

**Meeting Minutes**  
**Hailey Planning and Zoning Commission**  
**Tuesday, June 20, 2023**  
**5:30 p.m.**

**Present**

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

**Staff:** Robyn Davis, Cece Osborn, Rebecca Bundy, Jessie Parker, Mike Baledge

**5:30:33 PM Call to Order**

- **5:30:54 PM** Public Comment for items not on the Agenda.

**5:31:39 PM Consent Agenda**

- **CA 1** Adoption of Meeting Minutes dated June 5, 2023. **ACTION ITEM.**

**5:31:46 PM** Sauerbrey motioned to approve CA 1. Scanlon seconded. All in Favor.

**Public Hearing**

**5:32:25 PM** Smith motioned to hear public hearing two first. Scanlon seconded. All in Favor.

- **PH 2 5:33:00 PM** Consideration of a Design Review Application submitted by Edward Stacy Ivie for the construction of a new garage with an upper-level, two (2) bedroom accessory dwelling unit of 894 square feet, to be located at 214 W Croy Street (Lot 7A, Block 4, Croy Addition) within the General Residential (GR) and Townsite Overlay (TO) Zoning Districts **ACTION ITEM**

**5:33:08 PM** Davis introduced project, noted outstanding items by staff due to incomplete application. Davis explained reasoning for incomplete application due to at time of submittal there were multiple amendments taking place and it was thought he would not need to in front of Planning and Zoning, that after seeing the plans staff decided it did need to go in front of Planning and Zoning.

**5:35:05 PM** Stacy Ivie, introduced himself, and explained his intent for ADU is for long term housing of first responders.

**5:36:07 PM** Scanlon noted backside of building was rather plain, suggesting ideas of how to break up that elevation. Scanlon encourages all plumbing vents into one through the roof. Scanlon asked how much of the concrete will be exposed. Ivie stated will be acid etching on the exposed concrete. Scanlon asked what the R value is of the log walls. Scanlon asked if will have chinking. Ivie stated no chinking. Scanlon asked for clarification of setback measurement – if measuring to face of wall or center of wall. Scanlon stated this needs to be verified. Scanlon asked about roof rafters vs. trusses. Ivie stated will be trusses.



[5:40:18 PM](#) Mike Barker, architect, concrete stem wall is 24 inches tall, and it is a log purlin? truss. Barker explained the roof plan. Barker confirmed R value will be 50 in the roof. Scanlon asked what the soffit material will be. Barker stated potentially soffit. Scanlon and Barker discussed proposed materials to be used.

[5:47:00 PM](#) Stone asked if applicant is one living in main home and what the plan is for utilities. Ivie confirmed he will be living in a primary house. Ivie discussed potential utility plan for power underground. Stone clarified proposed construction location on the lot.

[5:50:10 PM](#) Smith clarified foundation is 9 ft from lot line and logs perturbed into further in. Smith clarified setback requirements with staff. Smith asked for material for parking/driveway. Ivie stated compacted road mix. Smith clarified the deck width. Barker stated 24 ft setback from property line to wall is incorrect. Ivie confirmed stain used will match existing house. Davis confirmed snow storage calcs meeting standards will be a condition of approval.

[5:57:39 PM](#) Sauerbrey asked about landscaping. Ivie stated not adding any more grass, grass shown is existing and everything else will be xeriscape. Sauerbrey suggested prewiring for solar and EV. Sauerbrey asked if it is a hot roof. Barker confirmed will vent it. Sauerbrey expressed concern about potential ice damming. Sauerbrey suggested caps on wooden beams and to make sure pathway safe.

[6:02:37 PM](#) Chair Fugate asked if the roof goes past the railing. The applicant confirmed it does not and confirmed will add snow clip on both sides of the roof. Chair Fugate asked what other energy conservation methods are proposed beyond windows. Sauerbrey confirmed applicant will install gutters. Chair Fugate asked if there is room that allows for RVs. Ivie does not plan to have RV parking.

