

**MINUTES OF THE
HAILEY PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
Monday, March 19, 2007**

The meeting of the Hailey Planning and Zoning Commission was called to order at 6:30 p.m. by Commissioner Chair Stephanie Marvel. Commissioners present were Commissioner Vice-Chair Elizabeth Zellers, Commissioners Owen Scanlon and Michael Pogue. Commissioner Nancy Linscott was excused. Staff present were Planning Director Kathy Grotto, City Planner Diane Shay, and Staff Assistant Becky Mead.

Public Hearings:

Blocks 86 & 61 Rezone

An application by Dave Anderson/Sprenger, Grubb & Associates for an amendment to the Hailey Zoning Map. The application would change the zoning of Lots 1-7, Block 86, Woodside Plat 25, from Business (B) to General Residential (GR); and Lots 1A and 2A, Block 61, amended Woodside Plat 15, from General Residential (GR) to Limited Business (LB), subject to a development agreement limiting the uses to residential only.

Lots 1-7, Block 86, Woodside Plat 25 (approx. 2.4 acres) from Business (B) to General Residential (GR)

Michael Pogue recused himself to represent the applicant, David Anderson of Sprenger, Grubb & Associates. Pogue stated the first parcel (Block 86) had a previous rezone proposal for Neighborhood Business (NB). They are now proposing to downzone to General Residential (GR).

Lots 1A and 2A, Block 61, Amended Woodside Plat 15 (approx. 3.4 acres) from General Residential (GR) to Limited Business (LB) subject to a development agreement limiting the uses on the property to residential (with a base density of up to 20 units per acre).

Pogue stated some of the permitted uses were single family and multi-family dwellings. He stated that it addressed the Comprehensive Plan, *Section 5.4 Land Use Districts, Goal: To provide for a balanced mix of land uses suitably related to each other and their natural setting. Include sufficient space in all types of districts to accommodate future growth. Direct density of development towards the community core, with increasing green space and generally decreasing density toward the edges of the community and within the Area of City Impact.* He stated there would be no commercial use on this property. Pogue pointed out that this rezone also addressed the Comprehensive Plan, *Section 6.1 Central Business District*; Pogue stated this rezone would eliminate a business zoned parcel outside the Central Business District; *7.1 Population Increase: I. Goal: Ensure that increasing total population does not diminish the quality of life in Hailey and its environs.* Pogue stated the rezone would accommodate the growth and would be compatible to the surrounding areas.

Grotto announced there was a similar rezone done in 2004 for Sweetwater. This rezone would be like a swap; a compromise situation for the surrounding neighborhoods.

Scanlon asked why they chose Limited Business (LB) instead of Neighborhood Business (NB). Anderson replied “for the density.”

Public Hearing Opened

Kellsie Hill, 830 Antelope Drive, stated to the applicants that she was in complete support of the change and thanked them for the compromise.

Tony Nice, 1431 Woodside Boulevard, asked about the parcel to be zoned General Residential (GR).

Grotto stated the allowable uses for General Residential (GR).

Public Hearing Closed

Scanlon agreed with Hill’s comment as far as the compromise. Zellers concurred.

Marvel stated this rezone would work for the City and she felt that it was appropriate.

Scanlon motioned to recommended the zone change of Lots 1-7, Block 86, Woodside Plat 25 (approx. 2.4 acres) from Business (B) to General Residential (GR), and Lots 1A and 2A, Block 61, Amended Woodside Plat 15 (approx. 3.4 acres) from General Residential (GR) to Limited Business (LB), subject to a development agreement limiting the uses on the property to residential (with a base density of up to 20 units per acre); Based upon the Hailey Comprehensive Plan, Section 5.0 Land Use, Section 6.0 Economic Development, Section 7.0 Population, and Section 12.0 Growth Management, as stated in the staff report.

Zellers seconded the motion; the motion passed unanimously.

