

MEETING MINUTES
HAILEY PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
SPECIAL MEETING
Tuesday, March 7, 2017
Hailey City Hall
5:30 p.m.

Call to Order

[5:29:37 PM](#) Chair Fugate called the meeting to order.

Public Comment

No public comment for items not on the agenda.

Consent Agenda

[CA 1](#) Adoption of the Meeting Minutes of February 13, 2017

[CA 2](#) Adoption of the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision of a Design Review Application by Hailey Sheep Sheds, represented by Marc Corney of Red Canoe Architecture, for two new 2,294 square foot single family residences, to be located at 215 North 1st Avenue and 217 North 1st Avenue (Lots 2A and 3A, Block 45, Hailey Townsite), in the General Residential (GR) and Townsite Overlay (TO) Zoning Districts.

[5:30:32 PM](#) Scanlon motioned to approve the Meeting Minutes of February 13, 2017, and the Consent Agenda items. Pogue seconded and all were in favor.

Public Hearings

[PH 1](#) Consideration of a City-initiated Annexation, the Quigley Farm PUD by Quigley Farm & Conservation Community, LLC, represented by Hennessy Company and SERA Architects. The proposed annexation area would consist of 175-200 residential units, depending on the final boundaries of the annexation area, to be built over approximately 3 phases. The project would also include a school site, nonprofit office and meeting spaces, mixed uses, agriculturally-related uses, small-scale neighborhood business and lodging associated with nonprofit use, baseball and soccer fields, parking, open space and common area, Nordic area, summer trailhead access, bike/pedestrian pathways and trails.

The proposed project will be located on portions of:

- RP02N18010333E, which is referenced as T2N R18E Sections 3 & 10 Tax Lot 8368
- RP02N180022310 (LOT 1 & 2, S1/2NE, W1/2SE & NESW SEC 2 2N 18E)
- RP02N18011333E (FR S1/2SW SEC 2 FR W1/2NW TL 8369 & NENW, NWSW SEC 11 2N 18E)
- RP02N180107200 (FR NESE SEC 10 TL 8370 2N 18E)

[5:31:51 PM](#) Lisa Horowitz provided background information. Horowitz noted that two public hearings were conducted in 2016. The project moved to City Council and the City Council has conducted four hearings regarding project. In February 2017, the City Council received a letter from the Developer stating that the Developer would not be opposed to City Annexation. Horowitz and Williamson outlined letter for City Council regarding the involvement of a possible City-initiated Annexation. City Council requested that Planning and Zoning Commission make a recommendation on Land Use and Zoning pertaining to project.

[5:33:03 PM](#) Horowitz went on to explain the Noticing procedures and corrected an error in the March 7,

For further information regarding this agenda, or for special accommodations to participate in the public meeting, please contact planning@haileycityhall.org or (208) 788-9815.

2017 Notice that was mailed to Adjoiners within 300 feet of the project. Horowitz confirmed that a corrected Notice was mailed and another Special Meeting will be held on March 28, 2017. Horowitz also noted that the Notice was correctly published in the Idaho Mountain Express.

[5:34:04 PM](#) Ned Williamson reminded the Commission, Staff and Public that the primary focus would be on Land Use and Zoning recommendations. All recommendations would be presented to the City Council.

[5:34:36 PM](#) Jeff Roberts, SERA Architects, provided background information on the project regarding the conceptual plans, buffers zones, open and residential spaces and more. Roberts noted that during a workshop in May, a gathering was held on site to discuss site plans, road ways and potential development. Roberts noted that workshops focused on a more walkable community with small retail spaces, open space and how the site could be utilized as a gateway for recreation. Roberts also elaborated on Phase I, as well as the beginning stages of the development. Roberts also elaborated on non-profit spaces and other commercial space.

[5:45:48 PM](#) Jim Laski discussed the proposed Zoning of the project. Laski would like to maintain the density and noted that one zone area would be labeled as General Residential (GR), a second zone would be labeled as Integrated Development Zone, a new proposed zone for the project. Laski explained the idea behind this new zone: respond to changes in community development needs and trends with an emphasis on proactive integration, urban or village agriculture facilities, and other uses in the zone. Laski noted that the proposed zone would allow for dwelling units within mixed use buildings, Accessory Dwelling Units, Home Occupations, and Urban Agriculture. Presentation ensued.

[5:49:39 PM](#) Chair Fugate questioned the involvement of small livestock processing. Hennessy noted that it could involve poultry processing; however, it would not involve cows. Hennessy also noted that it could mean slaughtering chickens, turkeys or wild game. It could also mean making sausage.

[5:51:06 PM](#) Laski noted that the idea would be to utilize local resources and source food locally. Laski noted local food could also be utilized by restaurants in the area. Discussion ensued.

[5:55:29 PM](#) Horowitz went on to shed some light on the Comprehensive Plan. Horowitz noted that the Comprehensive Plan categorizes Quigley as a Neighborhood Service Center. Horowitz noted that the current Zoning Code for Neighborhood Business designates a size of three (3) acres. Horowitz also noted that the code doesn't contemplate mixed uses. Horowitz suggested setting a maximum square footage size, as acreage doesn't translate well. Laski noted that the proposed zoning was developed to accommodate the application and proposed uses for zone.

[5:57:35 PM](#) Horowitz went on to add information regarding the issue of non-profit space. Horowitz noted that the Community Campus is 110,000 square feet of non-profit office space, which is zoned General Residential (office space is permitted as a Conditional Use Permit). Horowitz presented two options: 1) zone all of the proposed non-profit space as General Residential (and permit as a Conditional Use), or 2) create a zoning district that covers both neighborhood business ideas and the non-profit office space, and set square footage maximums within zoning district.

