

AGENDA
HAILEY PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
Monday, January 24, 2017
Hailey City Hall
5:30p.m.

Present: Richard Pogue, Dan Smith, Janet Fugate, Jeff Engelhardt, Owen Scanlon

Staff: Lisa Horowitz, Mary Cone

Call to Order

[5:32:55 PM](#) Chair Fugate called the meeting to order.

Public Comment

No public comments

CONSENT AGENDA

[5:33:36 PM](#) Scanlon moved to approve all Consent Agenda items. Pogue seconded and all were in favor.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

[PH 1](#) *Continuation of a Text Amendment Application by Economical Housing Solutions, LLC, to Title 17, Section 17.04G.050, Bulk Requirements, to Title 17, Section 17.05.040 District Use Matrix, Multi-Family Residential Density, and to Title 17, Section 17.09.040 On Site Parking Space Requirements.*

[5:34:54 PM](#) Lisa Horowitz suggests that applicant may want to open with this item.

[5:35:24 PM](#) Jim Laski representing applicant speaks to the Planning and Zoning Commission. Laski gives an overview of this item, changed from text amendment to overlay district, and revised language from last meeting which now requires a CUP. Parking agreed to have at least 1 guest parking space for every 8 dwelling units in the structure. Also, the minimum aisle length is now 22 feet versus previously 20 feet parking spaces. [5:37:54 PM](#) Laski then reviews the conceptual site plan. Added 14 improved parking spaces added. Laski then outlined a few items discussed that were not changed; 1 to 1 parking requirement. Laski then discusses what is currently changed with the City of Ketchum and their parking ordinance.

[5:42:06 PM](#) Fugate asked a question. Laski responded.

Other items discussed that did not change units larger than 300 sq. ft. Any issues with smaller units can be addressed with the CUP process, Laski explained. Having a maximum number of units per building, feel this can be handled during the application process. [5:43:57 PM](#) The Tree Committee suggestion of removing the minimum distance set back. Laski showed the conceptual design, taking 20 feet out removes much needed parking. There is plenty of room for trees. They don't need a temporary snow storage place, snow will be removed off-site.

[5:46:40 PM](#) Horowitz discussed the staff report conditions. Small residential overlay district unit is another possible name of this project. 9 foot clearance height, management plan is in there, CUP is part of this proposal. Commissioners should discuss units over 300 sq. ft. have a mix or 100% of small units. Indoor communal area, 15% of sleeping units, some inside gathering area seems necessary. Parking

credit applies to commercial improvements now, Horowitz feels like guest parking spaces could qualify for the parking credits. Lastly, removed the maximum building size it was removed from the last draft, don't feel we need this requirement. Commission may add this back if you wish to. 20 ft. setback requirement seems large, discuss this and determine what you want to do with this seemingly outdated requirement. [5:51:27 PM](#) There is no requirement in our Ordinance that mandates a temporary snow storage onsite.

[5:52:12 PM](#) Dan Smith is there a plan for any covered parking spaces, where would they be, applicant Jim Warjone replied to this question. Not sure if covered parking or heated driveway yet, considering them.

[5:54:22 PM](#) Scanlon asked how many units are in the building, you have 40 parking spaces shown on the plan. Warjone answered 23 units, 3 stories. The number of units will be determined by the parking spaces, enough for 1:1 spaces. Laski clarified.

[5:56:26 PM](#) Pogue asked the size. Warjone responds largest units are 271 sq. ft. 4 sizes in total, with the smallest units sharing bathrooms.

[5:59:47 PM](#) Janet Fugate asks about the sizes, smallest 173 sq. ft, largest is 271 sq. ft. Warjone responded.

Public comments:

[6:00:43 PM](#) Tony Evans Idaho Mountain Express inquired about the cost of units.

[6:01:25 PM](#) Doug Brown Sun Valley Economic Development speaks in support of this project. A week doesn't go by that a business does not call him and ask what we are doing to build affordable housing in our valley. Hope you take interest in the project.

[6:02:49 PM](#) Peter Lobb, this is a rural town, not a big city, different environment than Seattle or Portland. Wouldn't it be nice if developers adhere to our standards instead of the city tailoring to developers? Lobb hopes that we come up with our criteria and then let the developer meet it.

[6:04:00 PM](#) Gary Poole, part owner of this lot, he owns a studio in Ketchum, the last time it was available, he got 24 calls. Poole thinks that this is a really good project and good for our future. Poole believes we need affordable housing.

[6:05:55 PM](#) Paul Voss with St. Luke's Medical Center speaks. Voss is always looking for short term housing and housing for employees. Voss is in support of this project.

