

**Meeting Minutes**  
**Hailey Planning and Zoning Commission**  
**Monday, March 6, 2023**  
**5:30 p.m.**

Hailey Planning and Zoning Meetings are open to the public, in person, and by electronic means when available. The city strives to make the meeting available virtually but cannot guarantee access due to platform failure, internet interruptions or other potential technological malfunctions. Participants may join our meeting virtually by the following means:

**From your computer, tablet, or smartphone:** <https://meet.goto.com/CityofHaileyPZ>

**Via One-touch dial in by phone:** [tel:+15713173122,,506287589#](tel:+15713173122,506287589#)

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

---

**Present**

**Commission:**

**Staff:** Robyn Davis, Brian Yeager, Chris Simms, Christian Ervin, Mike Baledge, Cece Osborn, Emily Rodrigue, Jessie Parker

**5:30:07 PM Call to Order**

- **5:30:30 PM** Public Comment for items not on the Agenda. No comment.

**5:31:31 PM Consent Agenda**

- **CA 1** Adoption of Meeting Minutes dated February 21, 2023. **ACTION ITEM.**

**5:31:36 PM** Sauerbrey motioned to approve meeting minutes dated February 21st. **seconded. All in Favor.**

**Public Hearing**

**5:32:00 PM** Chair Fugate stated PH 1 and PH 2 will be held currently.

- **PH 1** Consideration of a Planned Unit Development Application submitted by Blaine County School District c/o ARCH Community Housing Trust, Inc. for one (1), two-story multifamily building consisting of four (4) residential units and a one (1), one-story detached studio unit, to be located at 128 W. Bullion (Lot 10A, Parkview Estates) within the General Residential (GR) and Townsite Overlay (TO) Zoning Districts. The PUD Application includes additional amenities and a request for waivers. The Applicant is requesting the following waivers:
  - Minimum Size for Planned Unit Development: Reduce the minimum lot size from one (1) acre to 0.31 acres.
  - Maximum Density: Increase allowed density from three (3) multi-family units to five (5) multi-family units.
  - Maximum Lot Coverage: Increase the maximum lot coverage requirements by approximately eight (8) percent. **ACTION ITEM.**

[5:33:29 PM](#) Davis provided brief history of parcel and applicants intent of project. Davis turned floor to applicant team.

[5:35:14 PM](#) Michelle Griffith, ARCH Community Housing Trust, thanked commission and public. Griffith introduced applicant team. Griffith provided a background on housing struggles within BCSD. Griffith explained plan is to rent the units to district employees no more than 30% of adjusted growth income. Griffith explained design is meant for one household in each unit.

[5:40:26 PM](#) Sam Stahlnecker, Opal Engineering, went through the proposed site plan. Stahlnecker stated each unit will have two dedicated parking stalls. Stahlnecker discussed paving and pedestrian access. Stahlnecker provided an alternative layout with studio on along Bullion frontage, noting access isle would be longer. Stahlnecker provided revised site plan, noting changes include wrap around porch along frontage of Bullions with the 3plex.

[5:45:47 PM](#) Martin Kaplan, introduced himself and Susan Scovill. Kaplan explained decision behind design of studio at rear. Kaplan stated all units are identical except for the ADU. Kaplan provided revised elevations that include first unit to access off Bullion. Kaplan explained how broke up the façade with the roof lines, projections, and siding.

[5:51:22 PM](#) Scovill noted how entry roofs help break the building up, and that all entries will have snow clips.

[5:52:00 PM](#) Scanlon asked if there will be a property line vacation for the access. Scanlon asked if there is some way could step the building at the midpoint, possibly add a gable? To help break up the roof. Scanlon suggested another porch on the southwest corner and different colors/materials.

[5:54:29 PM](#) Stahlnecker stated there are no plans to vacate the property but as part of the process will have an easement recorded in perpetuity.

[5:54:56 PM](#) Stone asked if viable at 30%? Griffith stated that is the industry accepted standard. Griffith explained trying to make the house affordable for any employees. Stone asked what happens if don't have any BCSD employees to put in it. Griffith explained options school district has. Stone asked how ended up with 1 acre for PUD. Davis stated that number has been around for a very long time and that could be an update for the future. Smith asked if allowed other projects that did not meet the 1 acre. Davis confirmed – River Street Townhomes. Griffith added that River Street Apartments is another.

