

MEETING MINUTES
HAILEY PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
Wednesday, June 18, 2008

The meeting was called to order by Commission Chair Stefanie Marvel. Commissioners present were Owen Scanlon, Geoff Moore, Michael Pogue, and Mark Spears. Staff present included Planning Director Beth Robrahn, City Planner Mariel Platt, Planning Intern Eric Grootveld, City Attorney Ned Williamson, Parks Project Coordinator Becky Keefer, City Engineer Tom Hellen, and Fire Chief Mike Chapman.

New Business

Public Hearing upon an application by Quigley Green Owners, LLC for annexation of Quigley Canyon Ranch. The parcel contains 1,109 acres and is located to the east of Hailey, within Blaine County, and is zoned R-5 and A-10. The applicant is proposing RGB, NB, LR-1, LR-2 & GR zoning, a total of approximately 379 residential units and an 18 hole public golf course and Nordic facility.

Introduction and Orientation

Chair Marvel outlined the physical characteristics of the proposed annexation and development. She proceeded to outline the format of the meetings. She stressed that there is no timetable set; there will be as many meetings as needed in order for all comments and information to be heard and presented.

Director Robrahn reviewed the agenda for the night's meeting and the topics general land use, water, resource impact and consumption, visual impact on hillsides, affordable housing, transportation, public access and trails. She then gave a brief explanation of the Commission's role and the Council's role in an annexation process.

Applicant Presentation

Dave Hennessy, 668 Carbonate St. expressed that the developers attempted to balance a number of different goals and interests as they developed the plans for the project. Three main goals were:

1. Provide an extension of Hailey's community.
2. Provide community-wide recreational opportunities; golf, Nordic, trail system, community clubhouse.
3. Minimize impact on environment and City of Hailey; water reclamation, water tank site, well site, Energy Star/green buildings, reclaim Quigley Creek, maintain wildlife corridors.

General Land use

Thomas Kopf, 1881 9th St. Boulder, Colorado discussed some of the issues that they took into account as they developed the plan. They calculated density differently than what was in the Staff Report; it is outlined by taking undevelopable land out of the total area used for the calculation. Building envelopes are specified on the large lots, so the building will only be occurring in a certain portion of the land. He stressed that uniform lot sizes, uniform streets, and lack of open space were much of the issue that he defines as sprawl. Mix of lot sizes, home

types, etc. is important. He discussed variety in affordability, lot size, and home size. Design guidelines will encourage appropriate home designs for a given lot type/size. He pointed out in the down canyon there are smaller lots, alley loaded, smaller homes, more affordable, includes town homes and live/work units, and a house that has a business space/business entrance for a home business. The mid canyon will have larger lots, front loading garages and larger homes. The up canyons will affluent locals and there could also be the possibility of second home buyers.

Water

Norm Young, ERO Resources 3314 Grace St., Boise explained his background and purpose in dealing with the applicant. He stated the water is currently being used for alfalfa farming, and as such its use can be transferred to provide water for a different use of the same land. Between Quigley Creek, storage, and ground water supply, the applicant claims all 300+ acres can be covered. The groundwater supplies 128 of those acres. The Snake River Basin Adjudication Court recommended that the claims be approved, but with a 10% reduction in acreage, though the applicant is objecting to this recommendation for a reduction in acreage.

Resource Impact and Consumption

Kopf presented a LEED Chart and explained how the applicant has attempted to bring the plan into compliance with both LEED guidelines and Comprehensive Plan goals.

Visual Impact on Hillsides

Kopf discussed the way that people process visual information, regarding foreground detail, shapes/textures, colors; mid ground larger shapes, color blocks and background terrain features (mountains, etc). Development is designed to have the visually prominent dominant features from any point of view be attractive. He showed a number of different renderings to illustrate the visual impact of various features. The clubhouse site has been lowered in order to minimize its visual impact.

Affordable Housing

Hennessy stated that 77 of the housing units would be affordable community housing, which complies with the City's ordinance requiring 20% of a development to be designated as such.

Transportation

Tom Johnson, Fire Protection Solutions, Arizona explained the fire road access and outlined a set of characteristics of fire apparatus access roadways (fire lanes), and how the planned development meets the City's requirements for fire access.

