

Meridian Planning and Zoning Meeting

October 20, 2016

Meeting of the Meridian Planning and Zoning Commission of October 20, 2016, was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by Vice-Chairman Patrick Oliver.

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

Members Absent: Commissioner Rhonda McCarvel.

Others Present: Machel Hill, Andrea Pogue, Bill Parsons, Josh Beach and Dean Willis.

Item 1: Roll-Call Attendance:

Roll-call

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

Oliver: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. At this time I would like to call to order the regularly scheduled meeting for the Planning and Zoning Commission for October 20th, 2016. Let's begin with roll call.

Item 2: Adoption of the Agenda

Oliver: Next we will begin with the adoption of the agenda. We have the approval of minutes for October 6, 2016, and the fact and findings, conclusions of law for approval for the Twelve Oaks, H-2016-0100. Do I have a motion?

McCarvel: Mr. Chairman, I move we adopt the Consent Agenda.

Oliver: We have a motion to adopt. Do we have a second?

Wilson: Second.

Oliver: It's been moved and seconded that we adopt the agenda. All in favor say aye. Opposed say nay.

Pogue: Mr. Chair, just a point of --

Oliver: Yes.

Pogue: With regards to number two --

Oliver: Yes.

Pogue: We wanted to clarify for Item Action 4-C that the file number is incorrect on the public agenda and make the correction -- correct your agenda when you adopt it. So, we need a motion to correct that.

Oliver: Thank you.

Pogue: Then move forward to adopt it.

Oliver: So, looking at Item C, public hearing for Linder Road Apartments originally was H-2016-0118. It should H-2016-0111. So, I need a motion to approve?

McCarvel: Mr. Chairman?

Oliver: Go ahead.

McCarvel: I move that we adopt the agenda as noted.

Oliver: Commissioner McCarvel has moved to adopt --

Wilson: Second.

Oliver: Second. All in favor say aye. Opposed say nay. It has been adopted. Thank you.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Item 3: Consent Agenda

- A. Approve Minutes of October 6, 2016 Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting**
- B. Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law for Approval For Twelve Oaks (H-2016-0100) by Twelve Oaks, LLC Located at 1845 W Franklin Road**

Oliver: Okay. Slow down. Okay. Moving on to the Consent Agenda, which will be the -- the minutes and the fact finding and conclusions of law for Twelve Oaks. Do I have a motion to approve the Consent Agenda?

McCarvel: Mr. Chairman?

Oliver: Commissioner McCarvel.

McCarvel: I move that we adopt the Consent Agenda as presented.

Wilson: Second.

Oliver: It's been moved and seconded. All in favor say aye. Opposed say nay. It is approved.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Item 4: Action Items

B. Public Hearing for Bannock Ridge (H-2016-0113) by Lee Gientke Located 2940, 3101 and 3155 S. Mesa Way

1. Request: Annexation and Zoning of 9.42 Acres of Land with an R-4 Zoning District
2. Request: Preliminary Plat Approval Consisting of Thirty-Five (35) Building Lots and Four (4) Common Lots on 13.57 Acres of Land in an R-4 Zoning District

Oliver: Okay. Moving onto the Action Items. The agenda for tonight. I'd like to first start out by talking about continuances. We have one item that it will be continued -- we have asked to be continued, which is B, public hearing for Bannock Ridge, H-2016-0113. That is being asked to move from tonight to November 3rd. Do I have a motion to accept?

Fitzgerald: Mr. Chairman, I would make a motion that we -- are we opening the public hearing on this and, then, I can make a motion?

Oliver: Yes.

Fitzgerald: Okay. Mr. Chairman, I would move that move H-2016-0113, Bannock Ridge, to the hearing date of 11/3 -- or November 3rd.

McCarvel: Second.

Oliver: Okay. The public hearing for Item H-2016-0113 has been approved and seconded to be moved to November 3rd, 2016. With that said all in favor say aye. And opposed say nay. That is approved.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Oliver: Okay. Before we begin I just want to talk a little bit about how this works for tonight, as we have a lot of people sitting in front of us. We will start with opening each item. We will have the staff report and findings regarding how the item adheres to our Comprehensive Plan and Uniform Development Code with staff recommendations. Then the applicant will come forward to present their

case for approval for their application and respond to any staff comments. The applicant will have up to 15 minutes to do so. Any public testimony will, then, follow. There is a sign-up sheet at the back as you enter. Anyone wishing to testify may. Any person testifying will come forward and would be allowed three minutes. If they are speaking for a larger group, like an HOA and there is a show of hands to represent the group, they will be given up to ten minutes. After all the testimony has been heard the applicant will have an opportunity to respond if they desire. They have another ten minutes to do so. Then we will close the public hearing for that item. The Commission will have the opportunity to discuss and, hopefully, be able to make a recommendation to the City Council.

A. Public Hearing Continued from 10/6/16 for Paramount Director (H- 2016-0104) by Brighton Investments / Land Holdings Located Southwest Corner of W. Chinden Boulevard and N. Meridian Road

1. Request: Rezone of 37.31 Acres of Land from the C-C and TN-C Zoning Districts to the R-15 Zoning Districts
2. Request: Preliminary Plat Approval Consisting of 196 Building Lots, 12 CommonArea Lots and 2 Future Right-of-Way Lots on 35.63 Acres of Land in the R-15 Zoning District

Oliver: At this time I would like to open the public hearing for Item 2016-0104 public hearing continued from 10/6/16 for Paramount Director. With that could we have the staff report.

Allen: Thank you, Chairman, Members of the Commission. The applications before you are a request for a rezone and a preliminary plat. There is also a development agreement modification, but it does not require Commission action. The subject property consists 35.63 acres of land. It's zoned C-C and TN-C and is located at the southwest corner of West Chinden Boulevard and North Meridian Road. Adjacent land use and zoning. To the north is West Chinden Boulevard, State Highway 20/26. Across that is agricultural and commercial land, zoned MU, DA in Ada County. To the south is West Director Street and single-family residential properties in Paramount Subdivision, zoned R-8. To the east as North Meridian Road and a church zoned RUT in Ada county. And to the west is North Fox Run Way, a collector street, and single-family residential properties, zoned R-8 and an assisted living facility zoned C-C that is currently under construction. This property was annexed in 2013 and a modification to the development agreement for the larger Paramount development was approved to include the annexation area in the existing development agreement. A preliminary plat was approved earlier this year that included the subject property Paramount North 40. The Comprehensive Plan future land use map designation

