

Meeting Minutes
HAILEY PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
Tuesday, February 18, 2020
Hailey City Hall
5:30 p.m.

Present

Board: Janet Fugate, Dustin Stone, Owen Scanlon, Dan Smith, Richard Pogue

Staff: Lisa Horowitz, Chris Simms, Brian Yeager, Robyn Davis, Jessica Parker, Kelly Schwarz

5:29:46 PM Chair Fugate called to order.

5:30:04 PM Public Comment for items not on the agenda. No Comment.

Consent Agenda

CA 1 Adoption of the Meeting Minutes of February 3, 2020. **ACTION ITEM**

CA 2 Adoption of the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision of a Design Review Application – by David and Shannon Presson, represented by Jay Cone Architecture, for a 951 square-foot addition to an existing 671 square foot existing residence, and a 585 square-foot garage, for a total of 2,265 square feet (a portion of the existing residence will be demolished, and is not included in the square footage). The project will be located at 311 South 4th Avenue (Lots 6 and 7, Block 24, Hailey Townsite) within the Limited Residential 1 (LR-1) and Townsite Overlay (TO) Zoning Districts. **ACTION ITEM**

CA 3 Adoption of the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision of an Amendment to Title 18, Chapter 18.06, Section 18.06.026: Street Tree Guidelines and Standards, to replace the existing section with more complete street tree guidelines that encourage tree diversity and promote strong, healthy trees that are not limited by environmental conditions from achieving a long life and mature size. These amendments are the recommendation of the Hailey Tree Committee. **ACTION ITEM**

CA 4 Adoption of the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision of an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan. The amendment includes the additions and deletions to Section 5, Land Use and amending the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map to include Airport Critical Zones and additional lands in the Area of City Impact. **ACTION ITEM**

5:30:32 PM Scanlon recused himself.

5:30:46 PM Smith motioned to approve CA 1 through CA 4. Pogue seconded. All in favor.

Public Hearing

PH 1 **5:31:05 PM** Consideration of a previously approved Design Review Application by L.L. Green Hardware, for a new 17,549 square foot mixed-use building, to be located at 21

*East McKercher (Lot 1, Block 2, Northridge Subdivision X). The new commercial space will include one (1) residential unit of approximately 600 square feet, office space, retail and warehouse space. The project is located within the Limited Business (LB) and Downtown Residential Overlay (DRO) Zoning Districts. This project was previously approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission on May 21, 2018 and is being reheard due to the expiration of the previously approved Design Review. No changes are proposed. **ACTION ITEM***

Scanlon recused himself from this item as he is part of the applicant team.

[5:32:03 PM](#) Davis explained previous approved project that has expired which is why seeing it again. Scanlon explained no change from previous approval that all but Stone were present for previous application. Scanlon asked Stone if he would like to go through the plans. Stone said he reviewed them. Stone asked if reason project is not getting built. Scanlon explained financial reasons. No additional questions from the commission.

[5:33:36 PM](#) Chair Fugate opened public comment.

[5:33:49 PM](#) Oliver Whitcomb introduced himself and started public comment. Chair Fugate interrupted Whitcomb asking if he was speaking to LL Greens or Sunbeam. Whitcomb confirmed Sunbeam. Chair Fugate explained that item is set to be discussed next.

[5:34:59 PM](#) Chair Fugate closed public comment.

[5:35:31 PM](#) Pogue motioned to approve the Design Review Application submitted by L.L. Green's Hardware for a new 17,549 square foot commercial building, to be located at 21 East McKercher (Lot 1, Block 2, Northridge Subdivision X), within the Limited Business (LB) Zoning District, finding that the project does not jeopardize the health, safety or welfare of the public and the project conforms to the applicable specifications outlined in the Design Review Guidelines, applicable requirements of the Zoning Ordinance, Title 18, and City Standards, provided conditions (a) through (o) are met. Smith seconded. All in Favor.

