The regular meeting of the Hailey Planning and Zoning Commission was called to order at 6:30 p.m. by Commission Chair Kristin Anderson. Commissioners Stefanie Marvel, Elizabeth Zellers and Nancy Linscott were present. Commissioner Trent Jones was absent. Staff present included Planning Director Kathy Grotto, City Planner Diane Shay, and Deputy Clerk Tara Hyde.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

TAYLOR MADE SHOP BUILDING

An application by Scott Taylor for Design Review of a new, 2-story building, located on Lot 1C, Block 3, Airport West Subdivision (61 Jetstar Lane), in the Service Commercial Industrial-Industrial District.

Marc Corney, speaking for Mike Mattias, representative for the applicant, gave an overview of the plans presented. The new building calls for approximately 4000 square feet on the first floor and 1000 square feet on the second level. Five parking spaces are required for the project; the applicant is proposing six spaces. Plans call for man-doors on all sides and 3 overhead doors off the alley. A landscape strip is planned along Aviation Drive incorporating 5 Crabapple trees. Corney advised the applicant meets snow storage requirements and plans the installation of 2 evergreens to screen parking from Aviation Drive. The applicant plans to use small trash receptacles instead of a dumpster; the cans will be located inside the building with pick up off the alley.

Corney covered materials and colors planned. Top ridge vents will be made of cortense. The roof will be zinc colored. The upper level will sport light bark gray and brown board and batten. The fascia and the lower level will be a darker bark color. Beams, window boxes and awnings will be gray. Windows will be of aluminum clad brown wood. The lower wainscot presented is a corrugated galvanized metal siding. The silo shown on the building serves the function of collecting the wood dust for the shop.

Corney advised the building stands at 30’5”. Snow clips are planned over all public areas, and heated downspouts and gutters will lead to subsurface drywells. There are 10 external fixtures planned which will meet the Hailey Outdoor Lighting Ordinance. The alley elevation will incorporate galvanized gooseneck fixtures. All fixtures will house 60 watt bulbs (allowed with frosted glass fixtures).

There was discussion about encroachment of doors into the sidewalk area, as was a comment of the Building Official. Linscott asked for clarification of the doors opening out on Lear Lane. Grotto explained that Lear Lane is an easement and suggested the applicant may choose to change the doors on the Lear Lane side of the building to swing
in instead of out. Corney advised the applicant would probably just change those doors out to a window because the doors swinging in would interfere with plans for inside.

Diversity of landscaping was discussed.

Anderson opened the public hearing.

There being no public comment, Anderson closed the public hearing.

Marvel referenced color schemes, asking the best way for the Commission to view those colors prior to a meeting. Staff advised the color boards are usually available in advance of the hearing and can be looked at in the Planning office.

Linscott asked what activities the building would house. Scott Taylor said activities included millwork only. No painting or staining/finishing would take place on the property.

Grotto addressed the conditions, explaining that condition “d” had been addressed and could be removed. She suggested language be added to condition “e” allowing for any future dumpster.

Zellers moved to approve the application, finding conformance to the Comprehensive Plan, that the application does not jeopardize the health, safety and welfare of the general public, and conforms to the Design Review Guidelines specified in the staff report with the following conditions:

a) All Fire Department and Building Department requirements shall be met. Items to be completed at the applicant’s sole expense include, but will not be limited to, the following requirements and improvements:
   - Sidewalk width at location of exit doors shall meet International Building Code.

b) All City infrastructure requirements shall be met as outlined in Section 5 of the Hailey Subdivision Ordinance. Detailed plans for all infrastructure to be installed or improved at or adjacent to the site shall be submitted for Department Head approval and shall meet City Standards where required. Infrastructure to be completed at the applicant’s sole expense include, but will not be limited to, the following requirements and improvements:
   - Water and sewer connections per City Standards; inspections will be required.
   - New drywells per City Standards and state permit required

c) No exterior storage shall be allowed.

d) Any dumpster shall be screened on three sides with solid cedar fencing
or other materials matching the primary building.

e) All exterior lighting shall comply with the Outdoor Lighting Ordinance.

f) Automatic irrigation and ongoing maintenance of the landscaping shall be provided.

g) Any man doors on the west elevation shall swing inward when opening, or a vestibule shall be provided.

h) Except as otherwise provided, all the required improvements shall be constructed and completed, or sufficient security provided, before a Certificate of Occupancy can be issued.

i) The Planning & Zoning Administrator has the authority to approve minor modifications to this project prior to, and for the duration of a valid Building Permit.

Marvel seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN – LAND USE

Anderson called a five minute recess to allow the public to look at the map as presented.

Proposed amendments to the Land Use component of the Hailey Comprehensive Plan. Land Use examines existing and projected land uses as they relate to each other and their natural setting. The Land Use section includes a Land Use Map, which indicates suitable projected land uses for the city.