for this property is -- the northern 26 acres is designated mixed-use community and the southern 15 acres is designated medium density residential. The rezone of 37.31 acres of land from the C-C and TN-C zoning districts to the R-15 zoning district is proposed for the development of 196 single family residential attached units, consistent with the associated future land use map designations for this site. An amendment to the existing development agreement is also proposed that will update the development plan for this site. A preliminary plat is proposed as shown that consists of 196 building lots, 12 common area lots, and two future right-of-way lots on 35.63 acres of land in the proposed R-15 zoning district. The proposed phasing plan is shown there on your left. Two different types of single-family attached structures are proposed within this development. The Encore units are shown there on your left. They are an age qualified 55 and older single story attached product configured in quads with shared driveways and side entry garages, located on the western portion of the development, consisting of 98 total units. The Cadence units shown on the right are a two story attached project -- product with side entry garages accessed from shared driveways, located on the eastern portion of the development, also consisting of 98 units. All development is required to comply with the dimensional standards of the R-15 district. The applicant has submitted an exhibit for each of the unit types as shown that depicts the building footprint, setbacks, common driveways and off-street parking. The rear setbacks for the Encore units that back up to a common area is showing at three feet. It actually needs to be extended to a minimum of 12 feet in the rear and the parking pad for the Cadence units does not meet the minimum dimensional standards for the two off-street parking spaces per unit that are required, which makes the development short 196 off-street parking spaces. The plat and/or unit types will need to be revised to comply with the minimum setback and parking standards or the applicant may submit an application for alternative compliance to the parking standards. Access is proposed via North Fox Run Way, a collector street, and that, if you can see my pointer here, is the road going right up here. This access was previously approved with the development agreement and the preliminary plat for Paramount North 40 and is shared with the assisted living facility to the west. Two accesses are proposed via Director Street, a collector street, and that is this street right here. This is one access. This is another. Direct lot access is not proposed or approved via West Chinden Boulevard or North Meridian Road. Common lots are proposed along Chinden and Meridian for future right of way for expansion of these streets. Common shared driveways are proposed throughout the development for access to the units. A total 8.63 acres or 24.2 percent of qualified open space is proposed. Proposed site amenities consist of a swimming pool and clubhouse in the Encore portion of the development and a swimming pool with a restroom facility, tot lot, and associated parking area in the Cadence portion. A ten foot wide multi-use pathway is proposed along Chinden and Meridian in accord with the pathways master plan. This is the proposed landscape plan for the site. As you can see here, the swimming pool and clubhouse and, then, the swimming pool over here and restroom facilities. Conceptual building elevations were submitted for each of the two types of

attached units as shown, the Cadence and Encore. Building materials consist of two different types of materials with stone veneer accents. The applicant states that there are two different Encore floor plans and one for the front units and one for the rear units with elevation variations and one floor plan for the Cadence units with a few differences between the back-to-back units primarily on the first floor. All attached structures are required to comply with the residential design standards listed in the architectural standards manual. Written testimony has been received from Mike Wardle, the applicant's representative, in response -- in agreement with the staff report. Staff is recommending approval with the conditions in Exhibit B of the staff report. Staff will stand for any questions.

Oliver: Are there any questions for the staff by the Commission?

McCarvel: Not yet.

Oliver: Seeing none, could we have the applicant come forward? State your name and address, please.

Wardle: Yes, Mr. Chairman, Commission Members. Mike Wardle, Brighton Corporation, 12601 West Explorer Drive in Boise. Appreciate Sonya's work. In fact, this represents a lot of work. We had a lot of discussions over time on the issues and, in fact, we -- we do concur with the conditions recommended by Sonya. There were two specific items and I -- in a moment I'm going to run through the -- just a few clarifying slides. But the setback issue with Encore is really not a problem, because it abuts common area. So, it's the same space, it's just whether it's in a lot or whether it's in a common area. So, that's an adjustment that we will make at final plat. With regard to the Cadence parking issue, we have had a lot of discussion on that matter. Condition 1.2.3C it says, basically, we either reconfigure or we find a way to provide alternative compliance. We will work through that process. That condition is acceptable, because, essentially, that means that we will have the same product. It will have the same general configuration, but very likely when we get to a final plat there will be fewer units. There will be, obviously, some -- some loss, but we will work through that, because there is still some design tweaks that we have to do on the units themselves, so we will see how that all configures, but I would expect that by the time we get to City Council we will have a fairly good idea. But I just want to stress that the product and everything will remain the same. The slide that's up basically shows that area and I -- the only thing that I wanted to stress is that this -- just to the west of the Veranda assisted living complex now under construction, remains the only parcel in the entire Paramount community that has not yet been planned or detailed and it's part of, actually, the -- there will be some commercial use that will take place there in the future. We do not have a plan for it at this point. But this really represents the last of the residential components of Paramount and kind of excited, because when it all boils down there will be some 1,700 units in this square mile, but with an elementary school, with a high school, with a lot of parks, a lot of commercial. It will be a fairly complete community and

it's been a long time coming. It's 13 years in process. So, we are -- we are excited that we are at this point. Sonya, I thought I knew how to -- there we go. Just a little bit of a simple schematic that shows the separation between the two. With the -- the Cadence product, a two story townhome community as we term it, it's -- Sonya's staff report talked about attached single family and that's, you know, a distinction without much difference, but it's a family type of a community and, thus, the swimming pool complex associated with that one is for the broader community. On the Encore side of that facility, the pool and clubhouse, will be for that community itself. There will not be interchange between the two. And, of course, that product for the age qualified abuts the assisted living. So, it could be a transition use over time. I pushed the wrong -- Sonya, the buttons are not pushing. Again, Sonya showed this, but it just shows the single story configuration of the Encore age qualified community and the area that is subject to the condition is that row of single lots along the east-west street to the north. That's where we will have to expand from three feet to nine feet at the back, but it will go into that common area. There will still be room for the pathway and one other condition that staff has recommended is that there be a pathway north-south through the little common area just to the west of that row to kind of tie in and allow people to get back in there without having to go around the street system. Next slide is simply showing a product or -- in Boise. There are two communities in Boise that actually have the same configuration. They are paired units in a quad configuration and have the same type of parking arrangement and there is sufficient on-site parking to meet all of the requirements of the code without any issues. So, just -- that's an example. And, again, with Cadence, the two-story structures with the -- the pairing on the common wall and the garage doors are, basically, side entry garages at the face on that first floor level and, then, the next slide simply shows how the quad configuration of Encore and the paired configuration of Cadence work. And, of course, it's that latter one that we will be working on the parking situation to resolve that condition requirement of 1.2.3C. So, with that, Mr. Chairman, Commission Members, I would answer any questions that you have, but we are excited about this. It just adds a -- a little bit of a different character in terms of the offerings, because, primarily, Paramount is a single family community. We do have apartments that will be coming forth shortly at the southeast corner of that section, which was approved a year or so ago. But this is a new offering, a new opportunity, and a little bit of -- the opportunity to kind of share the demographic makeup of the community with some new product line. So, happy to answer your questions.

Oliver: Commissioners, do you have any questions?

McCarvel: No.

Oliver: I would just like to make a quick statement, is that I think it's a nice transition to have the 55 and older and that, yet, having the multi-development on the right side there that makes it a nice transition. I'm glad to hear that you're

willing to fix the parking situation. So, when that finally gets the final look at it it will be fixed. So, with that I think it's a good plan. It works well.

Fitzgerald: Mr. Chairman. Mike, is there -- what they are -- kind of your example is the Orchard kind of what you're using that quad --

Wardle: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Fitzgerald, yes.

Fitzgerald: Okay.

Wardle: That is -- that is the same --

Fitzgerald: Perfect. Thank you.

Wardle: -- configuration.

Oliver: Commission, any further questions? Thank you.

Wardle: Thank you.

Oliver: At this time we have two people signed up to testify. We have Elizabeth Davis. Would you like to come up and testify? Please. When you come up to the microphone, please, give us your name and address.

Davis: So, my name is Elizabeth Davis and I live at 115 Bacall Drive, which is very near parts of these images that were displayed by Mr. Wardle. We moved into Paramount in April -- yeah, in April and we love it. We love our neighborhood. We love our community. We love our children's school. We feel like with the more high-density housing at the southeast and the southwest corners of Paramount, we don't feel like there is a big need for more higher density multi-family living in our neighborhood. Like I said, we -- we love it. We are not at all opposed to the assisted living and really not to the 55 and up. That seems, you know, appropriate for people who are looking to retire and that model has been, you know, used it sounds like in other parts of town. We are not thrilled with the Cadence, kind of the multi-family townhomes. We feel, like I said, like we already have -- within our square mile we have other areas where there is high-density options, so we don't feel like there needs to be another.