Public Access and Trails

Kopf described an additional non-motorized access connecting to Antler Drive that has been included due to staff recommendations.

Hennessy pointed out the up canyon trailhead have been included for access to BLM lands.

Brad Lucas, HW Lochner Engineering, Salt Lake City, Utah described a traffic study that had been done to evaluate current traffic conditions. They studied Fox Acres Rd. to SH75, as well as Croy and Eastridge Dr. He stated currently Fox Acres Rd. at AM peak hours carries 850 vehicles per hour; the current LOS ranges from A-D at AM peak. He stated Foxmoor Dr. is the most problematic intersection with left turns; Woodside Blvd. has some delays as well. He sees the future 2019, without any development deteriorates to LOS C-F along Fox Acres Rd. With the proposed development, approximately 330 extra vehicles in the AM peak hour could be expected. He recommended improvements to Fox Acres Rd. to include a third lane for turns, which would provide a LOS B-D through final build out; the north end would remain at LOS A with proposed improvements.

Staff Report

Director Robrahn wished to reserve much of the staff analysis until the next meeting once the applicant has presented all their material. She explained that the Quigley application is so important because of how it relates to land use and planning for growth. Land use is the underlying issue behind much of the discussions that will be occurring. There are many ways to calculate density, and they can be changed depending on what is factored in the calculations.

Growth Projections used by staff were from the wastewater projected growth study. These have been adopted by City departments as a valid estimate for use in projecting future growth for planning purposes. Hailey is projected to grow by about 10,000 people by the year 2025. The development in Quigley is a significant portion of the land available for expansion. She stated that the city needs to decide how much of the projected growth Quigley Canyon should absorb. The development as proposed would accommodate about 10% of the city's growth needs.

Attorney Williamson talked about procedural issues regarding public record, disclosure of ex-parte communication, and site visit procedure. He expressed that a clear statement is necessary regarding water rights and who they would belong to, in addition to a table with all the water rights the applicant has claimed, quantities and flows, the Director's recommendations and applicant's third party objections to those recommendations. He also wanted a written analysis of the impacts of the water rights claims on the city's water service and systems.

Chair Marvel asked whether an independent water study would be in order. Attorney Williamson said that some of the issues potentially would require independent studies and third party/peer reviews of the existing studies.

Fire Chief Mike Chapman clarified that the fire presentation defined private and public roads as fire access roads; this is incorrect in accordance with the City of Hailey's fire code.

Agency Comments

John Kurtz, BLM in Shoshone talked about trails and the county wide recreation and travel plan that the BLM and Fish and Game worked together with the county to develop. The plan outlines areas where trails are appropriate, as well as areas where human activity will not be encouraged. Trails that have been proposed do fit within the trails plan. Winter land use issues include wintering wildlife. Closure of some of the land during winter would provide for this.

Becky Keefer, Parks and Lands Board also discussed trails and recreation. She stated the Parks and Lands board endorses winter closure of proposed areas. She said that in concept, they were in support of the trail plan, though the design review process would be needed to ensure that all the details work out as they should.

Commission Questions on Topics Presented

Commissioner Spears disclosed an ex-parte communication with a man who handed him a flyer which he did not read and asked the following:

- Asked if the reclamation of Quigley Pond/Creek affect status of the water study? Would the groundwater situation change due to the reclamation?
- Asked if the City Engineer Hellen could comment at some point on the new transportation study. He also wanted a study from Fire Chief on the revised transportation plan.
- He expressed a desire for a number of third-party studies on economic impact, traffic, water, etc.
- He requested story poles for the site visit, as well as a visual representation of the extent of the driving range. He asked whether the clubhouse height of 60-70 feet above the valley floor was the original proposal, or if that was the revised height after lowering the clubhouse.

Commissioner Pogue asked the following:

- How the proposed density compared to the allowed density under the current zoning.
- He asked about a new water system master plan and whether it took this into account. City Engineer Hellen clarified that it is a wastewater master plan that is being redone.
- He asked what the net gain or loss of water usage would be compared to current use.
- He also asked for more information about the affordable housing that would be made available.

