

MEETING MINUTES

HAILEY PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION

Monday, January 7, 2019

Hailey City Hall

5:30 p.m.

Present

Commission: Janet Fugate, Dan Smith, Richard Pogue, Sam Linnet, Owen Scanlon

Staff: Lisa Horowitz, Robyn Davis, Chris Simms

5:29:13 PM Chair Fugate called to order.

5:29:40 PM Smith motioned to amend agenda to include nomination of Chair and Vice Chair. Pogue seconded. All in Favor.

5:30:13 PM Public Comment for items not on the agenda. No Public Comment.

Consent Agenda

CA 1 Adoption of the Meeting Minutes December 17, 2018. **ACTION ITEM**

CA 2 Adoption of the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision of a text amendment to Title 17, Section 17.04J.20, Flood Hazard Overlay District (FH) and to Title 17, Section 17.05.040, District Use Matrix, to amend the building height to be measured from the Base Flood Elevation (BFE). **ACTION ITEM**

CA 3 Adoption of the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision of a Design Review Application by Flowing Wells, LLC, represented by Jolyon Sawrey, for an exterior commercial remodel to the existing 2,418 square foot building, known as The Liquor Store. An 1,855 square foot, two-story mixed-use addition is also proposed. **ACTION ITEM**

CA 4 Adoption of the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision of a Design Review Application by Lightworks, represented by Chase Gouley of BYLA, for a new 2,324 square foot mixed-use development, to be located at 41 Mercure Lane (Lot 2E, Block 3, Airport West Subdivision #2) in the SCI Industrial (SCI-I) Zoning District. **ACTION ITEM**

Smith stated CA 1 needs to be modified, motion incorrect and applicant name misspelled.

5:31:46 PM Pogue motioned to approve consent agenda items with those two changes. Scanlon seconded. All in favor.

New Business

NB 1 Nomination of Chair and Vice Chair. **ACTION ITEM**

5:32:12 PM Scanlon nominated Dan Smith as Chair. Smith declined. Chair Fugate stated as always happy to stay or step down.

5:32:36 PM Smith nominated Janet Fugate as Chair. Pogue seconded. All in favor.

Chair Fugate asked Pogue if he was willing to continue as Vice Chair. Pogue confirmed he was.

5:33:16 PM Chair Fugate motioned for Pogue as Vice Chair. Scanlon seconded. All in Favor.

Public Hearings

PH 1 **5:33:33 PM** *Consideration of a Zone Change Application by Travis Jones, for an amendment to the City of Hailey Zoning District Map, Section 17.05.020, and Downtown Residential Overlay (DRO), Section 17.04R. Proposed changes would include Lot 5C, Block 1, Elmwood Subdivision #2 (131 West Pine Street) in to the Downtown Residential Overlay (DRO). The lots to the east are within the requested overlay district. The underlying zoning district(s) will not change.*

5:34:08 PM Horowitz opened the discussion by clarifying the two applications tonight are not related or tied together other than they are near each other on River Street. Horowitz provided a summary of how the Downtown Residential Overlay was adopted. Horowitz turned floor over to Robyn Davis. **5:35:35 PM** Davis explained the applicant's request, the current zoning of the property and overlays. Davis confirmed required setbacks would not change. In code, section 17.050.090 D, it does note if the lot is divided by a zoning district boundary line the less restrictive zoning requirements may be extended not more than 25ft into the more restrictive zoning districts. Davis explained how this is applicable to this parcel if the existing home were to be demolished but right now the location of the home precludes this standard. If the parcel remains as is and is chosen not to be included in Downtown Residential Overlay, two units can be developed on this lot. If included in Downtown Residential Overlay, could possibly see an increase in density if all requirements met. Chair Fugate requested Davis to discuss further the less restrictive zoning. Horowitz summarized that this means the applicant could extend 25ft into the general residential within the width of the limited business district. **5:40:56 PM** Travis Jones, owner of 131 W Pine Street and realtor in Ketchum and Hailey. Jones said he purchased the home in 2013, pointing out existing ADU and has approximately 2800 sq. ft. Jones explained his initial thoughts would be to add 1 or 2 apartments on the parcel, and that parking is more than sufficient. **5:43:25 PM** Scanlon asked Jones to trace where

his property line is at. Linnet asked if apartments would be connected to existing building or part of current footprint. Jones explained would be part of existing footprint. Horowitz said setback on property line would not change whether or not added to DRO. Chair Fugate asked if later down the road, if home was demolished, if it could accommodate 15 units. Davis explained that was an estimate and dependent on meeting parking. Linnet asked Jones if apartments are for long term or short term. Jones said intention is for long term. Pogue confirmed current facility contains a residence and 1 ADU. Jones confirmed and that looking at 1 more ADU. Chair Fugate confirmed this would go through design review.

5:48:54 PM Chair Fugate opened public hearing.