Oliver: Thank you.

Davis: Uh-huh.

Oliver: I also have Brian Davis. Would you like to come up and testify? Once again give your name and address for the record.

B.Davis: So, Brian Davis.

Oliver: Address.

B.Davis: Oh, sorry. 115 West Bacall.

Oliver: Thank you.

B.Davis: So, similar to what my wife has stated. The other thing is before we moved in we were renting, you know, in the Paramount neighborhood. I would prefer, you know, to keep the single housing model that -- that we have in the neighborhood there, which is right next to us to -- for the following reason. I feel like -- you know, when we were renting we took care of the house and everything, but we weren't as invested in the community. What I'm a little bit afraid of is -- is that they will be lower-priced houses and become, you know, bought up by say investors or something, the townhomes, and -- and turned into more of a rental-type situation and just -- when you're renting you're just not as invested in the community and that's all I had to share.

Oliver: Thank you. I don't have anyone else signed up to testify. Is there anyone else that would like to testify in this hearing? Seeing none, Mr. Wardle, would you like to come back up?

Wardle: Mr. Chairman, Commission Members, the density of this project in terms of gross in the range of six units per acre. This is not high density, nor is it multi-family. It's just a different configuration of a single-family home which affords a little bit of a different -- and the comment was made about lower price units. I don't expect these to be low priced units. The character and quality of what we anticipate doing is -- will be consistent with the community as a whole. Pardon me. Just a -- so, we -- we ask for your recommendation for approval of the rezone and of the preliminary plat, knowing that this will be done -- just a different character of housing, but not an impact on the neighborhood, because it will be consistent with what already exists. Thank you.

Oliver: Thank you. Commissioners, do you have any other questions for the applicant? Okay. At this time we have no other testimonies, could I get a motion to close the public hearing?

Fitzgerald: Wait a minute. Mr. Chairman, you have one more person that --

Oliver: Somebody came in. Is there anybody else to testify on this first item for the Paramount Director -- no?

Fitzgerald: Mr. Chairman, I would move we close the public hearing.

Oliver: We have a motion to close. Do we have a second?

McCarvel: Second.

Oliver: We have a motion and a second to close. All in favor say aye. Opposed say nay. Okay. The hearing is closed.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Oliver: Discussion?

Fitzgerald: Mr. Chairman?

Oliver: Mr. Fitzgerald.

Fitzgerald: I -- I think this is a great closure for this neighborhood. As you already pointed out, I think the -- the transition from the Veranda assisted living facility into the over 55 neighborhood is great. I think that hard corner -- putting a little bit of density in that corner kind of matches what the original plan for Paramount is. I think this is a neighborhood that could be modeled in a lot of places. If we had a square mile -- and Brighton's done an exceptional job of laying this out and pulling the vision that they had originally kind of coming to fruition and so I think it's great. I think the additional product that isn't apartments and it isn't -- you know, I guess a four-plex if you will, it's more of a -- that Orchards higher end style, but it's still attached product, I think it's something that's necessary and I think it's a great place for it and so I am in support.

Oliver: Thank you.

McCarvel: Mr. Chairman?

Oliver: Mrs. McCarvel.

McCarvel: Yeah. I think I'm in favor of this as well. It looks like a good product and, like he said, it's not even really high density, it's more of a medium and that corner would be right for it as well and I think the whole thing is a nice transition, as long as the applicant and staff both feel like they can work out the parking space issue I think there is no problem in moving forward with it.

Oliver: Thank you.

Wilson: Mr. Chairman?

Oliver: Mr. Wilson.

Wilson: I'm also in favor. I think the houses look good. I think the configuration is interesting and a good fit for the -- for the area and -- and I will also be supporting this.

Oliver: Thank you. As I said before, I think it -- it works. I think it will be a nice transition and as long as they are willing to meet compliance with the parking situation and that will come forward on their next draft before, I think that it works well. So, I think it's a good plan.

Fitzgerald: Mr. Chairman, I think I applaud the applicant for, you know, saying that they are willing to lose some lots to come in to where staff want it to be to meet the code requirements, so I appreciate that. And I also appreciate the fact that you have two major amenities that are pretty close to each other inside of this community. So, I think it's -- it's an addition that's a positive.

Oliver: Just a nice way to finish up the whole development.

Fitzgerald: Exactly.

Oliver: Any other discussion? If not, I need a motion, if we could get one.

Fitzgerald: Mr. Chairman?

Oliver: Mr. Fitzgerald.

Fitzgerald: After considering all staff, applicant, and public testimony, I move to recommend approval to the City Council of file number H-2016-0104 as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of October 20th.

McCarvel: Second.

Oliver: It's been moved and seconded that we accept the H-2016-0104 for Paramount Director. All in favor say aye. Opposed say nay. It's accepted. Thank you, Mr. Wardle.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Wardle: Thank you.

C. Public Hearing for Linder Road Apartments (H-2016-0118) by S 3 Investments LP, Located at 1770 S. Linder Road

1. Request: Annexation and Zoning of 4.55 Acres of Land with an R-15 Zoning District
2. Request: Conditional Use Permit for a Multi-Family Development in the R-15 Zoning District Consisting of Sixty-Four (64) Dwelling Units

Oliver: Moving on to Item C, which would be the public hearing for Linder Road Apartments, H-2016-0118. We will begin with the staff report.

Allen: Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, the next applications are a request for annexation and zoning and a conditional use permit. This property is located on the east side of South Linder Road, just south of West Overland Road. This property is zoned RUT in Ada County. Adjacent land use and zoning. To the north is vacant undeveloped property zoned RUT in Ada County. To the east is rural residential and indoor-outdoor entertainment facilities, Idaho Party Barn, zoned R-8. To the south are future single family residential homes in Fall Creek Subdivision, zoned R-8. And to the west is South Linder Road and future commercial uses, zoned C-C. The Comprehensive Plan future land use map designation for this site is medium density residential. The applicant is requesting a step up in density to medium high density residential without an amendment to the future land use map as allowed by the Comprehensive Plan, with approval by Council. The applicant proposes to annex and zone 4.55 acres of land with an R-15 zoning district consistent with the requested step up in density to medium high density residential. The proposed density of 14.71 units per acre is consistent with that allowed in the R-15 district. A conditional use permit is also requested for a multi-family development consisting of 63 dwelling units in an R-15 zoning district. The site plan before you depicts 16 four-plex structures that contain 63 two-bedroom units and a management office. Access is proposed via South Linder Road. ACHD is restricting the access to a right-in, right-out and is requiring additional right of way that is not reflected on the plat. The fire department is requiring an emergency turn around to be provided at the southeast corner of the site down in this area here and the applicant has submitted a revised plan as shown here that shows the turnaround. A ten foot wide multi-use pathway is required along Linder Road in accord with the pathways master plan. Staff recommends pathway connections are stubbed to the north and the east property boundaries for future pedestrian interconnectivity. A total of 1.99 acres or 44.6 percent of qualified open space along with site amenities consisting of large open grassy areas, a covered barbecue area, a tot lot, a sports court, bicycle maintenance station and a segment of the city's multi-use pathway are proposed in accord with UDC standards. Two types of multi-family structures are proposed within this development as shown. Building materials consist of a mix of horizontal and vertical siding with stone veneer accents. The two building types appear to be identical, except that they have different roof forms. Variety in the architectural character, the structures and design, should be provided as set forth in the architectural standards manual. Windows are required on all of the elevations that face pathways and areas used for children's recreation to allow views of these areas. All structures on the site are subject to design review. Written testimony was received from Kent Brown, the applicant's representative, in agreement with the staff report. Staff is recommending approval with the conditions in Exhibit B of the report. Staff will stand for any questions.

