

Meeting Minutes  
Hailey Planning and Zoning Commission  
Monday, July 17, 2023  
5:30 p.m.

Present

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

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

---

5:30:22 PM Call to Order

Public Comment for items not on the Agenda.

5:31:12 PM Dan Smith, If I may, I have something that's not on the agenda. I would like to express my appreciation to Mrs. Stahlnecker and Mrs. Griffiths for their cogent comments at our last meeting regarding the ordinance language for cottage developments. Thank you, ladies.

5:31:50 PM Consent Agenda

CA 1 Adoption of Meeting Minutes dated June 20, 2023. ACTION ITEM.

CA 2 Adoption of Findings of Fact, Conclusion of Law 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

5:32:04 PM Stone motion to approve CA 1 and CA 2. Smith seconded. All in Favor.

Chair Fugate asked move PH 3 to be heard first.

5:32:46 PM Smith moved. Stone seconded. All in Favor.

Scanlon recused himself.

Public Hearing

- PH 3 5:33:27 PM Consideration of a Planned Unit Development Application by F & G Idaho, LLC, for approval of a three-story, eighteen (18) unit residential project, to be known as Maple Street Apartments. The project will be located at 50 W. Maple Street (Lots 16-20, Block 5, Hailey Townsite), within the General Residential (GR), Townsite Overlay (TO), and Downtown Residential Overlay (DRO) Zoning Districts. The project includes proposed public amenities and a request for waivers. As the public amenity, the PUD Application includes a proposal for six (6) community housing units and the Applicant is requesting the following waivers:

Waiver to the Maximum Building Height of the General Residential (GR) and Townsite Overlay (TO) Zoning Districts: Increase the maximum building height from 30' to 35'.

Waiver to the Minimum Lot Size for Planned Unit Developments: Reduce the minimum lot size from one (1) acre to 0.47 acres. ACTION ITEM

[5:34:10 PM](#) Davis provided summarized background of this project, associated applications and why seeing this project again.

[5:35:27 PM](#) Owen Scanlon, Architect, introduced himself and his project. Scanlon explained requesting increase in the height to allow building B to come up out of the hole by approximately 18" to allow for better drainage. Scanlon stated this is why they are providing 6 workforce housing for this waiver.

[5:38:41 PM](#) Stone asked why going to 35' instead of 32' in the PUD. Scanlon stated not going that tall, planning at 32'-33' ft. Stone asked if could just go to height needed. Stone suggests bringing down to height need, does not want to agree to anything above what the applicant needs. Commission discussed options, all agreed to round to nearest whole number of height needed.

[5:41:09 PM](#) Smith asked about employee housing. Scanlon explained 12 units are for employee housing by owner and remaining 6 will be for workforce. Scanlon stated units will either be studio or 2-bedrooms. Smith would prefer half & half. Scanlon stated if able to build to height needed, all will be 2-bedrooms. Commission discussed employee workforce housing offered. Smith suggested incorporating some language into PUD that some will be exclusive and minimum of half are 2-bedrooms.

[5:44:04 PM](#) Sauerbrey agreed with comments made, would prefer to see all 6 units as 2-bedrooms. Sauerbrey asked what the difference between what was approved and what is proposed. Scanlon estimates 18 inches is height difference between what was approved and proposed. Sauerbrey clarified if increase height would alter design to allow for all units to be 2-bedrooms. Sauerbrey asked about disturbance to asphalt. Scanlon explained working with City Staff on issue. Sauerbrey asked where minimum lot coverage came from. Davis stated it is a long standing provision of code.

[5:47:46 PM](#) Rodrigue explained PUD would deed restrict the offered 6 units, that down the road the other 12 units may not be restricted.

[5:48:55 PM](#) Chair Fugate opened public comment.

