

AGENDA
HAILEY PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
SPECIAL MEETING
Tuesday, March 28, 2017
Hailey City Hall
5:30 p.m.

Call to Order

5:27:28 PM Chair Fugate called the meeting to order.

Public Comment for items not on the agenda

Consent Agenda

CA 1 Adoption of the Meeting Minutes of March 13, 2017

CA 2 Adoption of the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision of a Design Review Application by Patrick Lindahl, represented by Chip Maguire of M.O.D.E, LLC, for a new 1,112 square foot garage and 895 square foot residential unit, to be located at 302 South 4th Avenue (Lots 13, 14 & N. 10' of 15, Block 105, Hailey Townsite), in the Limited Residential 1 (LR-1) and Townsite Overlay (TO) Zoning Districts.

5:28:09 PM Scanlon motioned to approve the Meeting Minutes of March 13, 2017 and other Consent Agenda items. Pogue seconded and all were in favor.

Public Hearings

PH 1 *Continuation of a review of the Quigley Farm PUD by Quigley Farm & Conservation Community, LLC, represented by Hennessy Company and SERA Architects. This project is in the Hailey Area of City impact, and may be considered by the Hailey City Council for annexation. The possible annexation area would consist of 175-200 residential units, to be built over approximately 3 phases. The project would also include a school site, nonprofit office and meeting spaces, mixed uses, agriculturally-related uses, small-scale neighborhood business and lodging associated with nonprofit use, baseball and soccer fields, parking, open space and common area, Nordic area, summer trailhead access, bike/pedestrian pathways and trails.*

The proposed project is located at the eastern boundary of the City of Hailey, generally to the east of Deerfield Subdivision, and is accessed by Quigley Road and Fox Acres Road, and located on portions of:

- *RP02N18010333E, which is referenced as T2N R18E Sections 3 & 10 Tax Lot 8368*
- *RP02N180022310 (LOT 1 & 2, S1/2NE, W1/2SE & NESW SEC 2 2N 18E)*
- *RP02N18011333E (FR S1/2SW SEC 2 FR W1/2NW TL 8369 & NENW, NWSW SEC 11 2N 18E)*
- *RP02N180107200 (FR NESE SEC 10 TL 8370 2N 18E)*

The purpose of tonight's meeting is for the Planning and Zoning Commission to develop recommendations to the City Council on land use and zoning designations, including the boundaries of annexation areas.

Additional City Council meetings will be scheduled in late April or early May regarding traffic, natural environment and other issues.

For further information regarding this agenda, or for special accommodations to participate in the public meeting, please contact planning@haileycityhall.org or (208) 788-9815.

[5:31:07 PM](#) Horowitz summarized the points to be discussed during the meeting. Jeff Roberts, SERA Architects, presented an overview of the proposed annexation. Roberts discussed maximizing the opportunities for open space and clarified zoning for the proposed zone for open space on the map. Roberts also presented calculations regarding density for a neighborhood center. As a comparison, SERA Architects did a simple lot coverage analysis for three blocks (Main Street, Walnut and Pine Streets) of downtown Hailey. SERA Architects determined that density in focused area was approximately 57%. Discussion ensued.

[5:37:35 PM](#) Roberts went on to discuss options for non-profit groups, as well as the benefits of sharing a space and other resources. Roberts noted that the total square footage would be approximately 80,000 square feet, which would include approximately 60,000 square feet allocated to non-profit groups; the remaining 24,000 square feet would include other commercial spaces (i.e., ski shop, bike shop, etc.).

[5:40:53 PM](#) Horowitz presented changes to the zoning map from the last meeting. These changes included more open space to be added to the annexation area (requested by BCRD), and noted the additions of the Floodplain Overlay and the Hillside Overlay Districts.

[5:41:53 PM](#) Chair Fugate inquired about whether or not the Applicant Team was in favor of the recommendations made by the Blaine County Recreation District. Dave Hennessy noted that the team is in favor of including the recommendation in the annexation piece. Chair Fugate also questioned whether or not the Applicant Team is looking for compatible businesses to reside in the proposed commercial space (that is not already allocated for non-profit organizations). Hennessy confirmed that the Applicant Team is looking for other compatible businesses to reside in proposed commercial space.

