

**MINUTES OF THE
HAILEY PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
Monday, October 3, 2011
Hailey City Hall
6:30 p.m.**

Present: Chair Geoffrey Moore, Michael Pogue, Mark Johnstone, Janet Fugate, Owen Scanlon.

Staff: Beth Robrahn, Tom Hellen.

The Meeting was called to order by Chair Moore at [6:31:11 PM](#) .

Public Comment for items not on the agenda.
None.

Consent Agenda

Tab 1 Motion to approve minutes of September 19, 2011

Tab 2 Motion to approve Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision – Approval of Design Review Exemption of Hailey Elementary west elevation window replacement., Block 10, Hailey Townsite (520 S. 1st Ave.)

Tab 3 Motion to approve Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision – Approval of Community Campus CUP amendment, Wood River High School Campus PUD, Block 3, Lot 1 (1050 Fox Acres Road)

[6:32:15 PM](#) **Michael Pogue moved to approve the Consent Agenda. Janet Fugate seconded and the motion passed unanimously.**

New Business

Tab 4 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.

[6:32:46 PM](#) Mark Johnstone noted his ex parte communication with Scott Phillips at the end of August in which Mr. Johnstone mentioned that he generally favors infill over annexation. Geoffrey Moore disclosed ex parte communication with Gloria Carlton, during which he listened with no further discussion.

[6:34:49 PM](#) Beth Robrahn provided procedural history of the application.

[6:37:43 PM](#) Dave Hennessy was present as the applicant. He presented site plans describing the changes in the application and expressed his feeling that annexation remains the best course of action. He noted that the application was “at the big picture level now” and that details could be worked out later. He further explained that he sees the development growing as the City grows.

[6:54:28 PM](#) Commission discussion included space allowed for a proposed school site, development above the pond, possibilities if the project were to go to the county, the future and possible restoration of Quigley Creek, whether there would be a homeowners’ association, the possibility of a community infrastructure district, the school district’s intent use the proposed property, whether there was any input from the Blaine County Recreation District on the proposed Nordic plan, and costs in the future should development take 15 to 20 years, traffic and economic impacts.

[7:07:16 PM](#) Jim Keating, Director of BCRD, spoke about the Nordic center, and the needs of the community. He expressed that he felt “very good” about working with Mr. Hennessy and said he believes the proposed plan is a substantial asset to the community.

[7:09:01 PM](#) Mark Johnstone asked if there was any guarantee to ‘orderly development’ and whether there was any willingness to lessen density if the fire department might be more comfortable with that. Mr. Hennessy agreed that could be a possibility. Michael Pogue spoke on lot size and density. Evan Robertson provided lot size and density information on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Pogue continued on Nordic access and possible golf course development, wastewater issues, and how the build-out process might work.

[7:25:56 PM](#) Mark Johnstone noted planned lots in avalanche zones.

[7:26:32 PM](#) Geoff Moore noted a discrepancy in math regarding lot areas. He continued on the possibility of a golf course and traffic impact on city, and asked the applicant if the City might receive a study on those impacts. He further asked if there would be any neighborhood business zones in the project. Mr. Hennessy noted that the live/work areas in the revised application were the same as in the original application. Tom Hellen provided more details on the trunk line for wastewater in the future.

[7:31:18 PM](#) Janet Fugate asked which party would be responsible for paying for trails. Mr. Hennessy noted the burden would be on the Quigley developer and volunteers.

[7:33:05 PM](#) Beth Robrahn spoke on trail locations and the potential for recreation above the pond. She noted she would seek input from Idaho Fish & Game on south-facing slopes and wildlife habitat.

[7:34:40 PM](#) Chair Moore opened the meeting to public comment.

[7:34:49 PM](#) Michael Wickes, 311 E. Bullion, suggested the City its own “ologists” to provide balanced research and information. He stated “this is a terrible plan for Hailey.”

[7:38:56 PM](#) Rick Kapala, 205 E. Myrtle, said he was very comfortable with the revised plan in his role in the Nordic program. Then, speaking as a Hailey resident in support of the application, he noted that the larger question should be on this opportunity for development and annexation as a means of appropriate control to mitigate impacts.

[7:40:27 PM](#) Eric Rector, 651 Con Virginia, noted that recreation access is a real opportunity to create a world-class Nordic facility, and encouraged a four-season approach to planning. He was in full support of annexation.

[7:41:46 PM](#) Peter Lobb, 403 E. Carbonate, noted his opinion that Hailey residents could still receive the benefits of this development even if the project remains on county land. He further opined that he thought a PUD would be necessary.

[7:43:05 PM](#) Jim Keating, 1121 Wolftone, expressed full support saying this is a strong trail-based recreational plan that meets the needs of the City, and that connectivity is strong asset.

[7:45:32 PM](#) Pat Cooley, 3040 Woodside Boulevard, asked for a timeline for studies from the applicant. He further inquired as to the Commission’s goal for this meeting.

[7:46:22 PM](#) With no further comment offered, Chair Moore brought the meeting back to the Commission.