Commissioner Scanlon reported an ex-parte communication with Mike Brunell regarding concern with transportation, traffic, and congestion. Scanlon asked the following:

- He wanted more information on the transportation plan regarding traffic control, speed limits, and bicycle network. He asked Young for clarification on whether there are three wells existing or three wells proposed.
- He wants discussion on street lighting and its visual impact in the canyon.
- He wants to know whether or not the right-of-way is currently wide enough for the proposed improvements to Fox Acres Road.
- He asked about the applicant's plan with the county for development if the annexation is denied.
- He commented that the applicant had earlier discussed setting aside an area for a fire station. He commented that he had not seen anything further on that in this proposal

Commissioner Moore asked the following:

- He asked about the city's ACI; annexation is allowed outside the ACI, according to Ordinance 649. Is Quigley in the ACI? Attorney Williamson said that there had been an amendment to Ordinance 649 (Ordinance 731) and that under state law, a voluntary annexation (one where the property owner is requesting that the property be annexed by the city) is allowed whether it is inside or outside the ACI.

- He asked about the gray water system, what exactly it entails, and its affect on well heads, septic systems, etc. What happens if in the future the cleaning process for some reason is changed and the discharge is no longer cleaned as proposed?
- He asked about the impact of the neighborhood business zone so far from our business core.
- He asked about large lots being subdivided again in the future.
- He expressed that (especially regarding priority of water use) he wanted it viewed as annexing neighborhoods, and getting a golf course and Nordic area as well, rather than annexing a golf course and Nordic area and getting 300+ houses with it.
- He suggested having two primary access roads that go all the way to the back of the canyon rather than a single primary road.

Commissioner Marvel disclosed that all the Commission members have been to the site on a regular basis for recreational purposes. Commissioner Marvel commented that the connectivity is important and asked Director Robrahn about the growth projections. How much influence can be made on the amount of growth that will occur?

Applicant Response to Water Issues:

Young stated that many of the issues are too complex to try to just answer off the cuff. Technical answers will be provided. The three water right claims pertain to one existing well. An analysis of the net gain/loss will be provided, along with the other questions asked.

Commissioner Marvel called for a 10 minutes break.

Commissioner Marvel called the meeting to order and opened the public comment.

Mike Chatterton, 314 Third Ave. North expressed concerns of Blaine County School District. The additional 227 students is almost an entire extra elementary school. The school district projects needing a new elementary school sometime around 2013 even without the project. They do not have any sites currently that could handle the need for the additional students from Quigley. If they need to purchase land at market value all taxpayers will pay for the extra cost of the school. They would like to see assistance from the developer regarding the cost of the new school.

Mike Walbert, 1030 Woodside Blvd. was concerned about the number of units on a single access road. He stated that Hailey’s ordinance limits development to 36 units on a single access road.

Catherine Graves, 750 Buckhorn Dr. expressed desire for the City and the Developer to work on a traffic mitigation plan for Deerfield Subdivision with sidewalks, bike paths, speed control, etc. It is already a problem in the Deerfield area, and the study did not do much to address this part of town. She also thanked the developers and the city for their willingness to work with the residents of the community to address their concerns.

Penny Thayer, 540 Buckhorn Dr. also would like traffic mitigation in Deerfield Subdivision, with connectivity between the community campus, high school, and Quigley Rd.; a connection to the city core by safe pathways.

Kristin Anderson, 530 Buckhorn Dr. asked about the generally accepted growth projection and asked when this was done. She asked if it was still current. She pointed out the growth patterns have changed recently. Will Buckhorn Dr. become a collector, as it looks like it has the potential to be? What will the role of Quigley Road be; will it still access Quigley Canyon? She commented that density is relative. She asked if the density at the periphery was appropriate, given that the Deerfield area is one of the less dense areas in town. Is it fair to put the dense development so close without a buffer to existing lower density development? She asked about phasing; given the current economy, how is the applicant planning to schedule development?

Darylene Phanelle, 710 Bullion St. East asked if a traffic study was done for Bullion and Croy Streets. Who will pay for improvements to the roads? What is an acceptable LOS for the city? Will there be lights on the top of the story poles so that we can see the impact of lit buildings? She asked how many vacancies exist in Sweetwater. How successful have they been, and how have those lessons been applied to this project?