Life Church for Annexation & Rezone of “Life Springs”

The current legal description of the property is Tax Lots 7734, 6879 and 6880, located at the northwest corner of the intersection of McKercher Boulevard and Main Street. The parcel is currently zoned Residential in the County. The proposed zoning is Transitional (TN) and the proposed use is for a church. **(Continued from February 20, 2007)**

Scanlon recused himself as he is a neighbor to the applicant.

City Planner Diane Shay announced after the last hearing for the Life Church had adjourned, Commissioner Linscott approached the applicants to share her concern regarding the buildings commonly referred to as the “Forest Service Buildings” that are presently located on Main Street (where the large pine trees were removed this last spring). The applicants began a dialog with John McGowen who owns that property and who are now are in negotiations with him to move those buildings to the rear of the Life Church property. A rendering of the property with the buildings on it was submitted on March 15, 2007.

On March 16, 2007 Shay received a couple of diagrams of what the conceptual layout of the church would be, as well as a phasing plan, a memo from Pastor Hendricks and a set of three (3) separate scenarios the applicants were considering.

John Gaeddert presented the application for Life Church. He stated this was the fourth hearing; he did a recap of the previous hearings. They have presented three different options to choose from for rezone. Gaeddert stated what he heard from the public is they support the church being built. All three scenarios contain a development agreement stating there would be no commercial uses and very limited opportunities for commercial within the Transitional (TN) zoning. Gaeddert spoke about the phasing plan of the church and mentioned the church would be similar to the size of the Meriwether building. He noted that when the County looked at their layout in the past it was much bigger and there was also no traffic signal installed at that time.

Gaeddert stated that Linscott approached the applicant at the end of the last meeting and told them that she and her husband had bought two of the "Forest Service Buildings". She suggested the church should consider having the remaining three buildings; she thought the designs would work well on the church property. Gaeddert stated a letter of intent was being composed with the help of John McGowan, who is representing the owner of the lot, and wished to donate the three buildings to the church. Gaeddert showed a simulation of those three buildings on the property.

Gaeddert noted the difference between Option 1, 5.26 acres as church property and Option 2, 6.06 acres as church property. He spoke about the property next to Marketron to be zoned Transitional (TN). He pointed out other employers who have expanded in the area throughout the years, as Marketron could possibly do. Gaeddert recapped the idea to relocate the forest service buildings, to limit the church property, and/or zone it General Residential (GR). Within all the options the City would have Design Review control. He spoke about the concerns with the street lot, and mentioned there were no current plans and is subject to annexation by the City. He mentioned they were willing not to annex it; and his final point was the instrument contained three legal descriptions that combined to create the 10.86 acres. Gaeddert stated the applicant would have to obtain a record survey to amend the legal for the portions of the property that would remain in the County, and what would be annexed into the City; an administrative process for record survey.

Shay placed a phone call to Linscott who was in Kansas and Linscott was put on the speaker phone for participation. She stated that Linscott requested to be reached so she could be present via phone for this application. She asked Linscott, for the record, to disclose her ex parte.

Linscott stated after the last meeting with this application, she thought there might be an opportunity that could provide some all around solutions to the number of challenges that were faced by the City and the applicant. She spoke about the three (3) Forest Service Buildings that she considered were historic or treasured assets by a lot of people. She thought the Life Church could salvage those buildings and place them on their property in an arrangement that would retain their rural, natural resource heritage. Linscott thought the people of the City would like to have these buildings as City heritage. The City

would have a nice gateway entrance having those buildings on the Main Street lot. Linscott spoke to Grotto and Shay who encouraged her to speak to applicants regarding this. She also stated that she had an opportunity to speak to one of the builders of the Forest Service Lot and asked if they had heard from the applicant but he had not. She spoke to Gaeddert and asked if they were able to move forward with this idea. Linscott stated that while viewing the applicants' schematic concepts she had comments. She asked Marvel if she should continue and Marvel replied that she would like to hear from Shay and then hear the Commissions' comments.

