

Meeting Minutes
Hailey Planning and Zoning Commission
Tuesday, February 21, 2023
5:30 p.m.

Present

Commission: Janet Fugate, Dan Smith, Sage Sauerbrey, Dustin Stone, Owen Scanlon

Staff: Robyn Davis, Cece Osborn, Emily Rodrigue, Jessie Parker, Christian Ervin

5:30:54 PM Call to Order

- Public Comment for items not on the agenda. No Comment.

Consent Agenda

- **CA 1** Adoption of Meeting Minutes dated May 2, 2022. **ACTION ITEM.**
- **CA 2** Adoption of Meeting Minutes dated February 6, 2023. **ACTION ITEM.**

5:32:24 PM Stone motion to approve CA 1. Smith seconded Sauerbrey abstained. Stone, Smith, Scanlon and Fugate in Favor.

5:32:39 PM Smith motion to approve CA 2. Scanlon seconded. All in Favor.

Public Hearing

- **PH 1** **5:33:09 PM** Consideration of a Design Review Application submitted by Lido Equities Group Idaho, LLC c/o Edward Smith for eight (8) condominium buildings with three to five (3-5) units each, for a total of 36 units, ranging in size from 778 square feet to 1,278 square feet. Twenty (20) of the condominium units consist of two (2) bedrooms, and the remaining sixteen (16) condominium units consist of three (3) bedrooms. Each of the thirty-six (36) dwelling units ranges between 778 and 1,278 square feet in size and is accompanied by one (1) garage of 178 to 319 square feet in size. The proposed project is located on Woodside Boulevard, between Laurelwood and Winterhaven Drives on two (2) condominium lots (COPPER RANCH CONDO 1-5 COMMON AREA and COPPER RANCH CONDO #1 AM PARCEL A5 PHASE 6) within the Limited Business (LB) Zoning District. This project is known as Copper Ranch Phase 6. **ACTION ITEM.**

5:34:04 PM Osborn introduced project and provided summary of project beginning in 2003. Staff turned floor to applicant.

5:34:52 PM Jeffery Smith, developer, introduced applicant team.

5:35:23 PM Samantha Stahlnecker, introduced herself. Stahlnecker stated this is the final phase, referred to as Copper Ranch Phase 6 with a total of 8 buildings proposed. Stahlnecker explained why building 17 is included in Phase 6. Stahlnecker explained why unit count was reduced by two units. Stahlnecker provided a plan reflecting snow storage and confirmed will amend areas of

snow storage that are less than 10' in the permit submittal. Stahlnecker explained parking and that exceeding parking requirement by 19 additional spaces. Stahlnecker confirmed developers have also agreed to construct bus stop just to the north of project. [5:39:00 PM](#) Chair Fugate asked required parking. Stahlnecker stated required 50, but that providing 69. Stahlnecker noted pedestrian connectivity proposed adjust to north of building 15. [5:40:20 PM](#) Scanlon asked where Gravity is located in relation to proposed pedestrian connection. Stahlnecker, using aerial showed where connection proposed is in relation to Gravity.

[5:41:24 PM](#) Nathen Schutte provided proposed landscape plan, explaining how proposing to match existing landscape of Copper Ranch. Schutte explained proposed landscape locations and how being used to provide screening. Schutte summarized use of irrigation. Schutte confirmed project team is onboard with using native grasses near Gravity to allow for that area to still be used for snow storage. Schutte continued to discuss proposed landscape.

[5:44:55 PM](#) Rick Stuart, project manager, explained proposing to mimic same building style as to what is already existing onsite. Stuart confirmed total of 8 buildings – 5 5-plex and 3 3-plexes. No material boards submitted. Chair Fugate requested material samples be brought in. Stuart explained materials will be same as existing materials used. Stuart summarized materials to be used using color renderings submitted. Stuart stated all materials are sustainable. Stuart showed interior colors and materials proposed. Stuart explained how changed interior of units. Stuart provided site plan showing where mechanical units are proposed with vegetation screening proposed.