Shay gave an overview of the mapping exercise. She advised that a large group of citizens had met on December 16, 2004, and January 26, 2005, for the purpose of input into the mapping exercise. She added that much of the input had been incorporated into the text.

Shay explained that the December 16th meeting had been a 2 hour workshop, and involved the break down of the large group into smaller work groups which then met separately. The group met again on January 26th to explain their ideas. Changes to the map that came about from those work groups include identification of City boundaries, the addition of street names in the core for clarity of location, the line incorporating Transitional was made more fuzzy, neighborhood service centers were made more fuzzy, the airport was given its own color with text explaining, 4 community gateways were identified, and a disclaimer was added to explain that the map represented broad community goals. She indicated a representative from each group was at tonight’s meeting and asked each to give a brief summary of how they arrived at their ideas.
Aaron Domini advised his group had conceptually approached the growth issue, brainstorming broader goals. His group believed the downtown core should be more 3 dimensional, with gathering places and destinations; suggesting there should be 3-4 destinations to arrive at once in the core. Walk-ability within the core was important. They believed parking structures were needed. Community identification through gateways was important to them as was more flexible building and zoning, with smaller lot sizes. They believed density incentives should be created.

Domini stated his group addressed the moving of the airport, believing the property would be appropriate for an athletic complex and clustering of a residential development. They believed growth should run east and west, versus north and south, to compact the boundaries of the City. He suggested the importance of clustering development to protect the recreational, scenic, and agricultural uses now in effect.

Jim Phillips advised his group took a numbers approach to accommodate growth. They looked at how many lots were currently available and how many units would be available through subdivision. They looked at the number of units that could be provided through annexation of property. They addressed the airport property, believing the southern portion should be residential in nature; parks, common space and public uses should be looked at for the middle section of the current airport property; and higher density should be looked at in the northern portion, with berms and open space along the entire highway. They believed 480 units could be incorporated into the airport site. They suggested raising the density in the urban core through mixed use. He stated his group did not think annexations alone were the answer to accommodate the growth expected in the next 20 years.

Nancy Linscott explained that her group looked at flexibility of lot sizes, use of accessory dwelling units instead of high density units for infill, and traffic impacts. Some members of her group believed River Street should be incorporated in the north/south flow of traffic. Other members believed a bypass should be constructed to the east of the core for traffic mitigation. She stated the map presented at this meeting better incorporated the idea of Transitional fuzziness.

Shay summarized for George Kirk’s group. The group had looked at density in the core through smaller lot sizes. They worked on the premise the airport would stay where it is currently located. Expansion was looked at with priority given to the east, then the north, then west, and finally to the south.

Grotto addressed changes to the text associated with the maps. Text boxes formerly located on the map were expanded upon and incorporated into text of 5.0-Land Use. Goals were added addressing the Townsite Overlay to help retain the character of Old Hailey. Airport language was included advising that a master plan would be needed if the airport moves. She added that the Land Use section and the map should be revised when it is known what will happen with the airport. Section 5.4, Policy 2 added verbiage addressing 3 dimensional growth as suggested by Domini.
Implementations “j” and “k” were added addressing sidewalks and underground parking. Section 5.4, Policy 5.d was changed to allow for expediting sidewalks and pedestrian amenities in high traffic residential areas; 5.h was added for consideration of conservation designs to allow for creative design that preserves and protects sensitive areas; 5.i states lands to the east and north of the existing city limits should be considered as most appropriate for residential annexation. Policy 6 provides that institutional and public facilities shall be integrated within the community.

Grotto further shared the addition of “special planning tools” to 5.5 Overlay Districts. The Goal of 5.7 references appropriate housing densities; Implementation “d” looks at densities greater than 20 units per acre in the CBD and allows for community amenities to accompany developments with increased densities.

Marvel addressed the fuzzy Transitional (TN) area shown on the map; stating she was against Transitional (TN) zoning altogether, believing that residential neighborhoods get eaten up because offices tend to take over. She believed that TN zoning was leading to losing Old Hailey. She believed TN areas should be more defined as residential and business.

Anderson asked if the mixed use was facilitating loss of residential. Marvel stated that, in practice, residential is lost through TN zoning.

Anderson opened the public hearing.

John Dean, 1510 Heroic Drive, asked where the 14,000+ population figure came from.

Grotto advised the figure was estimated through the sewer plant capacity master plan studies.

John Gaeddert, 1 Quigley Road, thanked staff for inclusion of input from the public, and suggested the following changes: move the 2nd paragraph of 5.2 to the beginning of 5.2; make neighborhood service centers a sub-ordinance to the downtown core; in 5.3, change references from “we” and “our” to “City of Hailey”; and paragraph 3 in 5.3—change “will require” to “may require” because a factual analysis has not been done.

