

DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Meeting Minutes
Monday, April 19, 2021
Hailey City Hall 4:30 p.m. (before P & Z regular meeting)

From your computer, tablet or smartphone: <https://www.gotomeet.me/CityofHaileyPZ> Via One-touch dial in by phone: tel:+15713173122,,506287589# Dial in by phone: United States: +1 (571) 317-3122
Access Code: 506-287-589

Present

Commission: Janet Fugate, Dan Smith, Richard Pogue, Owen Scanlon

Staff: Lisa Horowitz, Robyn Davis, Jessica Parker, Brian Yeager, Heather Dawson

Other: Dwayne Guthrie

Absent: Dustin Stone

[4:31:53 PM](#) Chair Fugate called to order.

Public Hearing

PH 1 [4:32:17 PM](#) *Five-year update to the Development Impact Fee Ordinance to consider land use assumptions, level of service and facility needs, capital improvements plan; review of cost allocation alternatives for each Development Impact Fee; review of above with consultant.*
ACTION ITEM.

[4:32:30 PM](#) Horowitz turned floor to Dwayne Guthrie. Guthrie introduced himself and provided a summarized history of himself and the work he has done with the City of Hailey. Guthrie explained this meeting is mandatory in Idaho, and has provided a power point to provide an overview. Guthrie explained DIF is about how to pay for growth-things to be funded by impact fees. Guthrie noted impact fees in Hailey are Streets, CIP, Parks and Fire. Guthrie summarized decisions options for growth costs. Horowitz asked Guthrie to explain why the police were removed from the impact fees at his convenience. Guthrie summarized generally the whole valley pays similar impact fees. Guthrie summarized what DIF fees are and methods used to determine the fees. Guthrie explained the impact fee formula used. Guthrie explained impact fees are not a tax. Guthrie summarized the Idaho Impact Fee Process- the Advisory Committee does not approve the fees but provides input. Guthrie stated today will be looking at the land use development and when meet again will further discuss fees. Guthrie explained fee requirements in Idaho. Last slide of power point listed Capital Improvements Plan.

Pogue asked about assumed 2% annual growth rate for population and in that is 2.74 persons in a housing unit. Is the housing unit single family or if includes apartments? Guthrie stated it includes all housing units. Pogue asked if the 2% growth rate would average out over 5 years. Guthrie summarized this is a basically an average of the next 5 years, but can review more if committee would prefer and not opposed to changing the 2%.

Smith asked Guthrie to define service units. Guthrie explained for each type of fee that's going to be residential fee based on people per housing unit and on nonresidential, it's going to be

jobs per 1000 sq ft of floor area or trip generation rates. Guthrie went on to discuss various trip generations. Smith agrees with Pogue, the 76 units seems low for this year particularly – listing current projects Blaine Manor, Silver River, Sunbeam, Tanner Investments (Block 86), etc. Smith anticipates given the number of available lots, lumber pricing and contractor availability is limiting some construction to take place in near future. Smith stated that perhaps based off what seeing currently, if revisitation of this sooner than 5 years would be appropriate. Guthrie confirmed will discuss further with staff.

Scanlon agrees with both Smith and Pogue regarding the 2% growth. Scanlon asked if there are considerations of number of bedrooms in units. Guthrie explained has better information on the side of the units, and will get to that in the end. Guthrie explained tables listed under Figure A6 and they are applying this to Hailey.

Chair Fugate stated it seems the vehicles listed seems low, that a one bedroom would at least have 1 car per person. Guthrie explained numbers seem lower due to the number of seasonal homes in area.

Scanlon asked to go back to slide 8 – Legal Requirements. Scanlon asked Guthrie explained the chart, discussing the number of workers who live and work in Hailey. Guthrie noted has more people leaving Hailey for work.

Guthrie requested the committee to focus on page 7, Figure A7. Guthrie explained the changes proposed that the categories increased. Horowitz suggested could start the range at 600 or less. Horowitz noted she also mentioned to Guthrie seeing multiple bedrooms in smaller units. Chair Fugate requested starting at lowest point the best. Chair Fugate thinks having more categories will be helpful. Guthrie confirmed can review further. Horowitz confirmed staff will research more. All commissioners are in agreement.