[5:50:22 PM](#) Stahlnecker explained how team went through different variations on how to bring this into ADA compliance. Stahlnecker explained reasoning behind proposed sidewalk placement in regard to proposed condition for sidewalk along Wimbledon. [5:54:26 PM](#) Scanlon asked if rest of Copper Ranch has sidewalks along both sides. Stahlnecker stated it does not. Stahlnecker pointed out where the limited sidewalk is located at in existing Copper Ranch. [5:55:15 PM](#) Sauerbrey asked where the bus stop is proposed. Stahlnecker noted existing location and proposed location for new stop. [5:56:12 PM](#) Sauerbrey asked if existing sidewalk that can be utilized along section of building near 17. Stahlnecker confirmed.

[5:57:11 PM](#) Sauerbrey asked about possibility of parking behind Gravity. Stahlnecker explained concerns of use of that area and how there is limited use of common space, and that area is utilized for snow storage. Sauerbrey asked if there are any proposed community housing or deed restricted housing. Stahlnecker stated not at this time.

[5:58:34 PM](#) Smith asked if across from building 17, if that is a vacant lot. Stahlnecker confirmed there is but it is part of a separate subdivision. Smith believes 3-plex seems pretty monotone, suggested more color or something to break it up more. Smith stated what current PUD Agreement requires for parking. Osborn explained current PUD Agreement does not specify certain parking requirements. Osborn explained confusion on earlier notice sent out, and that applicant is held to current standards. Osborn confirmed error of parking in staff report, confirming applicant is providing 69 spaces. Osborn confirmed required parking for Gravity, summarizing they are almost double required spaces. Smith asked size of garage door. Stuart stated garage doors are 8' wide. Smith asked width of garage itself. Stuart stated 9.5' wide.

[6:02:56 PM](#) Chair Fugate asked if garages vary in size. Stuart confirmed, the ADA unit is 10' wide. Chair Fugate confirmed there is just the one that is larger. Stuart confirmed. Stuart clarified exact size for each style of garage.

[6:04:05 PM](#) Stone asked to go through procedure of PUD amendment. Davis explained procedure of PUD Amendments and how it goes just to City Council. Stone asked if this request meets requirements of existing PUD. Davis confirmed. Stone asked why changing it. Davis explained what applicant is amending with PUD. Chair Fugate confirmed the 2.5 parking spaces is not part of PUD. Davis confirmed, that was only part of Design Review from 2003. Stone is concerned about approving project prior to PUD Amendment. Stone asked for clarification of waiver of setback. Stahlnecker explained reasoning behind changes to setbacks, including previous lot line adjustment associated with Gravity. Stone asked how that affects ADA compliance. Stahlnecker does not believe ADA compliance is affected due to changes to building foot prints. Stone asked how snow would be stored in area behind Gravity that do not want to use for parking. Stahlnecker noted access at rear of northeast section. Stone and Stahlnecker discussed potential of using this area as parking. Stone asked if spoke with Mountain Rides regarding proposed bus location. Davis confirmed. Stone asked about garbage. Stahlnecker stated would have individual garbage cans. Jeffery noted proposed garages are larger to account for garbage cans and space discussing for parking was the original snow storage space. Stone asked if still need it. Jeffery believes so. Stahlnecker noted there are not a lot of open spaces for snow storage. Jeffery noted area that could add potential of 8 more spaces along the northern area. Stone likes landscapes, suggests keeping trees further apart to allow for ease of pushing snow around. Stone noted building 4 has large area of grass. Schutte said could look at some berming and trees and planter pods to help break it up. Schutte noted why trees are smaller than required by code. Stone asked about cross walk and stop sign. Stahlnecker explained existing signage and crossings.

[6:17:28 PM](#) Scanlon is confused why some sheets say phase 5 and some say phase 6. Stahlnecker explained sheets will be corrected, this is all phase 6. Scanlon agrees with lot of questions asked already. Scanlon was concerned about neighbors' comments. Scanlon asked if unit was not ADA compliant would they be asking for waiver to setback. Stahlnecker explained bringing project up to ADA compliance was not only reason for request of waiver to setback. Scanlon asked about snow clips and downspouts, Scanlon stated would like to see size, location and color.