Bill Hughes, 241 Eureka Dr, expressed general opposition. He said the up canyon low density is irresponsible; impacts on transportation, wildlife, and is it compatible with existing development? HELP has received lots of accolades, but Energy Star and LEED certification don't necessarily mean that development is responsible.

Peter Lobb, 403 Carbonate St. East asked if the applicant is proposing to give water rights to the city?

Vanessa Fry, Citizens for Smart Growth, 221 River St. South said this was an opportunity to create positive things for the city. She asked what it needs. Do we want to extend beyond the pond? She said we do not. We ought to consider roundabouts in addition to stoplights/signs.

Bill O'Neal, 840 Buckhorn Dr. asked what would be the impact on Buckhorn Drive? The traffic study does not address this. He suggested routes to access the golf course should be more direct. He stated that homeowners aren't going to want that traffic directed through neighborhood and the golfers don't want to wind through a neighborhood to get to the course.

Darrell Fauth, 960 Foxmoor Dr. expressed excitement about the trails. He asked how many miles of trail would be added? How does it fit in with the city's trail plan?

Jim Lewis, Blaine County Schools, 118 Bullion St. West expressed a desire to see traffic lights at Woodside Blvd., and at the high school on Fox Acres Rd.

Attorney Williamson asked how much land the school district would like for an elementary school. Mike Chatterton responded that 20 acres would be needed, 15 if it was close to the high school.

Public Comments Closed

Staff responded to some of the questions.

Fire Chief Chapman responded to the issue of allowing 36 units per access road. He said it referred to multi-family units on dead end roads, and those roads can be up to 150' long if there is no connection. For single family homes, only five homes can be located on any one single access road, and there is no length restriction.

Hennessy Responded to Questions

- The school area need further discussion, as there had been talks but further resolution is needed.
- He expressed that they are very willing to work on traffic mitigation, traffic studies on Buckhorn Dr. and other issues rose. He agreed that Foxmoor and Buckhorn Dr. need a traffic study/mitigation.
- The gap between down and mid canyon is for a wildlife buffer, not for segregation of housing types.
- Regarding water rights and the city, they need to reserve rights for the golf course, public areas, and then talk with the city about deeding the remainder to the city.
- He said that they could commit to finishing Phase I if it is allowed to start, which includes all the public amenities.
- There would be 10 miles of summer trails within the development connecting to 9 miles outside. There would be 24 km of winter trails.

Johnson stated the project will meet the international and Hailey fire codes. He stated there are a number of homes, turnaround sizes, access roads, etc. which will comply with all the codes.

Hennessy stated there will be story poles put up, though much of the design is conceptual so it will be approximate. He said he would pay for improvements to Fox Acres Rd. provided the right-of-way on Fox Acres Rd. is wide enough to handle improvements.

Summary of additional information needed; based on Commission, public and staff questions.

Commissioner Marvel commented regarding the issue of energy efficiency; the density so far from the downtown/core may not be the best thing to encourage at this point. Independent, comprehensive traffic study is needed to explore impacts on the several different neighborhoods. Director Robrahn commented that perhaps City Engineer Hellen should evaluate the traffic study to see whether further study is warranted, in his professional opinion.

Commissioner Moore expressed concern regarding water supply and priorities with the water usage.

Commissioner Scanlon asked whether the applicant had been in contact with Mountain Rides. Hennesey said they had and that they were working on a plan for transit to the development.

Commissioner Pogue expressed that growth in Hailey is inevitable and we need to plan for it. This may be a good place for it, though he had concerns about extending past the pond.

Director Robrahn said that further steps need to happen to ensure that all the issues raised get addressed. A summary of questions, issues, additional information needed should be compiled and presented. She commented on growth projections as well. The study is current. Limiting growth is a policy decision, planning for the growth that is projected is needed until a decision is made to limit growth.

The site visit is scheduled for June 25, to meet at the entrance to the canyon on Quigley Rd. at 5:30 p.m.

Commissioner Spears asked how much of the information the applicant will present will be able to be provided by Tuesday's meeting. He requested that as much information as possible be made available in order to keep the schedule of meetings on track.

Adjourn

Commissioner Scanlon moved to adjourn. Commissioner Spears seconded, the motion passed unanimously.