Shay had an opportunity to speak with Becki Keefer, after reviewing her memo that was in the packet from March 14th, representing the Parks and Lands Board. Shay stated in their opinion, the RGB piece that was located at the back of the lot appeared to be a leftover piece and didn't appear to be open to the public. She suggested the possibility of the RGB piece to be located to the west and moved to the front of the property, with the Forest Service Buildings arranged on that lot. The Parks and Lands Board would be much more favorable for the RGB piece to be placed on the front lot, servicing as a Forest Service Park and creating more of a gateway into the City. Shay stated she mentioned this idea to Keefer and she said the board would be favorable to that idea.

Shay mentioned to the public, they might think this was awkward to have a Commissioner on the phone. She reported there was a City Council meeting held in November with no quorum; in order for a quorum they contacted another Council Member who was in Viet Nam, via phone, to complete the quorum. She stated the laws were reviewed to confirm that a member could be present via phone.

Marvel asked Shay when she was referring to the front of the lot, if she was referring to the lot on Main Street. Shay replied yes and suggested the church could come into the City as one piece.

Zellers asked Shay was the reason the County would not let them build because of the septic system. Shay stated that she wasn't sure if there were any further conversations with Bob Erickson from the County. Gaeddert stated he took Erickson's comments from the last meeting, that Erickson had never made a decision regarding the septic system. In 2002 the church approached Erickson about having a 6,000 sq ft building on septic. Gaeddert stated Erickson referred to the Plumber's Code and denied such a septic permit. Gaeddert asked the Commission if they would ask Staff to ask the Council if they would ever consider hooking up this property into the City. Gaeddert stated that assuming that they must have the Forest Service Buildings on the front lot, or assuming that none of the options proposed would work for the Commission, then they would ask the Commission to say no and they would go to the County with their application.

Pogue commented that the church had done a lot of work on this proposal and he was curious what the advantages were to the applicant's point of view, as opposed to simply going to the County and requesting the Conditional Use Permit and asking the County what they could do. Gaeddert stated they would like to have the church hooked-up to the City's water/sewer. Gaeddert pointed out the applicant's only goal here is to build a church. Pogue asked, then the question is what is going to happen to the rest of the property. Gaeddert stated they would propose whatever the church is willing to do.

Whether it's in the County or it's in the City, it's a church. If it's in the County, then it's septic and stated that he didn't think that was the best thing for the environment. It would be better for the church to hook up to the City's water/sewer system versus creating a whole septic system and drilling a well. He pointed out a schematic layout prepared as a concept. The advantage of carving this property up was being more responsible with the environment. Pogue asked what would be planned for the remaining parcels, i.e. the parcel on Hwy 75. Gaeddert stated they didn't have plans for that parcel and decided for that parcel to remain in the County. Pogue asked what the difference was between Option 2 and Option 3. Gaeddert replied, the zoning on the church property. One is General Residential (GR) and one is Transitional (TN), which could be with conditions. Pogue asked the applicant if they had any interest with the Forest Service Buildings. Mike Hendricks stated they had thought about the different uses for those buildings. They could be used as a youth building, or they could be used for their women's and children's meetings and also for office space. Pogue stated these buildings were mentioned as a suggestion and wanted to know if the applicant was including them as some sort of an appeasement or if they were really interested in their uses. Gaeddert stated it was an economic decision and felt they would add character to the property and appreciated the donation and concept that was suggested to them. Pogue referred to the RGB section that was tacked on to the rear of the church property. He asked what was the goal for that. Gaeddert stated that use provisions haven't been discussed for that yet. Pogue asked where the access would be or how would one access the parcel. Gaeddert stated it would be with public use provisions within the church's access.

Linscott commented on the Main Street parcel. She stated that when she approached the applicant about the Forest Service Buildings, she had envisioned them as part of the Main Street parcel. Linscott suggested an annexation agreement and CC&Rs that would limit future development on Main Street, to the Forest Service type layout and design to create a feeling of a rural nature at the entrance to the City. Linscott referred to Keefer's comments regarding a tucked away park would outweigh the access requirements. She stated her main concern would be the lot retained a historic, rural purpose, in its entirety. She felt the church's design should compliment that. Linscott stated what she would like to see would be the City's control over the Main Street lot with design and density complementing each other; the neighbors would not feel encumbered by an overwhelming density and have a preservation of natural areas. She asked what the vision of the applicant's design would be that would compliment the Forest Service Buildings.