[6:20:01 PM](#) John King, stated at this moment proposing snow clips but not proposing downspouts. King and Scanlon discussed downspouts, with King confirming if do add would come back to commission. Sauerbrey asked if required by code. Osborn referenced standards regarding downspouts that were noted in staff report. Stahlnecker noted typo in staff report, where it was checked as not compliant. King confirmed paying close attention to need. Scanlon asked Schutte if adjusting caliper size of tree. Schutte confirmed. Scanlon asked to review snow storage. Scanlon is concerned about snow piles on corners of intersection. Scanlon asked to see floor plan. Scanlon addressed garages with no manddoors, suggesting may think about added garage doors with manddoors in them. Scanlon asked about work force housing. Scanlon asked about maintenance, is it part of HOA. Jeffery confirmed will be incorporated into existing HOA. Jeffery stated have not incorporated work force housing into this as these are for sale condos. Sauerbrey noted that City has explored for sale units for work force housing and recommended working with Staff. Jeffery noted that complying with current code on parking. Jeffery noted few issues with existing parking with existing tenants. Jeffery noted HOA will be enforcing parking requirements with owners/tenants.

[6:30:43 PM](#) Chair Fugate asked if spoke with Clear creek yet. Stahlnecker stated no but following existing model. Chair Fugate asked if correct in understanding that the developer is paying for the bus stop. Applicant confirmed.

[6:32:29 PM](#) Chair Fugate opened public comment, stating comment will be limited to 3 minutes.

[6:32:49 PM](#) Sue Ahern, Copper Ranch owner for 4 years, wanted to reiterate what Stone said. Confused how project can be reviewed before City Council reviews the changes to the original PUD. The Commission cannot approve this project as submitted without the PUD approved changes in place because the submittal reflects those changes. How can we as a community trust any new agreement will be enforced by the city. An abandoned foundation was left to deteriorate behind a dilapidated construction fence for years. It was removed only after many complaints from Copper Ranch owners after a long period of time. IT has never been returned to its original state as required by the city. How can we as a community trust that this new phase will be completed in its entirety. Will the City set a completion deadline and will this deadline be enforced? Will the city ensure the finished project will be in substantial compliance with what is approved? When confronted at an annual meeting to explain the poor construction practices in the first phases of Copper Ranch- leaking roofs, inferior siding, leaking plumbing. The response was that they had to meet a certain price point. There are too many items in her unit alone to talk about. They don't care about the quality of the unit at all just the price point. If the city recognizes the universal building code as standard, what steps are taken to ensure that developers adhere to that standard? How is it monitored? Will inspections be conducted frequently during construction to ensure the final product of this phase will not be inferior as the first phases are? When the first phases of Copper Ranch were constructed, one of the contractors Lidos hired to install irrigation piping outside north Copper Ranch property line. When construction began on the new apartments on the north side of Copper Ranch, also a Lido project, a contractor Lido hired dug up this piping. Lido used Copper Ranch capital reserves to pay for those repairs. We are entirely separate entities, this seems criminal to her. Using Copper Ranch funds for Lido's mistake. Lido is the active developer for both projects and should be responsible for their contracts and cost of this inexcusable mistake. She is employed by the Elkhorn Home Owners Association, a community of 1642 residences. One of her responsibilities is to manage the architectural design committee. In her eight years tenure, has worked with many architects, contractors, developers, in every instance that involved a multiple family development the developer reached out to the neighbors who would be affected by the new project. Have had open houses, zoom meetings, question answer forums. This developer has never contacted any owners in Copper Ranch. This developer has proven time and time again, the quality of life for Copper Ranch owners is inconsequential. It's all about money. To the commission, please don't use this meeting as a formality and tick off all the boxes. There are real concerns here regarding this developer and this project that really need to be considered. A development this large needs thorough review time, and should not be approved without addressing the realty on the ground. Parking, snow storage, and a pathway between Copper Ranch and Lidos will be addressed next by other Copper Ranch owners.