Guthrie moved on to page 12 of the packet, discussing changes proposed to CIP for Parks. Yeager explained these sheets have been built off the FY21 Capital Project List, Hailey Greenway Master Plan and the Updated Transportation Plan. Guthrie went on to discuss the Fire stations and apparatus of the CIP, that only project active at this time is the fire apparatus. Chair Fugate asked if there is any likelihood of fire consolidation between the fire departments. Heather Dawson, stated there is still enough interest the meetings have continued but the meetings have been scaled back to twice a year. Dawson stated regardless the equipment replacement is necessary. Guthrie provided a spreadsheet of potential street improvement projects on page 14 of the packet. Yeager explained still working on this list, so there will be some minor changes. Chair Fugate asked if Cedar/Broadford/Hwy 75, is that including the improvements needed for the new housing units going in. Yeager stated it does not, it was one of the capital improvements plans from the Transportation Master Plan update. Yeager stated one that currently have that would reflect her question is on Maple Street. Chair Fugate understands this is part of that and will be looking at this again. Chair Fugate suggested moving on to deciding date of next meeting. Yeager provided a summary, stating this is part of the Transportation Master Plan, and will be prepared to answer questions at next meeting.

Staff and committee discussed date for next hearing. All in agreement on May 13, 2021 at 5:30 PM.

Smith asked if see water, sewer, or stormwater projects that would be applicable. Guthrie explained those are not part of the current impact fees, just updating the existing fees. Chair Fugate will have this list and the Capital Improvements List available. Yeager confirmed.

5:26:49 PM Smith motioned to continue the Development Impact Advisory Meeting to May 13, 2021 at 5:30 PM. Pogue seconded. All in Favor.

Chair Fugate called for 5 Minute Break.

Meeting Minutes
HAILEY PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
Monday, April 19, 2021
Virtual Meeting
5:30 p.m.

From your computer, tablet or smartphone: <https://www.gotomeet.me/CityofHaileyPZ>

Via One-touch dial in by phone: <tel:+15713173122,,506287589#>

Dial in by phone: United States: +1 (571) 317-3122 Access Code: 506-287-589

Present

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

Staff: Lisa Horowitz, Robyn Davis, Jessica Parker

[5:36:44 PM](#) Chair Fugate called to order.

[5:36:44 PM](#) Public Comment for items not on the agenda. No Comment.

[5:36:59 PM](#) Consent Agenda

CA 1 Adoption of Meeting Minutes dated March 15, 2021. **ACTION ITEM.**

[5:37:05 PM](#) Smith motioned to approve CA 1 with typo corrections sent to staff. Pogue seconded. All in Favor. Scanlon recused himself.

Public Hearing

PH 1 [5:37:51 PM](#) *Consideration of a Design Review Application by Antony and Sarah Gray for a new 2,609 square foot single-story residence. This project is located at 121 North 3rd Avenue (Lots 1-4, Block 38, Hailey Townsite) within the Limited Residential (LR-1) and Townsite Overlay (TO) Zoning Districts.*
ACTION ITEM.

[5:38:58 PM](#) Davis summarized concern from last hearing- location of garage not off alley. Davis confirmed change to design and turned to applicant. [5:40:02 PM](#) Sarah Gray introduced herself and explained changes to design – kept footprint very similar and placed the garage doors on the back facing the alley. Gray explained with changes to garage, lowered amount of fill will need for the project.

[5:42:31 PM](#) Pogue and Smith have no comments at this time.

[5:42:40 PM](#) Stone asked what trees would have been removed with previous design. Gray explained tree types and locations to be removed. Stone confirmed no trees to be removed from the front.

[5:44:42 PM](#) Scanlon asked what the percentage of the slope is out to Carbonate Street. Gray stated it would be from center of street to driveway, over 50'. Scanlon's only concern is steepness of Carbonate Street and angle of their driveway, will need to be very careful during certain times of the year.

[5:46:27 PM](#) Chair Fugate opened Public Comment.

No comment.

[5:47:09 PM](#) Chair Fugate closed Public Comment.

[5:47:21 PM](#) Chair Fugate asked if commission believes this is unique enough to allow without setting a precedent. Horowitz stated biggest precedent concern was the garage facing the street and another unique factor is that applicant is retaining historic buildings along the alley. [5:49:30 PM](#) Chair Fugate requested it be added to recorded that this is being approved due to its uniqueness.

[5:49:48 PM](#) Pogue complimented staff and applicant, believes this is a good compromise. Pogue does share Scanlon's concern about the steepness of Carbonate, encourages applicant to be careful on those winter days.

[5:50:38 PM](#) Smith agrees with Pogue, this is a good compromise. Smith appreciates saving the historic buildings and legacy trees. Smith stated thinks this does improve the safety aspect at the intersection off Carbonate.

