

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
OF THE HAILEY PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
HELD MONDAY, MARCH 6, 2006
IN THE UPSTAIRS MEETING ROOM WITHIN HAILEY CITY HALL**

The regular meeting of the Hailey Planning and Zoning Commission was called to order at 6:40 p.m. by Commission Chair Kristin Anderson. Commissioners Trent Jones, Stefanie Marvel, Elizabeth Zellers and Nancy Linscott were present. Staff present included Planning Director Kathy Grotto, City Planner Diane Shay, City Attorney Ned Williamson and Administrative Assistant Marti Amsbaugh. Minutes presented by transcribing secretary, Deputy Clerk Tara Hyde and Administrative Assistant Dusty Liman.

OLD BUSINESS:

PRESENTATION OF ADDITIONAL DESIGN REVIEW ELEMENTS FOR THE BLAINE COUNTY JAIL FACILITY.

Steve Christensen, Lombard-Conrad Architects, the Jail Facility architects, presented the proposed mechanical rooftop unit screening previously requested by the Commission. Most of the mechanical equipment will be contained within the building, however plans call for one rooftop kitchen blower unit, and an emergency generator. The items are screened by building mass from both accesses. The generator is 9 feet in height and a 10 ½ foot high masonry screen wall is proposed, intricately colored to allow it to blend into the architecture of the jail. It is a pre-manufactured screen unit that would be bolted onto the mechanical unit. He showed visuals of the elevations.

Zellers moved to approve the application for the proposed screening finding it in compliance with the Comprehensive Plan, they do not jeopardize the health, safety and welfare of the general public and they conform to the Design Review Guidelines specified in the staff report. Jones seconded and motion passed unanimously.

The attorney representing Soris LLC was delayed by weather. It was decided that approval of Findings of Fact and minutes would be moved forward to allow time for him to arrive.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Erstad Architect Height Text Amendment – Grotto confirmed she had the language as the Commission wished related to use of the subterranean floor. **Marvel moved to approve as written.** Zellers seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

Hailey Coffee Company Conditional Use Permit – **Linscott moved to approve as written.** Zellers seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

Anchor Building Design Review – **Zellers moved to approve as written.** Linscott seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

MINUTES:

February 6, 2006 – **Linscott moved to approve as written**, Zellers seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

COMMISSION REPORTS:

Jones announced he would not be available for the March 20, 2006, meeting.

Anderson will be unavailable for the April 3, 2006, meeting.

Zellers said she would be attending the April 3, 2006, meeting, but asked that her packet be delivered to her home.

Jones also asked that his packet for the April 3, 2006, meeting be delivered to his home.

There was discussion about Anderson submitting a memo for the April 3rd meeting to enter into the record advising that she must recuse herself from all Sweetwater proceedings.

Anderson was asked by Becki Keefer if the Commission would be willing to hold special meetings to review Old Cutters. Grotto commented the annexation is not complete, and that there may be need for other special meetings. The Commission did not wish to favor a particular applicant by holding special meetings.

STAFF REPORTS

Evans-Ferguson Building– A revised landscape plan was submitted indicating they would like to only plant Swedish Aspens in front of the building. One of the conditions was the requirement for a landscape plan meeting the 20% of species rule. The applicant has diversified the species of shrubs but wants the Swedish Aspens for continuity. There are also a couple of conifers planned. The Ordinance requirements were discussed, with Anderson stating the idea behind diversified species was for the event of disease. Street trees in the city have a uniform look per block and the look is attractive.

Shay advised the building permit is being held up for this condition of design review to be met. A motion should be made to accept the landscape plan as submitted and rescind that condition of the original motion, or to uphold the condition. Linscott commented that she was concerned about setting a precedent by permitting the use of one type of tree, rather than a diversity of trees and shrubbery.

Linscott moved to approve the revised landscape plan. Zellers seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

The attorney representing Soris arrived and the public hearing portion of the meeting began.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

ELECTRICAL WHOLESALE SUPPLY DESIGN REVIEW

An application by Soris, LLC for Design Review of a new building, located on Lot 6A, Block 4, Airport West Subdivision, at 1910 Electra Lane, in the Service Commercial Industrial-Industrial (SCI-I) District.

Shay advised that the applicant received Design Review approval from the Airport West Business Park Architectural Review Board on January 10, 2006. Matt Engel, representative for the review board, indicated that the board typically reviews only the architectural design of projects, with the understanding that all other applicable requirements of the City will be enforced by the City.