Oliver: Commissioners, do you have any questions? Seeing none, could I have the applicant come forward. State your name and address for the record.

Brown: For the record Kent Brown, 3161 East Springwood, Meridian, Idaho. As I started looking at this site initially one of the thoughts came to me is it's a lot like the intersection at Locust Grove and Overland Road. I did those apartments right there next to Mountain View High School when it went in. It was a lot in the configuration. It is planned for Linder to eventually go over the freeway and so this would be very similar in the -- in that aspect, the apartments behind all of these other uses that are there. In the design of the development with the drawing that's on the screen we are required to have a 15 foot setback. We are 20 plus on any of the exterior boundaries next to any of our neighbors. Had a neighborhood meeting. Only had one neighbor show up and wanted to know why he couldn't do the same thing on his property. He said that he had been trying to put these properties together to do a similar type of thing. Then I got a phone call from the Party Barn and they mentioned some concern in our southeast corner that south of their existing house where they live, that area they have receptions and so forth back in that area and so we made accommodations for them and moved one of the buildings that we had in that area and moved it across the parking lot and squeeze it into where all of those other amenities are. As you look at that, that -- what that does for our design is -- we are not adjacent to any of the other buildings that are adjacent to us at all. We are north of where that house is with -- with any of our buildings backing up. He has a parking lot. Even before we have started he's been preparing doing a berm between his parking lot and our property. The bare brown space to the north of us is a Meridian fire station site that the Meridian fire department currently owns. The design with the cluster in the center, having all of those amenities that are readily available to everyone internal, I think it makes it a short distance. In between on this -- how do I make this work? Push the arrow?

Allen: Pick a color.

Brown: Color. Okay.

Allen: And hopefully it will work.

Brown: This area right in here --

Allen: I'm sorry, Kent. That board hasn't been working very good.

Brown: Well, you can see it on this one on the site plan and on the landscape plan. We have an extra wide width in between the second and third building with a sidewalk going through there. We have got a 30 foot width. We have 20 feet in between all of the other buildings, which, again, creates that open space that we don't normally have the ability do in the apartments. We even have more space between where the buildings are and the parking areas is that in many of

the projects that I have been able to do in the past. And overall I think the design works really well for this area. I think that when we have done some of these before we have received comments that they need to be closer to busier roads and that's what this one -- this one does. Go to the one with the change. So, the fire department was concerned that we go too long to the south in that -- in that leg. We have provided to turn around in here. That dropped us a couple of parking stalls. I believe that between now -- just because we didn't have a whole lot of time to make those changes, since those -- those comments came Tuesday, that we can even pick those two parking stalls back up before we go to City Council and we would have the same 130 that we originally started with, which has over two -- two parking places per unit and I think our design works really well and would stand for any questions you might have.

Oliver: Commissioners, do you have any questions?

McCarvel: Mr. Chairman. Kent, is that -- I'm sure it is. There is a canal running to the south of that; right?

Brown: There is a couple of small ditches. It's not a canal. They are -- actually, you could jump over those ditches. But there is two ditches in that area, so that it is a water area and there is a road -- to the south of us is the Fall Creek Subdivision and their entrance goes way down and up in this pointed end is a cul-de-sac is what's to the south of us.

McCarvel: So, those are just small ditches that -- I am sorry if I missed it in there. Is that proposed to be piped, then, if it's small ditches or is it just left --

Brown: They are not on our property.

McCarvel: Okay. They are not --

Brown: We have fencing on our -- our boundary, but they are not on our property.

McCarvel: Right. Okay.

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

Brown: Thank you.

Oliver: Looking at the testimony sign-up sheet I have nothing for Linder Road Apartments. Is there anyone that would like to testify? Seeing none --

Fitzgerald: Mr. Chairman?

Oliver: Mr. Fitzgerald.

Fitzgerald: I move that we close the public hearing on H-2016-011.

McCarvel: Second.

Wilson: Second.

Oliver: We have a motion and a second to close the public hearing on H-2016-0111. All in favor say aye. Opposed say nay. Motion is closed. Or public hearing is closed at this time.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Oliver: So, any comments?

McCarvel: Mr. Chairman?

Oliver: Mrs. McCarvel.

McCarvel: I think it's just fine. I would be okay with raising the zoning there. It's a small area and it is going to be a five lane road with an overpass in the future and it's just an intersection and it's begging for more apartments. There is similar stuff across -- you know, bigger apartments across the street and with that little space of land there, I think it's a fine use.

Wilson: Mr. Chair?

Oliver: Mr. Wilson.

Wilson: I agree. I think it looks good. I think it fits the area very well. I think the amenities look nice. I think it looks like a nice complex and I will be supporting it.

Fitzgerald: Mr. Chairman?

Oliver: Mr. Fitzgerald.

Fitzgerald: I agree and I appreciate Mr. Brown and -- working with the surrounding landowners to maneuver some things to make it -- or make it work for them as well. So, I think it -- it looks good and it's -- it's well situated, so --

Oliver: And I agree with everybody -- what everybody else said is that I really think it's an excellent place to put apartments, especially when we already have apartments like Commissioner Fitzgerald -- or Commissioner McCarvel said is that -- we have got them right up there by the freeway. Perfect place to put them. So, I think -- I think it would be a well-designed project and would look very well there, so I'm in favor as well.

Pogue: Mr. Chair, just a point in making your motion you have final authority for the CUP, so --

Oliver: Okay.

Parsons: Sorry, Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission. This conditional use permit does accompany an annexation request, so it -- you are just making a recommendation on a conditional use permit application. So, Council will be the final decision maker on that.

Pogue: Okay. Thank you for your clarification. I was wondering. So, thank you for clearing that up.

Wilson: Mr. Chairman?

Oliver: Mr. Wilson.

Wilson: After considering all staff, applicant, and public testimony, I recommend -- I move to recommend approval to City Council of file number H-2016-0111 as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of October 20th, 2016.

Fitzgerald: Second.

Oliver: I have a motion and second to approve H-2016-0011 -- 0111. With that said, all in favor say aye. Opposed say nay. Motion approved. Thank you.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. ONE ABSENT.

D. Public Hearing for Citadel 4 Storage Ten Mile (H-2016-0114) by Citadel Storage, LLC Located 4015 N. Ten Mile Road

1. Request: Annexation and Zoning of 9.97 Acres of Land with an I-L Zoning District

Oliver: Okay. I'm going to the last public hearing for the Citadel 4 Storage on Ten Mile. H-2016-0114 by Citadel Storage. We will begin with staff report.