PH 2 [5:36:52 PM](#) Consideration of a Planned Unit Development (PUD) Application (Phase I) for Sunbeam Subdivision by Marathon Partners, LLC, represented by Samantha Stahlnecker, PE, of Galena Engineering, for development of a Two-Phased PUD totaling 145 units, with 90 units in Phase 1, to be located on Tax Lot 6655, Section 9 & 10, T2N, R18E, Hailey. The project will consist of:

- Park and Open Space for Residential and Public Use
- Bike and Pedestrian Connector Trails
- Recreation Field, Natural Play and Scenic Area
- Curtis Park Connection
- Single-Family Lots and Cottage Single-Family Lots **ACTION ITEM**

[5:37:47 PM](#) Chair Fugate asked if taking it in tandem with PH 3. Horowitz and Simms confirmed believes can take both together. Chair Fugate opened PH 3.

[5:39:13 PM](#) Stone disclosed spoke to someone regarding Phase 1 and Phase 2, who asked if it was possible to swap phases. Stone stated he referred this person to come to the meeting to get their request on record at the public hearing. Simms asked if anything about that conversation caused him to lose objective of this project. Stone confirmed no. [5:39:53 PM](#) Horowitz explained will be discussing water and transportation study. [5:40:29 PM](#) Ben Young, Landscape Architect, presented a power point providing a recap of where they are at, changes made since last public hearing, traffic study and water study. (*Power point on file with Community Development*) Young noted that this parcel was annexed into the city in 1981. Young discussed existing streets that tie into this parcel. Young explained potential design previous designed that they could do compared to the current design, discussing park differences between the designs. Young stated proposed park will be larger than other parks within Hailey. Young explained pedestrian access designed with current proposal. Young explained hope for smaller lots under the PUD Application. Young summarized feedback received. Young explained cleaned up intersections, updated the park, new location of cottage lots, added more diverse location of the smaller lots, bike path now connects to San Badger, added sidewalks to interior blocks within the proposed design, new parking area in central location of park, in regards to wildlife-IDFG has commented twice new letter submitted this week. Young discussed the build green checklist using for the subdivision. Young stated proposing recreation area for kids to run around, natural play area, place for picnic tables, and sled hill. [5:57:24 PM](#) Young asked to change power points to discuss Traffic Study. [5:57:44 PM](#) Ryan Hales, traffic and transportation engineer. Hales provided power point presentation giving an overview of a traffic study – analysis methodology, data collection, trip generation, synchro analysis and analysis results. (*Power point on file with Community Development*) Hales stated added 2% growth rate per year and included traffic from Quigley Farms. Hales explained estimated trips with single family homes built per phase 1 through phase 3. [6:10:06 PM](#) Hales pointed out intersections-Main Street and Myrtle Street and Main Street and Bullion Street discussing mitigations for each intersection. Hales discussed each intersection studied and their levels. Hales confirmed full traffic study is available online. Myrtle Street and Main Street mitigations suggested: stripe left turn lane and shared through right turn lane on the westbound and eastbound approaches. Bullion Street and Main Street mitigations suggested – striped right turn pocket on westbound approach and implement westbound permissive-protected and eastbound permissive left-turn phasing instead of protected-only left turn phasing. Hales explained warrants required to install traffic signal, explaining ITD will not install one yet at Myrtle and Main Street. [6:15:24 PM](#) Hales discussed Eastridge and Quigley Rd intersection, stated may need to move stop sign out more so it is more visible. Hales discussed Eastridge and Quigley Rd intersection estimated traffic in 2030. [6:16:44 PM](#) Hales discussed the sight access point, stating having 6 access points helps distribute the traffic. Hales stated El Dorado and Carbonate will see some traffic but not a lot. Hales stated majority of the traffic going towards Quigley. Hales asked if commissioners had questions. No questions from the commissioners. [6:18:59 PM](#) Samantha Stahlnecker, Galena Engineering, explained storm water and drainage system proposed. Stahlnecker stated