James Wyatt, of Nielson, Bodily & Associates, PA, made the presentation to the Commission. Wyatt said the footprint of the building has not changed since the submittal of the June 2005 application; however, there has been a redesign to the façade of the building. He stated the road easement issue is not the main reason for resubmission. There are 5 parking stalls on Electra Lane, which meets parking requirements. The roof is flat with internal drains, so there are no drip line or snow issues. He said they incorporated feedback received at the August 5, 2005, meeting into the design. Additional landscaping has been incorporated. Larger windows have been placed in the rear of the building. A six foot sidewalk will run in front of the building to separate the parking from the entrance to the building. The main canopy will be located over the main entry to the building. A small canopy will be placed over the secondary overhead door into the warehouse space.

Wyatt stated the exterior of the building will include two shades of concrete block; split-faced concrete block and honed face block. All lighting will consist of down lights to meet the Hailey Outdoor Lighting Ordinance. Snow storage is required at 656 square feet. Lot size is 15,900 square feet with the building sized at 4960 square feet and meets the lot coverage regulation.

Circulation was addressed by Bart Davis, attorney for Electrical Wholesale Supply and Soris, LLC. He gave a history of Electrical Wholesale Supply. Discussion ensued regarding the location of the building that went to the edge of the easement, which the applicant believed the plat provided. The Fire Marshal expressed concern for safety and requested a 3 foot setback from the edge of the easement.

Davis went on to discuss a perceived lack of understanding between staff and his client. There was a concern regarding process and plan submittals at various stages of the application process. Davis said SORIS desires to have their application approved. He said his client does not want to sue; they just want to get the building built. He said another building in the area had the same problem and the building was allowed to build

to the property line. Electrical Wholesale Supply is prepared to move the building back 3 feet if absolutely necessary. The design before the Commission is the design that will exist in either location.

Shay said she had nothing to add and asked Hailey City Attorney Ned Williamson to provide further comments.

Williamson commented that Staff did a good job in outlining standards in the zoning district. He said he was here to address the south side of the building with regards to street traffic, snow storage and conflicts with pedestrian traffic. The Commission will need to weigh the standards and suggested conditions, especially “g”, as it relates to any portion of the building being located within three (3) feet of the edge of asphalt.

Linscott understood that the building could not be moved closer to Merlin Loop because of an easement setback for the public utility easement for Airport West. Anderson explained that Merlin Loop was a public street within Airport West and no structures could be placed in it.

Zellers asked about the applicant’s plan B if the setback was asked for. The applicant produced a drawing showing a change to the location of the building. The building would be placed 3 feet off the easement line with asphalt clear to the building. It does not impact landscaping, snow storage, or parking. All those items would be as per the original submittal.

Marvel proposed that the 3 feet be a raised sidewalk with a curb for pedestrian safety.

Anderson expressed her concern about pedestrian safety during the winter months when the plowed snow piles up allowing for no sidewalk traffic.

Jones expressed his concern about the blind corner and pedestrian safety and believed a buffer was justified.

Linscott supported the Commission’s concerns regarding pedestrian safety. She believed the application hinged on the safety factor associated with that blind corner and she wanted to know how the applicant planned to mitigate the problem. Wyatt believed moving the building 3 feet off the line would help to alleviate the problem.

Grotto clarified that no other building is set right on the edge of the easement on Electra Lane. Sun Valley Auto Club is set back 2 feet from the edge of easement and paved to the edge of existing asphalt.

Jones liked the added windows on the south elevation of the building.

Anderson opened the public hearing.

There being no comment, Anderson closed the public hearing.

Marvel said she appreciated the addition of the windows to the south side of the building.

Linscott asked for clarification of the snow storage easement shown also as a parking space. The applicant indicated the snow storage area was being moved and underground power was going in that location. It is not one of the required parking stalls.

Jones said he supported the 3 foot setback. He questioned what the surface of that setback should be finished with. Grotto said possibly a gravel surface or another surface could be placed in the pedestrian walkway as opposed to a sidewalk and curb. She agreed with Marvel's comment that just extending the asphalt would not solve the problem. Marvel believed a raised sidewalk was the only way to address the pedestrian safety issue in the area because of the nAero street. Zellers thought possibly grass might work. Linscott suggested the addition of a sign indicating "Blind Curve Ahead" and bollards would work.