5:49:21 PM Tom Crais, in building adjacent numbers 135/137, has been in the building for about 17 years. Really wandering, to increase the density of the population there which in reading the resume seems like it is increasing it potentially substantially. First question is where is the parking going to come from. And his statement is that it seems like a pretty high-density population to go in that corner in the back. That gives him concern as a property owner just adjacent to it right next door. The other point has to do with parking. Between the dentist and himself and that building every day their parking lot from the applicant's property line to across the street is consistently filled. Question is if the public is allowed to encroach, the people renting from the applicant are allowed to use the parking places that are for their children receiving dental care and his patients of every age receiving medical care. Despite fact that have parking on other side from a building that takes up a lot of parking to begin with. Those are his questions. Number 1) Where's the parking coming from and is this going to affect the quality of the living environment and parking in that area. It really concerns him a lot because it's a small area, very condense, in the back, off the street. It worries him a lot.

5:51:16 PM Peter Lobb, 4th and Carbonate, disagree a little with Lisa. Went to the meetings as you probably know when did this new overlay. Does not remember the boarders were going to be fungible, that it was something all of sudden could just change them when we feel like it. If in fact we do that, feels like we are opening it up for the building community and the real-estate community for lots that are contiguous to this zone to simply apply and if do this you will set the precedent that they will say hey you did it for him why don't you do it for me. Ned already tried this, and believes Planning and Zoning and Council said no. thinks there is a precedent of saying no to this. If in fact you do do this you are pretty much telling every body that our zoning boarders don't mean much, that they are fungible, we can just change them whenever we want. Thinks this sets a really bad precedent to do this. When we went through those meetings, you guys and staff took a lot of time going around town to see where this was appropriate and the Council agreed with most of it. Now here we are changing it. The ink is hardly dry and we are changing it. Why are we changing it? It's obviously about money of course. All a developer has to do is come in and say look we don't have enough housing and play the

housing card and think we will just give them what they want just because of that. This is about pride, purely, as most things are. As soon as you do this, this property becomes much more valuable. It's a gift. Hopes before start giving gifts away like this, you really think about it. And hold off on this until at least we have some time to deal with the overlay and see what the consequences are.

[5:53:42 PM](#) Michelle Preuss believes it is strange that one parcel is in two different zones. Not a zoning guru, so not sure if it is odd or not but strikes her as odd. Wonder if this is a specific circumstance, a special circumstance where it is not normal. Is this something that is normal in Hailey? Maybe more of a question for P&Z. Is this something that is going to pop up in the future? Where there are these lots in two different zoning areas or is this just a one off.

[5:54:58 PM](#) **Chair Fugate closed public comment.**

[5:55:17 PM](#) Horowitz stated that any parking that is required under the overlay have to be on private property and if can't fit the parking can't do that number of units. Horowitz confirmed it is fairly unusual to have split zoning.

[5:56:14 PM](#) Bill Smith, 410 Willow St, right in back of Travis. How much parking is required for 15 units? Is it just a single car per unit, or 1 ½ cars per unit? Knows how cramped things are at end of Pine St.

[5:57:09 PM](#) Horowitz stated requirement is 1 space for every unit if under 1000 sq. ft. and if they are more it is either 1.5 or 2 spaces and with 1 guest space for every 6 units.

[5:57:39 PM](#) Pogue asked if we know how many lots are in split zoning. Horowitz said no but can get back to him. Pogue said would be hard to get 15 units on the lot. Horowitz explained did not have an architect look at it, it was an estimate. [5:59:17 PM](#) Smith said shares some of Peter's concern. Smith said when originally considering this he was concerned about the size of downtown residential area that was opening up and how had talked about utilizing the Design Review process to control what actually showed up in effort to try to make it appropriate for various neighborhoods. Smith said to his mind, it is a little pre-mature, prefer to see some activity take place as far as some of the in-fill and some of those other things on the vacant lots etc. So, we get a little better feel on how this is going to impact the look, the feel, the character if you will of Hailey. Smith suggested maybe with some additional information, his concerns could be allayed somewhat. Smith summarized his feelings. [6:00:40 PM](#) Chair Fugate clarified what Smith is saying. Smith further discussed his opinion and feelings regarding this type of development. [6:01:46 PM](#) Linnet said he is more encouraged about this project, that it doesn't sound like the footprint will be increasing but that the applicant will be decreasing his home size to add apartment buildings. Linnet said would be interested to know with more certainty if 25ft buffer would get the applicant where he wants to go without the zone change. Linnet said he favors density and having it downtown is a good idea. Linnet explained he does

not want to set a precedent that our boundary lines for our different zoning districts are not set in long term but believes this is a unique situation and more inclined to be in favor for. [6:03:41 PM](#) Scanlon asked Dr. Crais if has a backdoor on his building. Crais confirmed he does. Scanlon asked why have this island of limited business. Scanlon listed his concerns and why his is not inclined to change the zoning. Scanlon summarized does not feel good about it for multiple reasons. [6:05:03 PM](#) Chair Fugate said in favor of housing and thinks it important to encourage people that want to do things like this, but feels hesitant to change this for something that is not certain. Chair Fugate said thinks Linnets question was very good and wonders what could be done there. [6:06:26 PM](#) Horowitz explained options that can now proceed with. [6:06:47 PM](#) Simms explained the additional procedural option would be to table. [6:07:04 PM](#) Commission and staff discussed project, agreed to table it and have applicant come back with more information.