Gaeddert further recommended that options to address development in open or green space areas should include development agreements at the time of development to protect those areas, instead of the verbiage “land preservation agreements”. He asked what the word “oversight” meant in the next to the last paragraph of section 5.3. He also questioned the use of the word “spatially” in 5.4, Policy 2. He suggested removing TDR references from Policy 5.4, Policy 3.e, and questioned the use of the word “collector” in 5.6, Policy 2.c.

Gaeddert reminded that with regards to park space, the school fields are online and available for use. Marvel stated that the school fields are not included in City park space because they are not City owned.
Becki Keefer, 1221 Green Valley Drive, said that “land preservation agreements” is an umbrella term for many agreements; the list is not exhaustive and development agreements would fall under that umbrella. She advised that the collector routes are tagged for additional pedestrian/bicycle routes.

Jon Marvel, 316 Bullion Street East, asked why language addressing different lot sizes with developments was deleted from 5.4, Policy 5.a. Grotto advised the Council had changed the language in the Growth Management section. The Commission believed the language should be included. Marvel stated his belief that the TN zone was a failure, in effect creating a ghost zone in town, with offices repeatedly driving out residential. He listed other buildings in TN zoning that have no residential included.

Lili Simpson, 7 Quigley Road, referenced Section 5.4, Policy 5.h, asking who, or what entity, established sensitive areas. Anderson believed that would be better discussed with the Natural Resources application.

Evelyn Phillips, 20 Quigley Road, asked about Ketchum’s TN zone. Grotto indicated some type of transitional zoning was fairly common between full on business and residential. Grotto added that TN zoning might be addressed through a change to the uses, making residential mandatory.

Stoney Burke believed that TN zoning on the east side of Main Street should end at First Avenue.

Dan Henry, 316 Second Avenue North, expressed concern about how the City would put the density along River Street and east to Second Avenue. He suggested middle school traffic should be rerouted down First Avenue.

Anderson closed the public hearing.

Anderson expressed concern with the definition given for “transitional” under Section 5.2, believing it sounded good, but was not working in real life.

Marvel believed partial residential should be required in buildings located in the TN zone.

Anderson believed the intent of the TN zone should be included in the document.

Grotto gave a brief history of TN, stating the original TN zoning was established approximately ½ block around the Blaine County Court House. She added that actual uses within the district should be looked at through the Zoning Ordinance.

Linscott believed a percentage of residential should remain in TN zoning. She suggested modifying the language to allow a buffer to high impact businesses but not allowing TN
zoning adjacent to business use that is not high impact. She believed TN zoning should be looked at on a case by case basis.

Marvel believed it important to remember that TN is residential.

Anderson suggested removing the “stand alone” verbiage found in Section 5.3, third paragraph.

Grotto asked if the Commission thought the “land preservation agreements” language should be included. All Commissioners believed the language should be used as an umbrella term.

Marvel suggested removing Friedman Memorial Airport language dealing with relocation and expansion from Section 5.3.

There was discussion and explanation about the word “generally” being added to the goal of 5.4. Addition of the word allows for pockets of higher density within the fringe neighborhoods.

There was concern about the verbiage of 5.4, Policy 2, with the Commission believing the wording was vague. Grotto explained the Central Business District (CBD) was too linear, and she believed use of the word “spatially” equated to higher, wider and multi-dimensional in terms of use. Marvel believed the language should say what we really mean to avoid confusion.

Marvel referenced 5.4, Policy 1.e, suggesting a hard line on the Business district to keep from spill over to TN. She did not believe incentives were needed for infill development.

Linscott disliked the option of continuing expansion of a linear Main Street.

Grotto said she would look at the implementation items and rewrite them with words related to what the City is trying to accomplish. She referenced the addition of Domini’s comments including consideration of underground parking and additional pedestrian sidewalks and amenities within the CBD.

Marvel referenced Policy 5.d, believing sidewalks were needed in all areas, not just those experiencing high traffic. Anderson thought there should be some mention of priority; Grotto suggested verbiage of prioritizing the areas of high traffic.

Grotto suggested the addition to 5.h of language dealing with “rural character and cultural community assets/areas”, along with protecting sensitive areas. Linscott agreed the language should be added.

Marvel suggested restoring the word “public” to green space in Policy 7.a. Grotto said that public land could be a type of green space as included in the definition of green space.
Anderson referenced Policy 5.7-Goal, asking what “traditional” meant with relation to neighborhoods and public spaces. It was noted that traditional does not mean the same thing to everybody. Domini explained traditional neighborhood design dates to pre-WW2.