Owen Scanlon asked Mr. Kapala if his organization currently uses the Quigley trails. Mr. Kapala said yes, and provided a brief history of Quigley trails and south county recreation opportunities. Mr. Scanlon asked Mr. Hennessy the reason behind any threat to Nordic access should this project go to the county. Mr. Hennessy explained that the county development plan has different constraints that include larger lots and fences that would preclude trails. Mr. Scanlon further asked how a possible golf course might affect migration patterns.

[7:51:40 PM](#) Geoffrey Moore asked Tom Hellen to address Pat Cooley’s question regarding impact studies and timelines. Mr. Hellen noted that information is relatively easy to access. Beth Robrahn commented that the nature of the public process often generates further information...

[7:55:28 PM](#) Michael Pogue expressed his feeling that annexation makes sense out Quigley canyon, and that open fields forever is not realistic.

[7:57:29 PM](#) Mark Johnstone expressed discomfort with the idea of a 'need' to annex based on recreational packages since Hailey currently has available space inside City limits, and possibly more space where the airport is now located. He also expressed the importance of clear answers on water issues.

[7:59:44 PM](#) Owen Scanlon assured he does not want to discount the value of a Nordic facility at Quigley, but agreed there is already vacant land inside City limits and this project further burdens infrastructure in this challenging economy.

[8:01:13 PM](#) Janet Fugate noted that east/west annexation makes more sense to her than north/south growth. She further commented that she supports the City's Comprehensive Plan, and that this project's recreational assets could have good potential for attracting people to the community.

[8:04:12 PM](#) Geoff Moore commented that this new application does not match the Comprehensive Plan and expressed his thought that this is not the right time for this project.

[8:05:23 PM](#) Janet Fugate noted her concerns about adequate wildlife accommodation.

[8:05:46 PM](#) Geoff Moore felt he did not have all the information he needed to make a decision at this meeting, and that the goal is to see if there is a shift between the original application and the current one. Mike Pogue noted there are changes, but wondered how the current version complies with the Comprehensive Plan. If it does not, he suggested asking the application to provide that information.

[8:08:21 PM](#) Ned Williamson and Beth Robrahn commented on land use issues, water, and the value of water rights.

[8:10:05 PM](#) Evan Robertson spoke for the applicant on water and land use issues and asked who has jurisdiction over those issues.

[8:12:17 PM](#) Geoffrey Moore noted the possible fiscal impacts and asked what specifically the City Council needs from P&Z.

[8:13:33 PM](#) Michael Pogue stated he was not comfortable weighing in on water rights issues, and expressed concern about walking away from this opportunity for Hailey. He felt there were enough safeguards built into the application.

[8:15:33 PM](#) Janet Fugate noted the benefits of this recreational opportunity and its contribution to Hailey. She further noted she would prefer more input on how the development might occur.

[8:16:27 PM](#) Owen is not in favor in extending city boundaries and how that conflicts with the Comprehensive Plan.

[8:17:27 PM](#) Geoffrey Moore stated he cannot approve the application with the information provided, and asked the applicant if he would like the Commission to continue the matter or proceed to a vote.

[8:18:11 PM](#) Evan Robertson asked for a brief recess to confer with Mr. Hennessy.

[8:22:48 PM](#) Chair Moore brought the meeting back to order. Mr. Robertson asked the Commission to consider going through a detailed comparison of the application with the Comprehensive Plan, to recommend approval or denial, and then give the applicant an opportunity to come back to P&Z.

[8:24:08 PM](#) Owen Scanlon felt troubled by density at the mouth of the canyon, and asked for more direction from staff as to tonight's goals. He wondered if all traffic studies were in and why the letter from the Hailey Library was not yet addressed.

[8:27:33 PM](#) Geoffrey Moore commented on ways he felt the application missed the mark.

[8:33:10 PM](#) Beth Robrahn noted letters received from the public for the record. She also noted that the staff report was intended to compare the Comprehensive Plan with the application conditions.

[8:35:16 PM](#) Janet Fugate provided her specific concerns.

[8:40:36 PM](#) Mark Johnstone returned to his question regarding whether Hailey needed additional size right now.

[8:41:26 PM](#) Michael Pogue noted that he is comfortable that the requirements of the Comprehensive Plan have been met in this revised application.

[8:42:26 PM](#) Mr. Hennessy asked specifically which points he still needed to address. Geoff Moore offered to forward his written points so the applicant is clear. Mr. Robertson emphasized the applicants sincere desire to answer the Commission's concerns.

[8:43:56 PM](#) Beth Robrahn noted that the next meeting would be held October 17, and inquired if that would give the applicant enough time. Applicant assured it would be.

[8:44:33 PM](#) **Janet Fugate moved to continue the public hearing to October 17, 2011. Mark Johnstone seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.**

Commission Reports and Discussion

[8:46:06 PM](#)

Staff Reports and Discussion

[8:46:32 PM](#) None.

Adjourn

[8:46:41 PM](#) Michael Pogue moved to adjourn. Mark Johnstone seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.