[5:59:29 PM](#) Smith complimented applicant team. Smith asked if done some kind of market study for how many people would want a 3 bedroom place. Jim Foudy, BCSD Super Intendant, explained that 50% of employees employed are up for retirement within the next 5 years and that this is part of a larger project hoping to complete. Foudy summarized issues facing with housing and employees. Smith stated hoping to hear from adjacent neighbor on their preference of north south facing building.

[6:02:45 PM](#) Sauerbrey stated would like to see possible updated material board. Sauerbrey would like to see some communications between neighbors that will be affected. Sauerbrey asked about if fire access could still be met with the changes. Stahlnecker confirmed met with Fire Department did feel comfortable with both layouts. Griffith added will be doing 2hour firewalls. Sauerbrey would like to

see other forms of energy efficiently meeting code requirements. Sauerbrey asked how the 30% adjusted growth income worded. Griffith explained it's within the land lease between ARCH and BCSD. Sauerbrey is curious if BCSD would be open to considering deed restrictions. Griffith explained that the land lease addresses that, and it is a recorded document. Simms stated there would also be a recorded PUD Agreement. Sauerbrey confirmed that would continue even if ownership changes. Staff confirmed.

[6:10:07 PM](#) Chair Fugate thinks will need to go with studio in front. Chair Fugate stated it's great to see partnerships with the school district. Chair Fugate agreed with other commissioners comments.

[6:12:09 PM](#) Kaplan addressed Scanlon's concern regarding roof, that there was an intent in no having any dormers due to maintenance challenges. Kaplan stated could easily wrap deck along southwest side.

[6:15:45 PM](#) Chair Fugate asked if establishing agreement. Griffith confirmed there will be an easement and can address parking in one of two ways 1) add to ground lease or 2) house rules that are enforced through property management.

[6:16:33 PM](#) **Chair Fugate opened public comment.**

[6:17:24 PM](#) Tom Dale, 200 W Bullion, read aloud public comment. "We live directly next door to the proposed BCRD/ARCH development at 128 W. Bullion St. in Hailey. We were looking forward to seeing what ARCH would design, impressed with their other projects and mission. We very much support desperately needed workforce housing for the community and look forward to meeting new neighbors. Before we bought our house at 200 W. Bullion we asked the school district what they planned to do with the neighboring lot and they weren't sure, maybe a house project for students but really, no idea. We were aware of and trusted the Hailey GR zoning and went ahead with our home purchase. We didn't expect a four unit + 1 adu housing complex development and oppose both the waivers and the design. The current design is very large project on a small piece of land, oddly out of character with the neighborhood and strangely oriented with four front doors facing the side of our house. The 3rd waiver wasn't on the original mailed notice about allowing a larger project footprint relative to the property size. Please build the very necessary housing without the proposed waivers and more in character with the neighborhood. Please change the project scope to preserve the integrity and trust in the city zoning, and preserve the reputation of the school district and ARCH as good neighbors. Thank you"

[6:19:45 PM](#) Pen Stroh, lives across the street, think ARCHs is amazing and excited about it. Would deny the waivers, personal, they were expecting 3 units there, looking forward to having 3 units there. Like idea of plan flipped, so it's a little softened up front but it's a giant building. Think it's a little creepy that people who rent there would have to come out of their garages under the noses of their super intendent. As much as hear you're amazing. Also concerned about safety. Concerned about families with children playing on their bikes in the parking and to have only access to and from this building from that parking lot. Seems slightly off to her. Would prefer just the 3 units and somehow oriented towards the front back so that people have privacy and privacy from the district even though district employees and would keep the vegetation, keep the trees. Have letter on file. Chair Fugate confirmed had letter.

[6:21:33 PM](#) Brian, 216 W Bullion, echoes what the other neighbors have said in terms of the scale of the project. Does not feel like it fits in to the neighborhood, single family. Concerned with how this is going to fit in with the rest of the development taking place at end of Bullion. Think there is a lot going on and that in this pieced mealed development process feels like Hailey has. This is not something that is going to be figured out now but with all the waivers that have given for other projects on River Street neighbors here. Feels like whole River Street area getting a little over developed, maybe cart before the horse in terms of getting infrastructure. On Bullion St there is a talk about sidewalk. Point being, think if have more and more density in this area there needs to be more public safety and more consideration in how it all fits in bigger picture then lets approve this and then approve next project.

