

Meeting Minutes
HAILEY PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
Monday, May 4, 2020
Virtual Meeting
5:30 p.m.

Planning and Zoning Commission

Please join my meeting from your computer, tablet or smartphone.

<https://www.gotomeet.me/CityofHaileyPZ>

You can also dial in using your phone.

(For supported devices, tap a one-touch number below to join instantly.)

United States: +1 (571) 317-3122

- One-touch: tel:+15713173122,,506287589#

Access Code: 506-287-589

5:30 PM Chair Fugate called to order.

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

Consent Agenda

CA 1 *Adoption of Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision of Preliminary Plat Subdivision Application (Phase I) by S.V. Flying Squirrels, LLC, represented by Bruce Smith of Alpine Enterprises Inc., for Quigley Townhomes, located at Lot 1A and Lot 2A of Quigley View Subdivision (631 East Croy Street), where Lot 1A and Lot 2A are subdivided into eight (8) townhouse sublots, located within the Limited Residential (LR-1) Zoning District. This project converts a condominium subdivision to a townhouse subdivision. **ACTION ITEM***

CA 2 *Adoption of Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision of a Design Review Application by Lena Cottages, LLC, represented by Chad Blincoe of Blincoe Architecture, for a 2,064 square foot, seven (7) bay garage building to serve seven (7) single-family cottage style units, located at Lot 9, Block 3, Old Cutters Subdivision within the General Residential (GR) Zoning District. **ACTION ITEM***

CA 3 *Adoption of Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision of a Preliminary Plat Subdivision Application by Lena Cottages, LLC, represented by Chad Blincoe of Blincoe Architecture, where Lot 9, Block 3, Old Cutters Subdivision is subdivided into seven (7) sublots. This project is located within the General Residential (GR) Zoning District. **ACTION ITEM***

CA 4 *Adoption of Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision of a Preliminary Plat Subdivision Application by ARCH Community Housing Trust on behalf of Blaine County, represented by Galena Engineering for Blaine Manor Subdivision, located at Lot 3A, Block*

1, Wertheimer Park (706 S Main St) where Lot 3A is subdivided into two lots, with an 11,755 square feet proposed public Alley Right of Way located on the northwest rear corner of the proposed Lot 1. This project is located within the General Residential and Hailey Townsite Zoning Districts. **ACTION ITEM**

Scanlon pulled CA2.

5:32 PM Pogue motioned to approve CA 1, CA3 and CA 4. Stone seconded. All in Favor.

Scanlon noted page 12 of the Report, the word approve is not included.

5:34 PM Scanlon motioned to approve CA 2 to be approved as amended. Smith seconded. All in Favor.

Public Hearing

PH 1 5: 35 PM Consideration of a Design Review Application by Tanner Investments, LLC represented by Samantha Stahlnecker of Galena Engineering for a six (6), two-story four-plex units. The proposed project will be located Lots 1-6, Block 86, Woodside Subdivision No. 25 (East side of Woodside Blvd. between Antelope Drive and Baldy View Drive), within the General Residential (GR) Zoning District- **ACTION ITEM**

5: 36 PM Horowitz turned floor to applicant to present. Stahlnecker introduced herself and provided a summary of the proposed project. Stahlnecker discussed some changes from original proposal – sidewalk, parking and setbacks. Stahlnecker went on to discuss a revised site plan they put together today – increased rear yard setbacks, relocated one building to center area and moving drive access further in. Chair Fugate clarified Stahlnecker stated applicant will accept this revised site plan if project is approved tonight. Stahlnecker confirmed. Stahlnecker went on to discuss new site plan- parameter sidewalk, recycling facilities, and reiterated increased rear setbacks. Stahlnecker proposed a new condition “n”. Scanlon asked about possibly moving building with 13 ft rear setback to center area and have the backs of the buildings facing each other. Stahlnecker stated she can confer with the applicant before deliberation. Stahlnecker went on to discuss rear view of the building facing Woodside Blvd and the side elevations of the buildings facing Woodside Blvd. Stahlnecker moved on to discuss proposed colors for the doors that add a pop-up color to the buildings. Stahlnecker confirmed applicant will meet the standards for the tree caliper required. Stahlnecker explained allowed for potential spaces in front of each building to be converted to ADA Parking. Stahlnecker explained CC&Rs will prohibit RV Parking. Stahlnecker stated the applicant plans to adhere to the drought friendly landscaping and plans to plant drought tolerant turf. Stahlnecker confirmed will work with Mountain Rides to meet all of their standards for a bus stop. Stahlnecker confirmed gutters will be same color as the trim. Stahlnecker confirmed applicant did decide to use floor plan as is.