[5:59:40 PM](#) Horowitz discussed boundaries of possible Annexation area.

[6:00:44 PM](#) Chair Fugate questioned whether or not the Commission should decide on the boundaries of the Annexation. Chair Fugate also questioned what would it mean if a portion of development remained within the County. Williamson noted that any development within the County, County rules and regulations would apply. Discussion ensued.

[6:06:22 PM](#) Chair Fugate opened the item for public hearing. John, Bullion Street, noted his concerns regarding traffic flow coming from new development and the access to Main Street. John suggested a new traffic light on Croy Street, as Bullion light is over utilized and City could benefit with second light. Marti Prentice is also concerned with traffic and would like to see the City develop other areas already located within the City, prior to annexation.

[6:09:50 PM](#) Darlene Finnell noted her concerns with increased traffic and believes the zoning needs to accommodate traffic while preserving the character and charm of Hailey. Finnell noted her concerns with annexation and believes new development should focus on River Street. Karen Lindhill, Mike Wilkinson and Janet Carter agreed.

[6:13:01 PM](#) Jim Phillips believes the proposal has interesting aspects; however, also believes there are design flaws and conceptual challenges of project. Phillips believes there are two underlying issues: what is the appropriate density and the appropriate uses. Phillips believes development would take away from the downtown development and would run traffic through neighborhoods. Phillips would like to see proposal redesigned to accommodate traffic in another way.

[6:21:41 PM](#) Lili Simpson agreed with previous comments and added that the zoning is ambiguous. Simpson noted her confusion and would like to see a more detailed notice of project.

[6:25:02 PM](#) Troy Thayer expressed his support for sports; however, noted his opposition in baseball fields.

[6:27:53 PM](#) Doug Brown, Sun Valley Economic Development, is in favor of the innovative ideas proposed in the project. Brown also agreed with the housing density and noted that the more dense housing is, the more affordable the housing would be. Karen Lindhill disagreed with Brown's comments and believes there is too much traffic in area currently.

[6:30:09 PM](#) Daralene Finnell would like to see a more accurate traffic study conducted.

[6:31:22 PM](#) Chip Maguire believes the zoning seems appropriate for scale of canyon. Maguire also believes density is less than previous proposed. Maguire noted that traffic may not have a direct impact, as it could take the burden from Deerfield. Maguire believes project could greatly benefit the community.

[6:35:58 PM](#) Tony Evans noted that with regard to the sense of urgency, the City Council agreed with the Developer's request to keep the analysis period to 30 days. Williamson noted that a hearing is set for City Council on April 3, 2017.

[6:37:38 PM](#) Lili Simpson questioned the acreage of the proposed development area and how it relates to what is being presented. More specifically, Simpson inquired about the Hailey Comprehensive Plan (Part Three, Section 5), "only the mouth of Quigley Canyon (55 acres) is developed at city density (4+U/A)", and "It is reasonable to assume that some of this land will be left as open space and not all of it will be developed at city level densities (e.g. only the 55 acres at the mouth of Quigley Canyon)". (Hailey Comp Plan, revision 2010). Simpson questioned the total acreage of the proposed development area.

[6:39:35 PM](#) Chair Fugate closed the item for public hearing. David Hennessy noted that the proposal totals approximately 55 to 60 acres. Hennessy also noted the concept behind the hotel use: a convention-like center for non-profit groups like Higher Ground.

[6:43:11 PM](#) Scanlon likes the concept of the project and is in favor of the new housing numbers. Scanlon questioned how traffic would be dealt with and has some concerns with the processing of meats and other agricultural mediums.

[6:47:06 PM](#) Engelhardt shared his concerns with traffic and accessibility. Engelhardt believes commercial space doesn't necessarily fit within project; however, likes the plan, but would like to see transportation handled differently. Engelhardt also noted the importance of having an arterial route from the town center to Quigley Canyon.

[6:55:15 PM](#) Pogue is in favor of having housing capped at a maximum number. Pogue agreed with the attention given to the agricultural and farming side of the project; however, didn't completely agree with the processing proposal. Pogue applauds the proposal of growing and sourcing food locally. Pogue noted his concerns regarding project competing with downtown core, development and vitality.

[6:59:09 PM](#) Chair Fugate agreed with the innovation of project and also agreed with Pogue's concerns about project competing with downtown core and development. Traffic was another concern of Chair Fugate's. Chair Fugate agrees with commercial uses, such as adding a convenient store. Finally, Chair Fugate would like to see processing categorized under a Conditional Use.

[7:04:28 PM](#) Horowitz suggested allowing the Applicant Team to digest comments and concerns, and return with a revised draft on the next special meeting, Tuesday, March 28, 2017. Chair Fugate agreed.

[7:06:03 PM](#) **Richard Pogue motioned to continue the City-initiated Annexation, the Quigley Farm PUD by Quigley Farm & Conservation Community, LLC, represented by Hennessy Company and SERA Architects. The proposed annexation area would consist of 175-200 residential units, depending on the final boundaries of the annexation area, to be built over approximately 3 phases. The project would also include a school site,**

nonprofit office and meeting spaces, mixed uses, agriculturally-related uses, small-scale neighborhood business and lodging associated with nonprofit use, baseball and soccer fields, parking, open space and common area, Nordic area, summer trailhead access, bike/pedestrian pathways and trails. Owen Scanlon seconded and all were in favor.

New Business

Old Business

Commission Reports and Discussion

Staff Reports and Discussion

SR 1 Discussion of current building activity, upcoming projects, and zoning code changes.
(no documents)

SR 2 Discussion of the next Planning and Zoning meeting: **Monday, March 13, 2017**
(no documents)

Adjourn

7:09:08 PM Richard Pogue motioned to adjourn. Jeff Engelhardt seconded and all were in favor.