wastewater system proposed is a typical system. Stahlnecker stated proposing to connect to the municipal water service. Stahlnecker stated City of Hailey is undergoing a water study with Northridge and Old Cutters, explaining Sunbeam was able to expand those studies to include Sunbeam. Stahlnecker explained slight reduced pressures in Northridge and Cutters when Phase 1 and Phase 2 go in. Stahlnecker discussed the fire flow protection and the increase when added Phase 1 and Phase 2. Stahlnecker stated they anticipate no issues. Stahlnecker discussed the irrigation water proposed, discussing irrigation for the park and improvements to Curtis Park. [6:25:13 PM](#) Stone asked if they looked at any other water drops in town with Sunbeam. Stahlnecker explained typically only gather information from surrounding neighborhoods. [6:26:03 PM](#) Smith asked about pressure at Curtis Park. Stahlnecker stated not aware of any issue there. [6:26:18 PM](#) Scanlon asked if lots irrigated by the municipal system will have water meters. Stahlnecker confirmed, explaining will be a standard connection like most connections in Hailey. Scanlon confirmed the irrigation will not be separated from the potable water in the house. Stahlnecker confirmed will be serviced with the standard municipal water. [6:26:44 PM](#) Chair Fugate asked what the difference between water usages are between the agriculture and residential area. Stahlnecker does not know the difference. Horowitz explained applicant is not metered at this time. [6:28:11 PM](#) Jim Spec, local attorney, does a lot of water rights work. Spec explained the state purpose of the statute referenced in the Staff Report, summarizing issue of water right. Spec explained critical points of water rights are the priority dates, discussing current priority dates in valley and what are priority cuts. Spec provided graph in PowerPoint presentation showing year's water right were cut. (*PowerPoint is on file with community development department.*) Spec explained in light of this history, he thinks that it is only prudent that they plan for likely hood that this water right may be cut more frequently. [6:34:22 PM](#) Spec stated as a municipal planning body, they should consider economic feasibility and efficiency in determining whether this water right is reasonably available. Spec stated if water right is cut off, the water would have to come from the municipal system. Spec referenced letter from Ed Dumke in the Staff Report. Spec compared water priority dates of Quigley and Colorado Gulch and those are not comparable to this proposal. Spec stated the only comparable development is Old Cutters, and the city did not requirement them to build a separate system. [6:38:41 PM](#) Spec stated asking P&Z to recommend to City Council that the sunbeam water right is not reasonably available. [6:39:03 PM](#) Stone asked if graph represents dates the water was cut for this partial property. Spec clarified it represents the all the water rights under that date. [6:40:01 PM](#) Scanlon asked if this ground can get the water right that it is allowed. Spec stated in its present state the water can be delivered there, but it is somewhat precarious. [6:41:03 PM](#) Stahlnecker stated it is clear the city needs a new well, explaining applicant has offered a large contribution towards the development of a new municipal well. [6:42:07 PM](#) Young discussed how they are trying to conserve water on the residential lots – restrict percentage of turf cover of remaining area left over after house built, require smarter water controllers on each parcel. Young stated they will be really encouraging water conservation for the entire subdivision. [6:45:01 PM](#) Scanlon asked if everything that is not turf is going to be a weed patch. Young explained options available – drought tolerant.