Pogue asked about the necessities for the flag lots. Stahlnecker explained the previous layout and that Lot Line Adjustment is being reviewed administratively. Stahlnecker explained revised lots. Pogue applauds changes and agrees with Scanlon’s suggestion with moving the second building to the center.

Smith asked if street was public. Horowitz clarified not called private street but an access parking aisle. Smith explained not able to see revised site plan. Smith asked about the landscaping. Stahlnecker explained the more turf they can provide, the more area the families children would have to play. Smith asked about border around trees and trash receptacle. Smith suggested possible areas that could review to reduce water use.

Stone asked if the only color change was the door. Stahlnecker confirmed. Stone asked if the roof is going to shingles. Stahlnecker confirmed. Stone asked about the snow clips. Scanlon explained why he thought it was a good precaution to have snow clips.

Scanlon listed questions/concerns – change of door colors is a start, wonders if could make the window trim the same color? Use large building numbers in color to introduce more color. Does think there should be snow clips. Asked about drawing of trash enclosures. Does want to see water sensors used. 600PM

Chair Fugate explained need for more color. Chair Fugate asked Horowitz about the ADA parking. Horowitz stated she will double check with the building official.

Chair Fugate opened public comment.

6:00 PM David Anderson, 1340 Woodside Blvd, referenced letter written to the P&Z. The configuration directly affects their property, feels the development changes the harmony in the area. Point 1 is the traffic issue, discussing morning traffic. Point 2, the development is not contiguous with the surrounding neighborhood. Asking if this development considered plot zoning? If it is PHZ that within the state or subdivision guidelines. Scratched point 4. Note 7 of letter, during walk around the neighborhood with flyers only a small percentage had heard about the P&Z project. Those uninformed due to COVID had not gone out to get a paper or their mail. Ask as the group that P&Z allow them more time to mount a better defense if possible.

6:06 PM Michael Abbott, lives on Aspen Valley, – wondering why planning is worrying so much about the curb appeal, when this whole building area is affecting all the houses around it. Thinks that should be more of a priority than curb appeal. Think the buildings should be moved in more. These buildings are going to affect her backyard. That when bought these homes this was going to be a park. Asked if the elevation could not be so high. Also has a problem with the color of the buildings, does not blend in with the surrounding colors that are all earth tones. Also worried about the population in that area.

6:08 PM Kev Anderson, 1574 Baldy View Drive – Also has the same concern, could not tell if townhouses or apartments. Concerned about property values going down. Think will be traffic issue in morning. If these are apartments, these individuals will not have the same concerns as home owners. Wish had more time to consider it, felt very rushed to him.

6:10 PM Jeffery Jones, 1441 Woodside, lives directly across from proposed project and does not understand why traffic study has not been done. If correct, there are 33 covered parking and 39 parking structures. The parking when school is session and not in a COVID situation backs all the way to his house and this is going to back it up even further.

Where exactly is the access locations are located in connection to his property. The color of the buildings is horrendous.

6:11 PM Kim Bryson, 1510 Woodside Blvd – also very concerned how close they are. Not sure if these will be apartments or if rentals or to be sold. Concerned about possible limit on how many families in one unit? Colors are horrible, really thinks there needs to be a difference. Also concerned about the exterior lighting. Believes lighting should be required to be turned off when not in use. Concerned about the project overall, when bought, was told this would be a park.

6:13 PM Bo Kozen, 830 Antelope Drive- development happening in her backyard. Why are we building apartment units in single family home area? This will not improve the value but will bring the property value down. Appreciates effort of additional setbacks but really does not make a difference. Existing residents should not sacrifice all esthetics in view of the new development. If does get approved, need a stop sign at Baldy View and Antelope. Kozen asked what is going to happen to cars if have additional cars beyond the two parking spaces. Kozen was also told this would be a park when purchased her home. Thinks area should stay as single family.