[6:09:04 PM](#) Chair Fugate opened public comment.

[6:09:59 PM](#) Chair Fugate closed public comment.

[6:10:03 PM](#) Commission moved to deliberation of project. Staff and commissioners reviewed proposed conditions of approval. All agreed to changes/additions for conditions H) snow clips on both sides, I) material sample board and receive approval prior to issuance of permit, m) provide snow storage calculations prior to issuance of permit.

[6:14:19 PM](#) Commission and applicant discussed existing and proposed area for power.

[6:16:00 PM](#) Sauerbrey motioned to approve a Design Review Application by Edward Stacy Ivie for a detached 894 square foot garage, with a two-bedroom, 894 square foot ADU located above, located at 214 W. Croy Street (Lot 7A, Block 4, Croy Addition) within the General Residential (GR) and Townsite Overlay (TO) Zoning Districts, 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 Title, and City Standards, provided conditions (a) through (m) are met, as amended. Smith seconded. All in Favor.



- [6:17:09 PM PH 1](#) Continuation of a City-Initiated Text Amendment to amend the Hailey Municipal Code, Title 16: Subdivision Regulations, Chapters 16.01, Definitions, 16.04, Development Standards and 16.08, Townhouses and Title 17: Zoning Regulations, Chapters 17.02, Definitions; 17.05, Official Zoning Map and District Use Matrix; 17.06, Design Review and 17.09 Parking and Loading Spaces to modify/create definitions and standards for detached townhouse and cottage housing development. **ACTION ITEM**

[6:17:53 PM](#) Davis introduced project and summarized request by Commission and Council to review lot cottage standards. Davis turned floor to Rebecca Bundy, Architect and contract planner.

[6:18:44 PM](#) Bundy disclosed few projects she is doing in Hailey and that none of those have any conflict with cottage lot development.

[6:19:13 PM](#) Bundy explained that staff took feedback received on May 15<sup>th</sup> hearing and tried to place it within code. Bundy summarized feedback received and how applied to the proposed change. [6:23:10 PM](#) Bundy noted primary code changes in Title 16 and asked commission feedback on four townhouses being allowed to be accessed off of one driveway. Bundy continued to go through proposed changes. Bundy moved on to proposed changes within Title 17. Bundy asked commission for questions.

[6:30:58 PM](#) Scanlon asked for clarification on standard F. a. (3). Staff clarified common space shall have a unit on at least two sides and confirmed will amend the language. Scanlon asked where the minimum/maximum size of units was. Bundy stated that is in the District Use Matrix.

[6:34:02 PM](#) Stone asked for clarification on why single-family swapped to conditional under LB in the matrix. Staff noted error but asked commission input on if should make conditional – all agreed to change from permitted too conditional. Stone asked if Bundy went through Woodside during her inspection of parking. Bundy explained that she had not, she only looked at newer developments since the code change. Stone encouraged staff to inspect those areas. Stone expressed concern over parking. Stone asked if there is any limit with code of cottage development. Bundy explained how code does not limit it just like it does not limit multifamily, single-family. Stone asked about parking d (4). Bundy explained the concept that this was based off. Stone and Bundy continued to discuss parking.

[6:50:26 PM](#) Smith and Bundy discussed about bonus density option. [6:56:28 PM](#) Smith asked about providing better accessibility given winters in area, where the garage is not so far detached. Bundy and commission discussed potential requirements and that staff can consider the option to require ADA parking.

[6:59:44 PM](#) Sauerbrey stated some of his confusion is the driveway parking issues. Sauerbrey and Bundy discussed the different forms of access for driveways, private drives, and how applies to cluster parking. Commission and Bundy continued to discuss cluster parking. Bundy explained Townhouse dwelling units do not have cluster parking, cottage units are required to have cluster parking or garages/carports. Bundy confirmed correction to B5 (page 23 of packet) to striking cottage. Sauerbrey asked about the storage being required to be detached. All agreed should read as dedicated storage unit. Sauerbrey asked about density bonus requirements and energy



compliance requirements. Bundy and staff discussed bonus requirements and energy compliance requirement.