Maintenance of the sidewalk was discussed, with Grotto stating the applicant would be held responsible for snow removal from that sidewalk.

Jones was comfortable with delineation between asphalt and 3 foot area. Grotto said the applicant might wish to propose some kind of treatment for the 3 foot setback. They could come back with that information but still get approval tonight with a condition that the applicant come back with their proposal for the 3 foot area.

Grotto said this was more of a site issue and the Commission may wish to condition the setback area completion be tied to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy versus issuance of a building permit.

David Gardner, 331 Golconda, did not see the blind spot issue because of the location of a fire hydrant and if the building was pulled back 3 feet, it would provide a long sweep of vision. Jones agreed with those comments.

Anderson thought the 3 feet gave pedestrians a place to walk.

Zellers clarified the 3 feet started at the easement line.

There was discussion whether or not the plan for the surface of the 3 foot setback should come before the full Commission or reviewed by staff. It was agreed the plan should be presented for staff approval.

Linscott moved to approve the application finding it in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan, does not jeopardize the health, safety, or welfare of the general public; and conforms to the required specifications outlined in the City's Design Review Guidelines with the following conditions:

- a) **All Fire Department and Building Department requirements shall be met. Items shall be completed at the applicant's sole expense. Items to be completed at the applicant's sole expense include, but will not be**

limited to, the following requirements and improvements:

- Bollards and a hydrant flag shall be required around the fire hydrant.
 - Square footage of mezzanine must be called out prior to issuance of a Building Permit.
 - All utility locations need to be shown to prevent protrusions into the right of way and/or vehicular damage.
- b) This building has been designed as a combination “B” and “S2” occupancy classification. Any change in use or occupancy type may require additional improvements and/or approvals.
- c) All City infrastructure requirements shall be met as outlined in Section 5 of the Hailey Subdivision Ordinance. Detailed plans for all infrastructure to be installed or improved at or adjacent to the site shall be submitted for Department Head approval and shall meet City Standards where required. Infrastructure to be completed at the applicant’s sole expense include, but will not be limited to, the following requirements and improvements:
- The location of the water connection from the ¾ inch line to the building shall be verified prior to issuance of a building permit.
 - City and State permits shall be acquired for the drywell.
 - The handicap ramp shall align with the entrance door.
- d) All irrigation and landscaped areas shall be maintained in good condition.
- e) No outdoor storage of any materials shall be allowed.
- f) All exterior lighting shall comply with the Outdoor Lighting Ordinance.
- g) No portion of the building shall be within three (3) feet of the edge of asphalt.
- h) The project shall be constructed in accordance with the application or as modified by these Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision.
- i) Except as otherwise provided, all the required improvements shall be constructed and completed, or sufficient security provided as approved by the City Attorney, before a Certificate of Occupancy can be issued.
- j) The Planning & Zoning Administrator has the authority to approve minor modifications to this project prior to, and for the duration of a valid Building Permit.
- k) The applicant shall provide a plan for pedestrian safety within the 3 feet between the edge of the asphalt and the building and submit it prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy.

Jones seconded for discussion of item “g” above and clarified that it really meant no portion of the building shall be within 3 feet of the edge of the existing easement. Anderson called for the vote and the motion carried unanimously.

The Commission took a five minute recess.

GREENSCAPE DESIGN REVIEW

An application by Chip Mayle for Design Review of a new building, located on Lot 1F, Block 3, Airport West Subdivision, at 1761 Lear Lane, in the Service Commercial Industrial-Industrial (SCI-I) District.

Tom Whitworth, 991 Strawberry Lane, Boise, gave an overview of the project. He addressed the staff report and advised of a couple of changes; over the doorway on the south side there will be an addition of a 2 foot “eyebrow” and snow storage has been increased to meet requirements.

Whitworth shared explanation of the color sample board.

Marvel asked how the parking would work. Whitworth replied the three office suites will each have a designated parking stall and there will be additional on-street parking. There will also be stacked parking. Ten spaces are required, 12 are supplied. Anderson expressed concern about the proposed parking plan in that many of the spaces are not accessible to the public.

Grotto explained related to parking that plans call for most of the building to be a landscaping business done at a customer’s site, with no retail sales. The discussion continued regarding the parking situation. Marvel expressed concern that the stacking of internal parking would not be convenient to those who would rent the offices. Grotto said the city allows stacked parking.