[6:09:52 PM](#) Smith moved to table this decision to a future time dependent upon City Staff getting back to Commission after they have had time to study this and converse with the applicant so will have a more complete picture of exactly what options might be available for the applicant. Linnet seconded. All in favor.

PH 2 [6:10:46 PM](#) *Consideration of a Zone Change Application by West Crescent Advisors Idaho, LLC, represented by Jay Cone Architecture, for an amendment to the City of Hailey Zoning District Map, Section 17.05.020, and Downtown Residential Overlay (DRO), Section 17.04R. The proposed changes would rezone Lots 1-7, Block 19, Hailey Townsite (301, 303 and 307 S River Street and 104 W Walnut) and Lots 1 and 3, Block 1, Elmwood Subdivision # 2 from Limited Business (LB) and General Residential (GR) to Business (B). 301, 303 and 307 S River Street are currently within the Downtown Residential Overlay (DRO). Lots 1 and 3, Block 1, Elmwood Subdivision # 2 (no address) are requesting to be added to the Downtown Residential Overlay (DRO). Lots to the north and the east are zoned the requested zoning district and are within the requested overlay district.*

[6:11:51 PM](#) Horowitz explained location and request by applicant. Horowitz went through older plats of the project location and old zoning maps. Horowitz turned floor over to applicant. Jay Cone, 65 El Dorado Lane, introduced himself and Dave Patrie. [6:16:33 PM](#) David Patrie, representative for the owner along with Jay Cone, stated disappointed that did not go into the standards in last project and why. Patrie explained what he recalled of the DRO. Patrie said need three things to get housing – demand, proper regulatory environment, and willing property owners. Patrie explained one of the reasons doing this, is from 2007-2017 the City of Hailey has had 2 permits issued for multi-family housing. Patrie said they are doing the right thing but still have ways to go. Patrie said if zoning approved, will see the project in Design Review. Patrie explained what applicant is asking for. [6:21:51 PM](#) Patrie went through the review criteria in his PowerPoint presentation, mentioning land use and infill requirements. Patrie highlighted comments from Staff Report. Patrie went on to discuss the required standards. Scanlon asked what

Patrie meant by more people living in units. [6:27:05 PM](#) Patrie explained it is overcrowding. Using example of four people living in a studio. Patrie continued discussing review criteria and vacancy rates. Patrie explained out of 440 units, 1 unit is vacant. Patrie said 5% is where we should be shooting for but we are practically at zero. Patrie discussed distance of the parcel from core overlay district. [6:30:13 PM](#) Patrie summarized how requested rezone meets the criteria, benefits housing, businesses, and the downtown vitality. [6:31:45 PM](#) Scanlon asked if Cone has anything to add. Cone said he would like to address a comment made during Travis Jones's application. Cone referenced comment about commission hearing request from Ned Williams, summarizing that Planning and Zoning did not hear the request that it was presented to City Council. Cone explained the process of how DRO boundary was determined. Cone summarized project specific applications relating to DRO were avoided during the time the DRO boundaries were being established.

[6:40:24 PM](#) Chair Fugate asked if understanding correctly, if a development agreement for the rezone as a condition of approval, would then the specifics of that be in the Design Review process. Simms explained how this could proceed. Horowitz explained would need to understand exactly what wanted and that not sure if know enough to enter into a development agreement at this time. Chair Fugate asked what the square footage is being asked to be included into DRO. Horowitz and Chair Fugate confirmed square footage. Cone said could respond to Linnets request for massing study. Cone handed out drawing to public and commission to. Cone clarified that the building in the drawing everyone is reviewing, has been designed with assumption of being approved with the zone change. Chair Fugate reiterated what Cone said.

[6:49:10 PM](#) **Chair Fugate opened public comment.**

[6:49:19 PM](#) Peter Caldara, said this is his backyard. It is very interesting, and may just be a coincidence that Mr. Cone was on Planning and Zoning, also one of the voices for this DRO and incidentally the architect applying for West Crescent LLC that now wants to change the zoning and include this unbuildable lots. Which he agrees they are, that was always his solace for the buffer for whatever projects were going to be developed, into the DRO and rezone from Limited Business to Business. Mr. Lobb had eloquently said he thought and he is also concerned with the precedent that this may incur for future people to buy land adjoining downtown residential overlay and request to include it in DRO and change the zoning of those properties which could adversely affect the health, safety and integrity of those neighborhoods as well. Has bad taste in his mouth on how this has all transpired. He hopes Cone was as altruistic as his seems to be with this property. That it was all coincidental, that the properties that were just bought in the past year or two, 303 and 307 River St, are now included in the downtown overlay, but not that they are included but that they are trying to go from Limited Business to Business and to include the 2 Elmwood sub lots into the overlay and change them to business from general residential. It just seems like he has a problem on how all this

seemed to come to play all at the same time. Is it coincidental or is it not, or is it a benefit for one client? Would that precedent be something they want to have affected for other pieces of property that could possibly be put into this downtown residential overlay? Like he said really does not want a 3-story building that is going to look like 4 stories because the property is about 8-10 feet lower than where it is being built on his property line. They want to change the zoning, to put as many units as they possibly can on this property. He understands the need for housing has no problem with that but think it should be done to the letter of zoning that is already established.