6:17 PM Mary Keppler, stated she was able to see the plans last Thursday for this project, glad to see people involved are willing to make concessions. Her house is 20 ft from the property line, it becomes unusable space that close to the property line. To consider the proposed building being that close to her property line was very frightening. Does not think even with the additional space for some of the people who live around the parameter does not think it is enough room. Keppler expressed desire to see revised plan with additional buildings in center and suggested possibly putting parking along the parameter. All residents in area are being affected, know that their property values are going down and this project causes such an intrusion into their life they can longer live there.

6:19 PM Kathy Nice, 1431 Woodside Blvd, straight across from project, takes issue with entire project would be staring into a parking lot. Nice was told this would be park. Asked if this was an apartment complex, when first started was told this would be townhomes. Nice does not agree with it, this is a family-oriented family home section of Woodside, feels should stay that way. Why trying to shove six big buildings into that small of space. Definitely needs traffic study done before this goes forward.

6:21 PM David Seelig, 1320 Woodside Blvd, has not heard anyone talk about the 250 houses coming up from Croy Canyon, going to same place to get out of Woodside Blvd. The traffic is going to be a joke. Was told this would be a park. Its time for P&Z and the city to take care of those promises. A bunch of apartments going there will be a nightmare, he does not border the project but knows it will affect him. Its going to be a total nightmare for traffic. Those people who don't live there should not be making decisions for them.

6:23 PM Mary Roberson, 1580 Baldy View, this is to Tanners advantage that limited people knew about this due to COVID-19, she just found out on Friday. There needs to be more time, it is very biased. Was also told this would be park. This is for the profit of a few people. This is family-oriented neighborhood, not meant for an apartment. Why can't the developers build single family homes, won't make as much money is her guess. Roberson suggests to

postpone until people can come to the hearing. She has a lot of things need to say. The traffic is ridiculous. Why don't the commissioners go there at 7:00 am on a Monday morning. Would also like to do a study of the police presence in Woodside, believes not represented by the police as much as the rest of Hailey is. People speed on Woodside Blvd. Wants this delayed until they can participate face to face as should.

6:25 PM Matt and Vicki Pitcarin, Woodside Blvd, agrees with several people already spoken. Bamboozled with this thing, believes Tanner took a great time to drop this on them. Traffic will be an absolute nightmare. Asked if this is not the 2nd busiest road in the entire county. Asked for more time to mount a defense against this. Would not have known this was going on if someone had not put a notice on their door. Was told this was going to be a park too. Ok if it is not going to be a park, but make it single family. Does not matter what color the buildings are, they are hideous. Asked if this could be put on hold until they could get more information.

6:29 PM Tony Nice, 1431 Woodside Blvd, been here a long time has studied the traffic, road along with the police to figure out they need. Police always like to watch the traffic when it is not the time for people leaving or going to work. Why did the City when built the grass side Blvd. need to keep this as a family area not a Balmoral type area? Does not know who is going to rent these places, could park on Baldy View. Who takes care of renters? Who's responsible if 6-10 renters in one unit? Park looked good, believes city hid it.

6:31 PM Caroline Nutter, 441 Aspen Valley Drive, buildings are directly in her backyard. Increase of noise, being two stories high buildings in back yard block view of her house. Round about congestion is really bad at peak hours, it takes her 7 min to go a half mile at its worse. This will change the neighborhood dynamic. Does not approve of the aesthetics.

6:32 PM David Seelig, stated virtual meetings are wrong, this should be on hold until can meet in public. Would not have know about this except for notice on his door. Commission needs to think about the 200+ homes from Croy Canyon.

6:33 PM Chair Fugate closed public comment.

Horowitz confirmed the project met all required noticing and explained that the governor has allowed for remote meetings in Idaho. Chair Fugate asked Horowitz if she has any idea why people feel they did not get proper notice. Horowitz suggested its possible that they may not have been within the 300 ft. Stahlnecker stated that they appreciate all comments and understands this is a complicated time. Stahlnecker noted that they are not proposing a zoning change, that they are meeting the setback requirements of that zone. They are trying to exceed t hose and do everything they can do be sensitive to the surrounding neighbors. Stahlnecker noted this property is close to multifamily housing in others in Woodside. Gary Slette thinks it is important for the commission and neighbors to note that this property was non-conforming when Woodside was developed. Slette provided a brief history of this property, that it was rezoned from LB to residential. Slette explained Tanner Investments bought this property understanding that it was residential and that they knew what the zoning laws allowed. Slette explained changes to the plan. Slette stated they are in compliance with the zoning requirements with the density.