[6:24:26 PM](#) Dan Turner, Blaine County School Board Trustee, think need to keep in mind is the Why. The why is so critical. The amount of turn over seeing with staff at this point is in education is in crisis. People are leaving the industry in droves and have seen retirement rate go from 8% to 18% in last 3 years. Going to need to bring in a lot of skilled educators for our community if going to meet education needs for our kids. We are asking for little more than what is on the table but the need is so much greater than what asking for. We do have the one unit on Winterhaven and with that think it will be effective to help bring teachers into the program but again can't overstate what the need is.

[6:25:39 PM](#) Chair Fugate closed public comment.

[6:25:53 PM](#) Stahlnecker explained what asking for and what they are providing with the PUD application, summarizing that believe the benefits outweigh the impacts. Stahlnecker stated happy to work with neighbors. Griffith explained how the previous house was much prior to being demolished had a bigger impact than the proposed building. Griffith confirmed amend plans to have door/porch added and can have ADU either north or south. Griffith noted only one mature tree will be removed along that property line.

[6:30:20 PM](#) Nathan Schutte, landscape architect, explained intent is to keep as much vegetation as can and to supplement when can't.

[6:30:54 PM](#) Chair Fugate asked if all in agreement for different colors to break up units, would like to hear on feelings of studio location, and change of south unit door way, and anything else they have to say.

[6:31:50 PM](#) Scanlon asked length of parking outside of garage. Stahlnecker stated 20-22 ft. Scanlon suggested moving building about 2'. Scanlon thinks ADU should front Bullion. Scanlon asked if school district does not need the units, is it just restricted to non-profits. Griffith explained it is part of the land lease, but that also would not have empty houses sitting there. Griffith explained goal is to serve need allowed to be there. Scanlon asked in event someone leaves during school year, instead of being empty could it be used for City of Hailey. [6:36:23 PM](#) Foudy stated the waiting list for staff looking for homes is so long was able to get someone into existing unit.

[6:36:47 PM](#) Stone congratulated applicant team. Stone noted there is a lot of lawn, encourages reducing amount of turf proposed. Stone likes idea of doors to north and south side. Stone stated it seems to him that the PUD is with the school district and that would need to come back if that needed changed. Stone does not like way the roof and entry ways look, not sure how to make look better suggested gable or materials. Stone asked about infrastructure issues, staff is not aware of any.

[6:40:26 PM](#) Smith asked Tom Dale his preferences on doorways and studio apartment. Dale confirmed by shifting south would remove some of his privacy concerns. Dale expressed concern for his apples along his east property line. Dale stated everything does not like is because of size, it takes up so much space. Dale asked if rooms could be sublet out or have room mates. Applicant confirmed no. Dale confirmed would be better going south.

[6:43:46 PM](#) Scanlon asked how the subleasing is enforced. Griffith explained lease documents residents sigh anticipate all of this. Griffith summarized process, confirming no subleasing aloud and that a lot of inspections completed.

[6:45:24 PM](#) Smith would like to see staff come up with mechanism to downsize lot requirements, at least in GR. Smith is hoping this will get picked up along the way. Smith thinks changes by applicant will go a long way. Smith believes another 2' setback could help. Smith asked about landscaping. Schutte explained proposed plants. Smith and Schutte discussed landscape ideas for screening. Smith appreciates willingness of applicant team to change things around.

[6:50:12 PM](#) Sauerbrey believes issue from public comment is density. Sauerbrey stated needs to be looked at in frame – is it warranted? Sauerbrey discussed potential connectivity in future on Bullion and how this type of project putting school district employees in the center of it could be a good thing. Sauerbrey would like to see language regarding the flexibility of how these units can be rented out. Sauerbrey agrees these types of local partnerships are important to our community. Sauerbrey thinks public comment needs to be taken into great account moving forward. Sauerbrey supports flipping project by moving adu and move the doorways and also believes moving south doorway doesn't really create an extra walk. Sauerbrey believes need to take chances on opportunities we have, this is why PUD option exists.

[6:56:59 PM](#) Chair Fugate agrees with what has heard. Chair Fugate confirms all in agreement studio apartment moves towards Bullion, take the extra 2' in parking to give more breather to neighbors, get more specifics on plantings. Chair Fugate asked that the neighbors consider that basically going to know who tenants are. Chair Fugate thinks it is great that there could be some shared parking. Chair Fugate and staff discussed options for continuation. All in agreement will approve PUD tonight and continue Design Review. Commission confirmed with applicant items to bring back.

