined them. Instead of doing two four-plexes to try to increase areas of parking that we were doing. Originally we had four-plexes, but we were coming -- we figured it would make for a nicer product type getting more different buildings in there to do a true mixed use type of development.

Fitzgerald: Okay. Thank you.

Arnold: And place those away from existing single family.

Yearsley: Thank you. Any other comments or questions?

McCarvel: Mr. Chairman?

Yearsley: Commissioner McCarvel.

McCarvel: Could you speak to -- I know we had one person testify and I saw it in the staff report, the concern on fire equipment and stuff getting into that loop and the one access in there. Have you had comments from the fire department on that?

Arnold: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner McCarvel, yes, we have had -- we had a pre-application meeting with fire. Because this is a loop road it was adequate and, then, also with our -- our access out onto Meridian Road. The alternative, if it was a problem, we would have pushed a connection between the single family and the multi-family, but that was not a concern by fire.

Oliver: Mr. Chairman?

Yearsley: Commissioner Oliver.

Oliver: I have just one question on -- looking at the homes facing Meridian Street, you have this upper, but are there also going to be fenced around those - - each of those multiplex family or will that just be open?

Arnold: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Oliver, no, the -- most of the fencing -- we do have some screening for the mechanical units and, then, there is a little bit of fencing for the individual open space for them, but it's -- it's on their back patio, essentially, is partially fenced off. But the idea is have it open to landscaping and open along the -- there will be fencing on the perimeter of the subdivision, though.

Oliver: Thank you.

Yearsley: So, there was some -- some comment -- sorry, were you done?

Oliver: Yes.

Yearsley: There was some comment about adding -- basically putting a road in between the two homes and go out to Meridian, but if you did that you would still have to tie into the stub street off of Sedgewick, is that not correct?

Arnold: That is -- Mr. Chairman, that is very correct.

Yearsley: Okay.

Arnold: When I worked at the highway district, we came up with that sign that, you know, this road is going to be extended in the future regardless of -- you know, I mean the whole idea of getting the stub is to have multiple in and outs and it's too bad that we didn't get one from the west and, then, to the north -- I guess there has been -- I didn't address that, but there was questions about why we are not getting a road going north and one of the problems was -- if you -- you have got the intersection of Ustick and Meridian Road. Even if we could, if there wasn't a development north of us, the offset of that intersection doesn't meet ACHD's requirements. So, you know, I would assume that's why, you know, we are not doing a public street, we are doing a pedestrian pathway, is to have those interconnected that way.

Yearsley: Okay.

Oliver: Mr. Chairman?

Yearsley: Yes.

Oliver: So, in relation to the pathway going north, that pathway connects to what outside of your property lines? Because there is a -- yeah, there is the church, but there is also the retirement --

Beach: Mr. Chair, if you look at the -- the aerial for that, the assisted living facility is here on the hard corner and, then, the church picks up this portion here. What you can't see in this aerial photograph is the church has since expanded significantly from this and they have added significant portion of additional parking on the site, so, essentially, will connect to the church. There is not a whole lot of additional open space to recreate in that area, but that could potentially get folks closer to the intersection and up to the park.

Oliver: So, basically, what it just does, it connects to the church where they have a pavement and they can walk up to the park from there. Okay. Thank you.

Yearsley: Thank you. Any other questions? Thank you. With no more questions, I would entertain a motion to close the public hearing on file number H-2016-0075.

Fitzgerald: So moved, Mr. Chairman.

McCarvel: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Yearsley: Comments or thoughts?

Fitzgerald: Mr. Chairman?

Yearsley: Commission Fitzgerald.

Fitzgerald: This one is hard for me. I -- and I'm a -- and you all know that I like a mixed use -- mixed density projects. I think you do have a step up between residential homes, multi-family, and, then, you have a community -- or I mean an assisted living facility to the north. I think that's good. For some reason this just feels odd to me, though. I don't know if it's the layout or something. I'm not sure what it is, but something is not -- I don't know. I'm not -- I haven't totally made up my mind about where I'm headed. This just feels like we may have packed too much stuff into the -- onto the road or something is not -- I don't know. Something is not sitting well or perfect with me. I'm not sure if it's the eight-plexes or the stuff that's right up against Sedgewick to their south. If it would have been just on Meridian Road I think I would have been fine, but I think -- I don't know. It seems that we are maximizing the multi-family too much.