[6:52:50 PM](#) Tom Crais, born and reared in New Orleans LA which has preserved a couple significant areas of their city that has thrived throughout 2 - 3 centuries now. What has seen happen to so many beautiful environments is no attention to the preservation and or the development to the beauty and culture of the area. All you have to do is look about 10-15 miles north and you will see what could have been really developed into something that could be would be attractive from a different standpoint as opposed to a development thing. His point of question or his descent is, has lived in a total of nine major cities in the country and in Europe. Has lived in mid-size cities, and has lived in 3 relatively small towns. This is the smallest one. He has never ever seen where increased population density and housing improves the quality of life. It always has led to, to over time 20, 30, 40 years, a decrease because you cannot afford to keep it up in that respect. You can look at any major city and mid-size this is your business not his, just giving his personal experience. The cities happen to be Pensacola, New York, Boston, Berlin, San Antonio, El Paso, New Orleans, Baton Rouge and now beautiful state of Idaho. Maybe you can straighten him out on that, but his impression of increased population density in housing decreases the quality of life. First point, point of descent. The second thing is, he listened to their eloquent presentation. However, you lost him, started talking about turn from Limited Business to Business then quoted figures of vacancies. What vacancies? Are we talking residential rental vacancies, are we talking business vacancies? You kind of switch around. Then took a place like this should have a certain percentage. Does not think talking apples and apples, oranges and oranges. Data really confused him, and lead him down a primrose path that looked like a yellow brick road. So maybe could clarify that a little bit more precisely such that we know you are talking about apples and apples and oranges and oranges and not taking mixed data.

[6:55:54 PM](#) Marti Prentice, 811 Wintergreen, per Limited Business district is intended to be transitional zone between residential and business areas. If look at all of River St, if go anywhere north of this property it is all business, if go anywhere south it is all residential. There is plenty of room for this project if they need business zone to go north. Limited Business is Limited Business, it is a transitional zone. If they want to do it on the p property they own, it is a difference of a 10ft setback vs. building right up to the property line. Going on the west side of the property, running from General Residential to Business is like going from grade school to high school, forgot about that middle school.

Fine with moving that unbuildable property to Limited Business. So, can take advantage of the property. But to move the whole thing to business, it is a transition zone.

[6:57:03 PM](#) James Mitchel, 225 W Walnut, been there since 1996. The applicant's aggressive nature is quite rude and quite disconcerting. He mentioned that it's not affordable. These are not being sold, they are going to be kept in the family they are going to be rented out at market rate for generations to come. How they can say these are not profitable is quite mind boggling. Have a whole area that has been designated for this downtown overlay, none of it is being built in so far. As Mr. Smith has said we don't know what this is going to bring, everyone seems quite happy to dump on their doorstep and see how it works out. That is fine, but we live there have lived there for a long time. It is a lovely neighborhood, just built a nice bridge down by the river. You want to put something in that dwarfs every building around it. Substantially. You want to build 0 lot lines, don't want to put in buffers of landscaping, providing 42 parking spaces for 42 units with 2 bedrooms. Does anyone here believe they are only going to have one car? The applicant already owns the property on corner and struggles to keep it neat and tidy. There's an abandoned car sitting there, left near the dumpster on the corner. Its ridiculous even discussing this in this zoning. Put it where it was originally meant to go or if want to build some other housing take it down where it is already zone. To change the zoning at this point in time, when have no idea what it is going to do is ridiculous. No one else except this architect is applying for this kind of thing. So, they say there's a need out there but no one else seems to be wanting to change their properties. So, think need to think very, very hard about what we are doing here. As Dr. Crais said, population does not lead to better live style. They say that millennials are going to be catching buses and things but then they talk about snow plow drivers and paramedics and things like that. They are going to have cars and rushing off to do things. This is putting a huge concentration of people on a small block of land in a neighborhood that just doesn't have it and doesn't want it.

[6:59:31 PM](#) Joyce Fogg, 125 W Walnut, confirmed provided letter of her concerns and comments. Lived there for 30 years, adjacent northwest of this property. Feel concerned about the size, the size of building seems to be out of context for rest of neighborhood and any other building in that area. Worry about how close the building comes, so no setbacks out to main road as far as she knows, will hear more about it. Just concerned about the parking, in an area where any overflow will be coming on each side of that road. Pedestrians, cars, children, pets will all be in a higher risk with this overflow parking if it's really only 1 car per unit, which is really unreasonable to think is enough. Appreciate all their statements, her letter, note may objectify how she feels. Very emotional about it.