[7:06:35 PM](#) **Smith motion to approve the Planned Unit Development (PUD) Application by the Blaine County School District c/o ARCH Community Housing Trust, Inc., for the construction of a maximum of five (5) residential units on 0.31 acres, with a request for waivers and proposed benefits, located at Lot 10A, Parkview Estates (128 W. Bullion Street), within the General Residential (GR) and Townsite Overlay (TO) Zoning Districts, finding that the project meets the standards under Section 17.10 of the Hailey Municipal Code, subject to Conditions 1-6 above. Stone seconded. All in Favor.**

- **PH 2** Consideration of a Design Review Application, to be heard concurrently with the Planned Unit Development Application, submitted by Blaine County School District c/o ARCH Community Housing Trust, Inc. for one (1), two-story multi-family unit consisting of four (4) attached residential units and a one (1), one-story detached studio unit, to be located at 128 W Bullion (Lot 10A, Parkview Estates) within the General Residential (GR) and Townsite Overlay (TO) Zoning Districts. **ACTION ITEM.**

[7:07:31 PM](#) Stone motion to continue the public hearing 2 to April 3, 2023. Scanlon seconded.  
All in Favor.

[7:08:12 PM](#) Chair Fugate called for 5-minute break.

[7:14:25 PM](#) Chair Fugate called to order.

Chair Fugate stated will hear PH 3 and PH 4 concurrently.

- [PH 3](#) [7:14:35 PM](#) Consideration of a Planned Unit Development Application submitted by Darin and Kathleen Barfuss to subdivide 1371 Silver Star Drive (HAILEY FR S1/2 TL 7731 SEC 16 2N 18E) into eight (8) single-family residential lots to be known as Star Light Lane Subdivision. The PUD Application includes Community Housing amenities and a request for the following waivers:
  - Lot width, size, and density in the LR-2 Zoning District; and
  - The number of units served by a private street. **ACTION ITEM.**

[7:15:39 PM](#) Osborn introduced proposed projects and provided a brief summary of proposal. Osborn turned floor to applicant team.

[7:18:19 PM](#) Chad Blincoe, Blincoe Architecture, introduced himself and the property owners. Blincoe stated will start with the key points and address public comment received. Blincoe summarized history of application. Blincoe noted based off lot size can provide up to 4 lots, not 3 without waivers. Blincoe explained struggles faced when developing plan and what they wanted to do for the city. Blincoe provided background on property owners and history that affected the property and the owners. Blincoe explained why requesting waivers proposed. Blincoe noted parking provided is greater than what is required.

[7:27:10 PM](#) Scanlon asked about 20 ft. parking spaces. Blincoe explained proposed parking, noting some are actually larger than what is required.

[7:28:02 PM](#) Chair Fugate asked what the gray area near parking spots. Blincoe noted it is gravel area for parking. Blincoe continued to explain that parcel A is clear of obstructions. Blincoe explained where originally proposed sidewalk and that the city requested an in lieu fee.

[7:29:47 PM](#) Blincoe summarized items that do not meet and that the PUD does allow for PZ and Council to make amendments. Blincoe confirmed also asking for density waiver. Osborn explained density waiver and why only permitted three lots not four. Blincoe explained how total project meets lot coverage and also the single-family units based off lot areas. Blincoe offered to add plat note that would limit any possible future access onto Broadford. Blincoe addressed concerns of buffer along Broadford. Blincoe confirmed project meets fire separation per IRC, and explained only requirement would be on underside of front porch on Lot 3. Blincoe believes this design does a great job of pushing the structures into the property leaving the front open for wildlife. [7:33:46 PM](#) Blincoe discussed proposed amenities. Blincoe noted dedicating dotted areas on plans that allow for ability to bring Broadford Rd into compliance. Blincoe asked why certain items were not addressed when Colorado Gulch was developed and how the owner is paying the price now. Blincoe continued to list community benefits proposed.

[7:37:36 PM](#) Blincoe explained architectural proposal for homes. Chair Fugate noted not hearing a design review application. Blincoe asked if there are any further questions on architectural. Chair Fugate requested to focus on Subdivision and Planned Unit Development application. Blincoe asked if applicant team had further items to add.

[7:39:39 PM](#) Jacob Thomas, Landscape architect, summarized green spaces proposed and landscape proposed for areas.

[7:41:39 PM](#) Applicant explained how part of the development is the community housing, and how the need for housing is going to continue to grow. Applicant stated could easily subtract units but asked if that would benefit community the most. Applicant explained this design was to show the max they could do. Applicant explained pros and cons of building 3 homes. Applicant asked what the City would like to see so they can modify the concept to meet what the city would like.