Yearsley: One thing, if you look at those four-plexes along the south, if you look adjacent to that it's actually a common area --

Fitzgerald: Exactly. That's -- agreed.

Yearsley: So, it does not -- it does -- I think it only backs up to maybe one or --

Fitzgerald: One house right there.

Yearsley: Yeah. So --

Fitzgerald: And that's actually what -- pulled up an aerial so I could see that, but --

Yearsley: Yeah. Any other comments?

Oliver: Mr. Chairman?

Yearsley: Commissioner Oliver.

Oliver: I, too, have some mixed feelings about this development. I do know that it's good to have mixed use and I know that any way we look at it that area is going to be filled in with something and -- and I don't know which is the lesser of two evils, to go one way or the other, but I think that if you look at this it does have some mixed use, which makes it nice and it is good access. What I worry about is putting anymore load on Meridian Road. But as far as the way it's set out, going out on to Sedgewick, it looks like that's about the only alternative we have and as far as the apartments, I think that's going to work out okay. So, viewing everything and knowing that something is going to happen, I think I would have to go with it.

Yearsley: Thank you.

McCarvel: Mr. Chairman?

Yearsley: Commissioner McCarvel.

McCarvel: Yeah. I have the same kind of odd feeling about this as everybody else. I think it -- it just -- it feels like it's got this little racetrack going around in there, but I would be -- obviously, it's just going to be homeowners in there using it, so, hopefully, you know, they pay attention and don't use it -- don't go around the corners real fast. But, yeah, it just seems kind of oddly disconnected, separated -- I'm not sure.

Yearsley: You know -- and I have a tendency to agree with you, but I like the way that they did it, that they are -- because my -- one of my biggest fears -- if you would have connected the two streets together is you would have had more of the apartments trying to get out through Sedgewick. So, by doing that -- I like the fact that they are trying to limit the amount of people exiting into another subdivision. Unfortunately, they were kind of dealt a poor hand with development to the north and not a stub street to the -- to the west. You know, barring having to buy a couple of lots and adding an extra street, which, you know -- so, I kind of like the fact that they did that. It helps to minimize traffic there. I like the fact that they tried to put their commercial -- or their apartments to the front and tried to minimize impact to the adjacent subdivisions to the south. So, is it the best situation? It's probably not, but I do think it's a -- it's a good compromise I guess is what it -- and I understand -- I'm sorry, we can't have comments. And I

understand -- yeah. It is tough to have growth happening in your backyard. But the developer does have -- you know, as long as he is meeting the development -- an opportunity to develop it how he would like it, I think it works. I think it's minimal invasive to the adjacent subdivisions. Like I said, he could probably have done worse. It's hard to say.

Fitzgerald: Yeah. Mr. Chairman, I think -- and I agree with exactly what you just said. I do think that the developer did a great job of trying to minimize traffic going into Sedgewick and that, so I do -- I give them a lot of credit for that. And I -- I mean it does help that the builder, developer is going to live there and I appreciate them bringing R-8 up against their own house, which is interesting. So, I mean at least they are putting themselves in the situation everybody else is in as well. I think my only comment was -- I mean somebody is going to develop there and it could be denser than it is right now overall. They could request that under the current -- the future land use map, so I think it -- could it be improved? Possibly. But I understand where you're going.

Yearsley: And I think the change, you know, between what they have seen and -- and how it ended up being today, working with staff, making comments and recommendations to try to help minimize those impacts, I think was a lot of the reason for the change.

Fitzgerald: And, Josh, in the future could we -- if we have something similar to this, can we see lot lines for the neighborhood around it, if the applicant doesn't provide it, so we can see what this -- what an R-4 -- or what the multi-family is up against, just so we can see it in the future. That would be helpful.

McCarvel: Mr. Chairman?

Yearsley: Commissioner McCarvel.