Shay addressed the proximity of the building to Aero Lane. It scaled out to one foot from Aero Lane, which dead ends. She explained there was a door that swings out into Aero Lane that the Commission may wish to discuss recessing into the building.

Anderson opened the public hearing.

There being no comment, Anderson closed the public hearing.

Whitworth said they could recess the door back into the building. He did not think the stacked parking would be a problem. Jones expressed concern that parking of other items owned by those who rented or owned could interfere with proposed parking. Parking could spill to the street and enforcement could be a problem.

Grotto clarified that there is no parking along Merlin Loop or Aero Lane.

Marvel stated there are endless problems with the private streets in Airport West, she stated she had driven through the area and shared the encroachments she saw into the private streets; storage of scaffolding, etc. She is afraid that people will find the stacked parking within the proposed building inconvenient enough that they will park on Aero

Lane and there is not room for it.

Anderson did not think the parking arrangement as proposed was one that would realistically work, and she believed the applicant should return with a new parking plan.

Mayle further explained his plans for the parking within the building. He believed if a person had a warm designated parking spot within the building their office was in, they would use that parking spot, not park in the cold out on the street. He did not want trailers and boats parked within his building.

There was further discussion about the recessing of the door off Aero Lane.

Jones asked staff to articulate, for clarity, as to why the Commission has made each of their decisions regarding setback of buildings to easement lines on each of the different types of circulation provided for within the subdivision, e.g. streets and alleys.

Anderson reopened the public hearing to address new information.

Brian Yeager, Galena Engineers, drafted the original APW plat; he explained the function originally planned for Aero Lane as an alley and not an access street. Jetstar Lane was planned as a circulation street.

Anderson closed the public hearing.

Reconfiguration of parking to make the parking arrangement work was discussed. Linscott agreed with Mayle that tenants would use the indoor parking, however she was concerned that in the future “junk transference” would occur. She stated that, without guidelines to further define parking, the application met the letter of the law.

Jones agreed that parking should be further addressed, especially as related to the number of applications from APW that the Commission hears. Each application seems to have parking issues. Grotto read the section of the Ordinance that allows for stacking of vehicles.

Zellers, aside from the parking issue, liked the building design.

Marvel commented she likes the colors and the addition of windows on the south side. She believed the parking enforcement will be an issue in the future, but the applicant has met the Ordinance and they could not deny him. Anderson agreed and felt the parking arrangement as presented was acceptable. Marvel suggested inclusion of a condition to recess the man door on Aero Lane.

Zellers moved to approve the application finding it in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan, it does not jeopardize the health, safety and welfare of the general public and it conforms to the required specifications outlined in the City’s

Design Review Guidelines with the following conditions:

- a) **All Fire Department and Building Department requirements shall be met. Items to be completed at the applicant's sole expense include, but will not be limited to, the following requirements and improvements:**
 - **Verification of the hydrant locations shall be determined when the snow melts to insure adequate spacing as per the Hailey Fire Department's requirements.**
- b) **Any change in use or occupancy type from the approval at the time of issuance of a Building Permit may require additional improvements and/or approvals.**
- c) **All City infrastructure requirements shall be met as outlined in Section 5 of the Hailey Subdivision Ordinance. Detailed plans for all infrastructure to be installed or improved at or adjacent to the site shall be submitted for Department Head approval and shall meet City Standards where required. Infrastructure to be completed at the applicant's sole expense include, but will not be limited to, the following requirements and improvements:**
 - **All drainage shall be approved by the City Engineer.**
 - **All water and sewer service shall be installed to meet City standards.**
- d) **All exterior lighting shall comply with the Outdoor Lighting Ordinance.**
- e) **The project shall be constructed in accordance with the application or as modified by these Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision.**
- f) **Except as otherwise provided, all the required improvements shall be constructed and completed, or sufficient security provided as approved by the City Attorney, before a Certificate of Occupancy can be issued.**
- g) **The Planning & Zoning Administrator has the authority to approve minor modifications to this project prior to, and for the duration of a valid Building Permit.**
- h) **The man door adjacent to Aero Lane shall be recessed.**

Linscott seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

EHRENBERG ANNEXATION

A revised application by Tony Ehrenberg for annexation and rezone of Tax Lot 7273, located on West Bullion Street just beyond City Limits. The property is currently located in Blaine County, zoned R-.4 with Floodplain Overlay. The applicant is requesting General Residential (GR) zoning with Flood Hazard Overlay.

