

Hailey Planning & Zoning Commission Meeting Minutes

November 1, 2010

6:29:46 PM Commission Chair Scanlon called the meeting to order.

Commissioners Present: Chair Scanlon, Commissioners Johnstone and Moore

Commissioners Absent: Commission Vice Chair Pogue and Commissioner Lloyd.

Staff Present: Director Robrahn, Planner Platt, Assistant Engineer Zarubica and Planning Assistant Mead.

Consent Agenda:

1. Approval of Minutes – October 4, 2010
2. Approval of Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision for Design Review Exemption for color change to United Oil tanks located on Lots 1-8, Block 97, Hailey Townsite (418 5th Avenue South) .
3. Approval of a 6 Month Design Review Extension for Woodside Fire Station Parcels O1 & O2, Block 62, Woodside Subdivision No. 15 (2582 Woodside Blvd.).

Commissioner Johnstone moved to approve the Consent Agenda. Commissioner Moore seconded, the motion passed unanimously.

New Business:

Discussion of Design Review Modification for Hailey Readiness Center (Armory), located on Lots 8-12 and 20-24, Block 125 and N 50' of Cedar St and alley within Block 125, Hailey Townsite (311 Cedar St E). The modification involves the location of the trash enclosure.

Director Robrahn stated the approved plans had the trash enclosure located by the driveway on Fourth Avenue and the enclosure ended up being constructed on Third Avenue. She asked the Commission to decide if this proposed location was acceptable or should it be located somewhere else so it does not impact the sidewalk. She said there were issues with controlling the access to the trash enclosure if accessed from the parking lot. She said the disposal company stated it prefers is the located on Third Avenue, however the enclosure needed to be wider to accommodate their equipment. She said regardless the determination of location, the width of the enclosure will have to be changed.

6:33:33 PM **Major Doug Warner**, 417 S. Byrd St. Boise said they have a mandate requiring an 82 ft clearance from the building. He said when they submitted their plans they had not finalized the location of the trash enclosure. In the current location of the enclosure satisfies the 82 ft clearance requirement. The access is now off of Third Avenue and if they move it so it is accessed from the parking lot, the trash company would still have to cross a sidewalk to get to the parking stall. He stated there are a lot of people who use that parking lot who are not military which in his mind creates a little bit of a public hazard with the trash truck inside of a parking lot.

Johnstone asked if the 82 feet was a safety concern. Warner stated it is as far as a threat, someone could put something inside the trash.

6:35:38 PM Martin Powel, ZGA Architects and Planners said the coordination of this was their responsibility. He said there were plans submitted to the City to begin the process. He said they did not know those plans were being submitted for the [design] review process. He said he believed they submitted their final civil engineering plans. He said Robrahn had already processed the application and did not look at the updated civil engineering plans and assumed they were the same, which was the basic miscommunication, right there. He stated they do not have a lot of options and if they are to adhere to the UFC guidelines for the location of the trash enclosure, it is a question of whether the access is preferable from the street side or the parking lot side.

6:36:48 PM Commissioner Moore asked Robrahn when the Hearing Examiner heard this was there a curb cut issue.

6:37:19 PM Robrahn stated the site plan that was submitted for design review had the dumpster located off of Fourth Ave. She said the plans that were submitted with the trash enclosure at the current location were not received by the City until January 12, 2009. She said the Hearing Examiner meeting was December 8, 2008.

6:38:28 PM Moore asked about access from East Cedar.

6:38:48 PM Powell said this morning that parking lot was half full, presumably with people who were using the Senior Center. He said they anticipate the parking lot will continue to have a high use and knowing that the disposal company usually makes mid-day trips, he sees this as a point of conflict, both accessing the trash itself as well as potential problems with parking. He said there is direct maintained access to that trash enclosure.

6:39:13 PM Scanlon asked when they decided to move the trash enclosure away from the building whether they provided the Planning Department with that information.