Parsons: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission. I'm actually filling in for Josh this evening, so I will probably do a stellar job like Josh would do if he was here, so bear with me as we come up to speed here for you. The application before you this evening is for an annexation of approximately 9.97 acres of land to the I-L zoning district. It's currently RUT in Ada county. The property is currently -- has some structures on it that will be removed upon development of the property if it is annexed into the city. To the north here we

have the Ada county residential properties zoned RUT. East we have North Ten Mile Road and single-family homes being developed in the Isla Creek Subdivision. To the south is a single family home and vacant Ada county property zoned RUT. One thing to note with the property to the south, it is, actually, developed with single family residences, but, believe it or not, there -- there a self-storage facility just farther south of these two lots and it is owned by the same entity that owns the developed storage facility that abuts this property. So, just for the record, even though they are single family homes there, it is, again, owned by another competitor or another storage facility company. So, I would imagine in the future that staff will see an annexation at some point for another -- for additional storage in the area. But I at least wanted to share that with the Commission this evening. And, then, to the west, again, we have the sewer treatment plant and, then, also -- or that vacant property that, again, may -- has the potential to develop with self storage units in the future as well. The applicant, again, is here -- or, excuse me, the Comprehensive Plan for this property is currently zoned mixed-use nonresidential. So, under that designation we do not envision having any residential component as part of the plan, but we -- our Comprehensive Plan does envision having a minimum of two types of land uses. If you see what's happening around that area, we have a commercial node to the south there at Ustick and Ten Mile, which is developing with a mix of commercial uses. As I stated to you, we have single family across the street being developed in the area and we also have a city park planned and, then, we have the wastewater treatment plant that currently is ongoing and having upgrades to that facility. So, in looking at the surrounding area and knowing that there is a larger mixed use designation in the area, even though this project is a single -- single use at this time, the city does envision additional uses occurring -- or developing in this area. So, staff is amenable to this property developing with just the self storage facility. So, the applicant is here to -- again, this is just an annexation, but they have provided a conceptual development plan, which they are proposing to develop the site in two phases. The red square that's before you this evening shows what will -- will encompass phase one and, then, phase two will be the eastern -- or the western portion of the site. Keep in mind that the final design of this facility will be required to go through design review -- CZC and design review with the city, which is a staff level approval. So, for tonight's discussion all we are focused on is, basically, annexation with an I-L zoning designation. Per the UDC the applicant is required to provide a 25 foot wide landscape buffer along Ten Mile Road, which is designated an arterial roadway. You can see on the submitted concept plan that the applicant is proposing an access off at Ten Mile Road. The dimensional standards for the I-L zoning district require that any structures have a 35 foot wide setback. So, the concept plan that's before you this evening depicts a 30 foot -- a 35 foot wide landscape buffer, but code only requires a 25 foot. One of staff's DA provisions that we are recommending as part of this project was we had originally required that the applicant provide cross-access to the property -- construct a drive -- a 20 foot wide cross-access driveway along the frontage of this property to tie into the property to the north and the property to the south. If the Commission recalls, we

had a similar project in a similar -- similar condition with the Citadel 3 project off of Amity and Meridian Road. We agreed at that time with the applicant that if that property didn't develop with a storage facility, then, cross-access would be provided and so our recommendation this evening is that you modify that DA provision tonight, which is 1.1.1D, I believe, and just, basically, add that language if it does develop with a self-storage facility, then, cross-access should be provided. The applicant did provide some conceptual elevations as well as part of the annexation request. Again, similar building materials as to what you saw on the previous three versions of this. I think they are adding a little bit different office structure, which is approximately 1,156 square feet. Parking for self-storage facilities are only predicated on square footage of the office building, so at the most you will see as far as parking for this site will be three parking stalls per the UDC standards. So, it's -- actually, it's one per 2,000 square feet, since it's -- they are requesting the I-L zoning district. So, all that's going to be required for that office building would be one parking stall per the UDC and the applicant has accommodated that. The other item that I'd like to bring to your attention is -- as I mentioned to you earlier in my presentation is although we know the ownership, south of this site is owned and held by a future -- or a competitor for an additional self-storage facility. There is an existing single-family residence that abuts that south -- a portion of that southern boundary and typically in the UDC when we have industrial zoned property up against residential uses, we required a 25 foot wide landscape buffer to separate the two uses. And in our recommended DA provisions to the City Council and under your consideration this evening, we have required that the applicant provide a 25 foot wide landscape buffer along a portion of that boundary or seek a reduction from City Council. In the applicant's rebuttal he plans on seeking a ten foot -- reducing that buffer from 25 feet to ten feet. So, there is nothing that needs to be modified as part of your motion. I believe we have enough flexibility in three with that language that Council has the authority to modify what is written in there. But the one thing that we should probably consider this evening the lot that abuts the southern portion where the residential use is, it's about a hundred -- it's about 500 feet of frontage or shared boundary there. Staff doesn't believe there should be a 25 foot wide landscape buffer 500 feet on the south boundary, so maybe the applicant this evening could clarify on what their intention is as far as what they want and what their desire is to have a reduced buffer and what length or the amount of that linear distance they would like to provide that buffer width along that southern boundary. So, just to elaborate a little bit more, the previous developments that came before the city were reduced down to ten feet. So, there was a requirement for 25, both the Commission and the Council supported a reduction to ten feet and I think staff is amenable to that based on the ownership that -- that is currently on that southern boundary. So, what we will need from the applicant this evening is -- will agree to a ten foot buffer, but what is the linear distance from Ten Mile into the south moving west and I think -- I think phone conversations with the applicant I think staff was agreeable with somewhere in the neighborhood of 150 to 200 feet, but we will have to see how that plays out. Other than that, staff did not receive any other additional

testimony on this application and we are recommending approval of the annexation request with the inclusion of a development agreement. With that I will stand for any questions you may have.

Oliver: Commissioners have any questions? Seeing none, could we have the applicant come forward, please. State your name and address for the record.

Conger: Yes. Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission, Jim Conger. 4824 West Fairview. Good evening. I think we only have a couple items, as Bill indicated, so I can run through those and get you all off to a football game I suspect. So, first and foremost, definitely thanks for letting us be in front of you and we are pleased to bring another Citadel in front of you and for the City of Meridian here. This is a unique location for us, because we think we are a great buffer, you know, in this nonresidential area and kind of buffering your existing or adjacent sewer treatment facility. We are in agreement with the staff report, with the exception of the two conditions that Bill indicated tonight. I have in front of you the site plan. I don't think we need to go through any of that. Per your comp plan we are -- we are definitely in a great location in the nonresidential use areas. So, I can make this, hopefully, extremely clear. Bill had already brought both of these to your attention and is in agreement, so I give you the red ink for your motion, hopefully, that would follow suit with what Bill indicated. Condition 1.1C, I will read it for the record. The applicant is also required to construct a ten foot wide landscape buffer for the eastern hundred foot -- 150 feet of the southern boundary adjacent to the existing rental house. As it pertains to the cross-access requirement of specific condition 1.1D, the red would say the applicant shall provide cross-access from the north to the south if the site does not develop as a self-storage facility. That is the same language that you guys put in place for us on Amity and Highway 69 and City Council accepted at a later date. I have further exhibits and can go into more detail on either one of those two conditions, but I will let you ask me for that if it's needed. With that we definitely appreciate the staff report with these two modifications and we look forward to approval tonight, so we can get onto City Council and, then, build this facility in 2017. Thank you.

Oliver: Any questions? No? Thank you. At this time I would ask for public testimony, but I don't think there is anybody that would like to come up and testify. Okay. No public testimony.

Fitzgerald: Mr. Chairman?

Oliver: Mr. Fitzgerald.

Fitzgerald: Being that there are no public testimony, I would move that we close the public hearing on H-2016-0114.

McCarvel: Second.