Brian Yeager, of Galena Engineering, presented the revised application. He reminded the Commission they had seen this application before but they had asked the applicant to take a look at the application with regards to the potential Caplow application. The applicant

is now presenting a revised set of plans; one that has a flag lot for access , which could be revised to allow direct access from a street within Caplow's property in the future, but also will allow an application that will stand on its own should the Caplow application not be brought forward.

Yeager explained that 2 of 3 accesses are planned for off that flag lot, allowing for only 2 curb cuts off Bullion.

The 2nd criteria the Commission asked the applicant to address was the neighborhood feeling and public streetscape. Yeager shared siting of the housing designs provided with this revised application to provide a less exclusive appearance to Bullion Street.

The 3rd item of concern at the previous hearing addressed protection of the riparian zone. The revised application includes building envelopes that give an additional 10 feet of setback beyond the edge of the riparian zone.

The 4th item of concern addressed density on the site. Yeager explained the revised plan shows only 3 lots; however the front 2 lots are sized so that they could become duplex lots in the future. If the Caplow development ever happens, Lot 3 is sized to allow further subdivision at that time.

Yeager believed the main issue of trying to build a relationship with the Caplows relative to access to their property has been attained, while not holding this application hostage to the Caplow timeline.

Yeager advised that Lot 3 is configured with a 20' setback and is prepared to accommodate a road should the property be reconfigured in the future. He said the applicant was fine with the references made to the ACS recommendations. He added that references to sidewalk on Bullion Street adjacent to the property should be addressed at the time of subdivision application.

Yeager requested that under separate motions in the back he would like to see item number 'D' state 'to provide ten feet of setback', not an "additional" ten feet of setback.

Yeager noted annexation is a more a question of when it is going to happen, not if it is going to happen. He is trying to provide the most flexible plan.

Zellers – question on the pedestrian access easement from Lots 1 and 2. Where does it start? Yeager stated it is to provide Lot 1 access to get through Lot 2 to get to the river.

Marvel – believed the riparian setback should be addressed.

Anderson stated that there already guidelines for riparian setback.

Grotto stated that she had reviewed the guidelines for riparian setback and they could be defined with more detail. There is verbiage as to the 100 foot setback and to the vegetation. There could be additional verbiage in regard to the recovery or restoration of the riparian setback and what plantings would be appropriate and required. There is also language as to permanent buildings and structures in riparian areas. Added language should state that hot tubs and/or man-made structures are prohibited.

Anderson stated that she received a very detailed plantings list for riparian areas from Katherine Goldman at the Wood River Land Trust.

Jones stated that these plantings are solely recommendations and not requirements. He was also concerned about the presence of travel trailers or any semi-permanent dwellings such as tents.

Anderson stated that she saw two issues: one, the Commission needs to work on the riparian setback language, and two, since this is an annexation, the Commission can frame the language for this piece of property.

Jones asked if the property was surrounded by City property and Anderson answered only to the east.

Marvel questioned installation of sidewalks. Grotto said that sidewalks are required when the applicant comes through for subdivision. Grotto suggested that off-site sidewalks should be addressed to connect to the west down to the bridge. Some additional sidewalk improvement on Bullion could be one of the required dedications from this annexation applicant; input from the City Engineer may be useful.

Grotto addressed the following points of the staff report:

- Caplow annexation application still is on hold and incomplete while they study possible FEMA map amendment to the flood plain – several months out
- Layout provides some flexibility with more public streetscape by having the duplex lots with front porches fronting Bullion
- Zoning request - requesting GR zoning with Flood Hazard Overlay
- Three findings for zoning recommendations:
 - The relationship of the proposed amendments to the Hailey Comprehensive Plan
 - The availability of public services to support the full range of proposed uses
 - The compatibility of proposed uses with the surrounding area
- Grotto laid out the separate motions the Commission should make in her summary and these were
 - Whether the proposed annexation will be harmonious and in accordance with specific goals and policies of applicable components of the Hailey City Comprehensive Plan
 - Whether the proposed annexation generally complies with the Hailey Comprehensive Plan

Jones asked what is compelling about annexing this small piece of property at this time.

Grotto said that the most compelling reason is that this property is already being served by City water and sewer and that we are not collecting taxes from them.

Zellers asked if the Commission could request more considerations with this annexation such as more sidewalks.