[6:37:10 PM](#) Cynthia Shearstone, owner in Copper Ranch, requested staff to read aloud Item C, site circulation. Lido Apartments are being built 20 feet from her two bedroom windows and patio. Staff read requested area aloud.[6:38:57 PM](#) Shearstone personally has two letters on file,

November 30, 2021, December 16, 2021 and a third letter that was signed by 9 owners dated January 23, 2022 objecting to a walking path along the north property line. Lido Apartments have been built so close to their units that people and dogs will be within 6 feet of their porches at some points. This walkway that was part of the Lido Apartment agreement and should not be part of the Copper Ranch agreement. Liabilities, cost, maintenance should all be on Lido development or drop the walking path all together. The design in Lido apartments has plenty of walkways without this one. Copper Ranch owners should not have any part of it and they don't want it. Bought her first floor condo in March 2021., Bought it for these reasons – price point could afford, HOA dues were reasonable, they have since doubled because no money was in the reserve funds when repairs came up. It is an easy access unit to be able to get in place, have hip and knee replacement surgery coming up in next two months. It is an attractive friendly neighborhood. Has a porch for outdoor living. It's been a safe neighborhood. Bought her unit anticipating it would be her forever home. Now she is worried about her safety, privacy, and her investment with a 104 rental units within 20ft of her back door. Would like to know if commission and staff have been down to see how close Lido has been built to their Copper Ranch homes. This section needs to be withdrawn from this design review application for the Copper Ranch phase 6.

[6:42:27 PM](#) Kay Geiger, 1940 A Copper Ranch, address parking issue and snow storage. Handed out sheet of paper that should give idea of what's going, it relates to snow storage and parking situation. Going to initially address the parking issue and also included snow storage. Kay explained handout legend. To speak to what Jeff said earlier, resident does have 3 vehicles and have 3 driving adults. Spoke with Rick and he indicated to her that snow was removed from Gravity and dumped on those lots. The space behind the tennis center is not being used for snow storage. Parking behind and alongside Gravity is posted as Gravity only parking. Had due increases. Don't understand how can possibly put amount of snow there now in what they have proposed for snow storage. It's going to cause them to have to haul off snow and they have to haul it off and pay for it not Gravity. Really confused about this is all going to work. Dues have increased tremendously because of poor management of board. Capital reserve assignment per person. That this growth is needed, not here to stop this project but make sure its healthy growth. That can live in a community that is happy, a good environment. Say again what Sue said, don't make a hasty decision. Don't make this meeting a formality. Come out and visit.

[6:47:01 PM](#) Steve, Copper Ranch, no other representation, don't even know what HOA is. Asked to see overhead plan that shows everything. Here have what is proposed project, this is half acre lot that has gone unpaved, undeveloped and is used their parking. Called the swamp, the mud pit and the hub. AT any given time there is some 6-22 people who park there. They are proposing to now develops this and put a building here. They are wanting to take away our parking for last 20 years. If look at rest of parking, it goes like this. Steve noted certain residences have 3 spots but that it's not open parking. Not understanding how parking was amended. If stopped before amended, Lido construction would owe them 12-15 spots based off ratio have been guaranteed for years. This is a long term project. He is new to snow. Steve noted where snow went when he moved here. They are asking to change the ratio and take away what's most important.

[6:50:02 PM](#) Beth Rothford, 1021 Copper Ranch, here tonight as community is concerned that Hailey PZ is ready to accept assurance from developer despite numerous long standing unsettled issues in the current Copper Ranch and existing PUD. There is a history of mismanagement and financial instability. Owners have been told to claim ice dam repairs on their own issuances

because the developer has threatened the Copper Ranch issuance could be canceled. This is violation of their fiduciary duty to their owners. It is also curious that this problem exists since one of the developer's board members is actually the Copper Ranch insurance agent. Seemingly a big conflict of interest. Developers did not create a capital reserve fund, even though knew it was needed. Fees were kept artificially low to sell units. The developer is on record stating the quality of construction was kept low to keep cost within budget. Developers are lax of snow storage and removal. And this new plan will require more hauling of snow, putting the cost of their mismanagement onto the current owners. This change in plan will cost the owners and on top of that have a \$25,000 assessment at the same time jeopardizing the viability for the residents. Significant changes and written accountability for the developer is critical. As currently the developer is non-compliant. Without this, the current residents will see an reasonable cost to owners and at same time reducing quality of living and long term viability of Copper Ranch. Please take the time, come visit before make any rash decisions because what's on paper and in reality are two different things.

