

**MINUTES OF THE
HAILEY PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
MEETING**

Monday, October 17, 2011

Hailey City Hall

6:30 p.m.

Present: Mike Pogue, Mark Johnstone, Geoff Moore, Janet Fugate, Owen Scanlon

Staff: Ned Williamson, Beth Robrahn, Tom Hellen

Call to Order

[6:31:43 PM](#) Chair Geoffrey Moore called the meeting to order.

Public Comment for items not on the agenda

[6:32:31 PM](#) None offered.

Consent Agenda

Tab 1 Motion to approve minutes of October 3, 2011.

Tab 2 Motion to approve Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision – Approval of Design Review of a bus shelter, located within the public right-of-way adjacent to Lot 4, Block 29, Hailey Townsite (205 S Main St).

[6:32:46 PM](#) **Owen Scanlon moved to approve the Consent Agenda. Mark Johnstone seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.**

New Business

Tab 4 Public Hearing upon a city initiated text amendment to Article 8B, Outdoor Lighting, of Hailey Zoning Ordinance No. 532 to add an exemption to the type of luminaries. The amendment would exempt luminaries that emit up to 15% of total lumens above 90 degrees, if installed by a Public Use and necessary for pedestrian safety, from the requirement of being full cut-off with the light source downcast and fully shielded. TO BE CONTINUED TO NOVEMBER 7, 2011 – AWAITING COUNCIL DIRECTION ON STREET LIGHTING RETROFIT (TO BE GIVEN ON OCTOBER 24, 2011).

[6:33:12 PM](#) **Michael Pogue moved to continue Tab 4 to October 31, 2011. Mark Johnstone seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.**

Tab 5 Continuation of Public Hearing upon changes to the application by Quigley Green Owners, LLC for Annexation of Quigley Canyon. The proposed development has changed from 1,109 acres with 379 residential units, 18 hole public golf course, Nordic facility and trails to 912 acres with 444 units, 93 acres of open space, Nordic facility and trails. The property is currently located in the County and is zoned R-5 and A-10. The annexation application requests that the property be zoned as RGB, NB, LR-1, LR-2 and GR upon annexation.

[6:33:50 PM](#) Beth Robrahn gave an overview and history of the application, clarified the City Council's request of the Commission, and highlighted the five major changes to the original application. (See staff report for more details.) Further, Ms. Robrahn suggested ways of approaching the analysis of this application, such as annexation versus infill, and pointed out that the Comprehensive Plan currently notes potential for annexation.

[6:40:54 PM](#) Dave Hennessy, applicant, provided a comparison of the original application to the current one. Mr. Hennessy noted the City's history of annexations, and added that Quigley Canyon is "the natural place for the City of Hailey to grow." He further expressed that this application allows the City to plan the growth here rather than allowing the County to do so, and highlighted further benefits such as a new well, off-site improvements, growth only in response to demand, diversity of lot sizes, traffic mitigations and water consumption.

[6:54:33 PM](#) Ned Williamson noted that the City will be asking a water appraiser to determine the value of water rights.

[6:55:18 PM](#) Commission discussion included density and prospective school site needs, phasing, the Blaine County School District's timeframe for deciding to use the proposed site, and how much of the project would be developed prior to the larger lots.

[7:00:46 PM](#) Chair Moore opened the meeting to public comment.

[7:00:58 PM](#) Michael Wickes, 311 E. Bullion, encouraged the Commission not to use Woodside as an example for future growth, but rather to gather relevant useful information and inject that into the application. He further noted his opinion that the Nordic track belongs to the valley, not to the City, and therefore, he felt that the applicant would not actually deny that access. Mr. Wickes stated that clear water analysis information must be readily accessible to the public and that the City should not use the applicant's data exclusively. He expressed strong concern that the water issue remain paramount.

[7:12:42 PM](#) Penney Thayer, 540 Buckhorn Drive, asked if the proposed school site is actually an expected school site, and how that would affect traffic studies.

[7:13:26 PM](#) Robert Blakely, [address not provided], noted that "the concerns of today may not be the concerns of tomorrow" and that he hoped the City would maintain

control of the development of the canyon. He further noted he would not mind seeing this development move forward given the treatment of wildlife access, and that most of the density would be located at the mouth of the canyon.