Scanlon asked if they would have a list of appropriate options. Young confirmed. [6:46:23 PM](#) Stahlnecker pointed out that there is no other subdivision within the city that has these types of restrictions. [6:46:40 PM](#) Chair Fugate asked if the water sense will be part of the infrastructure. Stahlnecker explained it is the type of fixtures used and will be required in the CC&Rs [6:47:17 PM](#) Stahlnecker summarized proposal with new changes. [6:47:58 PM](#) Horowitz asked Stahlnecker to reiterate how many lots could be built at 8000 square feet. [6:48:03 PM](#) Stahlnecker explained it is hard to know for sure because of the shape of the lot not sure if could get 177 lots but it will be between what they are proposing and the 177. [6:48:34 PM](#) Smith asked what the minimum lot width is. Stahlnecker stated it is 60 ft. Stahlnecker explained they are requesting waivers for two private streets and what the waivers are for. Stahlnecker explained request for flag lots. Stahlnecker summarized amenities providing. [6:52:21 PM](#) Chair Fugate asked if they are going to improve infrastructure for irrigation for Curtis Park. Stahlnecker confirmed. [6:52:50 PM](#) Ed Lawson, local attorney, summarized the project proposal. Lawson stated the applicant team truly believes this is the best proposal for this parcel. Lawson confirmed many staff, P&Z, and public feedback has been incorporated in the design submitted. Lawson confirmed all studies have been completed, and all standards have been met. Lawson stated the biggest issue P&Z will have to decide is whether or not to require the second water system to cover those lots. Lawson stated Spec has provided a compelling explanation of why that should not be a requirement. [6:57:09 PM](#) Lawson added that even with that in place, the municipal water would still be in need. [6:57:35 PM](#) Lawson stated this raises question of fee structure, that a lot owner in this subdivision would not be treated equally. [6:58:45 PM](#) Lawson stated if they determine a separate irrigation system has to be provided, this project would not go forward. [6:59:50 PM](#) Lawson explained such an arrangement was acceptable when the applicant was irrigating the land to grow hay but would not be acceptable for residential lots. Lawson explained applicant is aware of need of water conservation. Lawson summarized the water is not reasonably available and there for the secondary system should not be required. Lawson summarized this project will provide needed housing, will not burden current services or amenities but add to both. [7:02:27 PM](#) Lawson explained the Sunbeam development will pave its way and will not be a burden

[7:03:26 PM](#) Chair Fugate called break until 10 after.

[7:09:24 PM](#) Chair Fugate called meeting back to order. Chair Fugate asked if staff had any comments. Horowitz asked if needed hear from Brian Yeager regarding water model. [7:10:11 PM](#) Yeager stated water model used for Northridge is available on the website and provided a brief summary of how that relates to Sunbeam. Yeager showed location of the water model study on the City website. [7:15:21 PM](#) Chair Fugate stated that most of the pressure is under the 40. Yeager explained where the worst scenario of the pressure level is and what the city requirements are to meet the pressure level demands. Yeager showed where the alternative options to resolve areas of issue. [7:19:01 PM](#) Scanlon stated he liked the circular road to be more pleasing and asked if traffic engineer, Hales, saw an advantage of doing the intersections the new way. Hales explained how it helps

slow traffic down. [7:20:36 PM](#) Scanlon asked if there will be building envelopes on these lots. Stahlnecker stated they are not proposing building envelopes but could look at those if commission required on the larger lots. [7:21:30 PM](#) Chair Fugate asked if phase 1 will have 3 connections. Stahlnecker confirmed – Quigley, Grays Starlight and San Badger.

[7:22:20 PM](#) Chair Fugate opened public comment.

[7:23:03 PM](#) Oliver Whitcomb, 760 Bonanza lane, thanked applicant team and supportive of proposal. Had concerned about the water but after listening think they are on the right track. Whitcomb stated traffic is a concern to him, expressing need to go south. Whitcomb asked if the City has considered what this traffic is going to do going south. Whitcomb stated he is asking for a bigger picture plan, that sending all of them to Bullion and Main and Myrtle and Main are going to cause an issue. Whitcomb stated his other problem is that all the southern access points are not very direct. Would like an explanation on why El Dorado is necessary.

[7:26:59 PM](#) Jeff Gardner, lives on Quigley, reiterates what Whitcomb said. Gardner asked if the schools were considered during the traffic study and that it really needs to be considered. Gardner loves the bike path; however, this Sunbeam is an island that only connects into Cutters. Gardner stated he is the individual who approached Stone regarding changing the phases and explained reason is to assist elk in the change and providing a buffer for them. Gardner asked if the city well would impact the county water. Gardner asked if the city has adequate infrastructure for the wastewater.

[7:30:05 PM](#) Martha Bibb, 810 CD Olena, has issue with traffic study. Thinks school route is an issue. The bike path dumping into her neighborhood, nowhere to ride during winter. Martha stated they need to do something to disperse traffic dumping onto Myrtle.