McCarvel: Yeah. I mean my overall comment was just -- comment as far as on the overall design. I think they did a -- I do think they did a great job of trying to push most of the traffic from this directly out onto Meridian. Yeah. It would have been ideal to have some sort of road to the north, but, obviously, they didn't get that and I think the density -- you know, your -- in the staff report we are actually looking at a gross density of 4.2. Even though it's an R-8, it's spread out -- I mean you have got the R-8 and the R-15, but the R-8 portion I think they said it's a gross density of 4.2 over there, so it -- it is a good transition of what should be expected there I think.

Yearsley: Yeah. I agree. The one comment -- and I apologize to the homeowner -- the one shed that they are asking to keep, I don't know if I like that, having a shed in front of their house adjacent to the street. I know that's against city code and so I would recommend that it be removed.

Oliver: Mr. Chairman?

Yearsley: Commissioner Oliver.

Oliver: I also agree, because I was just sitting here thinking about it, that if they are in an HOA and the HOA say none of those allowed in the subdivision, that's not very fair when you look at somebody else, just because they were there, you get a variance to include that, so if you're going to be fair to everybody you have to play by the rules and I think that shed needs to come down.

Yearsley: Yeah.

McCarvel: Yeah. Mr. Chairman, I agree. I think if it was placed anywhere else, but it's right out there in the front where everybody has got to look at it and -- I agree it will probably have to go.

Oliver: Sorry about the boat.

Yearsley: So, with that, if there is no more discussion or comments I would entertain a motion.

Oliver: Mr. Chairman?

Yearsley: Commissioner Oliver.

Oliver: I haven't been here for a while.

Yearsley: I know.

Oliver: After considering all staff, applicant, and public testimony, I move to recommend approval to the City Council of file number H-2016-0075 as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of September 1, 2016. Do I need to put the modifications in the --

Yearsley: No. It's already in the staff report, so --

Oliver: Okay.

McCarvel: Second.

Yearsley: I have a motion and a second to approve file number H-2016-0075. All in favor say aye. Opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Yearsley: If you guys wouldn't mind permitting me, I would like to take a quick break if you would. So, we will stand for a quick recess.

(Recess: 8:11 p.m. to 8:17 p.m.)

D. Public Hearing for 2016 City of Meridian Comprehensive Plan Map and Text Amendment (H-2016-0098) by City of Meridian

1. Request: Amend the Future Land Use Map (FLUM) and Text of the City of Meridian Comprehensive Plan as Follows:

- 1) Update the Future Land Use Map (FLUM) So That it Represents the Built Environment and Existing Land uses;**
- 2) Update Various Text Through-Out the Document and the Goals, Objectives and Action Items**

Yearsley: All right. We would like to get started again. Next item on the agenda is the public hearing for H-2016-0098 for the Meridian Comprehensive Plan map and text amendment and let's begin with staff.

McClure: Members of the Commission, thanks for having me here tonight. I'm before you to discuss a number of proposed changes to the city's Comprehensive Plan and to the future land use map. A little history. The previous Comprehensive Plan was reformatted to be fresh and adopted on April 19th, 2011. Since that time staff has yearly reviews of the policy statements within the Comprehensive Plan of the goals, objectives and action items and several of those reviews have results in a number of text amendments to the Comprehensive Plan. This is the first city-initiated map amendment since the 2012 south Meridian update. All of the map amendments since this time have been entirely development driven. Broadly speaking, this Comp Plan application includes three types of changes, all of which staff considers to mostly be clean up. The first set of changes goes to the text of the Comprehensive Plan. Most of these are minor updates, names, references, or to inform of current efforts. The second half of the changes are to the policy statements in the Comprehensive Plan, the goals, objectives, and action items. Again, they are considered to be mostly clean up or status updates. Lastly, staff has proposed a number of future land use map changes. Some of these are rather significant, at least in times of - - at least in terms of the area of the map. All these, again, are still considered to be cleanups. For example, a number of school and park sites have been changed to a civil land use where previously -- currently they have a commercial or a residential designation. The reason behind this is that all of the older school

