

MEETING MINUTES

HAILEY PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION

Monday, August 6, 2018

Hailey City Hall

5:30 p.m.

Present

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

Staff: Lisa Horowitz, Robin Davis

5:28:22 PM Chair Fugate called meeting to order

Public Comment items not on agenda. No comments.

Consent Agenda

CA 1 Adoption of the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision for a Lot Line Adjustment by David and Jacqueline Hennessy, represented by Benchmark Associates, wherein Lots 1-12, the 13' portion of the vacated alley adjacent to Lots 1-12, and the 20' portion of the vacated Carbonate Street adjacent to Lot 1, are reconfigured to create Lots 1A, 2A and 3A. The reconfiguration of the lots would form three lots, Lot 1A, comprising of 19,265 square feet, Lot 2A, comprising of 13,284 square feet and Lot 3A, comprising of 9,963 square feet. The project is located at 666 East Carbonate Street, Section 9, T.2 N., R.18 E., B.M., City of Hailey, Blaine County, Idaho, within the Limited Residential (LR-1) Zoning District.

CA 2 Adoption of the Meeting Minutes of July 16, 2018.

5:29:46 PM Scanlon motioned to approve CA 1 and CA 2. Pogue recused himself. Smith seconded. All in Favor.

Public Hearings

PH 1 [5:29:44 PM](#) Consideration of Design Review Application by Juan Espinosa, represented by Juan Espinosa for a 2,905.57 square foot two-story commercial building. This proposal includes a commercial building composed of two separated spaces, one space for the owner and the other space to be utilized as a rental space. The project is located at 4309 Glenbrook Dr. (Lot 11, Block 42, Woodside Sub#10), in the Light Industrial (LI) Zoning District.

Davis turned project over to Jolyon Sawrey, introduced himself and described project. Sawrey discussed location of project, slope of lot, setbacks, parking spots in front and back, snow storage, landscaping and garbage disposal. [5:34:31 PM](#) Scanlon asked if truck/trailer would have to be backed in, Sawrey confirmed yes but only for the trailer. [5:35:42 PM](#) Sawrey discussed construction storage plan, floor plan of building, exterior light location, and roof slope and overhang on back of building. Sawrey discussed materials to be used on exterior of building. [5:38:19 PM](#) Smith questioned water shedding off into drywells without a drain spout. Sawrey confirmed yes. Smith asked what height is. Sawrey said 15-17 ft. Sawrey said no. [5:39:07 PM](#) Scanlon asked what the distance is from the building to the back edge of the side walk, if the overhang comes out 3ft. Scanlon asked location of drip line. Sawrey showed where the drip line is located at, stated the overhang is 3ft, Sawrey explained the rain river [5:39:18](#) is shedding the water on either side of the door. Scanlon confirmed height water is falling is 17ft, asked if concerned about water splashing on side of building or people coming in and out of the doors. Sawrey confirmed height and said he was not concerned about splashing. Sawrey explained history he had with drip stand point and he has not had issues. [5:40:38 PM](#) Smith stated concern of ice freezing. [5:41:10 PM](#) Sawrey said he does not want any safety issues, and that there will be an outlet available for gutters and heat strip if needed. Engelhardt, curious why did not go with an internal drain roof. Sawrey explained reasons why did not go that route. [5:42:21 PM](#) Sawrey pointed out exterior lighting materials and overhang on building on drawing. Smith asked if lights over were only over man doors. Sawrey confirmed yes. [5:43:46 PM](#) Sawrey explained how he did a narrative responding to the staff's conditions. Scanlon asked how he covers up the outside insulation. Sawrey explained how he covers insulation up, using flashing. [5:45:08 PM](#) Scanlon asked how much of the flashing is exposed. Sawrey said the vertical face exposed is 6in below the finish floor level. [5:45:22 PM](#) Scanlon asked what color is the flashing. Sawrey said it is the same as the base color. [5:45:37 PM](#) Smith stated it is similar to design used previously. Sawrey said he uses the design 95% of the time.

[5:46:09 PM](#) Pogue asked what the interior wall will be built of. Sawrey stated all walls will be built out of wood frame, the exterior wall will be 8 in and the interior wall will be minimum of 2x6. [5:46:29 PM](#) Pogue asked if will be put in, Sawrey confirmed it has to be. [5:46:42 PM](#) Scanlon asked if building sprinklered, Sawrey said no not required and no it is not. Scanlon asked if the wall between the two spaces is required to be a 1 hour wall. Sawrey does not recall would have to look at drawings but does not believe so. [5:47:11 PM](#) Scanlon asked if the mezzanine is both storage and office. Sawrey said it can be either. Sawrey explained exception to code regarding mezzanines and that the upper floor level that can be defined as a mezzanine but due to exception can be enclosed due to the square footage. Horowitz stated similar to Idaho Lumber.

[5:48:22 PM](#) Chair Fugate opened to public comment.

[5:49:23 PM](#) Peter Lobb, 4th and carbonate, asked how do you stop a huge ice dam from forming on the pitch.

[5:49:31 PM](#) Chair Fugate closed public comment.