Oliver: It's been moved and seconded that we close the public hearing on H-2016-0114. All in favor say aye. Opposed say nay. Public hearing is now closed.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Oliver: Discussion?

Fitzgerald: Mr. Chairman?

Oliver: Mr. Fitzgerald.

Fitzgerald: I -- I think it's the right location for this. I think it's -- it provides a buffer -- especially because it's -- the sewage treatment plant is there. I think the staff now can work great together to come up with some modified conditions that -- that make sense, being that we know that -- what's going to happen with that house likely to the -- or to the south. So, I'm more than happy to move forward with those two modifications.

Oliver: Thank you.

McCarvel: Mr. Chairman?

Oliver: Mrs. McCarvel.

McCarvel: I am in agreement with that as well. It's a perfect place for it and I'm thinking the applicant and staff can work out the couple of remaining issues and I'm okay with moving forward.

Oliver: Thank you.

Wilson: Mr. Chair?

Oliver: Commissioner Wilson.

Wilson: I am also in support and, yeah, I think this project looks good.

Oliver: All right. I agree as well. I think that we have seen over time that the Citadel -- that it -- we have seen around the facilities that are being put in in Meridian area look really nice and are very well done.

Fitzgerald: I agree.

Oliver: And with that said I think it would be a nice addition to the current storage facilities that are out there, that would also buffer against that sewer plant as they said earlier. So, I would be in favor of it.

McCarvel: Mr. Chairman?

Oliver: Mrs. McCarvel. Excuse me.

McCarvel: I do have one question for staff before we move on. Bill, did you say we don't need to address 1.1.1C in our motion?

Parsons: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission, you don't have to. I mean we have it written in here --

McCarvel: Okay.

Parsons: -- it's -- unless reduced or waived by City Council, but if you want to send a message to City Council and express your recommendation for this language, then, certainly, we could add that in and include it as part of the DA provision as a recommendation from you.

Fitzgerald: Mr. Chairman?

Oliver: Commissioner Fitzgerald.

Fitzgerald: I think -- I mean I think it makes sense. I mean the way it's written it makes sense and for the reasons both staff and the applicant have kind of outlined. I think these two modifications make total sense to me.

McCarvel: Then go for it.

Fitzgerald: Okay. Mr. Chairman.

Oliver: Mr. Fitzgerald.

Fitzgerald: With that said, after considering all staff, applicant, and public testimony, I move to recommend approval to City Council of file number H-2016-0114 as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of October 20th, 2016, with the following modifications: That we take -- Bill, can I tell you what the language is on the screen and you take that and go with it?

Parsons: That will work.

Fitzgerald: Okay.

Oliver: We have a motion. Do we have a second?

Wilson: Second.

Oliver: It's been moved and seconded that we accept the applicant's proposal with the modified conditions for 1.1.1C --

Fitzgerald: And 1.1.1D.

Oliver: -- and 1.1.1D. All in favor say aye. Opposed say nay. Motion passes. Thank you. Congratulations.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. ONE ABSENT.

E. Public Hearing for 2016 UDC Text Admendment (H-2016-0118) By Meridian Planning Division

1. Request: Text Amendment to the Unified Development Code (UDC) as follows: UDC Sections, Definitions; Density Requirements in the Residential Districts; Traditional Neighborhood Standards (TN-R and OT Districts); Ditches, Laterals, Canals or Drainage Courses; Fencing; Pathways; Structure and Site Design Standards; Landscaping Requirements (Stormwater Facilities); Common Open Space and Site Amenities Requirements; Specific Provisions (Certificate of Zoning Compliance, Annexation and Rezones and Alternative Compliance); Subdivision Process; and Subdivision Design and Improvement Standards (Block Length and Common Driveways)

Oliver: We have one more item on the agenda for tonight. That's the public hearing for 2016 for the UDC text amendment, file number H-2016-0118 by the public -- or the Meridian Planning Division and Bill will present.

Parsons: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission. It's been about a year since I was here last before you with the previous UDC updates. Tonight I will try to share with you the most recent changes that we are proposing. I won't dive into every one of them verbatim, but I do want to hit on a couple larger ones that we think -- get some feedback from the Commission. I would also let you know that all of these changes were vetted with the UDC focus group that we put together a couple years ago and I also shared these changes with the BCA, which is the Builders and Contractors of Southwest Idaho and no comments were received from any group as part of these proposed changes, so it should be pretty clean going forward this evening. So, there is about seven slides here with all the proposed changes. Hopefully you guys can read those. They are pretty tough for me. I wish I would have had a paper copy in front of

me. But the first section -- or at least this first page this evening really talks about a couple items as far as cleanup items for adding some definitions to our UDC. Over the years we have tried to revitalize our downtown area and we realize we were missing some of -- thank you. We were missing some key definitions that we wanted to -- to incorporate into the UDC and it also helps us align with some of the other documents that we use as we are trying to revitalize our downtown area and so that's really what this first page is. The one that I really want to point your attention to is really the -- the one where we are prohibiting double fencing. We have had a lot of code enforcement issues where residents back up against common open space and our code requires the developer to put that fencing in and the neighbors don't always agree with having that style of fencing and so they go ahead and don't pull a fencing permit and erect their own six foot solid fence up against an open vision fence or four foot solid fence along the common open space. So, we wanted to take a proactive approach and try to better define that in our code and I believe this does that. So, if it's residential, the residential and neighbors will each want their own fence. This doesn't apply. You can't police everything. The intent is to really try to capture eliminating double fencing in common open space lots and if you recall our fences -- our fencing changes last year, we actually made it easier -- made it less restrictive. You could have more fencing types along common open space to try to deter some of this from happening as well. So, it's kind of two fold. One last year we updated our fencing code to allow semi-private fencing along common open space, which is only 50 percent open and, then, this is the next phase where we want to eliminate double fencing all together. So, that's really probably the most important definition that we are adding here to the UDC. At the bottom of this page you'll notice -- and it coincides to some of the discussion we had last year, too, with -- currently we have a Comprehensive Plan that kind of guides what density is and, then, we have the UDC that dictates what maximum density is on property and as part of this UDC change we are proposing to eliminate our maximum density requirements in the Unified Development Code and let the Comprehensive Plan govern what the density will be within our residential areas. So, for example, when we always -- we always give you an update on -- or provide you a medium density residential designation that provides a density range between three and eight dwelling units to the acre. Well, we always get R-8 density. So, the worst case is they are capped at eight, because it's between three and eight or -- so, again, we feel we can still capture that through the Comprehensive Plan and don't need to -- to at least have a maximum density requirement in the UDC. If you recall last year's discussion, we were trying to reduce some of our dimensional standards so we could actually have our zoning match what actually -- get closer to the density requirements that we have in our Comprehensive Plan. Some of those dimensional standards did change and some of them didn't. Council did not feel comfortable moving forward with changes to our R-2 standards or our R-4 standards, so those remain the same, but R-8, R-15 and R-40 did change last year and the lots actually got smaller with less frontages. So, again, this is another step to try to get us to align with our density requirements in the Comprehensive Plan.

Fitzgerald: Mr. Chairman?

Oliver: Mr. Fitzgerald.

Fitzgerald: Bill, you want me to ask questions along the way or --

Parsons: Absolutely. Feel free anytime.