There was additional discussion about TN zoning for the map and text. Most agreed the fuzzy lines should be pulled in from the east and north. Zellers suggested further defining the text. There was agreement that the fuzzy lines were needed on the map with text to define the thoughts and address the concerns behind those fuzzy lines.

**Zellers moved to continue the application to the February 22, 2005 meeting.**
Marvel seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

**PURPOSE/NATURAL RESOURCES/RECREATION, PARKS & LANDS**

Proposed amendments to the Purpose section, the Natural Resources section and the Recreation, Parks and Lands section of the Hailey Comprehensive Plan. The Natural Resource element is an analysis of the uses of rivers and other waters, forests, range, soils, harbors, fisheries, wildlife, minerals, thermal waters, beaches, watersheds, and shorelines. The Recreation, Parks and Lands section is an analysis of recreation areas including parks, parkways, trails, riverbank greenbelts, and other recreation areas and programs. A map is also proposed for each section. *(continued from 1/3/05)*

Shay advised of the addition of language to Natural Resources, dealing with areas independent of land ownership or jurisdictional boundaries. She explained the addition of language addressing direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts of development on wildlife resources. Shay indicated the addition of language of continuous migration corridors and winter range, along with language addressing updates from appropriate agencies on natural resource inventories.

Shay explained the changes to the map and the legend.

Anderson opened the public hearing.

Alison Kennedy expressed concern that the land use map, showing residential development everywhere, was not addressing the impacts to the Natural Resources map. Anderson explained the maps would work in conjunction with other maps in an overlay, because of the amount of information presented on each.

Lili Simpson thought it important that an outside source be brought in, outside of Fish and Game, to do an analysis of where the wildlife moves.

Stoney Burke stated Roger Olson had done a GPS on mule deer crossings. Olson is currently out of town, but the information is forthcoming. He addressed Simpson’s concerns by stating that Pat Cudmore had done a complete study which was available to
the public. Simpson asked if it included non-game species also; Burke indicated it did.

Bob Jost, 351 Golconda Drive, believed wildlife corridors should be broad to allow animals to flux with development.

Shay advised language would be added that input from agencies should be updated continually with development of properties.

Terry Hogue asked if wildlife studies were being done out Croy Canyon too. Grotto advised if applications for development were received the applicants would be required to supply wildlife studies also. She added that general wildlife areas had been mapped out Croy Canyon also.

John Gaeddert asked, related to the maps, if the green space/green ways indicated were to tie the parks together. Marvel indicated that connectivity is part of the goal.

Jeff Pfaeffle, 409 Wall St, believed density and open space could be accommodated in the same area.

Anderson closed the public hearing.

Marvel suggested changing “range” to “uplands” in Natural Resources, page 2, para. 3. She recommended changing native “grasses” to native “plants” in Policy 2.1. She further suggested giving an incentive for watering of street trees in conjunction with upcoming metering.

Linscott suggested changing “discourage” to “prohibit” in Policy 1.1.2.2, more aligning it with 1.1.3.2-establishing penalties. She suggested referencing State laws governing weed control in 1.3.2.3. To 1.5.1, Linscott recommended adding “establish local environmental standards and ensure enforcement of all Federal…” She suggested changing “standards” to “regulations” in 1.5.1.6. Linscott thought tie in should be made to acknowledge Federal and State rules in 1.1.3.3.

Anderson added change to Section 1.0, para. 10 to read “…These areas are independent of land ownership or jurisdictional boundaries. Development must…”

**Linscott moved to continue the application to the March 7, 2005, meeting, for deliberation only, and that written comment would be accepted until 7 days prior to that meeting.** Zellers seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

**SUBDIVISION ORDINANCE #821 – HILLSIDE/AVALANCHE OVERLAY DISTRICT**

Proposed city-initiated text amendments to Subdivision Ordinance No. 821, adding references to Hillside and Avalanche Overlay Districts, and providing for in-lieu contributions for sidewalk improvements. **(continued from 1/3/05)**
Due to the late hour, Grotto suggested the application be tabled to date uncertain, and that if any Commissioners had ideas or suggestions, to please pass them on to her.

**Marvel moved to table the application to a date uncertain.** Linscott seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

Silver Street Place Design Review - Commissioners amended the Findings to include the requirement of additional egress from the residential units. **Marvel moved to approve as amended,** Linscott seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

**MINUTES**

The December 6 and December 20 minutes will be brought forward at the 2/22 meeting.

**Zellers moved to approve the January 3 and January 18, 2005 minutes as written,** Linscott seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

**STAFF REPORTS**

Grotto asked Commissioners to get back with her about which date worked best for training, March 19th or March 12th.

Due to an increased workload, Commissioners are being asked to pick up their packets. Hyde will advise when packets are complete and ready to be picked up.

**Zellers moved to adjourn,** Marvel seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 10:05 pm.