6:39:46 PM Powell stated they had four applications and a plan had been previously submitted before his direct involvement. He said that Major Warner and he did not realize that plan was the plan used for design review. He said when they submitted their plans and applications they did not know that the site plan had already been reviewed and approved.

6:40:28 PM Scanlon asked why the garbage enclosure was outside of the security area. He said it seemed if the trash enclosure was inside the security fence there would not be any concern. Powell said the disposal company cannot access a secured compound.

6:40:54 PM Moore stated his only concern would be the rod iron gates and could not control what goes in there. He said the gates will have to be rebuilt anyway and he does not want to see what is inside the enclosure and suggested something solid. He said he is not opposed to its location right now.

6:41:54 PM Johnstone agreed with Commissioner Moore. He is not opposed to the location but would like it to be shielded from public view.

6:42:25 PM Scanlon said he is opposed to its location but does not know where else it could be located. He asked the applicant if they contacted the trash company.

6:42:46 PM Major Warner said yes, they want the easiest way possible and want to access off of Third. He said Mr. Goitendia said based on all the options this location is alright.

6:43:09 PM Scanlon asked if he thought his men could pull the container out of the enclosure and pull it down to the parking lot so you could keep your parking spaces and pick up the trash.

6:43:21 PM Warner said one of Goitendia concerns was to back up the truck

6:43:51 PM Scanlon said he agreed with Moore's assessment that the door needs to be solid.

6:44:08 PM Robrahn said she it sounded like the Commission was okay with the location. She said she would draft the findings of fact to reflect that and also reflect that the doors are to be changed to be solid. She said as a condition of approval plans would ne required to be submitted to the City for final approval.

6:45:11 PM Public Hearing upon an application by **Sweetwater Co. LLC for preliminary plat approval of Sweetwater PUD Townhouses, Sub-lots 46-53**. The current legal description of the property is Parcel B1 of Sweetwater PUD Townhouses Phase I, Block 4, located at Woodside Boulevard and Mapleleaf Drive, with the Limited Business District. The plat would create 22 sub-lots.

6:45:38 PM Platt showed the preliminary plat to clarify the procedural history of this application. She said after speaking with the City attorney in greater detail, it has been determined that two separate plats should be recorded to address concerns of inconsistency. Sweetwater Co. LLC's representatives at Benchmark Associates are aware of the City's request and have no issues with it. It is a suggested condition of approval that Sub-lots 36-45 and 54-57 be removed from this preliminary plat and a separate final plat is recorded for Sub-lots 36-45 and 54-57 to complete the original preliminary plat approval and ensure consistency with standards and procedures of the Subdivision Ordinance. Following approval of this preliminary plat application the final plat should only include Sub-lots 46-53.

6:50:37 PM Scanlon asked why the eight lots were not included in the first go around. Platt said that was a good question and she did not know.

6:51:09 PM **Garth McClure** with Benchmark Associates representative for the applicant for this Sweetwater application. He said they had thought they needed to do a preliminary plat for all 22 units. He requested that staff go back and research to see what had been done. He said they are happy to follow the procedure that Platt outlined.

6:52:13 PM Moore wanted to confirm that they were only looking at the eight sub-lots 46-53. Platt verified that was correct.

6:52:39 PM McClure said the other units that they showed will go straight to final plat along with this after tonight..

6:53:31 PM Robrahn said there will be two final plats that will be submitted. McClure said to do one final plat since they are contiguous. Robrahn suggested speaking to the City Attorney before this is actually done. McClure concurred.

6:53:47 PM **Public Hearing Opened**

6:54:01 PM **Tony Evans**, Idaho Mountain Express asked if this was an indication that this area is building out or are these places that are already built.

6:54:25 PM Platt stated all the buildings have been constructed but she was not sure if they have received certificates of occupancy.

6:54:46 PM **Peter Lobb**, 403 Carbonate St East asked if this will go on to Council for approval or does this stop here. Platt replied that final plat goes to Council.

6:55:08 PM **Public Hearing Closed**

6:55:15 PM Johnstone said he is willing to go along with what staff have recommended.