[7:01:14 PM](#) Sarah Dress, 235 Galena Dr, I'm a young person lives right over there in the townhomes. Since talking about people who need these affordable housing units. She is a paid on-call firefighter and E.M.T for Wood River Fire also on ski patrol and maintains your trails during the summer. She loves what she does, but does not make a lot of

money. She was able to buy one of those for under \$200,000.00 which is only reason she has had a good place to live. Places like that are now unattainable, has gotten multiple friends kicked out for Air B n B's, now live to many people to a unit. Extremely frustrating to her to hear everyone talk about affordable housing who isn't affordable to someone like her under 40. Say affordable housing is under \$300 to \$400 unit in Woodside. That is absolutely absurd. That's not affordable. We all know this, we need people to respond to 911 calls and make our community function. But when it comes down to it, no one wants them in their backyard, which is what she is hearing. She would like you to consider, based off developer's presentation that it fits with what they are trying to accomplish. Which is making Hailey a community that has people who can function in it. Right now, we are right at the precipice. If we could just jump in and take care of it before it's an issue. Look at Ketchum, tons of places to live that people use 2 weeks out of year. We don't want that happening here. Very frustrating to her to listen to people who got their own, not want anything more for anyone else. Hope they would consider at least based on codes and regulations what will be the best for this community, that is places people can actually afford to live.

[7:03:04 PM](#) Steve Crosser, 431 Aspen Dr, urges the City not to pass this. If you do, going to have every River Street developer wanting to rezone outside the Business DRO for more density. Is this the test case for outside the DRO? It sure looks like it to him. This is the first. It just seems like if say yes now will be hard to say no to rest of developer. There are a lot of places for sale, lots for sale along River St. If go in past that, there's going to be houses outside of the DRO. Going to buys those and come to them and ask for a rezone.

[7:04:16 PM](#) Megan Schooley, full time employee at local nonprofit, has lived here for about 3 years and is a renter. Has lived in is a renter lived in 4 different houses, has been booted from her houses because of Air B n B's or because homeowner is selling it. She is a good tenant, she struggles hearing that density does not improve the quality of life. Because having someplace to live really does, and sometimes density is the way to do that. She does not have a formulated opinion on whether this specific project should be passed or not. She wanders if there is a middle ground, if someone doesn't want a 3 or 4 story in their backyard. If a feasibility study could pencil out a 2-story building, some sort of middle ground. She does know that housing is a huge issue, that she loves this valley and wants to stay here but wont stay here if can't ever afford to buy a house.

[7:05:27 PM](#) Peter Lobb, 4th and Carbonate, thinks presentation by applicant was pretty comprehensive and remarkable, but thinks about 80% of it was facetious. Has heard these arguments over and over again for years, has lived in the valley since the mid 70's. The argument that somehow the valley is going to fall apart. Been through this many times' before and we haven't. We have always survived, always done well. Has never been an easy place to live. When first came here, lived with four people in a house in Ketchum, it's what he had to deal with. Does feel for people who have a hard time finding a place. But every person he has met in the last five years who were having a hard

time finding a place, eventually found a place just wasn't the kind of place they felt they deserved. So, hope when they make their decision to recommend this or not recommend this that they don't do it based on hysterical arguments. Zoning is important, there are reasons for zoning. Urges them to stick with the present zoning and let's see what the new overlay produces. This may sound counter-intuitive but if you rely on the building industry and the real-estate industry to solve our housing problem, it won't happen. They are the reason or at least contribute to the reason why we have this. Least that is his opinion of that situation. He apologizes for one thing, going to go off topic for a second. You guys have been up there for a really long time, know the procedures. So, when staff recommends to you that you can table something, that to him is a bias from staff wanting you to do that. Think that you guys know that, know the procedures, don't needed to be reminded of that. If someone in the audience ask a question that is inappropriate, it is Janet's job to say don't do that or you are out of order not Staff's job. Only say that because think you should run the meetings, not staff.

[7:07:57 PM](#) Mike Firth, Walnut, think phase is about the size. Want to extend these lots, so it can be a bigger building. That is the core of it. So, thinks that is the crux of it, that size is what most people are here for. Extra housing is a great idea, but don't put a giant monstrosity on the back. Can do something in between here. That's his comment. Quality of life, does not know about anyone else, but did not move here to live in a city. It's a small town, this is what he wants. Small town, little houses, white picket fences all that kind of stuff. In terms of affordability, looks at the real-estate quite a bit. There is quite a bit of townhomes that are under \$250-200,000. So, there are things out there. Thinks that is really the piece here. Does not want to get into the giant part of the 42unit part that is coming up next. If you extend it, that allows for the 42 units and that is the crux for most people.

[7:09:23 PM](#) Michelle Preuss, 320 W Walnut, did not come here with an opinion, learning a lot and has couple questions and comment. First question, wanders if without the rezone, how many units could be built? Could there be any units built with the existing zoning? What is possible right now as is? Other comment again, is about the housing crisis. She is a social worker in the valley, works within the Blaine County School District, works with the students and their families. Speaking as a public citizen not on behalf of them. Its real, that there's really not much affordable here. There are a long of single parent families. There really isn't much that is under \$200,000. Its not that families are looking for their white picket fence, beautiful, country rural Idaho house. They are just looking for. Something that is safe for their family and they are not finding it. She can attest to that. There is a lot of doubling up, there is homelessness on the rise with students. That is a major concern of hers. She is personally willing to sacrifice a little bit of her comfort. Not exactly excited with a lot more cars on her street but if that means a safe home and independence for her students and their families, she is ok with that. That is kind of where her values lie. Does not have to be everyone's values, understands that. That is

her comment. Her question is what can be done now. Kind of that middle ground everyone is talking about. Does think it is extremely important that get smaller size houses out there that are more affordable. For some of these families of 3-4 that are doubling up with grand parents and friends and could get kicked out at any moment with no legal recourse.