Gaeddert stated he wasn't sure how the church motif could accommodate a forest service scale, given sanctuary needs, etc. He stated it would be a challenge but wasn't saying that they wouldn't take a hard look at that idea. Gaeddert noted that in his presentation the proposal was for a total footprint of 14-15 thousand square feet with a total gross floor area of 28 thousand square feet. He stated he wasn't sure with the Forest Service scale and motif if a sanctuary could be drawn to match.

Marvel was concerned the new application had not answered their concerns from the previous meeting. She stated that in particular, the application did not seem to meet the requirements of the *Annexation Procedure, Ordinance No. 889, Purpose, Section 14.01.010 The City of Hailey finds that the establishment of annexation procedures will*

promote uniformity and certainty in annexation applications and that the establishment of annexation procedures will promote the public health, safety and general welfare. Unless there are compelling reasons, the applicant shall submit plans and applicable studies for all components of the proposed annexation. She did not want to recommend this application for annexation at this time. Gaeddert spoke about the property located next to Marketrion and mentioned it could be a potential parking lot or potential office space in the future.

Public Hearing Opened

Geoffrey Moore, 406 First Avenue South, stated it seemed like it was the same proposal and didn't think the annexation should happen.

Sandy Kelly, 106 N. Angela Dr. appreciated Moore's comments. She stated she would applaud a church as a neighbor, but wanted to see more. She mentioned she owns a well and would like to see City sewer over County septic.

Peter Lobb, 403 Carbonate Street East, commented he hadn't seen more of a mess to an application than this one. He suggested letting the County deal with this. He spoke to Bob Erickson and Erickson was under the impression this would be a 6,000 square foot church. He thought the County would approve this one since it was a smaller structure. The City fees would increase if we annexed it and suggested to leave it in the County. Lobb thought the Forest Service Buildings looked like a legal bribe. He stated the City had no obligation to finance a church.

Patricia Weaver, 101 Mountain View Lane, Rivergrove Subdivision stated she attended the presentation given by the church and thought it was very nice. She suggested, what if the City would allow a sewer connection so the property could stay in the County. Weaver asked if it would be allowable for a septic tank with City water hook-up; she had never heard of this before. Weaver stated she had an issue about the square footage of the church. She wasn't clear about the septic tanks being put in because of the foundation. Weaver's final comment was that she wanted to see the land left in the County.

Paul Conrad, 1320 Heroic Rd. is not in favor of this proposal and felt this was stifling the possibilities for Hailey. He stated he didn't like the plan; he felt that it was cut up and didn't seem to be really working for everyone. He commented that the church was a good idea, but they needed to work out a big plan, a big picture, with the proper planning.

Suzzie Sander, 114 Empty Saddle, said she stated at the last meeting her reasons as being opposed to the annexation; she thanked Marvel for her comments. She stated that she needed to see exactly what was being proposed and where.

Brian Christiansen, 110 Bayhorse Drive in Bellevue, stated the zoning was in transition or in limbo. Looking at the master plan it was difficult to decide if it could be annexed or not. He stated he had lived in the County since 1972. He received a letter from the County to monitor the sewer systems in town and to preserve water quality. Christiansen thought it was a great idea for City to hook up, and was for the annexation.

Doug Finn, 105 Mountain Lane, said he appreciated the church listening to the public. He was against the annexation, but was looking forward to having the church as a neighbor. They have a lot of squatters in the RGB area to the west. He commented it was too bad the County and the City couldn't come to a compromise.

Trina Isiacs, 3241 Woodside Boulevard, said she thought it was important for the City to have control as to what would be a gateway into the City and also for environmental concern. She stated she was in favor of the annexation.

Wess Price, 22 Muldoon Canyon, stated he was in favor of the annexation. He thought that it made sense to hook up to a City water/sewer system. He mentioned that he had worked for the jail for many years and had seen how the church helped out the people in the jails with the youth outreach.