[5:43:45 PM](#) Horowitz and Williamson discussed the details of the new proposed zoning district, the Integrated Community Development District, in the District Use Matrix. Horowitz and Williamson outlined the Conditional, Permitted and Non-Permitted Uses for the new proposed zone.

[5:58:02 PM](#) Pogue questioned why greenhouses are not-permitted near the homes. Hennessy explained that greenhouses located near the homes would not be located in the new proposed ICD Zone. Roberts confirmed that greenhouses would be allowed in the General Residential Zone. Engelhardt questioned why no daycares are permitted to operate in zoning districts and in homes, as the new proposed zone encourages centralized operations of businesses and more.

[5:59:51 PM](#) Horowitz read through definitions of Community Event Center, Non-Profit Recreation Facility and Peri-Urban Agriculture.

[6:02:03 PM](#) Chair Fugate would like to see Artists Studio without an Attached Gallery as a permitted use. Chair Fugate inquired about Catering Services as a non-permitted use. Chair Fugate would like to see Catering Services listed as a Conditional Use, as Food Services is currently listed as a Conditional Use. Hennessy noted that Catering Services is covered under the definition of Food Services. Hennessy agreed that a Conditional Use would be appropriate. Lastly, Chair Fugate inquired about the definition of Peri-Urban Agriculture. Chair Fugate noted that per definition, it would permit chickens; however, Chair Fugate suggested included bees in definition as well. Engelhardt agreed.

[6:05:25 PM](#) Engelhardt questioned the warehousing and storage space of non-profits like, the Hunger Coalition. Roberts agreed and noted that most of the space would be storage. Hennessy noted that storage for the Hunger Coalition would be covered under Local Food Systems. Scanlon questioned in which zones chickens would be permitted. Chair Fugate noted that in the District Matrix, Urban Agriculture is not permitted, except chickens and bees. Hennessy noted that chickens and bees are permitted; however, cannot be raised as livestock or to sell.

[6:07:48 PM](#) Pogue questioned whether or not Applicant Team would be willing to limit or reduce the size of commercial space. Hennessy agreed and noted that commercial space has been limited within zone. Pogue also questioned whether or not non-profit space has already been allocated to four non-profits within the valley. Hennessy agreed that space has already been reserved for non-profits within City of Hailey. Pogue expressed concerns of the proposed commercial development impacting the downtown businesses of Hailey. Pogue is not in favor of proposed commercial development competing with businesses already located in downtown Hailey. Chair Fugate agreed.

[6:13:52 PM](#) Pogue went on to express concerns of allowing Accessory Dwelling Units to be built on every residential lot proposed in development, and the traffic associated with those ADUs. Scanlon questioned the difference in definitions between mixed-use housing and Accessory Dwelling Units. Hennessy noted that the definitions are the same and suggested removing ADU definition to more clearly define dwelling units within mixed-use housing, and in which zones they would be permitted. Pogue and Chair Fugate agreed.

[6:18:38 PM](#) Scanlon questioned the location of the Floodplain. Hennessy noted that a Floodplain remapping was submitted. Scanlon questioned how setbacks of the Riparian Zone would impact ICD units. Roberts noted that there would be approximately 100 foot setback between flood bank and ICD units. Scanlon questioned size of lots located in area. Hennessy noted that size of lots would be approximately an acre (with one cluster of homes).

[6:20:20 PM](#) Chair Fugate opened the item for public comment. Chair Fugate requested that comments address boundaries, zoning and land use, and the proposed new ICD Zone.

[6:21:25 PM](#) Lili Simpson would like the Commission to summarize acreage and square footage addressed for the proposed zone. Roberts and Hennessy summarized acreage and square footage of new proposed zone.