7:31:25 Rob Thomas, 621 E Carbonate, 2nd house on Carbonate, has known developer for 50 plus years. Would like to have traffic dispersed more. Worried about flood waters. Love bike path, but thinks going the wrong way down Carbonate suggesting looking at putting on Bullion instead.

[7:33:13 PM](#) Ed Harding, 460 Mother Lode Loop, is plowing the sidewalks part of their plan during winter. Ed asked if trips generated were per household or per subdivision. Ed asked about accounting for the traffic going by, that it was not incorporated in their studies. Ed disagrees with the city asking for the increase of density, does not think a higher density is appropriate for the area. Ed asked how many residences in total would there be.

[7:35:49 PM](#) Rachel Martin, 142 S Hiawatha, concerned about traffic on Myrtle due to school zone. Martin thinks the new bike/ped development should go all the way along Myrtle. Martin is concerned about the intersection at 5th and

Myrtle. Martin is concerned about traffic study not being based off of Old Cutters being fully built out. Martin asked if City had location for well.

[7:37:28 PM](#) Judy Morgan, 721 Myrtle, watching the numbers and graphs and does not feel there is enough human interaction. Morgan has lived in the valley for almost 30 years. Morgan stated new subdivision is not connecting with the surrounding neighborhoods in a safe way. Morgan expressed concern of no one having to stop. Morgan explained area is not developing in a way that has people stopping and looking for kids and dogs. Morgan stated it is designed to allow for people speeding through.

[7:40:26 PM](#) Angela Burrell, 393 Mother Lode Loop, understands concerns of access point but would like to address the El Dorado access point. Burrell discuss amount of turns it takes when use access points off Carbonate and El Dorado. that it is 5 turns of winding through subdivision when use access points off of El Dorado. Burrell does not feel it is necessary to impact remaining homes by drawing them in.

[7:43:10 PM](#) David Voss, 621 Bonanza, traffic on 6th street is high school for 7 months with no enforcement. Voss stated traffic study should address Buttercup, does not think they are considering amount of traffic going North and South. Voss discussed conditions during winter.

[7:44:41 PM](#) Jill Payette, 565 Mother Lode Loop, small lot sizes are more difficult to design and think there should be a study done on these lots to prove the potential development of these lots.

[7:46:09 PM](#) Jim Harrison, 721 E Carbonate, big part of traffic mitigation during non-winter months is going to be the bike path. Harrison stated to have the bike path on Bullion makes a lot of sense, the whole idea is connectivity to the main bike path. Harrison stated issue with traffic was based off of data in July when real traffic is during the school year. Harrison suggested to find a way to divert traffic more evenly.

[7:49:31 PM](#) Mary Ann Ward, 740 Bonanza Lane, has 3 points want to make. 1) high density housing in outskirts of town, 2) Curtis subdivision was platted as a neighborhood and road layout is convoluted and not designed for additional traffic and 3) concern of traffic increase on Bonanza. Ward asks the commission to review 1) re-examine plans for more affordable housing and placement of higher density 2) re-examine proposed traffic patterns for the proposed subdivision and 3) ask developers to fine tune analysis of potential traffic patterns on Curtis Subdivision.

[7:52:35 PM](#) Jess Goitiandia, 707 Bullion, compliments applicant team. Goitiandia asked for additional parking for Curtis Park. Goitiandia stated he is opposed to bike path dumping into Bullion for safety concerns. Goitiandia thinks the density is too great for the proposed area.

[7:54:13 PM](#) Paul Ries, 351 Eastridge, complimented applicant team. Ries expressed concern of traffic at intersection of Eastridge and Quigley Ries explained how Quigley was going to increase traffic and that traffic study showed it was not ok but now everything looks like it is ok. He does not understand how that is. Ries stated he thinks moving the bike path over through Curtis Park is a great idea. Ries relates to school traffic, particularly during lunch hours.

[7:56:17 PM](#) Charles Meyer, 150 8th Ave S, appreciates applicant effort. Meyer has issue is cottage unit placement, Lot # 8. Meyer asks that this cottage lot be relocated.