and park sites have the specific land use, so this is a consistency change. One of the reasons this is important is for land use analysis. I'm not planning to go through all the changes. There is a lot. So, I will stand for questions at the end if you have any specific ones. But I will go through a number of examples for each of the three categories I just mentioned. This slide shows a few proposed changes to the text of the Comprehensive Plan. Green underlined text represents new text. Red strike through text represents deleted text. The first here is just to show that the city has adopted a strategic plan since the Comprehensive Plan was adopted and it's important, so we are going to add it to the Comprehensive Plan. I should also note that the strategic plan has also been added to Chapter 7, which is the section that deals with all the adopted by reference documents. The second item here is just to show what a lot of these revisions are and that's minor. In this case we are changing Meridian School District and Joint Unified School District No. 2 to West Ada School District and this occurs in a number of locations. This slide shows a few proposed changes to the policy statements in the Comprehensive Plan. Again, the first item here is just a name change. We adopted the architectural standards manual at last year or early this year and the previous one was called the design manual. The second related item is just to show how we modified an existing guideline to take in what the original guidelines -- the design manual guidelines described. When we were for Planning and Zoning Commission and the City Council for the adoption of the architectural standards manual, we told you about a number of site changes that were going to have to be removed, because they weren't an application and some of those will be making their way into the Comprehensive Plan or into the UDC. I think this is the only example where we are actually picking up from the old design manual and put it in the Comprehensive Plan. The third item here is just another example of the cleanup. And the fourth is just to show that in some cases it is not actually a change in the guidelines, it's just a change that we are responsible for and in this case the city cultural -- arts and cultural person is in the Finance Department and the baton is being passed from the Mayor's office to Finance. This slide shows a few of the land use changes. Red outlined areas are -- have been the Comprehensive Plan and in all areas where this has occurred this is because the county has removed this from our area of city impact or because of an adjacent area next to that has been removed and it's not hard to service. Green highlighted areas again are kind of the same. They are where the county has added to the area of city impact and where we are at adding a land use that didn't previously have one. In these cases where this has occurred we are just -- the adjacent land use is just being in this new area, so there is nothing weird or significant going on. Where changes to the existing future land use, again, this is kind of mostly where we had schools before, there was a few other areas where we have had office that were developed in a PUD and it had a residential designation, so -- and all of these cases were just changing the land use to match what is built and what was envisioned to remain there indefinitely. A number of other future elements have changed, so we have the school sites and fire stations and things like that. Those are currently identified with halos. Where those occur before and now,

anywhere in that square mile we could have a park site or potentially fire station, something like that. The map has been updated to show that's no longer a possibility, so we can't actually put a park there anymore or can't put a fire station there anymore in a few locations where the parks and the fire department have identified needs. We have also added a State Highway 16. That's a future addition to the map. We already have a number of other future roadways, so we are just showing the future Highway 16 extension on there now as well. Tonight city staff are requesting a recommendation of approval to Council for both the text and the map amendments. Next is a public hearing before City Council for approval and, lastly, next year we are planning to do again our annual review of the policy statement and, then, we will also be looking to update the existing conditions report, which is an addendum to the Comprehensive Plan, which in learning it is very out of date. With that I'm happy to answer any specific questions you have, anything I have glossed over or didn't touch on, I will answer you if I can.

Yearsley: Are there any questions? No? You look perplexed, Commissioner Fitzgerald, so I wasn't sure if there is something -- okay. You know, I think it looks very good. I think it cleans up a lot of stuff and I think the changes to the map I think look really good. So, you did a great job, so -- I guess if there are no questions, I would entertain a motion to recommend approval of these text and map changes to the City Council.

McCarvel: Mr. Chairman?

Yearsley: Commissioner McCarvel.

McCarvel: After careful consideration of the testimony put before us, I recommend approval of the change to the map.

Yearsley: And plan.

McCarvel: And plan.

Fitzgerald: Second.

Yearsley: I have a motion and a second to recommend approval of the changes of the Comprehensive Plan and text -- a map and text amendment. All in favor say aye. Opposed? Motion carries:

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Yearsley: One last motion.

Oliver: Mr. Chairman?

Yearsley: Commissioner Oliver.

Oliver: I move to adjourn.

McCarvel: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. ONE ABSENT.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 8:22 P.M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS.)

APPROVED



STEVEN YEARSLEY - CHAIRMAN

9 | 15 | 2016
DATE APPROVED

ATTEST:



C. JAY COLES - CITY CLERK