Mark Merriate, 607 Cottonwood St. thought the church is looking at what's best for the people and for the City. He stated there is a need for a new church because they are cramped where they are now. He stated that he supported the annexation.

Owen Scanlon, Angela Drive, stated his property was right next door and there remained rules and regulations to be followed for the property to be annexed. He stated this annexation should not be taken lightly because what happens will affect the years to come. Scanlon stated he agreed with Marvel's statements of following proper procedures. He would like to see a church but said there were procedures and policies that needed to be met.

A letter was read by Sandy Kelly from Matt Well, 202 Empty Saddle Trail, who was opposed to the annexation. Kelly read another letter from Christina Cole, another neighbor, who was also opposed to the annexation.

Geoffrey Moore, 406 So. First, was curious if the applicant would get another extension and another and asked when the applicant would be closed down. Moore asked how many tries do they get to get it right.

Diana Whey, 211 E. Silver Street, stated the church was given this property and the church wanted to accommodate the City. She stated the church would be giving to the City by giving them snow removal land; the church cares for the homeless and also gives to the community who are in need. She supported the annexation because the County didn't want to approve them for a septic. Her final statement was they didn't have enough room in their present church location.

Alan Romine, 317 N. 7th St., Bellevue, stated he is a member of the church. He stated he has attended all of these meetings for the annexation and was looking at the water/sewage problem and didn't think that it made sense to have another septic tank. He noted the City would grow and expand at some point, and thought they would remain in control by this annexation. Romine stated Marketron is in the City and would expand. If they couldn't expand where they are at now, then they would leave and that would take a lot of employment away.

Evelyn Albright, 148 East 620 North, Shoshone, spoke about the section of land that was undeveloped and thought it was an eyesore. She stated the church was cramped and they needed a new church. She didn't think the land would stay empty because it is too valuable. She stated that she is in favor of the annexation.

Paul Webster, 105 Angela Drive, felt it was too much land to be annexed for a church. He disagreed that the land was an eyesore.

Peter Lobb, 403 Carbonate St. East, stated there seemed to be an implication that somehow the church members were more moral than the general community. He stated that was absurd. Lobb said that he could bring people in to say that the church was a wonderful institution; and he could also bring people in that would say this was the height of ignorance and superstition, but it was purely subjective. He commented "to say the church is needed is subjective, not relevant."

Shay stated she received Scanlon's letter. Shay also received a letter from Daniel & Nicole Lively, 3220 Woodside Boulevard, who were in agreement of the annexation. They felt the residential housing didn't make sense at the busy intersection. They were in support of the Transitional (TN) zoning. They commented on five services the church provided.

Marvel asked Gaeddert for his response to the comments. Gaeddert asked if the Commission would look at Option 1; Section 2.11 of the annexation agreement; it stated *upon annexation, the applicant shall file a record of survey that would eliminate the existence of the remaining three tax lots and property subscribed the definition of subject property as 5.26 acres.* Life Church owns 10.68 acres and the subject property would be half of that; the process would be upon annexation, a record of survey would be filed and the three lot lines would be removed. They would be re-described as Parcel A, adjacent to the highway, Parcel B would be annexed into the City, and Parcel C, would be the property between McKercher Boulevard, River Street, Mountain View Subdivision and Marketron. Gaeddert stated the County could do this. If there was a will there would be a legal instrument to do it.

Zellers asked if there was some kind of order to be followed. Gaddert stated no and mentioned that Airport West was an addition to the annexation with a performance clause for a certain amount of time.

Zellers asked if the City would allow a utilities hook up being on County property; Grotto stated no, this is against City policy.

Pogue asked if the applicant was limited in the development agreement for Option 1 for building a church. Gaeddert stated yes. Pogue asked where that was. Gaeddert pointed out Option 1 where the City would only annex the property that would be used as: a.) a Church and b.) a Park. He stated in Option 1, the 10.68 acres, has an acre and a half, roughly 30% of what was being annexed as a park and 3.76 acres sited for a church. Section 1.5 attaches Exhibit C which was a diagram that set forth the church building program.