Slette summarized how the project complies with the zoning requirements and attempts to be considerate to the neighbors. Slette explained that the Tanners deserve the fair hearing. Chair Fugate asked Stahlnecker about exterior lighting and if she could point out the access location. Stahlnecker explained exterior lighting, that will be downlight fixtures at each unit that this is residential lighting for each unit. Stahlnecker explained location of access points. Chair Fugate asked Stahlnecker about the possibility if it would be helpful if one access points was one way. Stahlnecker believes it would be concentrating the issue. Stahlnecker does not believe required to provide a traffic study as this project is meeting the requirements. Stahlnecker believes it would be an issue to police the one-way access. 6:47 PM Simms stated he is sensitive to the public comment, that he is very comfortable with the compliance of the legalities. Simms understands this is not the same as an in-person meeting and does not know when will get back to those. Simms stated with the comments heard tonight and what he observed at the last hearing, that they were clear that they would like to see this pulled off the property line. That drawing was just received today. Simms asked about possibility to work with the applicant to work with Staff to continue to another meeting.

Chair Fugate asked for commissioner comments. Pogue recommends a delay so can process the new plan received today and recommends the additional unit be brought into the interior. Pogue's other concern is the starkness of the units, would like to see more color than just the front door. Pogue noted that neither plan submitted showed trees that did not meet the number and caliper of trees. Smith would like to see an updated landscape plan that is compliant and minimize turf. Smith would like to see sensors used to minimize water usage. Smith agrees, more colors than just doors. Smith likes the idea of having more time as he has not been able to see the new iterations with the buildings in the center, suggest a to continue to a date certain. Stone was expecting at this hearing, a last-minute lot line shift to incorporate the number one concern by neighbors with no time for staff to review is not satisfactory. Stone hopes when comeback know what the shingles look like, have more color, other issues with tree commission and planting are addressed. Stone is interested in statements from neighbors and does believe them when they say they are feeling the pain of being in a single-family oriented area but that the zone does allow for. Stone thinks they should be going out of their way to follow the recommendations and if does not have the paper work ready not to present. Scanlon believes have adequately proven the legality of the project going forward but believes it could be softened, more color and a better landscape plan. Scanlon agrees with other commissioners and that a 10-day delay is not going to make that much of a difference. Chair Fugate agrees with what has been said and would like to reiterate that although this is compliant and meets the standards but that this commission wants to be sensitive to neighbors around the project. Chair Fugate summarized they would like to see a revised plan potentially moving the 2nd building to the center, believes the design is subjective but addition of color would help soften it, a sample of the shingles, snow clips and landscape plan that includes some trees that provide a buffer. Pogue stated would like to see issue with water sensors and irrigation. Smith and Scanlon agree. Stone asked if required. Horowitz confirmed not required. Staff, applicant, and commissioners discussed date to continue project too.

7:02 PM Smith motioned to continue the public hearing to May 18, 2020. Scanlon seconded. All in Favor.

Horowitz noted that it is unlikely we will get to the McMinn project tonight. Commission motioned to continue to May 18, 2020.

PH 2 **7:03 PM** *Consideration of a Design Review Application by Blaine County, 1,720 square foot new two-story mixed-use building to consist of a 288 square foot office and 572 square foot storage on the first floor and an 860 square foot one-bedroom residential unit on the second floor. This project is located at 302 S 1st Avenue (Lot 13A, Block 22, Hailey Townsite), within the Transitional (T) and Townsite Overlay (TO) Zoning Districts. **ACTION ITEM***

Horowitz introduced Courtney Hamilton, Interim City Planner. Horowitz turned floor over to Jolyon Sawrey. Sawrey introduced project summarizing proposed mixed-use building – residential unit on second floor and main floor will be office space. Sawrey noted one revision to drawing and that will go over it. Sawrey pointed out location of project, how the unit will be accessed from the alley. Sawrey noted that the apple tree was incorrectly labeled and is actually a pear tree that will be replaced. Sawrey discussed exterior coloring for new building and materials to be used. Sawrey confirmed fence along North side and between the parcels will remain. Sawrey discussed parking spaces to be improved. Sawrey pointed out location of snow storage. Sawrey discussed the drainage that has been amended done by Galena Engineering and that it was noted by Yeager to not hold project up due to drainage as it will be resolved. Sawrey discussed staging and amendments needed. Sawrey discussed the layout of the 1st and 2nd floor of the interior of the building. Sawrey discussed the architecture that adds to the character of the building, lighting, gutters, downspouts, drywells, snow fences.