[7:58:44 PM](#) Nick Maricich 1720 Heroic, does live in Northridge and does not have good water. Maricich goes north on buttercup every morning that the traffic coming south doesn't seem to bad. Maricich also works in real-estate industry. Maricich explained how he and several others do ride their bike to the store. That this development is really in the community core. From marketing standpoint, there is a real need for affordable housing and middle-income housing. Maricich did have the project listed for two years and it was economically impossible for local developers so had started looking at more national developers. Maricich is really happy it has turned out this way with a local developer.

[8:02:47 PM](#) Kameron Spencer, 2551 Woodside Blvd, likes the subdivision supports it approval, that it has more parts than they need to develop. Spencer thinks the bike connectivity is great. Spencer stated also need to consider Hailey has a lot of small lots and it really is not that far removed from other neighborhoods in Hailey. Spencer stated the middle-income housing is really underserved. Spencer stated some of these road connections will also mitigate some of the traffic concerns, that some of it is a benefit to the community.

[8:05:37 PM](#) Beau Burks, 640 CD Olena Dr, lived in area for 49 years. Thinks this subdivision is a great idea, does not agree with road through El Dorado. Does think Myrtle is the answer. Ask the city to help mitigate the speeding and to who is responsible to keep the sidewalks clear during the winter. Full support as a Cutter's resident.

[8:07:23 PM](#) David Sundholm, this property was annexed into the city in 1981 and not a surprise it is being developed. There will be traffic for people living there, that yes can discuss ways to mitigate it. That there is a developer and team who have done more than they were required. Sundholm stated he thinks the applicant is doing best that they can.

[8:09:14 PM](#) Carol Thomas, 621 E Carbonate Street, built home in 1981 and new dead-end street would eventually be punched through. Believe that the streets planned into the subdivisions are very important for emergency access.

[8:10:20 PM](#) Rod Tomas, forgot that 6th street traffic needs to be addressed.

[8:10:55 PM](#) Judy Morgan, Myrtle Street, experience with cutters the cottages and sound. Asking if the sound will be better handled with the higher density.

[8:11:58 PM](#) Angela B., appreciate that they moved the large cottage lot along Carbonate.

[8:12:20 PM](#) Jill Payette, hate having no stop signs, suggested putting stop signs on all roads.

[8:13:14 PM](#) Jim Harrison, E Carbonate St, there is a lot of vegetation at the parking lot at Curtis Park. Does not know if need additional parking with bike path connection.

[8:14:08 PM](#) **Chair Fugate closed public comment.**

[8:14:35 PM](#) Horowitz address public concerns about traffic going south, connecting to the high school via the back way and potential traffic signals in the future. [8:15:31 PM](#) Hales stated they did not count traffic in July but in October and April. Hales explained school traffic was accounted for and that they brought up the traffic up based off July numbers. Hales stated he understands the traffic concerns and that they have tried to account for everything as much as they can.

[8:16:56 PM](#) Young stated a lot of traffic concerns that already exist based off what he heard. Young stated they talk to Mountain Rides about potential of bus stop along Quigley Rd but that is to be determined in the future. Young stated they had talked about developing pathway to Eastridge. Young explained additional steps the applicant team is taking above the requirements. [8:20:25 PM](#)

Stahlnecker noted that the design does include a sidewalk in lieu fee and that the city needs to determine what is most important to the community. Stahlnecker addressed snow removal concern on sidewalk and total number of units. [8:21:51 PM](#) Chair Fugate stated need to have a conversation about the water system, narrow down what the HOA is going to maintain. Chair Fugate appreciates and likes the solution applicant came up with for the sidewalks, future bus stop, relocation of cottage lots, water conservation. Chair Fugate asked Yeager if that would be enough reduction. Yeager explained if implement the proposed improvements for Northridge that it would increase the water pressure there to 45 psi and this project would drop it down to 43 psi, that meet DEQ requirements. Yeager explained he does not know the location of the new well.

[8:25:03 PM](#) Horowitz stated it is not the purpose of P&Z to go into these details.