[6:52:09 PM](#) Julie Donnelly, Copper Ranch owner, family has owned and lived there for 19 years, agrees with what has been presented by other owners. Just have general concern about this area being developed, have Lido complex with 107 units that could be 200 plus people and copper Ranch Condos and now have this area, that is a lot of people in this area all from 7am to 9 going out to Woodside Blvd is wall to wall cars, there's huge traffic high density in this area that needs to be considered from people going to work and school and coming back. Copper Ranch owners are frustrated with lack of communication with HOA, live there these are their homes and it's also a financial concern some of the things going.

[6:54:12 PM](#) Jose, owner in copper ranch, no room no storage for parking. Need more room for parking spots. *(Comment not always clear.)*

[6:55:33 PM](#) Jeff Hamilton, stated north access was only 1 lane wide and snow pile was so high had to put his car in the street to see around snow on corners. Hamilton noted snow piles at south access, that glacier of snow. The parking's requirements are minimum. It's not true that each person has two spots, would say less than 40% of people can fit their cars in the driveway. Consider safety factors of people driving and snow removal.

[6:58:35 PM](#) Kyle Torgimson, appreciate other comments made, just couple of comments, do hope at some point this moves forward and is completed and that Copper Ranch owners have over 20 years of not having a voice about their community because its developer controlled. Does hope it moves forward so that the residents can have some ownership of their community. Would like to mention parking, know it's an issue for everyone there's not enough parking. Developer is threatening to remove tiny greenspace left to put more cars. Is that really what we want to do, remove what little green space have? He is the most impacted unit by Lidos, his is the 6ft. If look at quality of life, no parking, put cars in green space and put sidewalk in to connect to Lidos when Copper Ranch was not designed to connect to. When consider last phase really hope consider those design things that make it is as livable as can be and hope that there are compromises that can be made to make it complete.

[7:00:44 PM](#) Marie Fogli, Unit B, Will Copper Ranch Lane go through Lidos? Is there a definitive plan for dirt lot behind gravity fitness? All for it in taking the bus but that was a little on the crass side.

[7:01:28 PM](#) Camron and Allison Cossins, part of Copper Ranch, also like to express concern so of the proposal echoing other comments. Want to highlight downspouts and gutters, finally had to ask for downspouts and gutters to be installed that they face southwest. Camron explained issues of water/ice/stalagmites. HOA has tripled since moved in 2018, one of neighbors mentioned all the reasons did like it. They were close to the edge of capacity to own; this was a leg up. They are two teachers and took on a roommate who works at St Luke's to help that. Not reasonable to enforce limit of cars. Have also asked for heat tape.

[7:04:40 PM](#) Chair Fugate closed public comment.

[7:05:05 PM](#) John King, reiterated that parking required is 50 stalls but providing 69 and the garages are in excess of code and larger than existing garages. King believes there is a code compliant. King stated many knew 38 units were coming but that they are proposing 36. King confirmed will look into downspouts and gutters. King explained also work with Lido Apartments team, and how applicant team was happy to explore work force housing units.

[7:07:13 PM](#) Stahlnecker understands that things have been operating a certain way in last 20 years at Copper Ranch, think it is clear there are going to be some operational changes but that thinks once it becomes new norm those growing pains will not be as painful. [7:08:09 PM](#) Stahlnecker noted there is a large area of snow storage platted behind Gravity. Stahlnecker summarized in reality snow will be stored where it can and when out of room it will be hauled away. Stahlnecker stated explained if City amends code for requirements for parking can address it. Stone asked about building 27 placements. Stahlnecker explained lot line was adjusted due to parking lot. Stahlnecker will review snow storage requirements and platted area behind Gravity. Stahlnecker stated appreciate public comment, goal is to learn from previous phases and provide a good product.