[6:24:57 PM](#) Peter Lobb noted his opposition to annexation. Lobb believes that until Williamson has finished negotiations, no advice should be recommended to City Council. Lobb believes Information may change during process and strongly objects to system. Marti Prentice believes not much thought or time has been put in to the new proposed zoning district. Prentice agreed with Lobb's comments. Prentice also wondered how the proposed Neighborhood Service Area of Quigley is part of Comprehensive Plan when property is not located within City limits. Darlene Finnell also agreed with Lobb's comments. Finnell questioned why the City would ask to annex property, as Finnell believes it negates any negotiations. Finnell is not in favor of altering the Comprehensive Plan to fit a new proposed project, zone change or map change whenever the City sees fit. Finnell also questioned the City's commitment to adhere to the Comprehensive Plan. Lastly, Finnell expressed concerns of traffic and City infrastructure, if annexation progresses.

[6:32:01 PM](#) Williamson explained process regarding proposed annexation. Williamson noted that an application was submitted to the County by the Applicant for a subdivision. Williamson went on to explain an agreement between the County and the City regarding Area of City Impact. Per agreement, the City's Subdivision Ordinance, in large part, would apply to the applicant submitted by the Applicant. Williamson noted that an email was received by the Applicant's attorney, proposing a City-initiated annexation where terms would be renegotiated and the Applicant, Quigley, would consent to annexation. A memo was submitted to the City Council outlining pros and cons of City-initiated annexation. Both City Council and Planning and Zoning have been asked to analyze possible annexation. Williamson noted the next City Council meeting on Monday, April 3, 2017. City Council has asked Planning and Zoning Commission to weigh in on zoning districts and density; an evaluation would then be made to whether or not City would initiate annexation.

[6:36:15 PM](#) Jim Phillips commented on the permitted and conditional uses of the new proposed zoning district, ICD. Phillips believes proposed ordinance, specifically General and Professional Office Buildings, and Hotel/Motels, are not in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan. Phillips believes these items do not provide service to people within a ½ mile or ¼ mile of residences in neighborhood, and are not subordinate to, and compete directly with downtown. Lastly, Phillips questioned the concept of a non-profit and suggested addressing standards of non-profit organizations (i.e., 501c3, etc.). Phillips doesn't believe a recommendation to City Council can be made at this time.

[6:42:21 PM](#) Lili Simpson agreed with Phillips' and Lobb's comments made. Simpson shared concerns of project not being in accordance with Comprehensive Plan, as well as the process of annexation. Simpson would like to see a map of area under consideration. Simpson also questioned whether or not 200 homes and added commercial uses were considered in detailed analysis (based on Comprehensive Plan). Simpson inquired about the mapping of the Floodplain and Hillside Overlay Districts, as well as

whether or not the County has reviewed the Hillside and Floodplain Overlays, and environmental regulations of plans. Simpson went on to quote, "Only the mouth of Quigley Canyon (55 acres) is developed at City density at 4+ units per acre. Some of this land will be left as open space and not all developed at City densities, that is, only the 55 acres at the mouth of Quigley Canyon." Simpson questioned the area plan and whether or not it is the same plan as the previously reviewed plan in regards to subdivision rules and regulations required by the ACI agreement and Comprehensive Plan. Lastly, Simpson expressed her opposition to the development of the Integrated Community Development Zone and summarized the ACI preamble, nothing the development of land surrounding Hailey should not directly or indirectly impact Hailey City services, infrastructure or quality of life, in accordance to the Comprehensive Plan for the future fiscal development of the City of Hailey. Simpson again expressed her concerns with project not being in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan and believes the County application of Quigley Farms to be far more superior plan, both in detail and in boundaries.

[6:47:46 PM](#) Richard Stopol doesn't agree with new proposed district, the Integrated Community District, and believes annexation should not happen if plan cannot stand on own without the development of new district. Maureen Patterson shared concerns of impact and utilization of City infrastructure, regardless of whether or not project stays within County or is annexed in to City. Paul Ries expressed concerns and agreed with previous statements made. Ries shared concerns of the impacts to City (i.e., sewer systems, costs to City, and the use that current residents make of Quigley Road). Ries believes residents will lose recreational opportunity if road gets development and paved. Ries would also like to see environmental studies completed regarding project development.