[7:12:42 PM](#) Chair Fugate asked about addition of community building for accessory use. Bundy explained the reasoning for this requirement. Stone asked if it would define community building. staff referenced proposed definition.

[7:16:05 PM](#) Scanlon noted he has not seen ADA requirements in residential, but some definitions do require type b. Commission and Bundy discussed options for accessibility.

[7:22:19 PM](#) **Chair Fugate opened public comment.**

[7:22:34 PM](#) Samantha Stahlnecker, Thanks, Commissioners and hope Michelle is anxious to speak here too, so I'll try and be brief. Just touching on ADA requirements, there's pretty well-developed standards for multifamily housing, especially when there's more than 4 units in eight building. I think maybe instead of trying to reinvent the wheel there, maybe you just defer to those multifamily standards and apply those to cloud edges. Umm, I think that there needs to be some additional attention in the code to the planning process for cottages. Right now it's really unclear about whether you can plat these sublots without building the units, so if there could be some direction there, do the units need to be constructed before the final plat is signed and approved or can these subblocks be platted and they can be sold off to individual builders? Think that there needs to be a little more detailing there. Additionally, this is a minor note, but there's some language in the code that could be cleaned up about identifying garages on plats and creating potentially a separate deed for those garages. I think that a number of jurisdictions have referred to garages being dedicated as limited common. So I think that that's a nice clean way to make sure that those units don't lose their garages or get those garages get sold off and independently in the future. I think another thing that needs attention in the subdivision code is parks dedication specifically for these cottage units. So currently they're the subdivision code requires a park dedication that a specific ratio per unit is that park dedication required in addition to the open space that's defined now in this new cottage section? Is this open space in lieu of the park dedication? I think to incentivize cottage units, it would behoove you to remove the park dedication requirement for cottage units and potentially even for detached townhomes, townhouses. Let's see. I think that there there's a number of existing cottage subplot or cottage lots that are in Sunbeam subdivision and in cutters and clarification about allowing cottages and detached townhomes. There would be helpful. Those were platted with the intention of essentially the detached townhome standard and requiring them to pursue cottages instead. I think is. I don't think that's an appropriate application, which leads to my next comment. I think that cottages in LR1 and LR2 are inappropriate, specifically because of the detached garage requirement and the density associated with it. So LR1 right now allows for five units per acre, LR two just three units per acre. And you're suggesting that? 14 units per acre would be appropriate in those neighborhoods with the attached garages. I don't think that those two uses are compatible. I would suggest that the Commission consider allowing for detached townhouses up to a density lesser than 10, maybe 8 units per acre, and LR1 and LR2 if that's something that's desirable. It would allow for a little edit added density without I really changing the character of those existing neighborhoods in LR1 and LR2. I think that allowing an incentive for 100% Community Housing would be great. Up to 14 units per acre, and I'm sure there's more and I apologize. I didn't have time to coordinate with staff on these items before the meeting, so



maybe they're addressed, but I'm excited to get some more direction for developers on this. Thank you.