[7:44:16 PM](#) Chair Fugate asked staff to explain community housing. Staff explained how community housing is defined within the City of Hailey.

[7:47:49 PM](#) Scanlon asked Blincoe if had a drawing showing the lot with 4 units and why it didn't work. Blincoe does not. Blincoe explained it was the access, that was being penalized for too long of a driveway. Scanlon asked if looked at reducing units from eight in proposed design. Blincoe confirmed could do reduce the units but it would reduce the number of units for community housing. Blincoe explained looking for commissioner input on direction preferred to. Scanlon asked if there were any plans on the other parcel. Blincoe explained no, goal is to sell that property as his.

[7:52:48 PM](#) Scanlon asked about required dedication of Broadford Rd. Davis explained as it sets, Broadford is a substandard road and public works has asked for the dedication to bring the road to standards.

[7:53:39 PM](#) Stone asked if there was a letter of support from ARCH. Davis stated no, but there was one Blaine County Housing. Stone would like to hear from public.

[7:53:57 PM](#) Smith interested in hearing public input. Smith noted parcel is 1.2 acres per Galena's drawing and could divide into four lots with units plus ADU's.

[7:55:09 PM](#) Sauerbrey knows plan for connectivity, asked if the in lieu fee was sufficient to cover cost of development along Broadford. Davis explained staff preference would be for applicant to initiate the build out of the shared used path, that the in lieu fees would not be enough to complete the entire path. Davis stated applicant and staff would work internally for base and the city would come back through to pave it.

[7:57:00 PM](#) **Chair Fugate opened public comment.**

[7:57:07 PM](#) Jeff Giese, 1501 Red Feather Way, main question was area development plan and when would see it. Curious what will happen with the next parcel. Density bonus seems high in the sky ask and not sure where at on that. It seems if borders LR 1, if rezoned to LR 1 could get to 7 lots or units through the code without any waivers which would also allow setbacks to be met. One of things concerns him about pushing everything to Broadford, is there's a good buffer between Broadford and those lots and have height limitation on those lots that buffer. Something would ask for consideration



on. Geise noted line of sight is reduced as come down that hill. Geise is concerned about private parking, could run into issues with accessing parking. As far as amount of parking, thinks it's really important to make sure get adequate parking. These homes when completed are going to sell 800k-1.1 million and likely would need two families living in some of these to afford that kind of mortgage. Appreciates allowing to speak and hard work commission staff work. Understands Barfuss need to do something with the property.

[8:00:45 PM](#) Mark Overfelt, Colorado Gulch Preserve HOA, relayed petition that they have a copy of and got signatures from adjacent neighborhoods. Against density, not development of the property think concern is going from 4 lots to 8 lots. Biggest concern is connectivity to the city. It was mentioned is this the right place for density. Doesn't seem like this is the right place for density, would hope that they stick with density and do four lots.

[8:01:56 PM](#) Dustin Stellars, 1350 Queen of the Hills, as the design looks the amount of houses going on property line behind his house and height of homes is unreasonable. Basically 30 ft. tall, wall to wall and go along his fence line. There's a lot of concerns for his privacy, security of his children, noise. There's a lot more in letter submitted. Can't tell a man what to do with his land but there's a right and wrong way to do things. Feels like it's the wrong way to do things for our community.

[8:03:22 PM](#) Amanda Houston, 1541 Red Feather, a lot of her comments Chad addressed. Asked a lot of questions about code. Jeff mentioned separation and height limits in Colorado Gulch that they are required to adhere too. Have a 15 ft. public utility and snow storage easement off of Broadford. Wondering if the City is going to require that. IF go to the property now, where the fence is, believes that is about where the right of way is and the snow pushes all the way up there. Obviously, if the road is widened there has to be snow storage along Broadford. Doesn't the City own the parcel on the other side of Broadford; can't they widen the road on that side so not taking someone else's property? If look at GIS, there is a flag lot. Think Chad mentioned could not get back to ne corner parcel discussing and think could allow for four flag lots which could accommodate ADUs giving you that 8 unit density on that property. Houston stated they are part of an association, listing what the Colorado Gulch HOA does. Houston stated associations are really expensive, but all association dues add to bottom line of what people have to pay. Houston stated it is worth looking at the offset, if can get higher density with ADUs people are going to control their maintenance. These are things asking them to consider.