[6:06:41 PM](#) Jim Laski addresses some questions, units won't be for sale, rental only. The comprehensive plan asks for the city to consider amendments to the Zoning ordinance to allow for high density residential projects in the specific area where we are proposing. [6:07:30 PM](#) this is consistent with the framework. Laski then stated that they would like a chance to go to City Council for a decision at their level.

[6:08:04 PM](#) Owen Scanlon, how do you control who is staying in these units; management issues. Warjone responded to how they will enforce their lease with tenants. Neighbors will tell if there are

problems with non-compliance. [6:10:08 PM](#) Scanlon asks a question about lease terms, 6-12 months? Warjone confirmed yes 6-12 month leases.

[6:12:00 PM](#) Fugate gives overview of issues to discuss, CUP required, comfortable with 22 ft. aisle width for parking space, 20 ft. set back versus no setback? Minimum square footage of units, guest parking spaces, 1 per 8 unit.

[6:13:53 PM](#) Jeff Engelhardt, okay with high density corridor, ceiling height fine, management fine, certain percentage of common area? Jim Warjone replied, 8% of area. Parking, would any tenant not have a car? In winter, the snow will be problematic and reality that some parking will be unavailable waiting for snow removal to occur.

[6:18:02 PM](#) Dan Smith asked to look at the Comprehensive Plan map, the orange areas are high density areas, red business area. The overlay district proposed, Smith would like to see more of a business focus here. Smith suggests moving the boundary of the overlay district? More northern boundary 2 blocks over toward cedar, to encourage more business development. 2 blocks north and 2 blocks south and go to Cedar St. on the south. [6:24:51 PM](#) Smith clarifies his statement. Discussion ensued. Laski asked, Walnut to Cedar? Smith confirmed, yes.

[6:28:52 PM](#) Horowitz responded, we cannot expand the area without noticing the project again.

[6:30:59 PM](#) Smith makes another suggestion based on Horowitz clarification. Smith then asks about the landscape buffer, a fence. What are you thinking about? Warjone a 6 ft. fence to provide a visual buffer. [6:33:31 PM](#) Laski explains the limitations on the buffer. [6:34:12 PM](#) Smith comments on guest parking, 90 ft wide lot, 10 parking spots, suggests more guest spots, suspects this will be a challenge. Corrected, only 3 guest parking spots, 1 for 8 units.

[6:36:23 PM](#) Horowitz explains regarding the meeting tomorrow with Urban Renewal Agency (URA), explains that parking may be parallel parking on angled due to River Street improvements.

[6:39:08 PM](#) Richard Pogue asks a question about the sq. footage of units? Warjone responds.

[6:40:34 PM](#) Horowitz asks 150 sq. ft vs. 170? Warjone answers.

[6:41:01 PM](#) Richard Pogue, ceiling height of 9 ft. are you okay with it. Warjone confirms yes.

[6:41:32 PM](#) Jeff Engelhardt suggests wording, striking "workforce," so that it won't be limiting.

[6:42:20 PM](#) Owen Scanlon asks about the size of the smallest unit. How did you get to this size? Warjone answered; and then explained an alternative use to the building if housing doesn't work financially.

[6:45:05 PM](#) Fugate likes the "small residential overlay district" name. Fugate asked about the fence, Smith replies. Do we eliminate the 20 ft planting strip in this overlay district? Smith confirmed yes and Engelhardt confirmed yes.

[6:47:03 PM](#) Scanlon agrees with Smith, Engelhardt agrees too, striking #2 off conditions.

[6:47:28 PM](#) Fugate parking 1:1? Discussion around this condition, 1 guest spot for every 6 units? Fugate then discusses the communal area. Smith feels we need to require a common area. Engelhardt feels common area needs to be defined if we require it.

[6:55:44 PM](#) Horowitz reads other communal area definitions to the Commission, they like the definition which was read.

[6:57:10 PM](#) Fugate, 22 ft. wide parking spots.

[6:57:49 PM](#) Horowitz read, remove the southern section of this overlay? Fugate replied, yes and adjust at a future time if necessary. Smith concurs with Fugate. Deleted 2, 5 and modify 6 but not a percentage, 7 changed to be 1 per 6 units. Add a new condition regarding the southern section. Fugate explains the fence screening with landscaping but doing away with the 20 planting strip requirement.

[7:00:22 PM](#) Laski, strike the word “workforce.”

[7:00:44 PM](#) **Motion to approve listen subject to amendments discussed tonight and summarized by Horowitz and Fugate prior to motion, seconded by Smith, motion passed unanimously.**

[7:01:49 PM](#) Fugate called for a 5 minute break.