5:49:47 PM Robert Richardson's, I live at 630 S River street. Again, that was just not the proper way to shoe in this project in so I appreciate them denying that in in requiring them to revoke that application in regards to this specific PUD submittal. It's my understanding that PUD is to ask for waivers or variances in exchange for a public amenity. In this case, the single public amenity they're proposing is what they're calling Community Housing. Specifically, category L housing. From the research I've been able to do in the Blaine County Housing Authority guidelines Category L housing is specific to no income limit must, but must be full time resident of Blaine County, which they've confirmed. I want to be clear that our issue in our Community is not housing the issue in our Community is affordable housing. I think we would all agree on that there is housing available, but it's not affordable. I don't see how category L housing really

benefits that because there is no income limits. It simply requires these are simply Blaine County residents. I don't know how this pertains to a public amenity from the Blaine County Housing Authority guidelines, which this beauty references category L housing should be offered in tandem with housing categorized at an income level, category 5 or below. This application does not have any other categories, only category L there needs to be more meat to this PUD submittal. The income level requirements essential workers, first responders, teachers, etcetera, something that benefits this community, Blaine County residents is so broad. I don't understand how this could be classified as a public amenity. We're not talking about second homeowners flying in and using these for ski condos or ski lockers in Warm Springs. These are long term apartments in Hailey. I think there needs to be more in this PUD to justify a public amenity. Back to the specific project at hand. If you look at the specifications for this project, it is simply too big for this lot. It's clearly above the height restrictions and it also only falls under the maximum square footage on a technicality that the stairwells are only 75% enclosed and not 100% enclosed. If they were, it would exceed the maximum size for this lot. Now in this new submittal, they're asking for a waiver not only for the height, but also for the size and a PUD, the minimum size of a lot is 1 acre. This is .47 acres, which is drastically below that requirement. All these are just specs in stats on this specific building, but I think it all adds up to show that no matter how many times we see the same design, it is too big for these lots. This project was already submitted and approved in a previous design. In that design, the architect and the developer altered the roofline to be within those height limits, all while keeping the same number of units as originally designed. And to clarify Owen's response, where he said we lost four bedrooms, we actually only lost two beds. It went from 2/2 bedroom units to two studios. Each still having a bed, so they only lost two beds, not 4. I don't understand why that design is now no longer acceptable. Deities and waivers or variances or whatever we want to call them were created for extenuating circumstances. There are tools to help assist when a project cannot be designed to meet the requirements of a specific lot. It's a mechanism that was created so that we can approve projects when no other options exist. In this instance, it is not an extenuating circumstance. A multi unit building could absolutely be designed within the existing rules and regulations for this lot. I don't understand where we're not asking them to design within those regulations instead of going round and round on the exact same design that simply does not fit. In a previous meeting to this Committee on Record, Commissioner Smith, you asked me directly. I assume you did your due diligence before you purchased your home. On what those zoning regulations are and what could be built on the vacant lots next to me in the future, to which I responded absolutely, and now you guys are trying to change those regulations. Thankfully, again, that did not fly. Why are you not holding this applicant accountable to the exact same standards that you held to me? The architect for this project sits on this same Commission. Building A in this project meets the 30 foot requirement that is not an issue. Building B does not, and it does not because it sits on top of an 18 inch retaining wall. If they simply built this building at record grade, it would pass all the requirements in a PUD would not even be needed. To Owens comment that it digs, they would put the building in a hole. I happen to live directly next door in my house is at record grade. I simply have 6 steps that step up to where the garage is at alley level. I'm quite sure I don't live in a hole and I'm quite sure that my house was not extremely expensive to build. I don't have extenuating drainage in all these lot features that were described. I don't understand why that design is not acceptable. Sure. I'll pick it up. It's my understanding that your guys' job is to not make this project cheap and easy for developers. It's your job to ensure that the rules and code are followed, and specifically from the code, maintain the character of the existing neighborhood. Lastly, this is a comment to the rest of the public. It was a surprise to me because there's been a previous design already approved on this project. If

this is approved, they simply have to submit a modification to that design that will not be brought to PZ. It will not be brought to another public hearing. So because they have a design that's already approved, they only need to submit a modification to the city to do whatever they want within those guidelines, and we will not be notified of that. Nor will PZ. This period should be designed denied. It does not have enough meat to justify a public amenity. In my opinion, they have options. They can either use the already approved design that meets all the regulations, or they could actually submit a design that does. No one here. None of the neighbors are against a multifamily building and never has been. It's very possible to design A multifamily building on these lots that does work. I I I plead to this committee, make the architect and the developer do their jobs and design a building that fits.