[8:06:04 PM](#) KC, 1501 Red Feather, already been mentioned that Colorado Gulch and Broadford estates were required to put in a buffer. She can attest values the buffer parcel a lot, it helps with privacy, separation and noise. The current design of this parcel where houses abut right up to the easement, they are right on the road. Think it would actually be a deterrent to the residents who will eventually live there. Would advocate continuing that requirement for a buffer parcel and also adds continuity along Broadford and adds value to pedestrians. Snow storage, there is also a requirement for snow storage along Silver Star. Believe it was mentioned that there is a need for snow storage along Broadford as well. Think that those 2 things make this plan less appealing. Also would object to the density, feels really forced and out of character with the neighborhood. Would advocate for \*unclear\* delighted to see 5, delighted to see some community housing if could make it work. But don't believe this would be a successful plan.



[8:08:42 PM](#) Laura Jorgensen, 1521 Red Feather Way, would like more clarification on community housing. What counts as community housing? Can you sell it for profit? Can it be primary secondary homes? Someone who is working part time? How is it enforceable? What are its parameters? Is it truly a benefit?

[8:09:46 PM](#) Robbie, 1360 Queen of the Hills Drive, live right on the corner, walk Silver Star frequently. His concern is have seen near accidents on corner of Broadford and Silver Star, does not believe it was meant to be a full thorough fare. To hold amount of traffic that it has now. These developments should have easy access into town, there's no sidewalk, there's no real safe way to ride a bike into town. Have more people coming down Queen of the Hills now because of Broadford, having speeding there. The other concern, there's comprehensive plans have commercial property understand core needs of city and actually moved from 2<sup>nd</sup> Ave to be more rural. Opposed to the density, it isn't in line with their neighborhood or CGP sub.

[8:12:27 PM](#) Sam Stahlnecker, Carbonate Street, just wanted to pose a question to the commission, their job is to decide if benefits outweighing all the waivers requested. Doing some math while waiting because curious how many units could have in LR 1 and LR2. Think in LR 2 could go with 3 units with park requirements and LR 1 could go with 5 units with park requirements. Try to keep those unit counts in back of head for neighbor's sake is beneficial. Think this new type of housing is interesting, would ask given the makeup the given make up with City of Hailey is it really going to be that much more affordable or is there still that much demand for working class people who live here that make enough to afford market price housing. Think mention of comp plan is extremely important; is this location good for this amount of density? Or is a slightly less amount of density request more appropriate? In the PUD code, the maximum density bonus listed clearly is 25% so think 50% is significant ask especially in LR 2 on the outskirts of City of Hailey. Just getting into designs, think the plans are little misleading, documents submitted did not clearly define what the setbacks were proposed to be, did not see anything asking for waiver for those setbacks. Think that should be specified so that neighbors can be aware of what they are getting. It looked like some of the column on the front porches were feet apart which is a lot to ask for. Was looking at double frontage standards, and staff response saying there is an allowance to not impose double frontage standard but think it's important to create buffer along Broadford road. Last thing, talking about layout, the parking plan would require trespass on neighbor property to actually get into the stalls and think it's really important to look at how that actually functions if that is what they are proposing and if it is they should be requesting all of those waivers now so it's clear to the neighbors that's what actually going to be built. Commission has a big takes ahead of them and requires significant thought, and if this application is approved here the expansive and density around the perimeter of our city is much more plausible.

[8:16:13 PM](#) Aquila Kashino, 1360 Snowfly Drive, his primary concern, walk the kids down to pet the horses and it's been a dream of theirs to move out of a townhouse in Hailey and that kind of density to an area like this. It's still fairly dense, neighbors are easy speaking density. However wasn't anticipating looking at development that he came from being less than a 100 yards from their house. Sure there's been studies done, being the house is his biggest investment of his life, cant imagine anything but property value decline with this kind of development down the street. Although does understand community housing issues and understand it's a major issue. It does seem this is pretty high density. He knows what kind of living conditions arise when pack that many people into that small of an area. Traffic wise, crime wise usually higher density more that going on all of that was not

part of his dream, already have high speed traffic down the road and people using Silver Star as a thorough fare. Would be interested in studies on what this would do for property value.