[5:52:17 PM](#) Stone thinks they are doing a good job by upholding the precedent, he is not concerned too much that did what they could to help retain the look and feel. Stone thinks the grays are going to enjoy having the garage in a more scenic view.

[5:53:42 PM](#) Scanlon agrees with other commissioners' comments and has expressed his concerns prior. Scanlon stated as far as precedents are concerned, guidelines should allow staff to review each project individually. Scanlon thinks this is a great compromise.

[5:54:50 PM](#) Chair Fugate agrees with all that has been said and applauds applicant and city staff for their work.

[5:56:01 PM](#) **Scanlon motioned to approve the Design Review Application by Antony and Sarah Gray for a new 2,742 square foot single-story residence. This project is located at 121 North 3rd Avenue (Lots 1-4, Block 38, 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 Hailey Municipal Code, and City Standards, provided conditions (a) through (n) are met. Smith seconded. All in Favor.**

PH 2 [5:57:36 PM](#) *Consideration of a Design Review application by Hailey Airport Inn, LLC, represented by Owen Scanlon, for the addition of two (2) new three-story apartment buildings containing a total of twenty-one (21) units. This project is located at Lot 1A, Block 137, Hailey Townsite (804 South 4th Avenue) within the Limited Business (LB) Zoning District. **ACTION ITEM.***

Scanlon recused himself.

Scanlon summarized project and location of site, parking, drainage, etc. Scanlon referred to Kurt Eggers if there are any questions regarding landscaping. [6:01:33 PM](#) Scanlon confirmed all colors match the existing colors of Airport Inn. Scanlon summarized floor plans for both buildings. Scanlon explained was not able to break the buildings up but has offset the buildings to provide some relief from the solid wall. Scanlon went on to discuss exterior coloring and designs to help provide deviations from plan wall. [6:08:47 PM](#) Scanlon discussed exterior lighting, that the one pole unit is 20'. Horowitz stated code permits up to 17'. Scanlon confirmed that is what it will be then, going on to discuss the remaining exterior lighting and the photometric drawing. Scanlon noted will be removing the wall light and placing a bollard on the back facing the cemetery. Scanlon discussed the location and materials to be used for that.

[6:14:48 PM](#) Pogue no questions at this time, complimented the applicant team. Pogue stated due to number of bedrooms, may have renters with children but do not have a play area. Pogue confirmed that he understands they are across the street from the park.

[6:16:15 PM](#) Smith asked Scanlon to speak to the drought tolerant grasses and weed berm in the staff report. Scanlon stated weed berm is only partially on the property. Scanlon turned floor to Kurt Eggers to discuss the drought tolerant landscape. Kurt explained the proposed drought tolerant landscaping planned. Smith asked if safe to assume will be using double glazing and low e glass for the energy requirements. Scanlon confirmed. Smith stated with dropping light pole down to 17', will need to have the photometric plan revised and have staff review to ensure it still complies. Smith complimented the layout and design.

[6:20:49 PM](#) Horowitz asked how long each building are. Building A is 101 ft and Building B is 91 ft long.

[6:21:18 PM](#) Stone agrees with Pogue that a park is unnecessary with the access to the city park. Stone asked about an electric charging station onsite. Scanlon confirmed will have one or two, onsite. Horowitz confirmed can add as a condition of approval.

[6:22:43 PM](#) Chair Fugate asked if could place a shade tree with a few tables in place of the shrub in the grass area. Chair Fugate likes the idea of bollards and the offset positions of the building. Scanlon noted existing shade tree and BBQ area with tables for tenants.

[6:25:29 PM](#) Horowitz stated due to existing outdoor area, that standard has been met. Horowitz liked suggestion to change light facing bike path. Horowitz confirmed applicant team understands the need for recycling in the trash enclosure onsite and it will need to be addressed in letter from Clear Creek.

[6:28:42 PM](#) Chair Fugate asked about the outdoor area being on separate property, currently owned by same person. Scanlon does not image this property ever being divided, and could not do it as need entire space to justify additional units. Horowitz asked if the temporary shipping container can be removed as part of the remodel. Applicant team confirmed it will be moved. Horowitz confirmed applicant noted all utilities will be made underground.

[6:31:11 PM](#) **Chair Fugate opened public comment.**

No comments.