Grotto answered yes. The City Council has been negotiating very hard for more annexation fees, exactions, dedications. This piece of property would have to be forced annexed if the Board Property and the Lions Park property were annexed.

Anderson opened the public hearing.

Jobe Board, 316 W Bullion had question regarding access through Caplow.

Yeager showed where proposed access would be to the east side, adjacent to Caplow.

Board indicated he lives at the access point and is concerned about traffic.

Anderson closed the public hearing.

Anderson explained that the topics for deliberation were (1) if the Commission wants to approve annexation and if the Commission does approve annexation (2) what recommendations should go to City Council as to requirement of riparian setback, sidewalk or other amenities.

Linscott commented that there are numerous mature trees in the building envelopes. Concerned that there may be a loss of 15-20 mature trees and wants to ask that as many of the trees as possible be saved, moved or replaced.

Anderson asked Grotto if there was an existing guideline regarding trees.

Grotto answered that Design Review Guidelines consider trees with a 6 inch caliper an asset. However, this project will most likely not go through design review.

Linscott wants the developer to exercise care with respect to the trees and vegetation.

Grotto mentioned that Cedar Bend had language regarding the retention of as many trees as possible. This language was incorporated into a City approval.

Jones suggested mitigation.

Grotto suggested the language could include no net loss. Any removed trees should be replaced with a specimen tree.

Riparian setback requirements - all permanent buildings and structures shall have a 100 foot riparian setback. Removal of live vegetation or excavation within the riparian setback is prohibited with the exception of the removal of leaning or hazardous trees. Planting within the riparian setback is allowed as long as the plantings conform to the riparian criteria.

Marvel asked who would be responsible for maintenance of the planted areas and Yeager answered that the homeowner's association would be responsible.

Jones asked what was in the riparian area right now. Grotto and Anderson both answered that the growth is very dense. There was conversation about leaving the riparian area as is unless there are trees that threaten to fall on and damage new structures.

Anderson proposed a sidewalk of a certain length. It was decided to leave the sidewalk decision to the City Council with Commission's recommendations.

Jones stated, at a minimum, the sidewalk should be the distance from frontage property to the bridge (about 120 feet).

Anderson suggests that approximately 240 feet of sidewalk would be required of this applicant, to be placed where it is most urgently needed.

Findings in relation to the Comprehensive Plan:

- Availability
- Public Services
- Compatibility of proposed uses with surrounding lands (riparian areas)
- GR

Marvel moved to recommend the annexation application to the City Council with the following conditions:

- a) The applicant shall make dedications and contributions as required by the City Council, including but not limited to annexation fees, to ensure no negative fiscal impact to the City and its existing residents. Off site contributions may include but not be limited to additional sidewalk improvements within the Bullion Street right-of-way for a distance of not less than 240 feet.**
- b) Infrastructure improvements shall be completed at the applicant's sole expense at the time of subdivision, including but not limited to**
 - **A fire hydrant shall be installed adjacent to the subject property if required by the Fire Chief.**
 - **Upgrades to existing water and sewer infrastructure.**
- c) The annexation agreement for the property shall include clarification of what can and cannot occur within the 100-foot riparian setback, as follows: there shall be no manipulation of any natural plant materials, living or dead, except for the removal of hazards; the riparian setback shall not be utilized**

- for storage of any kind, parking, or placement of any permanent, semi-permanent or non-permanent structures.
- d) Any future subdivision of the property shall include building envelopes providing 10 feet of setback from the riparian zone, as shown on the schematic plan, and the subdivision plat should clarify what would be allowed outside the building envelope.
 - e) Any future subdivision of the property shall include a plat note stating that Parcel A is unbuildable.
 - f) The annexation agreement for the property shall include provisions for preserving, relocating and/or replacing existing trees in good condition to the greatest extent possible, with no net loss of trees on the entire property, in order to preserve the current riverside environment.
 - g) The annexation agreement for the property shall address the recommendations by Environmental Assessment & Compliance Services.

Linscott seconded. All were in favor and the motion passed.

Jones moved to recommend to the City Council that the proposed annexation of Tax Lot 7273 be zoned General Residential (GR) with Flood Hazard Overlay, finding that the proposed zoning would be consistent with the Hailey Comprehensive Plan and there would be Public Services to support the range of proposed uses and that the proposed use is compatible with the surrounding area.

Linscott seconded. All were in favor and the motion passed.

Linscott moved to adjourn. Zellers seconded. Motion passed unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 9:55 PM.