[6:50:57 PM](#) Penny Thayer agreed with previous comments made. Thayer shared concerns and questions regarding proposed development. Thayer questioned whether or not a study has been done regarding number of available lots for housing, as well as for commercial use (within County and City). Thayer questioned purpose of development, as vacant lots and buildings currently exist within County and City. Thayer questioned the proposed commercial space in Quigley and the impact it might have on downtown Hailey. Thayer also questioned the construction of a private school (Thayer sees private school as a business) and how it fits in to the Comprehensive Plan. Lastly, Thayer questioned requirements of proposed development in order to move forward.

[6:54:12 PM](#) Karen Lindhill agreed with previous comments made and also opposes the commercial development proposed. Lindhill believes project should remain within County.

[6:55:02 PM](#) Galen Hanselman expressed concerns of impact that traffic would have on current neighborhoods, especially from commercial development proposed. Hanselman also suggested a possible referendum, if annexation occurs.

[6:57:38 PM](#) Linda Ries shared concerns with floodplain and development of project. Ries questioned whether or not flooding has been considered, as Quigley Canyon has the potential to flood. Ries also shared concerns of proposed housing locations. Ries questioned whether or not a thought process and plan was considered for animals and winter range in proposed development area.

[6:59:46 PM](#) **Chair Fugate called for a five minute break.**

[7:07:26 PM](#) **Chair Fugate called the meeting to order.**

[7:08:37 PM](#) Frank Andrews inquired about the density. Andrews would like to get a better idea of what he would be looking at when sitting in his backyard.

[7:09:57 PM](#) Lili Simpson commented on the importance of Quigley Gulch. Simpson believes it is important for the City of Hailey to understand how economically valuable canyon is, the zoning and what is out there. Simpson went on to discuss the iconic landscapes that make Hailey attractive to people. Simpson mentioned Quigley Gulch, the mouth of Croy, and other places within walking distance. Simpson suggested that the Commissioners reconsider the zoning of project, focusing more on the open

spaces within City of Hailey. Simpson also believes open space is a powerful draw to area and would like to see Quigley Gulch preserved.

[7:12:51 PM](#) Emily Thayer believes recreational value of Quigley Gulch is something that community members care about and it should be valued when considering area for annexation.

[7:13:26 PM](#) Troy Thayer noted that there is no more frontier here. Thayer suggested making it here.

[7:13:49 PM](#) Chair Fugate closed the item for public hearing.

[7:14:08 PM](#) Jeff Roberts responded to public comment. Roberts noted that years of best practices looked at development as a planning opportunity. Roberts mentioned that the housing configuration was developed as a buffer to Deerfield neighborhood, and that the project has been respectful of existing water lines and infrastructure. Roberts also noted that independent trails and systems are being developed to enhance recreational experience. Roberts concluded that plans include restoring stream ecology and developing Quigley Canyon in a sensitive, sustainable way.

[7:17:48 PM](#) Engelhardt has no concerns with residential development; however, reconsidered his recommendation to City Council, after hearing public comments. Engelhardt applauds proposed plan. Engelhardt noted that property is private and owner can do with it what he pleases. Engelhardt would hate to see a fence built denying access to property. Engelhardt believes if annexed in to the City, the City has a better chance of controlling zoning of the development. Engelhardt also would like to see some of the commercial space reduced.

[7:20:17 PM](#) Scanlon reiterated that the property is owned and development of some kind is inevitable. Scanlon doesn't feel a recommendation could be made right now; however, believes the Applicant Team is working to develop property to minimize impact of City infrastructure. Scanlon agreed with Pogue regarding commercial development. Scanlon would like to see more information regarding all aspects (i.e., traffic, wildlife studies, and more).