6:55:24 PM Moore said he had no concerns, no comments.

6:55:33 PM **Commissioner Moore moved to recommend approval of Sweetwater Co. LLC's application for Sweetwater PUD Townhouses, Block 4, Sub-lots 46-53, located at Parcel B1 of Sweetwater PUD Townhouses Phase I, Block 4 (Woodside Boulevard and Mapleleaf Dr) finding that upon compliance with conditions (a) through (i), the application substantially meets the standards of approval set forth in the Hailey Subdivision Ordinance.**

6:56:19 PM Robrahn said because this application is very confusing with all of the different Sub-lots coming in at different stages, she requested that McClure submit a new preliminary plat that just shows these eight Sub-lots so the files will be as accurate as possible. McClure agreed.

Unfinished Business:

Continuation of the Public Hearing upon City initiated text amendment to the Hailey Municipal Code to add a new title, Title 18 establishing procedures in compliance with Idaho Code sections 67-6518 and 67-6509, establishing new street design standards, and adding infrastructure standard specifications and drawings and City initiated text amendment to the Hailey Subdivision Ordinance, Ordinance No. 821 to amend Section 1 to amend the definition of City Standards to refer to those standards adopted by ordinance in Titles 18 of the Hailey Municipal Code and to amend Section 5 to refer to Title 18 of the Hailey Municipal Code for minimum infrastructure improvements.

6:57:51 PM Robrahn gave a presentation of the changes to the proposed development standards since the last meeting and an overview of the sections of the zoning and subdivision code that currently require infrastructure improvements. She said she tried to simplify the number of street sections to clarify what are minimum standards and what was more flexible.

Robrahn continued stating the current requirements in Subdivision Ordinance, Section 4.1 requires street improvements, Section 4.2 requires sidewalks improvements for subdivision in all zoning districts, except for a Lot Line Adjustment in the Townsite Overlay and also for remodels or additions, these do not require any sidewalk improvements. She stated Section 5 of the Subdivision Ordinance refers to the City Standards and just elaborates on the Construction Standards for street, sewer and water. The Zoning Code Design Review Section 6A.7A requires street, sidewalks and drainage improvements. The Parking section of the Zoning Code allows for improvements to the right-of-way of 1200 feet for parking credits and drainage improvements are also required for the parking section.

7:02:05 PM Robrahn gave an overview of existing and proposed street sections.

7:12:28 PM Scanlon asked that the buffer area varies as to what the easement is 80 feet or 100 feet wide. Robrahn stated yes the right-of-way is 80 feet or 100 feet.

7:13:00 PM Moore asked if the residential collector would also include the school connectors. Robrahn stated yes and elaborated more on the school connections.

7:16:55 PM Moore asked if on bicycle designated roads if there were special conditions or safety issues you can separate the bike lane from the travel lane and asked if he read that in this. Robrahn replied no.

7:17:26 PM Director Robrahn spoke about the Residential Local 100' or 60' Street Right-of-Way.

7:20:39 PM Moore said the transition blocks are not too different from the residential other than curb, sidewalks. Robrahn stated when you go out to the transition blocks the design would be clear and asked Zarubica to explain.

7:21:41 PM Zarubica said he went out and walked some transition blocks and was initially envisioning some jogs but saw that would not be the case. It is a matter of transitioning from the larger sidewalks in the business down to a smaller sidewalk in the residential area. He said most of the sidewalks are to the east [of downtown] and are five footers and are in place. He said it will be about narrowing down the business sidewalks to meet the residential.

7:22:43 PM Moore said he was excited to hear that the grant was awarded for Woodside Boulevard. He asked if the street design would be through these standards.

7:23:00 PM Robrahn said the idea is to use that process to help inform the development of the standards. She said all the basic elements are covered and Woodside Boulevard will be used as a testing ground for the process. Zarubica stated that is the basic plan right now for Woodside Boulevard is the sidewalks at the right-of-way/property line, the landscape zone and a wider shared travel lane.