[6:31:45 PM](#) **Chair Fugate closed public comment.**

[6:32:02 PM](#) Davis confirmed with applicant they understand will need to complete a Lot Line adjustment. Horowitz confirmed one new condition for the electric charging stations- minimum of two.

[6:34:01 PM](#) **Smith motioned to approve the Design Review application submitted by Hailey Airport Inn, LLC, for the addition of two (2) new three-story apartment buildings containing a total of twenty-one (21) units. This project is located at Lot 1A, Block 137, Hailey Townsite (804 South 4th Avenue) within the Limited Business (LB) Zoning District, finding that the project does not jeopardize the health, safety or welfare of the public and the project conforms to the applicable specifications**

outlined in the Design Review Guidelines, applicable requirements of the Zoning Ordinance, Title 18, and City Standards, provided conditions (a) through (m) are met. Pogue seconded. All in Favor.

PH 3 [6:35:39 PM](#) *Consideration of a Design Review Pre-Application by Kilgore Properties, LLC, for construction of Sweetwater Condominiums to be located at Block 2, Sweetwater PUD Subdivision. This project was approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission on December 2, 2019; however, the Applicant has reconfigured the parcel, to consist of thirteen (13), ten-plex, three-story condominiums, each unit comprising of approximately 1,380 square feet. A total of 137 units (130 residential units and seven live-work units) are proposed. **ACTION ITEM.***

[6:36:12 PM](#) Davis summarized history of this application and that the applicant would like the commission feedback on a proposed reconfiguration. Davis turned floor over to applicant team. [6:37:06 PM](#) Kameron Spencer explained how the proposed reconfiguration of the project is a result after working with the existing homeowners. Spencer, using a power point presentation discussed the benefits for owners and HOA with the proposed reconfiguration and noted the condo units would be more affordable than the townhomes. Spencer provided a comparison of the old and proposed layouts, noting the proposed changes does increase the density by 4 units – Approved design has 316 Units and Proposed has 320 Units. Spencer went on to discuss the proposed layout with the front of the buildings facing the streets and the increase in parking and common open space. Spencer confirmed the condominium units would not change, providing a summary of the condo unit design. Spencer went on to discuss the revised color schemes. Spencer summarized main reason for change is – HOA gets simplified, allows for more affordable units and aligns the fronts of the buildings with the street, has two less street connections and increase to parking.

[6:47:02 PM](#) Pogue thinks some additional articulation could help, maybe in the roofline. Pogue thinks would look like a solid wall as come into the city.

[6:48:20 PM](#) Smith asked if looking at the back of the buildings in current elevation drawing. Spencer confirms, a new elevation drawing has been requested. Smith agrees with Pogue regarding the roofline. Smith is a little disappointed to see the full area go to condos, liked the previous proposal, and the break ups' it provided. Smith stated with this being south of Balmoral, this is going to provide a monolithic look to the entrance to the city. Smith asked what the material is to be used adjacent to the garages, the driving surface direct adjacent to the garage access. Spencer explained the road will be paved with asphalt and from the road space to the garage a concrete apron will be used. Smith thinks more differentiation is needed. Smith also has some concern with the parking – providing 1 car garages with exterior parking. Smith is also concerned about snow removal and snow storage.

[6:53:39 PM](#) Stone asked about the original intent between the blended condo and townhomes, was it aesthetically. Horowitz explained the previous approved plan on the left was approved in 2019 and was not the original plan approved. Spencer explained the intent was to provide a variety of homes, that it was pretty varied and a little haphazard. Spencer summarized the original plan. Spencer explained goal with the plan approved in 2019 was to be able to offer a little of everything. Spencer explained the duplex units are much higher than anticipated and would like to fast track the condo units as fast as they can to bring much needed affordable housing. Horowitz confirmed all these units will have access to all the common amenities. Spencer confirmed and that would also like to bring in additional amenities to this space. Horowitz noted as part of the PUD Approved in 2006, it is very important that all units have access to the amenities. Spencer explained intent is to have a tiered amenities level, so as not to over tax the existing amenities. Spencer went on to explain plan

to offer similar amenities to closer to each section, but that amenity building has not been designed less. Stone confirmed overall parking increased. Spencer confirmed.