Pogue is concerned with alley access for tenant, that on snow days what happens when it needs to be graded. Sawrey stated believes it is city requirement is that the owner's responsibility. Sawrey went on to discuss the mechanical and energy efficiency proposed. Smith asked about drawing #6, the west view highlights the corner trim and belt line in dark green. Smith asked if this was a mistake. Sawrey confirmed belt is green matching the trim. Stone confirmed that the city will not plow the alley way and did hear Sawrey's response but concerned with how and where the snow is going to go. Stone asked what the distance is between the current house and this proposal. Sawrey does not have the exact distance but estimates close to 16'. Stone asked if there is any requirement to submit landscaping plans. Horowitz explained that staff felt what was submitted was sufficient but commission can ask for more. Stone is interested in plan for rest of property. Stone asked for applicant to address whether or not there are any problems with the conditions of approval proposed. Sawrey provided assumption that snow would be piled and where it would go. Sawrey discussed the landscape plan and thought process. Sawrey moved on to discuss the conditions proposed and he did not have any issues with ones he was in charge of responding too a -o. Scanlon asked if the one on the lower corner is actually the east view not west. Sawrey confirmed. Scanlon confirmed that they have enough snow storage. Sawrey confirmed. Scanlon asked if possible, to create more shadow line along the plainer elevations, especially from Walnut Street. Scanlon request to see the spec sheet on the HVAC units are going to be 100% more efficient and the lower u value of the windows. Sawrey discussed the elevations and his personal opinions. Sawrey is not able to say on behalf of the applicant if can do more as

not aware of their budget. Sawrey discussed location of guard rails. Sawrey confirmed will submit the cutsheets as conditions. No further questions.

Chair Fugate opened public comment.

No comments.

Chair Fugate closed public comment.

Chair Fugate summarized areas of concern. Chair Fugate asked Scanlon if taking in consideration of fence if still need to have more interest. Scanlon confirmed. Chair Fugate asked if comfortable with energy issue assuming specs submitted are appropriate. All agreed. Chair Fugate confirmed with addition of new drainage and construction plan if that is satisfactory. All agreed. Smith noted that the new drainage is already a condition. Horowitz suggested condition j could be amended by staff regarding snow storage in ROW. Staff and commission continued to discuss conditions. Horowitz verified new conditions of approval. 7:45 PM Chair Fugate confirmed will amend condition j. Horowitz confirmed.

7:48 PM Stone motioned to approve the Design Review Application by Blaine County for a new 860 square foot garage and office space with an 860 square foot, one (1) bedroom Accessory Dwelling Unit above. The project is located at 302 S First Avenue (Lot 13A, Block 22, Hailey Townsite), 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 Title, and City Standards, provided conditions (a) through (q) are met. Smith seconded. All in Favor.

PH 3 Consideration of a Design Review Application by Kevin and Stefanie McMinn represented by Owen Scanlon Architects, for a new two story with basement mixed use building to consist of a 2,312 square foot dental office located on the first floor and two two-bedroom residential units on the second floor for a total of 1,633 square feet with a 1,512 square foot basement, with a total of eight parking stalls. This projected is located at 801 N 1st Avenue (Lot 2, Block 1, Taylor Subdivision) within the Business (B) and Downtown Residential Overlay (DRO) Zoning Districts. **ACTION ITEM.**

7:03 PM Stone motion to continue the public hearing to May 18, 2020. Pogue seconded. All in Favor.

Staff Reports and Discussion

SR 1 Discussion of current building activity, upcoming projects, and zoning code changes.

SR 2 Discussion of the next Planning and Zoning meeting: May 18, 2020.

- DR: Fire Safety House
- Text Amendment: Title 13

756 Scanlon motioned to adjourn. Stone seconded. All in Favor.