[5:49:40 PM](#) Sawrey explained that keeper strips that are affixed to the roof preventing the rock and snow from migrating. Sawrey described insulation of roof and how using keeper strips to prevent snow and rock from moving or falling off the roof. [5:51:27 PM](#) Scanlon asked if they are heating roof. Sawrey said no. Chair Fugate asked if insulation being significant enough to. Sawrey explained what the insulation does. Horowitz asked for examples in Hailey that have similar drain designs. Sawrey stated would have to get back to Horowitz on that. [5:53:32 PM](#) Smith asked where keeper strip is at on roof. Sawrey stated believes there are 2-3 keeper strips that he differs to the roofing guy. Applicant and Commission continued to discuss roof insulation. [5:54:25 PM](#) Davis added that staff suggest a side walk in lieu fee payment be made, and in code seasonal plantings are required. Davis mentioned only a handful of existing business in that area have seasonal plantings and that it may be something the Commission would want to discuss. Sawrey provided an aerial map showing sidewalks in the neighborhood and pointed out where existing sidewalks are located at in the area. [5:57:36 PM](#) No additional from Davis. [5:57:47 PM](#) Pogue, as to sidewalk, should not be required an in lieu fee is more appropriate. Pogue discussed landscape and building. Stating he is concern about roof. Smith asked about the energy efficiency, reading what Sawrey had listed. [5:59:42 PM](#) Smith discussed solar orientation and glazing on walls, stating this would be a very dark building. Smith asked why Sawrey decided not to utilize the solar benefit. [6:00:43 PM](#) Sawrey clarified on what he had written and explained why. Summarizing the building is more for storage. [6:03:24 PM](#) Smith stated anticipating basically a warehouse

function. Sawrey confirmed that was correct. [6:04:01 PM](#) Smith stated his view on plantings, per code shall be installed, even though other buildings may not be complaint, the intent is to break the drab look of the light industrial area. Smith said in his opinion the code says shall, they are more or less bound to expect they shall do it. No issues with side walk in lie fee. Smith explained has personal experience with single slope roof. Sawrey asked if has overhangs, Smith said no, described design he has. Smith does have concern of dropping water 17 ft, due to potential safety hazard. Strongly suggest and prefers Sawrey would do something to assist in containing the water coming off the roof. [6:06:56 PM](#) Engelhardt discussed ice problems he has seen on other roofs and what he would have done if it had been his project. Believes Smith is correct regarding energy issue, his perspective is that it seems to be more applicable to residential property. Engelhardt stated he will look at the roof in winter to see how it goes. Otherwise, he is ok with the project. Engelhardt suggest adding lighting above the signs. Scanlon likes color choices, does not have issues with sidewalk in lieu fees, agrees with Smith regarding planting, does have issues with the roof and agrees there will be ice dams. Scanlon believes needs to collect the water and bring it to the ground. He is concerned about stucco getting wet and deteriorating faster than it normally would. [6:10:51 PM](#) Sawrey asked to clarify planting and sidewalk comments. Agreeing no side walk but paying a sidewalk in lieu fee. Staff and commission provided examples of seasonal planting. Smith read code for Sawrey regarding seasonal plants. [6:12:03 PM](#) Horowitz suggested condition H, seasonal planting shall be provided at time of building permit application and approved by staff. Sawrey addressed comments made by commission. [6:13:02 PM](#) Chair Fugate stated her agreement with in lieu fees and is appropriate to put seasonal planting. [6:13:31 PM](#) Horowitz stated in relative to drainage, looking at standards J and K. Horowitz stated can take this to building official or can add a condition that says you shall add. Horowitz asked commission to review conditions on the screen. Commission and staff discussed conditions and concerns of roof. Horowitz offered a 3rd option that would be to bring back the project with the Building Official at another meeting. Applicant and Commission continued to discuss roof and condition options. [6:18:08 PM](#) Horowitz confirmed new condition: applicant shall manage liquid run off to the ground on the building permit plans as approved by the Hailey Building Official. [6:19:56 PM](#) Scanlon asked if in the manage of liquid water if it would somehow prevent ice dams. Staff and Commission discussed ice dams. Horowitz stated that standards are met. Horowitz read new conditions: H) seasonal planting shall be provided and approved by staff prior to issuance of building permit application I) applicant shall manage liquid run off to the ground and related freezing run off to the ground approved by Hailey Building Official. Scanlon request Chair Fugate to review permit.

6:23:37 PM Engelhardt motioned to approve the Design Review Application submitted by Juan Espinosa, represented by Jolyon Sawrey of Vital Ink, PLLC, for a new 2,906 square foot, two-story commercial building, to be located at 4309 Glenbrook Drive (Lot 11, Block 42, Woodside Subdivision #10) in the Light Industrial (LI) Zoning District, finding that the project does not jeopardize the health, safety or welfare of the public and the project conforms to the applicable specifications outlined in the Design Review Guidelines, applicable requirements of the Zoning Ordinance, Title 18, and City Standards, provided conditions (a) through (i) are met. Smith seconded. All in favor.

6:25:11 PM Chair Fugate called a five min break.