[8:18:52 PM](#) Ali Freund, Snowlfy, plan to raise her kids down there and grew up on lot behind this. Does have concerns of project in fact it is in lightest density zone with highest minimum lot size with requirements. It's clear it's intended to protect the light views and openness of that district. Reading through land use map in Hailey, think the intention is to focus density towards the core and would argue this is not the opportunity. Think single lot can divided into four and that already increases housing inventory and stays true to character of neighborhood and maintains that green space the zoning prioritizes. Still think there are some major parking issues that need a lot more scrutiny. Think that fact that extreme allowance are being made for community housing think community housing needs to be truly considered if it warrants this level of leniency. Think need to weigh impact these waivers have at expense of residences, neighborhoods. Truly does not think it will meet the housing needs and have great impact the residences and future development.

[8:21:57 PM](#) Rick, 1521 Red Feather Way, Think on sole issue, big thing to him is precedent. Anytime start changing things anyone anywhere has right if give someone right to change it. So when have development, neighborhood way it is and want to change it have to look toward future. Totally agree, they totally have right to develop their property but on other hand just change all the rules and come up with reasons for it anyone can do it. It's a precedent that commission sets when they do variances.

[8:23:07 PM](#) **Chair Fugate closed public comment.**

[8:23:14 PM](#) Mr. Barfuss, owner, stated has lived there for last 30 years and provided brief background. Mr. Barfuss understands those don't want it in their neighborhood, but the taxes have doubled since annexed into the City and cannot afford for a vacant lot to just sit there. Barfuss explained asking for few variances on this property. Understand everyone is worried about density, and can put four units with ADUs and that would be about the same density. Barfuss understands everyone looks at it as not in their neighborhood. Barfuss apologized to neighbors from interrupting the neighborhood, that not trying to upset anyone in the neighborhood just trying to make a good development for the City.

[8:26:28 PM](#) Blincoe addressed concern of density, explaining asking for 4 additional units that are offering as Community Housing. Blincoe stated within building height setbacks. Blincoe asked where is the appropriate location for density, referring to pocket neighborhoods. Blincoe explained why does not follow thinking of blocking view. Blincoe addressed snow storage, that the calculations submitted are for their use not the City. Blincoe stated staff can go into more detail of community housing, noting language does require more than 1500 hours of working locally. Blincoe noted that the corner lot even as proposed brings it into compliance with city standards. Blincoe stated willing to install sidewalks. Blincoe explained the inaccurate, confirming will be updated once receive feedback back. Blincoe confirmed did meet with fire department regarding access. Blincoe reiterated willing to put in sidewalk, that it's better for them than the in lieu. Blincoe stated does have a professional realtor as part of the design team and can have them assist in property value questions. Blincoe disagrees with multi families in one of these units. Blincoe stated there are some precedents being set. Blincoe stated will be back with some other development based off city feedback.

[8:35:04 PM](#) Davis addressed comment of extend Broadford along east side, that there is sewer line runs along that side. Davis turned floor to Brian Yeager to further expand. [8:35:42 PM](#) Yeager

explained during Colorado Gulch project they were required to do certain improvements but doing anything to the east was problematic due to this pressured sewer line. Yeager explained his preference for the west side.

[8:36:50 PM](#) Citizen asked about her question regarding Community Housing. Chair Fugate stated it's based off how many hours a person works in the community. Osborn added that it has been beneficial as the only purchasers have to be local, that the market would exclude those out of area.

[8:38:17 PM](#) Osborn explained why City Staff is very favorable towards this type community housing.

[8:39:40 PM](#) Scanlon was not aware there was a buffer zone along Broadford in front of Colorado Gulch Preserve and makes him concerned about how close these houses could be without a buffer zone. Scanlon thinks if could get back to where don't need a waiver for setbacks could help. Scanlon noted density is an issue, always an issue. Scanlon explained there needs to be a compromise, a win win for everyone. Scanlon asked about privacy fence. Blincoe explained proposing fence along Broadford. Scanlon asked if 6'. Blincoe confirmed. Blincoe noted location of proposed fence, and confirmed to be wood fence. Blincoe confirmed would develop fence and not require existing neighbors to build fence. Scanlon asked Simms to clarify on what is and is not precedent.

[8:43:51 PM](#) Simms stated cannot disagree with public comment about a social precedent being set but there is not legal precedent being set. Simms explained no true legal precedent being set. Simms can't disagree with comment in social sense. Simms looked back at criteria and urges commission to consider criteria such as comp plan.

[8:44:46 PM](#) Scanlon believes project is well conceived, but thinks that somehow need to be more respectful to neighbors.