[7:07:29 PM](#) Fugate called meeting back to order from break

[PH 2](#) *Consideration of an Annexation Application from Colorado Gulch Preserve, LLC, to annex Lot 1A, Block 1, Stevens Family Ranch, LLC (North of 81 Broadford Road, Section 15 & 16, T.2N., R. 18E., B.M., Blaine County, Idaho), comprising a total of 24.46 acres, into Hailey City Limits for the purpose of expanding residential zoning within the City of Hailey. Proposed zoning of the property is Limited Residential 2 (LR-2).*

[PH 3](#) *Consideration of a Subdivision Preliminary Plat proposal for Colorado Gulch Preserve Subdivision, to be located at Lot 1A, Block 1, Stevens Family Ranch, LLC (North of 81 Broadford Road, Section 15 & 16, T.2N., R. 18E., B.M., Blaine County, Idaho), comprising 24.46 acres. The project includes 36 lots, ranging in size from 0.28 to 0.78 acres. Several open space parcels are also shown on the plat.*

[7:08:34 PM](#) Horowitz opened with this item – intention of this meeting is to get an overview and then continue item to the next meeting. City Engineer from Benchmark Sam Stahlnecker and Garth Jensen are present tonight. They are here tonight because Brian Yeager (also a City Engineer) is representing the applicant. Horowitz showed the property within the Area of City Impact. The 1st annexation application was in 2003, it comprised of more land, some of which has since been purchased by the Wood River Land Trust (WRLT), application was denied by city in 2004 because of the avalanche area was not defined. Then next annexation in 2007 was the upper bench, 94 lots, compared to 34 lots now. Primary reason for denial in 2007 did not meet density in Comprehensive Plan. Then Horowitz showed the 3 application comparison. Horowitz explained the possible development density (20 lots?) in the County. [7:14:05 PM](#) tonight is an overview of the proposal and will gather the Commissions comments.

[7:14:42 PM](#) Brian Yeager with Galena Engineering presents for applicant. Yeager shows a presentation to the Commission. Williamson would prefer that the Annexation and the Subdivision to be handled

separately. For discussion purposes, some slides will show the subdivision to help understand the Annexation application, added Yeager. Yeager presents, LR2 zoning, city water and sewer connect through the Broadford Road main lines. Other LR2 in Hailey is in Northridge. Lots are slightly larger than the adjacent Hailey subdivision. Yeager explains the previous issues with annexations in 2003 and 2007 including, density, traffic, river trails and out parcel annexations. This application is has 36 lots, and less visible from Broadford Road, 38% of density compared to previous applications. Yeager then discusses the traffic, 345 trips per day with current application, reduced density and traffic by 62 % compared to previous applications.

[7:26:39 PM](#) Jeff Pfaeffle applicant speaks to the Commission. In the past application there was concern about the historic trails, this was resolved by selling property to the WRLT. This was a win for the City.

[7:28:12 PM](#) Yeager then discusses out parcel annexations (will let Williamson speak as he needs to leave early)

[7:29:11 PM](#) Ned Williamson comments on the out parcel annexations. City council can take this motion, annexation, forced annexation to the properties adjacent. Williamson suggests to look at this holistically which would include discussing the zoning for all the parcels for the forced annexation parcels to be able to make a proposal to Council.

[7:31:11 PM](#) Dan Smith asks question about Broadford Road, is it city responsibility. Not now, but all that should be annexed too suggested Williamson.

[7:32:57 PM](#) Jeff Pfaeffle speaks again to the Commission. Pfaeffle explains why he has applied for annexation again. Pfaeffle feels that this will benefit the city. He has sold 150 acres to the WRLT for permanent trails and green space. Now we have a more simple application. Pfaeffle then discusses the benefit of tax revenue and Development Impact Fees, and collecting water and sewer fees. Pfaeffle explained the reduced impact on Broadford Road with this application. Pfaeffle feels that we can have an open minded discussion with the adjacent forced annexation properties.

[7:42:39 PM](#) Brian Yeager discusses the annexation proposal, without forcing full requirements until a change of use occurs. Yeager explains the proposed development.

[7:46:48 PM](#) Scanlon asked if this was in a 100 year flood plain? Yeager confirmed yes. Are you building all now, or phased? Yeager, one phase, build out over time.

[7:47:53 PM](#) Horowitz announces to the Commission public comments received today of citizens not able to come to tonight's meeting. Horowitz handed out comments from Barbara Acker and Jill Bryson. Commissioners confirmed receipt of these public comments.

Public comments:

[7:48:13 PM](#) Bill Gehrke Broadford Road resident, lives south of this project, long time valley resident, this project is smaller than the other annexations, but still is a concern. Gehrke likes living in the county as do all residents on Broadford road. There is more traffic in this area than what the applicant mentioned with CrossFit exercise people and sage school students being dropped off by parents in the morning. Traffic is a concern and safety is an issue because of the traffic. Gehrke feels it should be

developed in the county. What are the benefits to the city or benefits to Broadford Road residents? Gehrke feels that less the better.