[8:26:30 PM](#) Chair Fugate listed other items would like to address – traffic connections, traffic mitigation. Chair Fugate asked commissioners their thoughts on water system and traffic or if have any other concerns want addressed.

[8:27:02 PM](#) Scanlon stated Lawson laid out question of evening – are they going to require a secondary irrigation system. Scanlon does not think it is achievable. Scanlon stated he questions how they are going to regulate the amount of sod. Scanlon stated he thinks they need to decide about the secondary water/irrigation system, that he does not think it is feasible. Scanlon appreciates Spec's explanation on how it works. Scanlon does not know of another way to do

the connectivity. [8:29:55 PM](#) Stone thinks the main road- San Badger is going to take the brunt of the traffic. Stone prefers to keep the irrigation water for the park they are giving to the city. Stone believes relocating the larger lots around was intelligent and that he 3rd exit in phase 1 is going to help. [8:32:10 PM](#) Smith believes the irrigation for the park makes perfect sense. Smith complimented the applicant team. Smith asked about the reduced cottage parking requirement, if they would provide street side parking for visitors. Smith asked for more information on the CPA, if have moisture sensors installed what does that entail. Smith likes idea of limiting amount of sod. Smith stated hopefully about the new city well coming up. Smith asked the applicant to consider connecting to Carbonate instead of Grays Starlight during Phase 1. Smith stated may have ability to relocate the requested cottage lot in phase 1 without impacting it too much. Smith applauds the project and applicant. [8:36:59 PM](#) Pogue compliments the applicant and their staff. Pogue does not see a need for a separate water system, that being said worry about the canal bringing water to it during drought and not being able to enjoy the beauty of the park. Pogue stated they are going to need the Hiawatha canal, and hopefully they can depend on it for its lifetime. Pogue agrees with Smith that looks like going to need the well sooner than later. Pogue recommended they look at school roads and start to put stop signs on them. Pogue stated the different housing is important as we grow and that it is not that far outside of the city core. Pogue complimented staff and citizens. [8:41:24 PM](#) Chair Fugate with all that has been said. Chair Fugate complimented applicant, staff and citizens. Chair Fugate asked if next hearing they will be able to work out what the HOA will maintain and the concrete vs. asphalt. Chair Fugate agrees a single system is the only way to go. Chair Fugate stated park is appreciated. Chair Fugate Smith suggestion for traffic connection during phase 1 is a good idea. Chair Fugate appreciates new design, thinks that it is safer. Chair Fugate complimented the sidewalks. Chair Fugate stated she thinks reducing turf is good, complimented green build. [8:46:58 PM](#) Chair Fugate asked if the solar is going to be part of this. Applicant confirmed they anticipate putting in the CC&R's. [8:47:44 PM](#) Horowitz stated there are two choices to continue, March 2nd or March 16th. Chair Fugate will not be available on the 16th. Applicant confirmed can make deadline for March 2nd.

[8:50:28 PM](#) Stone motioned to continue the public hearing two and three to March 2, 2020. Scanlon seconded. All in favor.

PH 3 [5:38:24 PM](#) *Consideration of a Preliminary Plat Subdivision Application (Phase I) by Marathon Partners, LLC, represented by Samantha Stahlnecker, PE, of Galena Engineering, where Tax Lot 6655, Section 9 & 10, T2N, R18E, Hailey, is subdivided into 90 units on 70 lots. This includes development of four (4) cottage single-family lots (23 units in total), A 4.72-acre Park will be dedicated in Phase 1. The project is to be known as Sunbeam Subdivision and will consist of two (2) phases of development. This application is concurrent with a Planned Unit Development (P.U.D.) Application. **ACTION ITEM***

This was discussed at same time with PUD Application.

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: March 2, 2020

- DR: Silver River Residences
- PUD: Sunbeam
- PP: Sunbeam

[8:51:21 PM](#) Horowitz confirmed hearing on February 27th hearing.

[8:51:45 PM](#) Smith motioned to adjourn. Pogue seconded. All in Favor.