**7:26:40 PM Michelle Griffith,** one of the stated goals of this new ordinance is affordability. And so I'm my comments are related to the affordability aspect of this and how the potential development can serve the population that are clients of arch. I would respectfully ask that for both the cottage units and the townhome units, when 100% of the units are deed restricted, affordable units that attached garages be permitted and the idea of living with detached parking and potentially detached storage is a lifestyle choice. Our residents, our clients, don't have choice. They have to live in whatever comes next, and it is a hardship for many people, particularly in snow country. These cottage communities are nationwide, but the bulk of them are not. In places where you have a winter like we just went through. And so if you're a single parent and you've got two kids asleep in a car, and now you've got to drag them and their groceries and everything else through the snow to your house, it's suboptimal. And that's the nicest way I could put it, so I would hope that you could have some elements of these codes that are directly related to affordable housing or workforce housing and that in those instances that garages could be attached. Additionally, if you're requiring that 100% of the units be energy efficient in order to get the density bonus, then 100% of the unit should be affordable in order to get the density bonus. Just giving a density bonus for some affordable units will result in some substandard units, unless you disallow that. Unless you say the affordable units have to be identical to the other units and the Community building I would hope would be an option, but not a requirement because it does add significant expense to the development and as do detached garages. You know the idea that you build a town home and then behind it 10 feet away, you build a garage. You're adding cost to that unit. Umm, the parking. I again, I don't know when the photos were taking out of Blaine Manor, but as the owner and operator of Blaine Manor, I can tell you that we wish we had more parking. There are units typically are two parking spaces per unit, and I would consider that and E parking is a necessity in this community and I'll just leave it at that. That one idea with respect to accessibility. There again, you may wish to allow if you're going to allow for an accessible unit, that the garage also be attached because mobility is a challenge when the garage is in one place and the house is in another and someone with mobility issues has to get there. Uh, the Idaho Housing and Finance Association have a standard which is a little bit lighter than even the B standard. It does require the wider. Doorways, and it does require the backer board in the bathrooms, but it doesn't require you to put in the removable cabinetry, and the reason for that is because it does limit the types of cabinetry you can get. Not all cabinetry can be removable. And also it limits the storage and in in a small unit storage is of umm a premium. So ohh, and then the final thing is the. Is it absolutely necessary to require that these cottage parcels be further subdivided? I think you all remember that parcel O what is city of Hailey land and arch has both ownership and rental units in kind of a cottage studying there. We have 9 units and 6/10 of an acre, and we used a a least lot description



in order to describe the the land that's associated with each unit. And it was much more cost effective than requiring a full subdivision. We are the owners of a cottage parcel in Sunbeam and the requirement to subdivide is is onerous. So now the architect has to do an entire set of plans for each and every house. Even though the houses are somewhat identical, and so I wouldn't let ask that, at least for the Community Housing units, if you have a section of this that talks about Community Housing, saying that the garages can't be attached, that you get the density bonus if 100% of the units are Community Housing units. If you could also consider that subdivision isn't necessary, but rather least lot descriptions are necessary that would go a long way toward affordability. Thank you.

[7:32:50 PM](#) **Chair Fugate closed public comment.**

[7:32:59 PM](#) Chair Fugate called 5-min break.

[7:39:29 PM](#) Chair Fugate called back to order.

[7:39:45 PM](#) Staff addressed public comment regarding density bonus for energy efficiency applies to Townhomes (detached and attached) and Cottage developments.

[7:41:50 PM](#) Chair Fugate requested to see input on plat process and lease lots. Chair Fugate confirmed community building is not required, just allowed. Chair Fugate requested further review of park dedication requirements. Staff confirmed will need to include provision where if say there are 12 cottage units provided, 6 being affordable -those 6 would not be lesser than the others. Commission continued to provide staff feedback on what would like to see. Davis noted internal discussions taking place for community housing bonus and asked if commission would like to keep separate or bring back together.

Staff confirmed will re-notice for August 21<sup>st</sup>.

#### **Staff Reports and Discussion**

- [SR 1](#) Discussion of current building activity, upcoming projects, and zoning code changes. *(To be presented as time permits)*
- [SR 2](#) Discussion of the next Planning and Zoning Meeting: **July 17, 2023 starts at 5:30 PM**

Davis discussed upcoming projects for July 17<sup>st</sup> and August 7<sup>th</sup>.

[8:04:32 PM](#) **Scanlon motion to adjourn. Smith seconded. All in Favor.**