[7:11:45 PM](#) Leanna Eddy, 506 N 2nd Ave, works at a non-profit in the valley as well. Has been looking at purchasing a home. Looking at this neighborhood and the opportunity this represents. She is really excited that we have something on the table to provide more housing for the community. Appreciates Michelle's question, she as well read the newspaper article, did not know enough until the presentation. She is still formulating an opinion about the appearances of this. But just looking at this moment where we are going to interrupt the zoning that has come about, it seems like a great opportunity to come together as a community to meet several needs for housing. She works with people every day that say they call every week to the apartments around town trying to find a place to live. Its so real, does not know who to make it strike home. This is about zoning and building community. Really encourages to consider the opportunity we have right now. To achieve multiple goals.

[7:13:31 PM](#) Tony Evans, IME, lived in city of Hailey for over 20 years reporting on affordable housing for much of that. What sees being a Hailey reporter, that there tends to be not a really consolidated view on what's going on in other parts of the county. He recommends to the commission or anyone who is interested to reach out to out municipalities to find out what is going on in Ketchum for instances. 80% of people looking for place to live and work in the valley are driving North to work every day. What's going on in Ketchum? People look to the south for a solution to housing problem that's driven by economic forces in the north valley. That seems a little out of whack to him. Also, near the hospital, there's big triangle property that has been on and off the table for housing for years. He doesn't cover that particular project in detail, it is not on his beat, but it has as held out a lot of hope for certain people for years. He thinks it is worth looking into and working with other cities, these other planning departments, in consolidated organized fashion. The same would go for City of Bellevue, they are looking at tiny house's developments now. Occasionally all of these groups will get together at a meeting, like what happened recently at The Mint. The Chamber hosted a big meeting there, it was fabulous. Ton of information from the North Valley, the South Valley. He hears Paul Conrad is thinking about requesting, proposing that the county open up some land on Glendale Road for affordable housing. That perhaps the county would be willing to do something like that. There is a chance some public lands could be opened up to affordable housing. He finds sometimes, that the focus on a particular project in a certain city where he happens to live, gets a lot of heat but the discussion is not broadened out to include wider discussion on what might be possible to solve the crucial housing issue.

[7:16:33 PM](#) Joann Vassar, 308 Willow, project is literally in her backyard. Married to gentleman here and lived there for 40 years. Understand need for more housing, the commission

has discussed the need for a progression of housing types. What she does not see is what the progression is. We have the 6-unit building on the corner, which neighbors a neighborhood of all single-family housing with a few attached accessory dwelling units. The project with 42 units is 7 times larger than the adjacent project. 7x larger does not seem to be a progression. Also agrees with how Peter Lobb discussed DRO. Did not participate in that but does not understand why when that was just adopted 4 months ago, we are already entertaining applications to amend that. That doesn't make sense to her. The other question, addressed by Michelle, why aren't we seeing something presented in the existing zoning. How many units could be built in the existing zoning. A few of them received notice prior to Christmas holiday and only first 300 ft of residents were notified. When there was a project on the other end the neighborhood that involved 14 single-family homes, whoever was in charge of that, was kind enough, neighborly enough to notify everyone all the way through China Gardens. Know that 300 ft is all that is required to be notified but that a 3-story building from their lot will look like a 4-story building. Thinks everyone in the neighborhood can see, to her effects more than the people who live just 300 ft away.

[7:19:38 PM](#) Ted Macklin, 245 W Walnut St, understand it is currently a transitional zoning there. He just traveled in Eastern Europe for two and half months, there were just little boxes stacked up. The thing that concerns him the most about this zoning change is that they are asking for a 0 setback. Having a 3-story high wall right up to the property line. What does that do to the guy next door? And how do you access that. there is no buffer zone. Think it was zoned to be a transitional zone, and think that's what they ought to keep. Thinks to rezone this, to accommodate something this large is a mistake.

[7:20:39 PM](#) John Preuss, 320 W Walnut St, He wants to see more apartments going in. Thinks they could go in on this block, but seems like too many apartments for that small of a space with parking. As mentioned before, having one car per apartment, does not seem like people will just have one car. Parking is biggest thing he sees. He does agree with the buffer, there should be a buffer between a building that big.

