

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
OF THE HAILEY PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
HELD MONDAY, JULY 3, 2006
IN THE UPSTAIRS MEETING ROOM WITHIN HAILEY CITY HALL**

The regular meeting of the Hailey Planning and Zoning Commission was called to order at 6:30 p.m. by Commissioners Trent Jones. Stefanie Marvel, Elizabeth Zellers and Nancy Linscott were present. Kristin Anderson was excused. Staff present included Planning Director Kathy Grotto and Administrative Assistant Dusty Liman.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

474 CLUB, LLC FOR A PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT.

Applications by 474 Club, LLC for a Planned Unit Development, Preliminary Large Block Plat, Flood Plain Development Permit and Design Review, located in central Woodside, between Highway 75 and Woodside Boulevard surrounding Countryside Boulevard. The applicant is proposing a development of 421 units on approximately 22 acres, to be named "Sweetwater". The property is zoned Limited Business (LB), and General Residential proposed for Limited Business.

Jones made an announcement that it was his intention to bring resolution to the PUD application tonight. They would move on to the Preliminary Large Plat and Flood Plain Development Permit, but there may not be adequate time to go into Design Review as there is one other hearing scheduled for tonight.

The PUD application was continued to tonight in order for the Commissioners to have opportunity to review additional information. Tonight's meeting will first address additional PUD information.

Catherine Benotto, Weber+Thompson Architects, addressed the drawings provided to the Commissioners and made clarifications:

- Setback drawing has been cleaned up
- Bike path has been granted desired access easement along Parcel A
- Median strip will be planted between road and pathway for bikes – there is room in the right-of-way

Jim Laski, attorney for the applicant, presented the revisions to the PUD Agreement:

- Reformatted the description of Community Housing component – numbers and requirements remain the same. Number of Community Housing units required is 40, not 42 as reported in the staff report – 10 per phase
- Traffic mitigation language – developer would pay for the traffic signalization at Countryside and Highway 75 with a completion date of September 1, 2007
- Additional explanation of PUD waivers
 - Added benefit of developer paying for signalization at Countryside. The light is estimated to cost \$350,000 total, with the City contributing \$67,000 from Balmoral and the developer contributing the remainder.

- Provision for bonding future phases of the development. If the project were to not be completed at any phase, the developer would landscape the remaining land and complete the streets
- Amenities, bus shelters and landscaping will be maintained in perpetuity

Grotto made additional comments on PUD agreement that are outstanding:

- Whether or not applicant will need to provide three bus shelters instead of two as stated in current PUD
- Bike path bridge replacement if widening is unfeasible has not been addressed

Laski addressed these two issues:

- Location of bus shelters – one at pick up location at Countryside and one on Shenandoah. May not be need for the third bus shelter
- Agrees to the bike path bridge widening or replacement

Zellers questioned the Owners' Association maintaining the bus shelters as bus shelters and Laski said the language is already in the PUD agreement.

Marvel asked Grotto if the method of payment for the parks was set out in great detail in the SGA agreement. Grotto stated that it is.

Linscott asked about the amenity building being open to the public. Laski answered that it is private, but open by reservation to the public with restrictions. Linscott addressed the lack of bike path linkage to the south of Countryside. Laski said that initially a bridge was proposed in a more southern location, but BCRD opposed this location for additional bridges.

Jones questioned Laski about the delay of the bike path into phase 2 from implementation in phase 1. Answer was that the commitment of signalization in phase 1 and completion of the amenities building in phase 1 moved the bike path provision to phase 2.

Marvel would like the bike path moved back to phase 1 and she would like three bus shelters provided due to the increase in the number of school children being serviced in the Sweetwater Development.

Grotto reminded the Commission that the FEMA study has not been completed and this may directly affect the bike path bridge. This may be a practical reason to allow the bridge in Phase 2. Phase 2 should be ample time for the FEMA study to be completed and reported on.

Jones would like to see bike path completed in Phase 1 and the bike path bridge completed in Phase 2.

Linscott supports the PUD with these issues addressed.

Zellers concurred with the request for three covered bus shelters.

Jones suggested that BCSD needs to be consulted about the need and the location of the third covered bus shelter.

Linscott suggested that BCSD build or split the burden of the third covered bus shelter.