[7:53:36 PM](#) William Miles a Broadford Road resident speaks to the Commission. Miles announced that the application is not complete, why not? You should not be having this conversation yet until you get the necessary information. Your task is to determine whether this is appropriate. Forced annexation is pertinent to this application. What law requires forced annexation, Miles asks?

[7:55:48 PM](#) Peter Lobb Hailey resident speaks to the Commission. Lobb knows that you must consider several things, the land below has nothing to do with this application – the WRLT owns it now. You need to look at the other properties, you must force annex some properties, those will be subdivided too. Not sure how many more laws would that be. We cannot continue to annex there without including the road, it is in bad shape. There are water rights with this property, city will want these to annex. One last point, these type of developments provide enough up front money for awhile, but they don't cover long term maintenance. Talk to the city council, they are very aware of this issue. Lastly, the collection system for the city, without overlay, we will need to redo the system main lines....does this mean if we annex, that we have to redo the main lines sooner? Lots of different considerations must be discussed.

[8:00:51 PM](#) Evan Downard owns property adjacent to this application. He appreciates the green space of this application but this just doesn't feel right.

[8:02:04 PM](#) Mary Hogan lives on Queen of the Hills Drive, she comments regarding traffic concerns, she sees traffic on her street and then it goes to River Street. Hogan is concerned with traffic and speed.

[8:03:06 PM](#) Jim Laski drives his child to the Sage School every morning, he is surprised at how easy it is to turn onto the road, no huge back up at drop off times. This development is not impacting the feel of current Broadford Road.

Applicant responses:

[8:05:01 PM](#) Jeff Pfaeffle comments regarding the previous owner and those annexation applications, would have produced 41 lots, this is less. The land sale is important to this application. Across the street is industrial, not residential. When you have a development this close to the city limits, City emergency services already responds without pay. Regarding water rights, it is already an option in your annexation ordinance.

[8:08:51 PM](#) Brian Yeager comments, many more discussions, tonight introductions. Yeager, issues brought up tonight will be discussed. Yeager clarifies is it harmonious and in the vision of the Comprehensive Plan, then advance application to city council. Broadford Road, proposing to not build sidewalks, gives a more urban setting, applicant wants to pay in-lieu fees, maybe for a pathway in Airport West or elsewhere.

[8:12:01 PM](#) Janet Fugate, takes a few minutes to air Commissioners questions or concerns so applicant can address for next meeting.

[8:12:57 PM](#) Scanlon asks what would the traffic be for 24 units? The bike path in Broadford Road can you show us where that is.

[8:13:45 PM](#) Jeff Engelhardt likes the concept of the subdivision. In favor of idea, road would need improving.

[8:14:51 PM](#) Richard Pogue would also like to hear about the road improvement. Pogue doesn't fully understand why it hasn't been annexed before. Makes sense to annex and force the other properties to be annexed. Pogue wants to understand more about the water rights.

[8:16:05 PM](#) Dan Smith wants to know what city engineers have to say with water and sewer. To the developers, have a border to prohibit building in the floodplain, have you thought about building envelopes? Smith would like to have a bicycle count out there, feels this contributes to the traffic concerns.

[8:18:06 PM](#) Janet Fugate has a question about parcel D, open to the public, access to the public, wetlands access, how is this addressed. Fugate asks about the berm and snow storage calculations from applicant.

[8:20:10 PM](#) Engelhardt asks about annexation fees. Horowitz announced that Alta Engineering will be helping with bike pedestrian solutions on Broadford Road, to make a good recommendation to the commission.

[8:21:39 PM](#) Smith comments on a potential bike pedestrian path through this property and its traffic impact.

[8:22:48 PM](#) Horowitz clarified next steps. Our code allows that both Annexation and Subdivision applications can be processed together. If together, Feb 21st parks and lands board will discuss the open space, if considering only the annexation, then won't go to Parks & Lands Board. [8:24:35 PM](#) Fugate asks for clarification. Horowitz suggests continuing both items to next meeting.

[8:25:41 PM](#) Fugate announced that the Commissioners can request more information in preparation of next discussion of this item.

[8:26:49 PM](#) **Smith moves to continue PH2 and PH3 to March 13, 2017, seconded Scanlon, motion passed.**

COMMISSIONER REPORTS and Discussion:

[8:29:14 PM](#) Horowitz announced that tomorrow at noon there is a URA river street design discussion and then a meeting with the developer for the Blaine Manor site will be after the River Street Discussion.

Next meeting is Feb13th, 2017 Horowitz added.

[8:32:06 PM](#) **Smith moves to adjourn meeting, Pogue seconded motion passed unanimously.**