[5:56:56 PM](#) Hi thanks. My name is Alicia Kavadi. I have not attended the previous meetings. I am a resident at 517 S river myself and my family young family and I think you know, I wanna thank Robert. First of all, for a very well researched and very well thought out and very well articulated statement that you just shared with us, I would have to say that I agree with 100% of it. You know we we are River St residents. The other item on this agenda today was for our very direct next door neighbors to build an ADU on their property. Very different project I understand, but you know we don't stand in the way. We don't see any issues with that. We get these notices all the time. What I found really alarming about this notice was that, you know, in Robert's words, it just doesn't seem to fit. I mean, what stood out to me on this notice and why I am at this very first planning and so zoning committee meeting as a as a public commenter for the very first time? Honestly in my life. Umm is because it just really jumped out at me. I mean, how are we waiving? You know a project that where the specification is for an acre down to less than half of that? Umm, so you know not an MBA and an A lifelong daughter of a developer. But you know, I think a another, it just seems like a really high impact, high density development for that lot and it really jumped out at me honestly is alarming and concerns my family and our residents. And as Robert said, maintained the characteristic of the neighborhood. So thanks for letting me have my statement.

[5:58:48 PM](#) John Omeara, 711 S River, Hi, my name's John Omeara. I'm an owner resident 711 S River Street. I'd just like to add my support to Roberts comments. I think this project needs to get reviewed as much as possible, as long as it takes to make the project the correct project for the neighborhood. We have a lot of people concerned about what's gonna go with there, and I think you need to take some extra time to look at his points and let's address because I don't think Owen has put enough information out front of us to make us feel comfortable.

Carol Thompson and I'm at 709 S river. I since you guys, well, I really sent it to CeCe, but I sent a picture and I'll start with this. This is Ketchum, and I think we've all seen it. It's where Mods is and Little Consign and Design and then a new office building that they built right across from Perry's. Now on the West side, you know that the lot that sold from somebody that's on the board here on the other side of Robert will more than likely be the same density. This is what Robert will look like. He's a house next to an apartment building. And asking a developer to level the lot and do away with a stem wall of 18 inches. I don't think it's a big concession compared in cost for them to what Robert and the rest of us are losing in our property values, so by allowing this thing even taller, your opening, I I really do feel that with this PUD and it not complying, you know to the specific specifications we're hoping opening Pandora's box to everything that gets built, we'll just go and do that and we'll get around. I don't think it it bodes very well for that. I have one

more I think thing that Robert I did that OK. I am concerned more so about the parking and they took 4-5 parking places off of Maple that were on the original design that we saw. So now there are only 18. So if those people have more than one car, if they have company that comes to visit them, where do they park? There's no street parking left, so it's not available. We know where they're going to park and it's going to be in all of our front yards, which is not, I don't think it's fair to any of us, it's very disruptive. The last point is the kids walking to Hailey, coming up out of Della and the the traffic that is there without the the right parking and it just adds that much more.

[6:02:43 PM](#) Hi, I'm Blake Shropshire. I live at 639 S River street, directly across from that lot. Umm I do this every day and catch them in Sun Valley, build these developments and what I'm gathering off of this when I haven't done a lot of research. But the research that I have done and just thinking about what has been commented on here tonight about drainage heights, I don't think you need to go higher to get drainage to work, right. I don't think that's part of this. I think that we're just, it sounds it dancing around and around and around until we either give up and we let them build it or I don't know what's gonna happen. But yeah, there's there's a development right next to us. The Amatopia 1 right now, they ran out of money. They can't pave their road, so we're just sucking dust off of that road every day as there are bonds in place for like this development set up to finish what they've started. Money set aside, I don't know. Those are just questions I have and I think we need to take a look at as well. I know it's different than Ketchum, but that's what special. It's Hailey not Ketchum. So that's really all I have. Just a few comments.

[6:04:17 PM](#) Susan Lidstone I live at 640 Robin Hood Drive and this is my first meeting for this. I'm wondering what the parking situation really is, because I ride my bike up River Street and it sounds like you know River Street down where I live is a mess. You know that they've tried to make bike paths further up, but I mean, is this gonna make it even worse? Thank you.

[6:05:16 PM](#) Chair Fugate closed public comment.

[6:05:28 PM](#) Scanlon addressed concern of 18" retaining wall increasing the height of the building, explaining it is to assist with the water shed from the building to street, it does not increase the wall height. Scanlon explained proposed parking.