[7:12:19 PM](#) Chair Fugate asked staff for comments. Davis explained that it was advised by City Attorney for the commissioners to review the design review prior to PUD Amendment by City Council. Davis addressed question about building inspections, Davis explained process of building plan review and inspection processes. Davis confirmed building code currently adopted – 2018.

[7:14:04 PM](#) Stone asked if PUD would be written around design review. Davis confirmed, design review if approved is contingent on PUD approval at City Council. [7:14:53 PM](#) Chair Fugate explained that understands how people may feel but that there are something out of their purview such as the HOA.

[7:15:40 PM](#) Chair Fugate would like to see the updated snow storage plan, material samples, see solution to ice dams and such. Chair Fugate asked if Gravity is part of the HOA. Jeffery conformed Gravity is not part of HOA and that they pay for snow removal separately from the HOA.

[7:18:56 PM](#) Commission reviewed photos of site with snow. Chair Fugate would like to see better snow storage and removal plan. Jeffery noted space for snow storage behind Gravity is approximately 6000 sq ft.

[7:20:18 PM](#) Sauerbrey would like to see project wrapped up. Sauerbrey stated there seems to be multiple compliance issues and safety issues referenced. Sauerbrey is not sure if all the kinks on

this are worked out – need material sample and be compliant with code before commission can move forward. Sauerbrey asked if there is a potential of an agreement with Gravity for parking. Sauerbrey would like to see space behind Gravity utilized for additional snow storage. Sauerbrey likes the building design overall, hope issues with construction will be taken and addressed. Sauerbrey stated overall seems like it has potential but seems like there are a few things that still need to be addressed such as work force housing.

[7:23:06 PM](#) Smith agrees with Sauerbrey. Smith stated have roof slopes dropping over entrances that will create ice and should address. Smith asked how going to allow egress/ingress if garage door is not able to be opened. Smith stated snow storage needs work. Smith thinks should look at shared parking with Gravity. Smith referenced complaints he has received by friends and others in Copper Ranch. Smith suggested developer think twice about how would address those grandfathered in with more than two cars. Smith would hope that developer will find way to address parking. Smith stated there is a level of frustration developer needs to address. Smith wants to see material sample. Smith suggested alternatives for workforce housing or somehow set aside for those who will live in our community.

[7:28:28 PM](#) Chair Fugate explained to those attending that even those they may understand and issue if it is in compliance it is out of their hands.

[7:28:55 PM](#) Stone believes original PUD should have some merit, that it would be nice to see original PUD and what was proposed. Stone does not believe met waiver requirement. Stone does like design of buildings, but building design of DR 3.02a suggested amendments to exterior material. Stone agrees, that should not think of workforce housing as something that will take a hit to his money it's to have access. There were a few questions that were raised but that will address at next hearing. Stone agrees with applicant and city that they met parking requirements, as citizens, there are elected officials who can do something to do something.

[7:33:58 PM](#) Scanlon agrees with all that was said. Scanlon asked citizen, Kay, where snow came from in areas marked green. Kay explained how she gathered her knowledge of snow storage and if it was all Copper Ranch – that was told some came from Gravity and that it was approved by all board members. Kay is concerned Copper Ranch is paying for snow removal when hauled off. Scanlon suggested that if the vacant lots were fenced off, may not be having this conversation, he agrees with Stahlnecker that it is going to be what it's going to be. Scanlon does believe there is common ground. [7:37:35 PM](#) Scanlon does not understand process of how one PUD agreement can be thrown out and a new one brought in without some type of continuation. Scanlon stated these people bought properties under one understanding. [7:38:21 PM](#) Scanlon believes that the developer should have an allegiance to those already there. Scanlon believes he has some things that can be looked at.

[7:39:04 PM](#) Commission thanked citizens for public comment.

[7:40:31 PM](#) Davis explained that there are four iterations of the PUD agreement, that the agreement is recorded with the land and it stays with the land unless amended. Davis explained PUD amendment process. Davis clarified that the Design Review Findings from 2003 were what expired. Davis stated parking was never mentioned in the PUD. Commission and Staff discussed history of PUD Amendments.