Jones asked the Commission to respond to four findings that need to be made

- Acceptable phasing schedule
- Acceptable Streets and thoroughfares – disbursement of traffics
- No excessive burden of cost or impact to public services
- PUD is in general conformance with the Comprehensive Plan

Marvel was disappointed that the applicant did not address the impact the development will have on the Public Library. Supported the PUD - pleased with the appropriateness of density and location of density.

Jones agreed with Marvel's support of the PUD.

Linscott and Zellers supported the findings for the PUD.

Jones addressed the Barbara Julian letter and said that he appreciated her comments as to her desire to see more retail in the development. Jones stated that community support was just not behind the addition of retail in this area.

Jones wanted to make sure P&Z adds language to the PUD addressing the City enforcement of restrictions regarding parking regulating of campers, boats, RV's, etc. Grotto stated she would add language to the PUD that the City would have the ability and authority to enforce parking regulations.

Jones asked Laski to work with BCSD and Peak Bus to address the need for a third bus shelter. Laski agreed.

The Commission covered the remaining findings:

- Utility services are adequate
- Significant natural features
- Each phase can exist independently from proposed future phases
- One or more amenities as set forth in Subsection 10.3.
- Exterior lighting
- PUD Agreement is acceptable

These were all generally found to be acceptable with conditions already discussed.

Linscott moved to recommend to the City Council acceptance of the Sweetwater PUD, with conditions a-j with addition that the bike path will be constructed in phase 1. Zellers seconded for discussion and moved to amend that the City would have the ability and authority to enforce parking regulations and with addition of a third bus shelter if deemed necessary by BCSD/Peak Bus. Linscott seconded the amendment. The amendment passed unanimously. Jones called for the question on the full motion as amended, and it passed unanimously.

PRELIMINARY LARGE BLOCK PLAT AND FLOOD PLAIN DEVELOPMENT PERMIT

James Laski had no changes to present on these applications, which had been presented at the June 5, 2006, meeting.

Grotto stated regarding Large Block Plat:

- City Attorney requested that the relocation of Maple Leaf Drive is made clear on the plat and dedicated on the signature page.
- 5' and 7' sidewalks would remain as originally presented
- Flood plain development permit is required under 4.9 of the subdivision ordinance
- Phases 3 and 4 townhouses and condos preliminary plat will not be approved until final determination from FEMA has been made and recorded

Zellers asked how the large block plat will be affected if phases 3 & 4 do lie in flood plain. Grotto said there would be required redesign and design review to become compliant with flood plain development requirements.

Marvel questioned addressing and numbering for the units facing alleys. Benotto went through the plan and process. Mainly, all alleys and courtyards will have names and addresses.

Jones opened the public hearing. There being no public or written comment, the public hearing was closed.

Laski suggested that in the condition related to community housing, 4.11.2 should be renumbered to 4.11. Grotto was in agreement.

Zellers moved to approve the preliminary large block plat for 474 Club, LLC (Sweetwater) with conditions A through L with change to community housing reference from 4.11.2 to 4.11. Linscott seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Zellers moved to approve the flood hazard development permit for 474 Club, LLC (Sweetwater) based on the conditions set forth in the staff report that no townhouse or condominium in phases 3 & 4 can be constructed until the FEMA study has been completed and recorded that plats for these phases are removed from flood plain designation. Marvel seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

474 CLUB, LLC DESIGN REVIEW

Benotto began by listing a schedule for design review:

- Architecture – 11 building types
- Color
- Landscape/Lighting
- Environmental Graphics

Benotto summarized the phasing:

- Phase 1 – just north of Countryside
- Phase 2 – just south of Countryside
- Phase 3 – south east corner
- Phase 4 – remainder of project

Power Point presentation by Mindy Black, Weber+Thompson, began with the 6 unit town house as it will be the first building to break ground in Phase 1. Mindy explained that this architectural unit has three variations. She used power point to show the different profiles of the units. Each Commissioner was previously given a bound color booklet with all power point slides depicted for reference.

Marvel liked the color palate, but wanted to make sure that color palate is not repeated in units that are adjacent.

Benotto requested that the Commission move to approve the architecture of the 6 unit town house so that building permit process might begin.

Linscott asked about snow clips – answer was that there are snow clips in areas where safety is a concern as well as gutters and downspouts.

Jones asked the Commission if they were comfortable with the stated schedule for design review. Grotto stated that the Commission can request this process be continued at the next scheduled P&Z meeting for Sweetwater which would be August 7, 2006. She suggested that this would be appropriate because a public hearing must be held and there is not adequate time for public comment at this meeting.