[7:22:56 PM](#) Pogue applauds certain aspects of development and believes it's an opportunity to better utilizing land, farms and small properties. Pogue favors the educational component of growing and raising own food, and training opportunities for people. Pogue sees development adding another dimension to City of Hailey. Pogue doesn't want to see recreational opportunity lost with Quigley Canyon and believes with appropriate planning, it won't be lost. Pogue also doesn't want commercial space to compete with downtown businesses and would like to see that all non-profit organizations hold a 501c3 status. Lastly, Pogue would like to address an agreement regarding the construction of ADUs, and would like a traffic study completed.

[7:26:39 PM](#) Chair Fugate reiterated comments noted by other Commissioners regarding private property and the utilization of City resources, infrastructure and streets. Chair Fugate would like to address traffic at some point; however, would like to move forward on project. Horowitz suggested crafting a letter for Commissioner review to catch comments and concerns of meeting. Chair Fugate suggested cleaning up items to include requested changes, and provide feedback to City Council.

[7:31:04 PM](#) Engelhardt agreed with Jim Phillips' comments and feels he needs more time to review project in greater detail. Horowitz suggested continuing meeting to another date and focus primarily on proposed neighborhood service center located in Quigley.

[7:33:04 PM](#) Scanlon agreed. Engelhardt would like to remove General Office and Professional Use from proposal. Scanlon inquired about the possibility of addressing other topics at the next meeting. Horowitz suggested providing feedback to City Council with information from the last two meetings, either in a Memo or Meeting Minutes. Chair Fugate asked the Commission if they had issues with the proposed boundaries. Commissioners all agreed with proposed boundaries. Williamson reiterated the three topics to be discussed. Williamson also reminded the Commission that City Council would like feedback on the density as proposed throughout the entire canyon. Scanlon is in favor of the density of canyon being closer to density of City of Hailey. Pogue agreed. Engelhardt also agreed and is in favor of density; however, noted concerns with the impacts to City infrastructure.

[7:37:52 PM](#) Williamson summarized the last discussion topic: zoning districts for the annexation area. Chair Fugate summarized the issues: proposed commercial space and the possibility of competing with

downtown, and lodging be made as a Conditional Use, and reword and redefine hotel/motel in District Matrix. Pogue suggested Educational Facility. Roberts suggested Retreat Center.

[7:40:12 PM](#) Jeff Roberts suggested a written recommendation to City Council regarding Neighborhood Service Center and how it would be defined moving forward. Chair Fugate agreed. Horowitz suggested summarizing all items discussed in to a memo for City Council and continuing item to another hearing date. Chair Fugate and Commissioners agreed.

PH 2 Consideration of Ordinance No.____, which includes:

- 1) *Amendments to Title 17, Chapter 17.04, Establishment, Purposes and Uses within Zoning Districts creating a new section, Article P, "Integrated Community Development Zone (ICD)", including purpose, permitted and conditional uses, and bulk and size restrictions.*
- 2) *Amendments to Title 17, Chapter 17.05, Official Zoning Map and District Use Matrix to add permitted, conditional and accessory uses and bulk requirements for the ICD.*
- 3) *Amendments to Title 17, Chapter 17.02, Definitions to add the following new definitions: peri-urban agriculture, Non-profit recreational facility, and Community/Event Center.*
- 4) *Amendments to Title 16, Subdivision Regulations, Chapter 16.04.020.L.1, Private Streets, adding Integrated Community Development Zone to the districts within which private streets may be allowed.*

[7:47:54 PM](#)

Richard Pogue motioned to continue Public Hearing Item 1 and Public Hearing Item 2 to a special meeting, Thursday, April 6, 2017. Owen Scanlon seconded and all were in favor.

New Business

Old Business

Commission Reports and Discussion

Staff Reports and Discussion

SR 1 Discussion of current building activity, upcoming projects, and zoning code changes.
(no documents)

SR 2 Discussion of the next Planning and Zoning meeting: **Thursday, April 6, 2017**
(no documents)

Adjourn

[7:48:28 PM](#) Owen Scanlon motioned to adjourn. Richard Pogue seconded and all were in favor.