7:24:07 PM Moore stated as a Woodside resident he would like to landscape his strip. He asked how would they accommodate what they take care of at these meetings. He asked how they will sleeve out there for irrigation.

7:24:34 PM Zarubica said that is currently being discussed whether the City puts in sleeves for future city irrigation systems. He said they really do not have this worked out yet.

7:25:12 PM Robrahn said the city needs to plan the streets for landscaping.

7:26:11 PM Johnstone had no comments.

7:26:16 PM Scanlon referred to page 9, Bicycle Corridors, and asked what do the words "be signed" meant.

7:26:37 PM Robrahn said that is reference to some terminology in the AASHTO Bicycle Guidelines. She said there are specific guidelines on how you sign a bicycle route and said she should call that out in the standards.

7:28:03 PM Scanlon commented on transition blocks. He said if part of the street was okay for bicycles and the other part was not okay how you would transition that.

7:28:18 PM Robrahn said you would want to make all streets safe. Scanlon asked if Robrahn was projecting the school being the bicycle safe route or are you having other goals in mind or just the entire street.

7:29:21 PM Robrahn said you want a bike route to be a usable connection. You would not want a bike route for just one block. She said you do not want to sign a street as a bike route until it is pretty complete.

7:30:21 PM Scanlon asked whether the frontage zone is a piece of ground that is from the right-of-way to the edge of the sidewalk.

Robrahn said that was a good question and said in the Business district the sidewalk would go to the building because buildings downtown are built to the property line and the sidewalk is to the property line and so that frontage is included in that. She said in the residential area the pedestrian zone will only be a certain width and the frontage zone would not be concrete.

7:31:03 PM **Public Hearing Opened**

7:31:14 PM **Peter Lobb**, 403 Carbonate St East asked if there have been any changes in the streets since the last meeting, which are collector streets and which are residential streets, are they still the same. He said particularly in residential under this plan, the actual streets, does it require widening the streets that are already there. He thought it was great to do Woodside Blvd and if there are problems it will show up. One might require the homeowner to be responsible for planting and maintaining it on city property. He said it will be hard to make someone do that; then who is going to water, homeowners do water already and it is not required. If the city decides to water that would be great. This will be a great thing to see as it materializes.

7:32:59 PM Robrahn thinks the one change is Second Avenue not being called out as a school connector. Lobb said but it is still a collector but not a school connector. Robrahn verified that was correct. She said the reason it is called out as a collector is carried over from the Comprehensive Plan and the Transportation Master Plan. She said as far of widening, if the street was actually improved it would mean widening the street [by a total of 4 feet].

7:34:54 PM Lobb said in Portland their bike lanes are in the middle of the street which is an interesting concept.

7:35:44 PM **John Marvel**, 316 Bullion St East said he was part of the committee who worked with Robrahn regarding the streets/sidewalk issues. He encourages the city to adopt some kind of standards. He said he would support this at City Council also. Marvel presented photos of new sidewalks constructed in the Townsite; Fifth Ave South of Croy, the sidewalk on First Ave North of Bullion and in front of the Eye Center, there are trees in front of the commercial building and then sidewalk by the Daycare and Nature Conservancy have no trees. He would like to see street trees in the commercial area. The sidewalk on Bullion West of Main there is a new sidewalk with openings for trees. Marvel said he had the project at the Hailey Elementary School stopped for a few days because there was no landscaping. He said on the east side of the school where the new parking went in, the curb is right out in the street and the sidewalk is right next to the travel lane and he said it is a very unsafe situation. There is a sidewalk without a curb, and no trees. Marvel compared the new sidewalks by the Judicial building on Croy and Third Avenue looking south in comparison the older sidewalks on Croy across the street from the courthouse and Second Avenue on Bullion by the Episcopal Church. Safe schools route on Elm St has a 10 foot sidewalk and no landscaping. He said every street is different, and there was no public process. He also mentioned the new sidewalks at the Armory and Senior Center, looking north, the school sidewalk is 25' farther out and the Grange Hall in between is in the right-of-way.