[7:01:33 PM](#) Scanlon agrees with Pogue and Smith regarding the giant wall of the building, noting relocation of buildings closer to highway does not help. Scanlon asked if looking at a pergola over the windows, and what it is made of. Spencer confirmed and stating it is timber with a metal roof. Scanlon thinks it would be helpful if could show shadow on one elevation. Scanlon asked if on side, if that is just a change of color. Spencer stated it is a change in foundation by 2'. Scanlon suggested a shadow lining on side as well would help. Scanlon asked for clarification on parking. Spencer explained most of the impervious surface area that goes away is the removal of the two street connections. Spencer went on to explain shift of parking location with change of plan. Horowitz stated this project is well over the parking requirements per code. Staff and commission discussed the number of parking spaces over code. Scanlon agrees with Smith on the parking concern. Scanlon asked if any of the parking is covered, Spencer stated no. Scanlon suggested may be beneficial to add.

[7:08:39 PM](#) Chair Fugate asked if could see the buildings elevation proposed as they are going to be facing out with the colors. Spencer confirmed these drawings are actually under process.

[7:11:19 PM](#) Davis stated she reviewed other buildings length through Hailey. Davis stated the length of proposed buildings-136 ft. And provided examples of recent projects building lengths for Blaine Manor Family and Senior, Senior Apartments. Horowitz suggested it may be important to fully understand the space between the buildings.

[7:13:06 PM](#) Scanlon noted the buildings on the Blaine Manor site, the space between the two buildings is larger than projected during their design review and he was pleasantly surprised.

[7:13:58 PM](#) **Chair Fugate opened Public Comment.**

No comment.

[7:14:36 PM](#) **Chair Fugate closed Public Comment.**

[7:14:59 PM](#) Horowitz confirmed no decision tonight as this is a pre-app.

[7:15:30 PM](#) Pogue asked Spencer what the plans for the remaining properties. Spencer stated the north parcel, north of the club house will be duplex units identical to the ones under construction now. Spencer stated on the south side of countryside, those will be townhomes, a mixture of 3-plex, 4-plex and 5-plex buildings.

[7:17:07 PM](#) Smith asked for clarification on the amenities access – option to optout or add amenities and provide separate access? Spencer explained amenities provided to each space. Spencer stated in addition to that will have access to the club house, but the existing HOA would like to provide a tiered option so that some people could opt out of using the pool in the main area and use the amenities near their building. Spencer explained as the project is built out, it would allow the HOA to flexibly package those amenities as needed. Horowitz stated that appears the nicer the unit the more ability to pay for the amenities, and that is contrary to the PUD Agreement. Spencer confirmed it is contrary, that getting a lot of pressure from the existing owners on how the amenities are structured and how they are accessed. Spencer stated does not want to provide a package that restrict the amenities but accepting that do not want to over tax the amenities. Spencer explained wanting to structure it in a way that is fair to the existing home owners and

future homeowners. Horowitz asked what the existing homeowners do not recall regarding the sharing of existing amenities. Spencer agrees, that the existing amenities are sized for the built out, but they feel like the club house gets overwhelmed by users in the summer time. The existing homeowners don't feel like they could add the number of users that residents using that one facility and keep everyone in a happy state and not over crowded. Horowitz stated will need to see national standards that shows how many amenities are needed of a condo unit of that size. Horowitz stated it would need to be proven it was designed inappropriately in the first place and the amenities are undersized. Horowitz said the president of the HOA can contact her for further clarification. Chair Fugate added that the reason so many units are allowed to be built here, is because of the PUD and she is not comfortable with tiered amenities. Spencer explained the original owners are townhome ownerships – own the ground underneath and when build the condominiums those will require a different level of management to maintain the building. Spencer went on explain that he is working with the HOA president regarding these needs.

[7:25:24 PM](#) Smith suggested may want to look at providing a condominium only amenity for that open space since have the condominiums all stacked together now. Smith stated there is concern from City side that this was proposed as one thing at the beginning, and that commitment needs to be carried through as the project proceeds.

[7:26:17 PM](#) Stone requested he would like to hear directly from the HOA. Stone is not concerned that the buildings are closer to the highway and that maybe they could look at spots to increase space. Stone thinks additional amenities are needed at this site.

[7:30:16 PM](#) Scanlon agrees with what has been said, thinks we need more information regarding amenity tiers.

[7:31:14 PM](#) Chair Fugate agrees with what has been said, and that does like the front facing the streets.

No motion, applicant team and staff will discuss next hearing date when applicant submits Design Review packet.

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 3, 2021**

- CUP: PA Spirits
- PP: Winterhaven Estates
- TA: GR Setbacks

Horowitz summarized upcoming projects for next hearing.

[7:37:13 PM](#) **Stone motioned to adjourn. Scanlon seconded. All in Favor.**