Pogue stated the church parcel property is proposed to be transitionally zoned and the permitted uses on this property are single family dwellings, daycare homes, daycare facilities, manufactured homes, churches and parks. Gaeddert stated if the list was too extensive to cross some of them off. Gaeddert said that it is a working document which could be limited to please the Commission. All they wanted was to have the church built.

Gaeddert had comments regarding Marvel's statement. Gaeddert asked what if the other lots were not annexed. Marvel stated that she couldn't ignore those lots. Gaeddert stated he was frustrated and would be more than happy to provide a master plan in Option 1, which would identify the uses and would be willing to add the Forest Service Buildings.

Mike Hendricks expressed frustration and wished more of the neighbors would have come to their presentation. He asked why there needed to be a master plan. This is not a design review process; it is a fifteen square footprint. He didn't understand the people saying they didn't know what's going on. The Forest Service Buildings were Linscott's idea. He stated Erickson denied them in the County. He stated they didn't want to put hardship to the neighbors; they were not hindering views, and asked what more did the Commission want from them. He didn't agree with the idea of having a park on Main Street with all the traffic. His final statement was they were only asking to annex the property for the church and park.

Zellers stated she didn't feel this application met all the requirements. The environmental decisions were there but that was not the parameter to annex this property into the City. Zellers made the comment, other than the fact that the church needed City hook-up; there was no compelling reason for the City to annex this property. She realized the annexation agreements were working documents, but putting transitional zoning at the north end of town was not harmonious with the Comprehensive Plan, Section 12.1. Zellers stated she was opposed to the annexation.

Pogue agreed with the comments that the church was a good neighbor. He agreed with Paul Conrad saying the property would be good for an annex, but he felt the way it was being presented right now was not appropriate. Pogue commented if there were a master plan for this entire parcel, the questions about vagueness wouldn't be coming up. Pogue felt there would be an argument in the future to rezone these parcels as transitional because it is surrounded by City land, and he didn't think that would be appropriate. He felt the church was trying to commit itself and felt they had an idea as to what they wanted but the development agreement didn't bind the church to anything. Pogue felt the commitments were not specific enough. He stated this annexation looked like a patch work annexation and he felt it was inappropriate.

Linscott stated that she wanted to reiterate that it was her idea for the Forest Service Buildings to be given to the church. She stated it would break her heart to see these buildings turned into firewood because there wasn't another entity that would take these buildings; these buildings need preservation to keep the history and the character of the City. She noted the City would have full control of the property and commented we can't always get what we want, but sometimes we can get what we need. Linscott stated she

would like to see the property hooked up to City services. She commented if the City was going to think environmentally then they needed to act environmentally. Linscott stated she did not want to see any more stress put on the ground water quality system; the City has an environmental imperative to preserve water quality. The City had an imperative to consider habitat and open space; a park doesn't necessarily have to be for a human. Linscott felt the Commission had been very vague with the applicant. She believed the water quality, historic character and habitat, were three very important things and stated if the City had control of the property they would have control through the annexation agreement. Linscott suggested this could be annexed at one unit per acre. Linscott didn't see the property having to be annexed as a high density development; she didn't want that and mentioned that people thinking she was in favor of high density were wrong. She didn't hear the church saying they wanted high density; she heard them saying they wanted to be compatible with the surrounding neighborhoods. She felt the Commission should look at what they could do for the annexation agreement to keep the density at a manageable level while preserving the habitat and water quality. She felt the Commission had been very vague with the applicant as to what they wanted; the applicant needed to be given parameters to live with. The City was already limited by the developed subdivisions to the north. Linscott believed the Commission needed to readjust their perspectives on this and do what was right for the City. Linscott stated what is good for the City was water quality, habitat, and historic preservation. Linscott was for the annexation and asked if the Commission would reconsider their positions.

Marvel didn't agree with Linscott and stated of course the environmental concerns were important. Marvel was concerned because she felt the annexation was something the City shouldn't be doing.