[8:45:11 PM](#) Stone believes that there is opportunity to use PUD in special circumstances, but does not see generating four more house being enough to grant a double density and various setbacks. Stone stated it takes all types of people to build a community. [8:46:58 PM](#) Stone does like concept of exactly what trying to work with Staff on but don't think this is setup will be successful that these homes would just sell at market value. Stone suggested sticking with in LR 2 requirements. Stone suggested some kind of buffering to neighbors to North West. Stone suggested possibly doing a four-plex, unsure if could do though. Stone does like language for community housing and does want to target it in other locations.

[8:49:14 PM](#) Smith asked if desire/need to provide more housing availability supersede our desire/need to maintain our neighborhoods, sense of place and community. [8:49:45 PM](#) Smith explained what sees currently when drives down Broadford Rd and that think make nice transition. Smith stated this just doesn't seem to compliment that transition. Smith is unsure if this is the location for this level of density. Smith would like to think applicant can come back with less density. Smith suggested allowing pre-pud applications like pre design review applications. Smith does like idea they are trying help out with community housing, but just does not think it's the right spot. Smith suggested may want to take a look at LR 1 potential. Smith confirmed things have changed considerably over the last 30 years but that change still needs to fit. Smith said may come up with higher density but not to this extent.

[8:54:47 PM](#) Sauerbrey stated thing that has come up on this project is that it seems so close and the density. Sauerbrey stated that a lot of houses have gone and will go in. Sauerbrey does want to see it maintain character as well as connectivity. Sauerbrey said as project is now have something that doesn't fit area as neighbors have said. Sauerbrey would like clarification on number of units can fit. Sauerbrey stated the bummer is that if say reduces units reduces community housing units provided. Sauerbrey thinks should prioritize affordable housing, but it doesn't do enough if support housing at diverse range of income levels. Sauerbrey believes will be dealing with inventory issue for long time. Sauerbrey stated if local owned and local rented it could support two local families. Sauerbrey would like applicant to incorporate everyone's comments, using ADU model and still get community housing.

[9:01:08 PM](#) Chair Fugate would like to see proposed model in action but does think this is not the place for density in this location. [9:02:18 PM](#) Chair Fugate thinks need to offer all kinds of housing, but thinks this area is more conducive to similar design of surrounding neighborhoods. Chair Fugate stated while there is no legal precedent but think it would open them up to future issues just like this, whether it's legal or not legal. Chair Fugate does not think the waivers being asked for were clear and would like those clarified. [9:05:09 PM](#) Chair Fugate summarized when see them again would like waivers clarified, snow storage more clear. Chair Fugate agrees with what has been. Commission thanked public for attending and thanked applicant for being amendable to what they are talking about.

[9:06:20 PM](#) Blincoe confirmed hearing clear – density, setbacks, etc. Blincoe asked for clarification on Stone comments about staying in LR 2. Blincoe is confused on reference to Lena Cottages. Stone clarified he did not see anything in the plan that warrants a waiver. Stone stated when reference four plex, was meaning increase the diversity. Stone is not opposed to density changes, what he does not think matches the neighborhood is a bunch of buildings very close together. Stone stated giving his basic opinion, provided suggestions such as Townhomes. [9:09:24 PM](#) Blincoe stated going to ADU aspect, he thinks that is the same density if not greater. Blincoe thinks design with ADU could be more difficult. Chair Fugate clarified not asking them to design ADU. [9:10:57 PM](#) Sauerbrey stated from his perspective is that they could do both. Sauerbrey explained that it seems to him could go two different directions, as proposed or with 4 homes with ADUs, density would be the same.

[9:12:24 PM](#) Applicant stated will be pulling this application, does not want to continue. Applicant stated will come back with a different application at a future time.

[9:13:24 PM](#) Simms confirmed no motion needed, to table project.

- [PH 4](#) [7:15:32 PM](#) Consideration of a Preliminary Plat Application, to be heard concurrently with the Planned Unit Development Application, submitted by Darin and Kathleen Barfuss to subdivide 1371 Silver Star Drive (HAILEY FR S1/2 TL 7731 SEC 16 2N 18E) into eight (8) lots, ranging in size from 3,024 square feet to 4,878 square feet. This project is known as Starlight Lane Subdivision. **ACTION ITEM.**

#### **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 20, 2023**

- DR: Maple Street Apartments
- TA: Matrix (continuation from 2/21/23)

[9:14:24 PM](#) Chair Fugate asked staff to send email of draft matrix.

[9:15:08 PM](#) Davis summarized upcoming hearing.

[9:15:51 PM](#) Scanlon motioned to adjourn. Smith seconded. All in Favor.