[7:21:35 PM](#) Peter Caldara, was told originally these were not going to be affordable housing they are going to be market-based housing. Just read in Mountain Express, there are over 7,000 people in this valley according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, that their average salary is \$600 a week. Just wondering, is this going to be affordable or market baring where they still can't afford it. They are going to have 2-3 people living in each unit, that brings 2-3 vehicles into play. Not 42 for 42 units. Know needs more housing, agrees with that. But think this project is a little to large to be the initial onset project in the downtown overlay. Of course, he is saying that from a personal stand point because he is right there. But also, in the overview of all the other neighbors talking about it, they do not want to see it either. This large at least.

[7:22:48 PM](#) Michael Firth, it is not more housing we need, it is affordable housing. Affordable housing is what we need, that have to have. Think this group needs to prove it is affordable and going to stay affordable. If you want that kind of density in particular going to have to show. It's not the amount, it's the pricing.

[7:23:37 PM](#) Michelle Preuss, 320 W Walnut St, had that question but got nervous. Her question was also about the pricing. Here the word affordable housing everywhere and that means something different to everyone. The number she had in her mind, let's say a single parent with a couple kids, living on a \$60,000 a year salary which is actually kind of high compared to. Going with higher example in mind, thinking of a particular situation in her mind, this family cannot find something under \$300,000 town home. Something that they can rent or buy. That example is in her head because in her mind, that is a pretty high salary in her opinion. And yet this family she is thinking of, still cannot find something. So, her question is, can you tell us is there an idea of what the rent is going to be.

[7:24:57 PM](#) Steve Crosser, 431 Aspen Dr, by saying no to this you're not saying no to the applicant to building this. The applicant can still build on this he can still have units, still make a profit rent stuff out stuff like that. The little lot alongside would make great buffer zone, green space, open space.

[7:25:31 PM](#) Bill Smith, would like to make statement about buffer zone. If you build to the property line, the access along that who wall in case of emergency of fire or anything else is going to come through the property owned by people down in Elmwood Subdivision, down on Walnut St. There's no access for fireman or any safety people to get in there if you take away that setback. We usually have setbacks so fire people, emergency people can get in. You eliminate that, you make the property owners to the west accommodate the lack of setback on that property.

[7:26:36 PM](#) Chair Fugate closed public comment.

[7:26:48 PM](#) Chair Fugate called for a break.

[7:33:59 PM](#) Chair Fugate called meeting back order.

[7:34:16 PM](#) Chair Fugate turned floor over to Staff. Horowitz responded to question of affordability. [7:35:36 PM](#) Chair Fugate turned floor to applicant. [7:35:53 PM](#) Cone responded to question of what could currently be built, summarizing that not able to tell you based off the number of lots involved. Cone stated from what he is hearing from public comment the Elmwood lots seem to be a point of contention. Cone explained the Elmwood lots serve to solve a dimensional problem. Cone feels like the word precedent has been mischaracterized and explained why. Cone said Patrie was clear that the ordinance very clearly spells out how you can grant these changes. Cone referred back to previous comments, explaining this is really how the process should work. Cone

explained not cynical enough to not believe the facts of this valley, clear more housing is needed and that the county has been unable to respond to it. Cone said this is why he has been supportive of the DRO. Cone said has two possibilities for tonight, both are widely divergent, DRO is already working. Cone clarified his comments about feasibility were made in a very specific context to this project and what he was tasked to do by his client and his comments are only related to market rate apartments on these parcels. [7:40:47 PM](#) Patrie said would address themes heard. Patrie added to the precedent comment Cone discussed. Patrie explained what they want from the commission and that if it were meant to be static would not have this process in place. It's a question of whether or not meets the criteria. Patrie said understood there was a question on the data, if it was for apples to apples. Patrie confirmed vacancy rate was for residential housing for Hailey. Patrie explained profit is not under the criteria to evaluate on and not about profit. Patrie stated he heard a lot about buffers, he would say 80% of the Business district borders General Residential, the rest of Hailey exist with Business and General Residential right next to each other. Patrie said other thing, wanted to talk about jobs and where the jobs are. Patrie went on to explain the perception that the North Valley has more jobs and how it is not true. Patrie stated would like to hear the commission deliberate the merits of the rezone in the code. [7:45:27 PM](#)

[7:45:30 PM](#) Linnet asked what the project would like under existing zoning and clarified what the applicant is asking. Linnet asked if an apartment building could exist on those lots with existing zoning district. Cone explained that applicant and he had not reviewed different designs. Linnet clarified that parking would be underneath, Cone confirmed. Linnet questioned space of parking, if Elmwood lots are needed. Cone confirmed lots are needed. Cone clarified not underground parking but under building parking. Cone went on to discuss podium design and parking. [7:50:38 PM](#) Smith referenced comments made of General Residential next to Business, using his home as an example. Smith stated profit is not a criteria but does know it is a balancing act. Smith said seems to him, Cone first opposed DRO and he had referenced a comment Cone made. Cone confirmed. Smith confirmed going to business to get the setback reduced, mentioning other differences that he is assuming not interested in. Smith suspects there should be some middle that would allow for an outcome that would be more agreeable. Smith discussed different zoning. Smith said suspects could modify the footprint and layout to handle the traffic underneath the building. Smith asked about the initial studies done by applicant and Cone, if had designs. Cone explained why the studies were done. Cone responded to Smith comments about it being about the setbacks, referencing quote by him in the paper. Cone stated the vast majority of DRO covers the B zone, this LB is just a strange pocket that his client happens to own land in. Cone explained the DRO was formulated for the B zone, and during the deliberations the council was at ease with the setbacks. All properties adjacent to River St are viable and should be considered for greater density. [7:56:45 PM](#) Cone stated the DRO makes this project possible. Smith clarified the DRO not Business zone. Cone confirmed both. Smith referenced comment of tremendous