Marvel stated that she needed more time to review the booklet, discuss at the next meeting and to go through the public hearing portion.

Marvel moved to continue 474 Club, LLC (Sweetwater) Design Review to August 7, 2006. Zellers seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

8:10 pm to 8:15pm break.

AN APPLICATION BY THE OWNERS OF LOTS 1-10, BLOCK 16, HAILEY TOWNSITE, FOR AN AMENDMENT TO THE ZONE DISTRICT MAP FOR THE CITY OF HAILEY.

An application by the owners of Lots 1-10, Block 16, Hailey Townsite, for an amendment to the zone district map for the City of Hailey. The application would change the zoning of Lots 1-10, Block 16, Hailey Townsite, located on 1st Avenue South between Pine Street and Elm Street from General Residential (GR) zoning to Transitional (TN). The City will concurrently initiate the rezone of Lots 3-10, Block 21, from Pine Street north to 301 1st Avenue South, from GR to TN. (This hearing is re-scheduled from June 13, 2006, due to notice delivery problems.)

Larry Young, attorney, represented the owners of lots 1-10, Block 16. Zoning and land use maps were distributed along with some photos to the Commissioners.

The land owned by the applicants that Young represents is in the vicinity of the school to the south, the church to the north, Main Street businesses to the west and residential property to the east.

Intensive land uses immediately adjacent include Pine Street Station, Main Street Plaza, CK's restaurant and the Catholic Church.

Grotto noted the three criteria to be considered by the Commission in making their recommendation to the City Council were:

- Comprehensive Plan
- Public Services
- Compatibility

Jones opened the public hearing.

Geoffrey Moore of 406 First Avenue South suggested the inconvenience of this application hearing falling within a holiday. He felt he is already surrounded by new TN businesses and he is feeling an impact. He wanted this application re-heard on a date in the future when there would be a more convenient opportunity for the public to attend and speak. He suggested the July 17, 2006 P&Z meeting will greatly affect the definition of TN.

Robert Lonning of 415 Second Avenue South was concerned about the domino effect. As use intensifies away from business, then the next street would become impacted. General public does not have a clear idea of what TN is. Residential character must be maintained in TN.

Steve Hogan of 416 First Avenue South agreed with Geoffrey Moore and wanted a better idea of what TN would mean after the July 17, 2006 P&Z meeting.

Public hearing closed. No written comment.

Jones asked Grotto about the potential for TN uses changing. Grotto stated that on July 17, 2006, the Commission will be hearing Townsite Overlay issues and the results of the Townsite Overlay workshops. Discussion will focus on Ordinance amendments as related to the Townsite Overlay, including bulk regulations. No changes in allowable uses in the TN district will be proposed. Clarification of the intent of the TN district will also be discussed.

Proposed amendments to the Townsite Overlay will include:

- Reduction in lot coverage in residential districts LR and GR
- In TN district – stays at 40% lot coverage for 2-story buildings and could be up to 50% for one story buildings

- Reduction in height from 35' to 30' in GR and TN to match LR
- Clarification that TN is meant to be a residential/buffer district only

Marvel said she takes issue with taking residences and turning them into business because these businesses do not have any activity at night or on weekends. That takes the residential flavor away and there is a loss of neighborhood. Suggested a live/work use. Marvel was conflicted.

Jones asked Young how many property owners he represents. Young stated six. Jones asked if the owners reside on the properties. He answered that some do and some do not.

Linscott agreed with Marvel and felt conflicted about the application.

Zellers concurred.

Jones also concurred and wanted to know who lives in the said block and how they would be affected by this rezone application. General consensus was to postpone this application until a future date after the July 17, 2006 P&Z meeting.

Linscott moved to table this application to a date uncertain. Zellers seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Approval of Findings of Fact:

TN Text Amendment (Jim Hill) – **Zellers moved to approve.** Marvel seconded. Linscott abstained as she was absent. The motion passed with Linscott abstaining.

Approval of Minutes:

May 5, 2006 – **Zellers moved to approve.** Linscott seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

June 13, 2006 - **Zellers moved to approve.** Linscott seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Commission Reports: Marvel will not be able to attend July 17, 2006 meeting

Staff Reports:

Council Update – Design Review Guidelines – passed and praised
Moratorium summaries – Grotto will send to Commission members via e-mail

Adjourn: Linscott moved to adjourn. Zellers seconded. The motion passed unanimously.