Fitzgerald: Okay. So -- and I understand the Comp Plan kind of rule over this in regards to maximum density, but is this -- were the developers kind of -- I guess would you confer with them? I think this makes it harder for average Joe to understand what's -- what they want to do. Developers -- if you're a planner or you're a developer that does this every day you know exactly what an R-8 is, you know -- but if you're Joe Schmo that has a half acre on a corner that you want to develop into apartments, you -- you have to have a meeting with you guys or -- you kind of can't -- you have a code book and say, okay, I can do this, this, this and this. So, I just want to get your take. Because I -- that's the first place I go when I get a call from a developer that's making hand notes and this is R-8 already, it's already zoned and I can tell you the whole exact what you're going to do on that land. So, do you have any concern that that's going to I guess keep people from developing that may not have the experience that a developer -- like a normal developer would?

Parsons: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission, at first blush the UDC focus group said we don't care, that doesn't impact our development. We -- we know what we want to do. We follow the comp plan. That -- it's really more of a staff driving this -- this type of change. Some of -- some of the developers even - - or some of the team from the UDC focus group also wanted us to almost rename our zoning designations, instead of calling them R-2, call them single family one and single family three and almost like Boise city where you can just -- you dictate density that way, not just -- we are with you. When you see R-4 you think four dwelling units to the acre and that's how we explain to folks. But if the average -- if this is -- if this gets approved and we don't have a maximum density, one, we will go to the comp plan and tell them what we anticipate, but, two, they will ask us what does an R-4 development look like. We are going to tell them 60 feet of frontage, 8,000 square foot minimum lot sizes. That's really what it comes down to -- that's how the conversations happen.

Fitzgerald: So, it's lot sizes and basing it on how much you can fit on a piece of property?

Parsons: Exactly.

Fitzgerald: Okay. I just wanted to make sure I understand. It's -- it will probably make your guys' life more challenging at times to try to explain to some of these

guys that aren't kind of well versed in this process, but I -- I mean that's -- if that's where the staff is going I guess it -- it makes sense to me.

Parsons: And the other one, to kind of elaborate a little bit more on this, the other reason why we are taking this off is if you -- I think we had a couple of these situations since I have been with the city is if you have an in-fill piece and you don't require a lot of roads, you don't require a lot of open space, because you're under five acres, you're not required, all of a sudden you want to go R-4 development, you're over the four units to the acre maximum, because you're not -- because you all have buildable lots and you're not having to give up open space or public roads and so we don't want to back someone into going to a different zoning district just because they are not meeting a certain density and so this was one of our -- this was one of our stabs at attempting to do that.

Fitzgerald: Thank you.

Parsons: But certainly if you guys don't feel comfortable with that, you can certainly ask that we take that under consideration.

Fitzgerald: I just wanted to understand where it was -- where kind of the process was going, so -- I feel comfortable. I just wanted to make sure I understood it.

Parsons: Yeah. And the next couple of changes, too, will go back to that same requirement we were taking out the maximum, so there is not really a lot on this, but what we have looked at since we have kind of analyzed all the other residential zoning districts last year, this year we are taking a stab at our traditional neighborhood districts, particularly our TNR zone. That's one that we don't have a lot of that zone within the city. Recently there was a project that came before you called the -- it was in Gramercy where they had to rezone it from TNR to the R-15 zone, because they couldn't hit -- they couldn't hit that net density and so with TNR we go off of the net destiny. With our other residential districts we go off of gross density. And so that, basically, forced that developer's hand to come in and rezone that to a different designation in order to fit the type of townhome they wanted to construct in there, even though it was a -- probably a fairly dense project for the amount of acreage that they had. So, these changes here represent what we are trying to do with that, because we do see value in the zoning district and we want to use more. This gives developers more flexibility and allows us to get tree-lined streets with those parkways, it allows us to get smaller block lengths. It allows us to get more housing diversity within developments and that's really what we are about as a community. We want to have all inclusive and multiple housing types with our community. That's what makes us a community is we got to have -- we got to account for everybody and that's -- this zone can do that. And so here is some of the dimensional standards. I apologize, they are small, but we are changing some of those net requirements down to it -- from eight net to six net. We are changing some of the setbacks from the alleys down to five -- five feet per alley setbacks. Some of the

parkway widths are changing. As I mentioned to you, these are in the TNR zone you're required to have eight foot parkways currently, we are changing that down to six foot and, then, everything else should be pretty standard. I mean there are no dimensional -- there are no minimum lot sizes in that zone, it is merely driven by design and density and net density and, of course, you have to have a minimum of two different residential product types within that district and we have even clarified on this slide that we had allowed almost like what Brighton was doing with the clustered homes or an alley load and traditional single family front loaded garage, that would constitute two different changes in product type. So, we are just better defining it and making it easier for developers to take advantage of that TNR residential district. The next item on this is canals. In our Comprehensive Plan we have set policies where we want waterways and creeks to be part of the natural environment. We want to encourage development to do that and so -- so -- so often developers just want to pipe over those waterways and relocate them, because it's just easier for them to do that to get the design that they want. But we are not here -- we are not going to require the development community to integrate waterways as part of the development. What this in the UDC will encourage them to at least think about it and take that into account that, hey, this -- this is a benefit to your community. Don't look at it as an eyesore in your community. Make it an amenity and make it incorporated as part of that development and I think we have some good examples in Meridian that -- where development -- developers have done that and we have had some bad examples where it hasn't worked so well. So, again, we are not making development communities leave waterways open and in enhancing them, but there is another option for them and that's always been an option for them to do that. We just want to clarify that we do encourage that and even when we pre-app with the developer we are even encouraging them to leave those waterways open and develop them as linear open space. Again, this next slide go back -- goes back to our double fencing. So, again, we added that as part of just the open space requirements and that's the red at the bottom here, if you can see my cursor here, and, then, also we are finding that along our multi-use paths -- or micro pathways, you know, they are kind of -- if -- there is a limit -- a maximum length requirement for micropaths and so the development community want to look at more flexibility on what type of fencing could be along those walkways, as long as it was visible for police to see into them, so we are allowing the developer to do maybe closed vision fencing where your micropath is only 250 feet in length and that way the police can still see better. We feel like that's a good compromise and people living next to those pathways feel like they will get some privacy as well. And, again, go back to avoiding that double fencing issue, because they are right next to a micropath and they don't have people that can look over into their yard as they are sitting on their patio or that dog is barking at everyone as they walk through the micropath. If you recall last year as part of the UDC changes we also revamped our design manual. So, we took a two-prong approach that we had phase one where we took it -- we removed -- we, basically, took our design manual and it was broke up into two sections. One was site design and one was building design and with that revamp what we did is