[7:14:59 PM](#) Pat Cooley, 3040 Woodside, encouraged further exploration of land use issues rather than being confined to areas that are similar to past proposals.

[7:15:48 PM](#) Peter Lobb, 403 E. Carbonate, expressed his belief that there is no need in this challenging economy for more lots and potential homes. He further noted his feeling that this “may hamstring the City for the next 30 to 40 years.” He reminded that the City can annex later if more land is needed then.

[7:17:44 PM](#) With no further comment offered, Chair Moore closed the public hearing portion of the meeting.

[7:17:57 PM](#) Follow-up discussion amongst Commissioners included clarification of the SPF water report and the permitting process. Evan Robertson, for the applicant, provided further explanation. Ned Williamson added that the associated fees for filing would be addressed by City Council.

[7:21:14 PM](#) David Hennessy clarified that the school was included in the traffic study. Tom Hellen noted that whether the proposed site is for a school site or a golf course, the traffic impact has been considered carefully. Mike Pogue asked the applicant for the reason they are requesting annexation at this point in time. Mr. Hennessy explained that they must plan for the future and will move on to a county application if necessary. Evan Robertson, speaking for the applicant, noted his opinion that Northridge is one of the best subdivisions here, as is Lane Ranch, and suggested the City plan for the future.

[7:26:35 PM](#) Beth Robrahn noted land use analysis and trends in growth over the last few decades and projections that may be drawn.

[7:29:48 PM](#) Geoffrey Moore clarified that the Commission need not be in any rush, noting that “we need to do this right.” Owen Scanlon noted the amount of time spent analyzing the first application, and expressed his discouragement by the low public attendance at this meeting. He further noted the applicant has made a lot of changes and has accepted conditions. Mr. Scanlon expressed concerns about water and whether the Commission should wait for adjudication on that issue.

[7:35:00 PM](#) Janet Fugate expressed her own struggles with the water issue, and her feeling that the development must pay for itself. Ms. Fugate further expressed concern about changing street standards to accommodate development, and the need for traffic calming to mitigate impact on existing neighborhoods. She also noted that the wildlife corridor “is part of our quality of life and should be respected.” She hoped changes to street elevations should be specific in any annexation agreement, and that impact on the City’s library should be addressed. She further asked that a specific agreement

between BCRD and the developers regarding the Nordic facility be included in any annexation agreement.

[7:41:32 PM](#) Mark Johnstone expressed concerns about looking at development of specific areas rather than looking at the larger picture. He noted his discomfort with the level of information provided before the Commission can make a qualified decision.

[7:42:50 PM](#) Michael Pogue stressed that water remains an issue and felt the Commission did not have enough information at hand. He wondered if conditions placed on the development to provide information as the project might move forward would be adequate, and whether the City needed more residential lots for sale at the current time. He felt annexation was appropriate for that location rather than north-south growth, and believed that the safety valves built into this plan would protect good growth whenever it comes. He further encouraged preservation of the Nordic facility.

[7:48:19 PM](#) Geoffrey Moore noted his concerns regarding water rights as “a bargaining tool” from the developer, background traffic noise and impact at the Fox Acres roundabout, safety issues of roads less than 50 feet, wildlife corridor reduction, irrigation systems and public facilities, the funding of the proposed school site, and ownership of the development’s open space.

[7:54:48 PM](#) Chair Moore asked of staff whether the Commission should make a motion or rather send their concerns on to the Council. Mr. Pogue noted that the Council only requested feedback, and asked staff if the Commission had been specific enough to send this along to Council. Beth Robrahn replied that she will write up specific concerns in a report to the Council, and bring it first to the Commission for approval.

[7:59:52 PM](#) Geoffrey Moore asked that affordable house be included in the items of consideration, and wondered if this issue would be part of the annexation or part of development agreement.

[8:05:31 PM](#) **Owen Scanlon moved to continue the public hearing to November 7, 2011. Janet Fugate seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.**

Commission Reports and Discussion

[8:06:03 PM](#) None.

Staff Reports and Discussion

[8:07:36 PM](#) None.

[8:07:40 PM](#) **Janet Fugate moved to adjourn. Michael Pogue seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.**