opportunity which seems to come with tremendous risk. [7:57:37 PM](#) Chair Fugate asked if would need to do something different, if decided tonight to just add that portion into the DRO. [7:58:13 PM](#) Simms explained has a list of possibilities ahead of them but what would like to see is the deliberation Patrie has requested. [7:58:57 PM](#) Horowitz confirmed if added Elmwood parcels in DRO, the setback would be retained. Chair Fugate and staff discussed options. [7:59:42 PM](#) Chair Fugate told applicant appreciated hand out and that would like to see what it would look like from standing in front of it and the adjacent neighbors. Smith clarified looking East from the West side. [8:01:40 PM](#) Cone said certainly has those, if get to the pre-app agenda item tonight. Cone said on that point, if the commission feels like it wants to grant pieces or parts of this application, respectfully ask that they continue application and why. [8:02:53 PM](#) Chair Fugate confirmed that she understands. Smith said he would follow up on applicant's request, that he would move to continue this then and why. Chair Fugate agreed. [8:04:23 PM](#) Scanlon said, as Cone knows not continuing this because it is late at night, but that they need more time to think about it more, need to investigate more. Cone responded that not about profit, that it is about feasibility. Chair Fugate confirmed they all are very aware of that and that specifically everyone should make their comments but is there any other information that may assist when address this again. Chair Fugate referenced Mr. Crais's comments and appreciates how Hailey has conserved the character of our town. Cone request handouts returned back. Simms said would need to keep one for record. [8:08:35 PM](#) Horowitz and Chair Fugate discussed when massing study done, points of view would like to see. [8:09:40 PM](#) Scanlon asked how fire protection works along property line. Smith asked if building would be sprinklered. Cone confirmed yes. Scanlon confirmed would like to see massing study as well. Pogue said would be remiss if didn't thank Cone for his input on the DRO when going through that process. Pogue explained if he were to vote tonight, he would not be for changing the zoning and why. Pogue stated he is absolutely convinced community needs housing and more housing but cannot do it without serious forethought on how it impacts existing housing. [8:14:12 PM](#) Smith thanked applicant and public. [8:14:54 PM](#) Linnet stated his opinion on this project and affordable housing. Linnet summarized it will have consequences but benefits as well. [8:19:25 PM](#) Chair Fugate added to Linnet's comment, referenced Smith comments and thanked public for their comments. Cone requested the Commission to reiterate items needed for next hearing. Chair Fugate listed massing study from neighborhood perspective and street level, fire access study, with setbacks thinks anything they can address in that area will be helpful, and what could be done with the existing zoning. Staff, commission and applicant discussed possible options within existing zoning. Cone explained that he feels the commission is trying to make a decision on the zoning based on a presumptive building and he does not feel that is appropriate. Cone stated he believes all are clear on what is required and that the ordinance is very clear what criteria is required for a zone change. [8:23:43 PM](#) Chair Fugate said that is true but counters with fact that zoning change will affect welfare of immediate neighbors. Cone said does still have the power of design review process, believes there's a provision in DRO that gives

additional authority. Simms said does not disagree with what Cone has said, but commission is within their rights to require the information and why. Simms summarized that it is perfectly appropriate. Staff and applicant clarified project will not be re-noticed as it is being continued.

8:26:30 PM Linnet motioned to continue the public hearing upon the request by West Crescent Advisors Idaho, LLC, represented by Jay Cone Architecture to February 4th, 2019. Smith seconded. All in Favor.

PH 3 *Consideration of a Design Review Pre-Application by West Crescent Advisors Idaho, LLC, represented by Jay Cone Architecture, for a 42-unit residential project proposed three (3) story building, to be located at SW 45' of Lots 1,2, 3 and Lots 4-7, Block 19, Hailey Townsite (303 and 307 S River Street and 104 W Walnut) and Lots 1 and 3, Block 1, Elmwood Subdivision # 2 (no address). The subject property is requesting a zone change and to be included in the Downtown Residential Overlay (DRO). The proposal includes tuck-under parking, fourteen (14) studios, fourteen (14) one (1) bedroom units, fourteen (14) two (2) bedroom units, and 2,971 sq. ft. of open space. **ACTION ITEM***

Chair Fugate asked if continuing Design Review to same date or different date as rezone. Staff and applicant discussed options and decided to keep same date as rezone.

8:28:39 PM Scanlon motioned to continue the public hearing for the design review application by West Crescent Advisors Idaho, LLC, represented by Jay Cone Architecture to February 4th, 2019. Pogue seconded. All in Favor.

8:29:15 PM Linnet motioned to adjourn. Smith seconded. All in favor.