[7:43:32 PM](#) Jeffery explained the bus stop was suggestion from City Officials. Jeffrey explained his opinion on the parking, bus stop, garage sizes. Stone explained to applicant no one is holding project up for parking and garage sizes, all have agreed those meet code.

[7:47:08 PM](#) Chair Fugate asked applicant to expand on energy conserving measures and if going to provide EV. Chair Fugate asked for more details on sidewalk. Stahlnecker believes walkway referred to by public is on Lidos. Chair Fugate would like to see plan as she was not clear either.

[7:49:21 PM](#) Sauerbrey would like to see proposal on how can provide more community housing.

7:49:39 PM Sauerbrey motioned to continue the public hearing to April 3, 2023. Scanlon seconded. All in Favor.

[7:49:59 PM](#) Chair Fugate called for 5-min break.

- **PH 2** [8:00:48 PM](#) Consideration of City-Initiated Text Amendment to the Hailey Municipal Code, Title 17: Zoning Regulations, Chapter 17.05: Official Zoning Map and District Use Matrix, Section 17.05.040: District Use Matrix, to include amendments and additions to modernize the matrix requirements. **ACTION ITEM.**

Chair Fugate requested a copy of the new condensed version to be provided. Staff suggested also alphabetizing. Smith agreed. Chair Fugate also requested to have footnotes listed on each page that are noted to be listed on bottom of each page.

Stone stated there multiple spots that are unclear to him, that has list of questions, asked if could email to staff. Stone stated there a few spots where believes could combine or eliminate. Stone asked if permitted everywhere, could they just remove? Asking if it could just be a line somewhere in code? Staff will do more research. Staff will add page numbers to next report. Stone noted on construction and landscaping, so construction materials, heavy equipment rental storage, building supply, safety services, landscaping and snow removal – have separated them out but they have the exact same permissions, allowed in all same zones. Stone asked why separate out internal and exterior storage, recommending combining those.

Chair Fugate's concern is that someone is going to come up with something don't have and it's not in the matrix. Sage expressed concern that something was missed in the consolidation of these. Commission would like to see the draft.

Stone stated when two similar have, and have exact same parameters there's no need to separate them out. Chair Fugate can see that. Stone noted on Solar Panels, same thing with the 5ft above building parameters and 10ft poles. Staff confirmed can combine those.

Chair Fugate stated Farming Equestrian is different that household appliances.

Stone noted amending verbiage to shall not instead of no instance or no case in building section. Stone stated can easily email his concerns to staff. Chair Fugate asked that a copy of Stone's email be included with the draft of the new matrix.

Scanlon understands Stone's approach but that if not familiar with area may not be aware.

Sauerbrey thanked staff for their efforts. Sauerbrey is little worried about some of the consolidation such as offices and retail trading and skill trades.

Stone does not know if trades have been split out as much as should be.

Smith expressed concern regarding exterior storage in business zone.

Commission provided base recommendations for staff.

[8:24:30 PM](#) Chair Fugate opened public comment.

[8:25:17 PM](#) Chair Fugate closed public comment.

All agreed to continue project to future meeting. Commission and staff discussed having commission individually reach out to staff to help assist with any questions or suggestions. Staff confirmed next available meeting March 20, 2023. [8:30:35 PM](#) Commission requested hard copies for next meeting of the clean and edited version.

Stone motioned to continue the public hearing to March 20, 2023. Sauerbrey seconded. All in Favor.

Staff Reports and Discussion

- [SR 1](#) Discussion of current building activity, upcoming projects, and zoning code changes.
- [SR 2](#) Discussion of the next Planning and Zoning Meeting: **March 6, 2023**
 - PUD & DR: BCSD/ARCH 128 W Bullion St
 - PUD & PP: Starlight Lane Sub.

[8:33:39 PM](#) Staff summarized upcoming projects.

[8:35:46 PM](#) Smith motion to adjourn. Sauerbrey seconded. All in Favor.