6:30:28 PM Chair Fugate called meeting back to order.

PH 2 **6:30:35 PM** Consideration of a City-Initiated Text Amendment to Title 17.07: Supplementary Location and Bulk Requirements, 17.07.010: Supplementary Yard Setback Requirements, to either remove the existing code, 17.07.010F: Side Yard Setbacks of Normal Corner Lot and 17.07.010G: Reverse Corner Lots, from the code, or reference these code sections as footnotes in Title 17.05, Office Zoning Map and District Use Matrix, 17.05.040: District Use Matrix.

Horowitz introduced project, stating this provision applies to homes outside of Townsite Overly. Horowitz stated staff would like to have this either footnoted or remove it. Horowitz explained that if on a corner do not get to follow the normal 10 foot setback, your side yard setback has to be 2/3 of your front or basically in most cases, 17 feet. Horowitz stated second item is the reverse corner lot and that suggest deleting as not aware of when it has applied. Chair Fugate asked what a reverse corner lot was. Smith explained what is considered a reverse corner lot. Horowitz provided an example of a side yard setback that does not meet the 17 ft. Horowitz stated does not see the harm in a 10 foot side yard setback but offered to review corner lots in Hailey to see what Commission thought. Smith stated for him, it is more of a design thing explaining basically matching up with the front set back with the neighbors behind the corner lot. Horowitz agreed good point. Scanlon asked if a certain lot was considered a reverse corner lot. Commission and Staff continued to discuss reverse corner lot. Horowitz asked if Commission wanted to take two provisions one at a time. Chair Fugate said yes. Engelhardt asked if all in agreement what a reverse corner lot is. Chair Fugate stated Smith's diagram makes sense to her. Horowitz asked if we could think of examples of reverse corner lots. Smith does not believe we have them at this time, but may not hurt to keep provision in there for future developments. Horowitz summarized would keep G and foot note it. Horowitz went back to discuss F, asked if on normal corner lots if it is important.

Commission discussed F and safety issues related to it. Horowitz asked if felt 10ft was unsafe. Smith said depends on speed limit. Chair Fugate stated theoretically 20 mph unless otherwise posted. Scanlon stated can't control who is driving around the corners and how fast they are going but can give them the best sight line we can. Pogue stated especially with ice, can't stop. Scanlon asked if staff was approached regarding this. Horowitz said no and explained reason for request. Smith stated they are currently included in all of the bulk requirements. Horowitz said currently not in District Use Matrix, where most architects go. Smith stated we would need to put it there. Chair Fugate agreed.

6:46:55 PM Chair Fugate opened to public.

6:47:01 PM Peter Lobb, 4th and Carbonate, matrix is a device that is evolving. Not everything is in there. Never intended to be 100% accurate, it's not able to include everything. As long as Staff understands what the rules are and Architects review code, it is right there and easy. He would prefer to have more setbacks, but thinks the 2/3s is a good compromise because each zone has separate setbacks. Believes 2/3 rule makes a great deal of sense. Does not think changing this would really accomplish anything, except make it worse. If look at old Hailey, believes the rule is 12ft from the road, regardless if front or not. Believes this is important to have the setback, does not think want buildings so close to road. It creates all kinds of problems, especially if people put landscaping in front of it. Does not think commission should do anything, leave it as is. As far as a reverse lot, seems like it has worked for our city. Suggested to just add to matrix.

6:49:31 PM Chair Fugate closed public comment.

6:49:43 PM Chair Fugate summarized footnotes to be added to district matrix.

6:50:22 PM Smith motioned to approve Ordinance amending Hailey Municipal Code, Title 17, Zoning Regulations, Section 17.05, District Use Matrix, to cross reference Section 17.07, Supplementary Location and Bulk Requirements, (A) through (G), to all zoning districts, that essential public facilities and services are available to support the full range of proposed uses without creating excessive additional requirements at public cost for the public facilities and services, that the proposed uses are compatible with the surrounding area, and that the proposed amendment will promote the public health, safety and general welfare and knowledge of the code. Pogue seconded. All in favor.

Staff Reports and Discussion

SR 1 Discussion of current building activity, upcoming projects, and zoning code changes.

Smith suggested to have discussion of potential inclusion of dual use in Transition Zone as far as residential and business since it is not allowed at this point. [6:52:49 PM](#) Horowitz stated can notice and put on one of the September meetings. [6:54:11 PM](#) Smith referenced a previous project this effected, how it was not allowed in the Transition Zone which is why he wanted to put it in Business Zone. Smith stated idea that we have a Transition Zone between Residential and Business but there's no residential allowed in Transition. Chair Fugate agreed. Smith suggested maybe there was a good reason not to, Horowitz confirmed can research. Pogue said if have a residence that is changed into Transition and puts an office in, can't change back to residence. Smith agreed because residence was grandfathered in. Engelhardt agreed discussion worth having.

SR 2 Discussion of the next Planning and Zoning meeting: **Monday, August 20, 2018.**

Staff confirmed Hailey Hotel only item on upcoming meeting.

[6:54:42 PM](#) Pogue motioned to adjourn. Engelhardt seconded. All in Favor.