we created a new architectural standards manual and just basically tied all the architectural design into the manual and we told you we would come back with phase two and tie in the site design standards back into the UDC and that's what we are doing here. We are clarifying some of the site design characteristics that we want incorporated as part of a mixed use development or a large commercial development. You know, when we come before you with annexations and these rezones, we always ask for a concept plan and typically we want buildings towards the street. We want them screening the parking area. Don't want a sea of asphalt. And those are some of the design characteristics that we have built into this section. Again, these aren't anything new. These are things that were removed from the old design manual and found a better place in the UDC. Now, they are tweaked -- we worked with them a little bit to make them more strict, because it is -- it is law, it is trying to codify these requirements, but, again, these were all the design concepts that were part of the original manual. The next requirements here -- not much interest in this. Basically as part of the subdivision designs, developers are allowed to count their storm water facilities as part of their open space. If they meet a certain design criteria. I have experienced this with the city. A few developers -- what will happen is the developer gets a landscape plan approved and, then, as they get to final plat they realize they have a drainage problem and, then, they have to build a pond or an open drainage pond to address high ground water. Well, they don't come back to the city -- and we have approved a certain amount of open space. They don't come back to the city and give us their design of their pond, they go to ACHD, because they control the drainage from the roadways and the city was -- were -- we were getting these drainage facilities that weren't very attractive. Now, they probably met the letter of the code, but they weren't very attractive, and so we worked closely with ACHD and the development community to try to devise or craft some better standards for those wastewater treatment facilities or at least those storage ponds. And ACHD has been pretty proactive on it. They have rewritten their whole manual on how to handle storm water and so these next couple slides is our attempt to adopt some of those standards and how we can help them better facilitate their needs and our needs and so there will be some coming down the pipeline -- ACHD will be allowing for more green infrastructure as part of design. So, basically, more bio swells if you will. They are allowing these drainage ponds to be vegetated again with certain materials, so that we don't just get a drainage pond with sand in the bottom of it and this unattractive nuisance for a subdivision to have to maintain. Now, this next section goes back to some of the conversation we had last year as well with our -- with our open space. You remember last year we were trying to devise a system to try to be more equitable with larger developments. Why do they have to provide so much open space coming with a 400 lot development you're putting on a lot more amenities, a lot more open space, and the development community -- at least the UDC focus group wanted us to come up with something that would be more proportionate to their development. I'm going to tell you that was pretty - - pretty hard to do. I presented some concepts to Council. They told staff to run with it. And so my recommendation to the group when we met was why don't we

just have -- allow the open space and the amenities -- allow them to go through the alternative compliance process, so that -- that would allow them to get that flexibility and that creativity that the development community was wanting. One example I can see how -- in how this could work is let's say a developer didn't want to do ten percent open space, but they wanted to do a 5,000 square foot clubhouse with a fitness facility in it and a community pool. Okay. Now, we can say, all right, we have this amenity package to offset what we are losing and that five percent open space. So, is that an equal to or better than what code requires and this we believe will give us that flexibility and you have the flexibility to take that under consideration with preliminary plat requests, annexation requests. To me that seemed to be the easier way to go than try to devise a code that you get so many points for this amenity and so much for this open space. To me this is the way to be equitable and fair and get some creative juices going with the city and the community and the developers in the community. Any questions on that? One item to mention on this slide -- and I will grab the cursor here -- is our short plat process. The Commission isn't really involved in that. That's really an application that goes directly to City Council, but what it will do for our -- currently the way the code is written, a short plat can only be processed -- it's almost like a final plat. Developer can -- if they have a lot and block in a subdivision, they can further subdivide that. But without having to go through you guys, they can go right to City Council and have them take action on a -- basically a lot split of that property -- up to four lots is how the code is written. Right now it's only allowed in our traditional neighborhood district's, industrial zones and commercial zones and it's not allowed for any residential districts. So, what we are doing here, based on the direction that we have heard, guided from a UDC focus group, they wanted us to broaden that and open that up to every district in the city. Open it up to the short plat process. Now, in our code there are some requirements that you have to comply with in order to be eligible for a short plat, but we felt that made a lot of sense. One, it streamlines the process and, two, it -- it encourages in fill and density without having to go through a rezone, a full-on preliminary plat, go through two public hearings. If they have a lot that meets the eligibility requirements for the short plat process they can go right to City Council with a short plat, get it approved, and go directly -- and go to the county and get that recorded. So, again, it's going to be treated more like a final plat if they can meet that criteria and the development community did like that. Common driveways. This one actually came from the Brighton Corporation. They wanted to have a little bit greater flexibility as to -- and modify the code on how we handle common driveways. Currently as you know six homes take access off that. What we do now -- the way the code is written now, if a lot abuts a common driveway you have to put a common lot there, a landscape buffer between the lot and the common drive restricting that access. This right here wouldn't necessarily require that open space anymore, that common lot. What it would say is if you did abut that, the home that's abutting that common driveway will have to make sure that driveway would be on the opposite side from the common driveway, so access wouldn't be taken from that. And, then, the developer would restrict fencing along that common drive, too.

So, it's kind of two fold there. Brighton kind of liked that a little bit -- a little bit better, it gives them a little bit more flexibility, and, then, Sonya -- I guess she didn't allude to it in her previous presentation, but whenever we have a common driveway our code requires the developer to provide us an exhibit map on how those homes are to take access from those driveways. They need to show us the building envelopes, setbacks, and access and we usually get that -- we can get that with the preliminary plat, but the code also allows the developer to submit that with their final plat application. So, if this change goes through, the developer is going to have to show us their fencing, their driveway orientations, which lots they are taking access from the common driveway, so that we can ensure that this complies with this new provision. So, we believe we have a captured developer. The onus is going to be on the developer to provide us that exhibit and tell us what they -- how they want that common drive to function, which is really consistent to what -- to what we do today. So, other than that I think those are the big items. I do appreciate your time tonight and I will conclude my presentation and ask for any questions.

Oliver: Commissioners, do you have any questions?

Wilson: I just have one really quick question. Last year when we did this was there -- you said like the building contractors didn't really weigh in. I mean is that typical because of that working group that you have constituted?

Parsons: Well, the UDC focus group has representation from --

Wilson: Okay.

Parsons: -- BCA. Well, there is members that are in that group, too. It's part of that organization. So, they always take comments back to them. But as a courtesy I do -- before I actually submit the application I actually go to their monthly meeting and I shared all of these changes with them and most of the comments I received -- they were positive. There weren't really any -- the only one concern that I heard was from an engineer that was there and he was concerned about us requiring them to leave waterways open and the tiling. That discussion. I said, no, we are not -- we are not getting in the business to make you do something that the irrigation district may not want you to do. So, all they want to do is clarify that we -- our preference is to leave them open and integrate them into the development. It's not our preference to mandate that.

Fitzgerald: Mr. Chairman? Bill, I think you did an awesome job. I think some of the things that you have incorporated make it more livable, like the waterways and I think preparing for less -- just green land to keep building on, I think you're prepping the city for in fill and so I think it's awesome. I think you're doing a great work.

Parsons: Appreciate that.

Oliver: Any other comments? No? I need a motion.

McCarvel: Mr. Chair?

Oliver: Mrs. McCarvel.

McCarvel: I move that we adjourn the meeting.

Oliver: We need to --

McCarvel: Oh, we have to -- okay.

Fitzgerald: Mr. Chairman?

McCarvel: I move that we --

Fitzgerald: After considering all staff, applicant, and public testimony, I move to recommend approval to City Council of file number H-2016-0118 as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of October 20th, 2016.

McCarvel: Second.

Oliver: We have a motion and a second to approve file number 2016-0118 as presented by the staff report. Hearing no other, do we have a -- all in favor say aye. Opposed say nay. It is approved. Thank, Bill.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Oliver: I have one more item, Mrs. McCarvel.

McCarvel: I thought we were just presenting it. I didn't realize we had to move on it. I'm sorry. I move we adjourn the meeting.

Oliver: I have a motion. Do we have a second?

Wilson: Second.

Oliver: It's moved and seconded that we close the meeting. All in favor say aye.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Oliver: Thank you very much. It's been a pleasure working with all of you.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 7:24 P.M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS.)

APPROVED



STEVEN YEARSLEY - CHAIRMAN

11 | 3 | 2016
DATE APPROVED

ATTEST:



C. JAY COLES - CITY CLERK