Pogue stated the environmental concerns were important but stated all he was hearing was off-the-cuff opinions and didn't think anyone had a handle of what the issues really were. He stated he was hesitant to make a decision with that factor in mind.

Zellers stated if every piece of property were annexed into the City, based on saving a septic tank, she didn't think that was a parameter to annex the property.

Zellers moved to not recommend the annexation for the Life Church, legally described as Tax Lots 7734, 6879, and 6880 in the County, finding they are not harmonious or in accordance with specific goals and policies applicable to the Hailey Comprehensive Plan; and specifically Section 12.1 of the Hailey Comprehensive Plan.

Pogue seconded the motion; Marvel and Zellers were in favor, and Linscott was opposed. The motion passed.

Marvel called a five minute recess.

Public Meeting:

Comprehensive Plan Amendments

Proposed preliminary draft of the Energy component of the Hailey Comprehensive Plan. The Energy component may address energy efficiency through land use and building regulations, energy efficient transportation, energy supply, and waste reduction.

Shay noted there was already a Public Utilities/Facilities component present in the Comprehensive Plan. She stated that her focus was more of an environment component. Shay announced the City recently approved a Climate Protection Committee who was meeting a couple of times a month and employees within the City were trying to work out strategies to do some regional planning. Shay said the Environmental Resource Center's representative came to a meeting and spoke about a massive recycling program for recycling computers, cell phones, televisions, and VCRs; basically things that were not wanted in the ground. She stated the Committee was working on plans for the City employees to become better citizens (environmentally) within City Hall. Shay noted the City's Attorney was in favor of all the ideas but was concerned whether or not they could be included in the Comprehensive Plan.

Grotto stated the City Attorney's point was every policy and implementation item needed to be something that could be tied to a subdivision ordinance standard or a zoning ordinance standard. Grotto suggested for the Commission to look through the items listed and decide if the item could become a standard in the zoning or subdivision ordinance or not; if it could not, Grotto suggested that another area of the City could address the items for Climate Control, possibly by the Committee or the Municipal Code.

Pogue's thought was they were nice ideas and asked what effect they would have.

Shay stated a lot of the ideas pointed to regional policies and planning; the City could only do so much, but if the Committee was not thinking globally, things would not get any better.

Scanlon stated there were some cities who offered bonuses for adhering to certain policies. He wanted to know if an incentive package could be incorporated with this.

Shay stated the Building Official was involved with this also. There are other counties who have a point system that might be tied to fees for a building permit and stated it was a very detailed list, "Green Buildings", and possibly the permit fee could be calculated according to how green the building plans were. Shay stated she had addressed approved building codes and regulations to insure energy and resource efficiency were included in new construction remodels and renovation projects.

Scanlon mentioned when he attended a seminar there was a gentleman there who was the City Clerk from Buhl and he mentioned Buhl was trying to implement a Dark Sky Ordinance. Scanlon noted he forwarded to him Ketchum's Dark Sky Ordinance. Scanlon thought that this was a good idea that Shay had.

Marvel took an article from the New York Times which was regarding Woodstock, New York, who had just passed an ordinance to reduce their carbon commissions to zero within ten years and what they were doing; for example installing solar panels on their City Hall building. Marvel suggested that these ideas could be tied to the zoning with implementing the point system.

Shay felt there could be a real opposition to the point system.

Shay suggested the Commission email her their suggestions and/or ideas. Grotto stated what they have been talking about was for more incentives for the actual construction. She stated there were already possibilities for bonuses in density and suggested to the Commission to come up with incentives or regulations that could be applied to the zoning and subdivision ordinances.

Approval of Findings of Fact:

Logan's Run Annexation

Zellers moved to approve as written; Scanlon seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

Approval of Minutes:

There were none.

Commission Reports:

Scanlon stated he should be back in town for the April 2nd meeting.

Staff Reports:

There were none.

Adjourn:

Pogue motioned to adjourn at 9:15 p.m.; Zellers seconded, the motion passed unanimously.