7:56:53 PM Lobb agreed with Marvel for the need for a design review process for sidewalks and for the public to be involved.

7:57:41 PM Marvel said he asked Tom Hellen why did you not put a street tree strip on Second Avenue from the Episcopal Church down to Marinello's and his response was that there are already trees there. Marvel said this was not his idea of civic planning when you look at private property and say there are trees there and accept that for landscaping [for the public right-of-way]. Street trees are a city amenity and private trees could be cut down tomorrow. Marvel said it is his view that staff deciding sidewalk design is not right in his judgment. He recommends to the Commission to do that.

7:58:48 PM **Tony Evans**, Idaho Mountain Express asked about a sidewalk design process that took place recently on River Street. He said he was unable to attend the meetings for River Street for revamping the sidewalks and building new sidewalks. He was curious how that went.

7:59:40 PM Robrahn said the procedure for River Street, for the preliminary design for the grant application, basically followed the steps that are outlined on page 8 of the proposed ordinance, the street improvement design procedure. She said a date was set to meet with affected property owners, a notice was published and a letter was sent to property owners and businesses that are adjacent to the affected portions of the right-of-way within the project area. She said they followed the basic dates with

notification 15 days prior to the meeting date. There were two meetings one in the morning and one in the evening and were well attended. The consultants for this project were there and took ideas and developed the preliminary design which will be submitted as part of the grant.

8:02:31 PM Evans asked if the plan included issues, for example, the issues Mr. Marvel brought up with landscaping, tree grates, and the issues that were brought up tonight. Robrahn pointed to the preliminary designs on the wall behind the Commissioners and said that landscaping and trees are represented in green.

8:03:10 PM Scanlon asked if any public input change anything in the design.

8:03:20 PM Robrahn said they did not have a design to start out with. Scanlon asked if there were any drawings. Robrahn said they presented the different concepts that had been in the Transportation Master Plan and the Downtown Strategy.

8:03:49 PM Robrahn said in terms of a process, it is outlined here and said she would like feedback on the process. Previously in the noticing were business owners and property owners and asked how we get notices sent to renters.

8:06:18 PM Robrahn addressed Marvel's comments about inconsistency in the design review process that she and Marvel spoke about the other day. She said there had been some inconsistencies in the design review procedures and which standards apply to which cases; it is very cumbersome and very confusing. She said this is the reason for updating the design review section last year. She said it is clearer now what standards apply to what projects. She said they have hopefully resolved the inconsistency in the design review procedures.

8:07:52 PM **Public Hearing Closed**

8:08:09 PM Johnstone said staff is doing an incredible job.

8:08:29 PM Robrahn said there is always additional fine tuning before it gets to Council and there is more editing to be done of this ordinance. The remaining portion contains engineering standards, specifications which Zarubica is working on. She asked for help with editing and at the next meeting suggested to make any recommendations and then this could go to Council in January. She said the standard drawings have all been updated and renumbered. She told the Commission if they would like a copy to let her know.

8:12:11 PM Scanlon asked Robrahn if she wanted to continue this to the next meeting. Robrahn responded yes.

8:12:40 PM **Johnstone moved to continue discussion on this public hearing to November 15, 2010.** Moore seconded, the motion passed unanimously.

Commission Reports and Discussion

8:13:12 PM Johnstone believes on November 10th the Hailey Arts Commission and the City is dedicating an entryway to the city at Roberta McKercher Park.

8:14:09 PM Moore would like to talk about the design review extension and would like to amend this to allow them to extend it longer than usual. He said the fire station is important. Johnstone and Scanlon agreed.

8:15:39 PM Robrahn said the trick will be allowing a little more time but not to be excessive because they want to treat the City's projects just like we treat any other project.

Staff Reports and Discussion

8:16:58 PM Robrahn said Hailey will host an Economic Development webinar Thursday and nine people from various organizations in the County plan to attend.

8:17:32 PM **Commissioner Johnstone moved to adjourn.** Commissioner Moore seconded, the motion passed unanimously.