[6:06:53 PM](#) Stahlnecker asked to refocus on proposed waiver and amenities of the PUD, explaining proposed application. Stahlnecker addressed comments of Category L and how that is a benefit to the local market. Stahlnecker

[6:09:16 PM](#) Davis summarized intent of PUD code and how the applicant complies. Davis summarized code history and lack of information due to time frame it has been codified. Davis went on to address concerns about parking, and right of way improvements.

[6:11:41 PM](#) Stone asked for clarification on Category L being in tandem with other items. Davis explained updates BCHA is working on updates, that has not seen revisions. Davis summarized intent of Category L. Discussion continued regarding Category L. Stone asked input from Michelle Griffith regarding housing designed for workforce but that is not rent controlled.

[6:15:48 PM](#) Michelle Griffith gave summarized history of ARCH and their processes. Discussion continued regarding diversity in housing and Category L.

[6:22:07 PM](#) Stone made note of parking requirements. Stone stated it feels odd to approve something that kind of half exists, odd to send into it without knowing what it is.

[6:23:54 PM](#) Smith asked how many parking spaces are being provided along River St. Scanlon believe there are 11. Smith noted that required to provide 3 so providing 8 in excess. Smith and Scanlon discussed section of building that would exceed height. Smith asked what drove the 20% related to category I. Davis explained how staff arrived to the 20%. Smith asked about applicant wanting to have a car dealership as well. Scanlon summarized owners' intent for car dealership where Karl Malone is currently located once they have moved to their new location.

[6:29:48 PM](#) Sauerbrey addressed concerns regarding pedestrian access and how the proposed project will mirror other areas, following approved design. Sauerbrey summarized it comes down to the 18" height difference. Sauerbrey asked applicant team if they would be willing to follow in diversity in housing, and set aside 2 units that are income restricted. Discussion continued regarding proposed waivers and amenities.

[6:39:39 PM](#) Chair Fugate addressed concern of Scanlon getting special treatment. Chair Fugate stated all her other questions have been answered. Chair Fugate commented on the workforce housing and parking.

[6:44:29 PM](#) Stone believes this could have almost been handled administratively and fact that getting the 6 workforce housing is a win even though still little concerned about category I. Stone applauded public.

[6:46:11 PM](#) Richardsons, Uh, my question is just in regards to that, the six Community Housing units. If the only regulation is around the hours worked in being a county employee then themselves as being a business owner and having these four employees, wouldn't those own employees then satisfy those same requirements? Discussion continued with commission and staff. Staff indicated if attempted to restrict believe would be violating Fair Housing Act. Sauerbrey addressed concern of owner of using the 6 work force units for their own employee.

[6:50:40 PM](#) Carol Thompson, I wanna bring up just because it's Robert's house. The footage that is 18 inches is on his side. That was the whole point in the very first meeting was to keep the building down. He now has no light from the South side and that even made it more. That's was the whole purpose. The premise of the 18 inches.

[6:51:24 PM](#) Chair Fugate closed public comment.

Commission summarized their thoughts on proposed project.

[6:54:56 PM](#) Smith motioned to recommend approval by the Hailey City Council the Planned Unit Development (PUD) Application by F & G Idaho, LLC, for a three-story, eighteen (18) unit residential project, to be known as Maple Street Apartments— including waivers to the maximum allowed building height - that waiver to be determined at future to the full rounded number minimum can make it and minimum lot size for a PUD, as well as the provision of a



community housing amenity— at 50 W. Maple Street (Lots 16-20, Block 5, Hailey Townsite), within the General Residential (GR), Townsite Overlay (TO), and Downtown Residential Overlay (DRO) Zoning Districts; finding that the project meets the standards under Section 17.10 of the Hailey Municipal Code, subject to Conditions 1-4 above. Stone seconded. All in Favor.

[6:57:54 PM](#) [PH 1](#) Continuation of a Design Review Application submitted by the Blaine County School District and ARCH Community Housing for a new, one (2) bedroom single-family residence of 1,195 square feet in size, and a one (1) bedroom Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) of 573 square feet in size. The proposed project is to be located at 111 East Croy Street (Lots of W. 45' of 9, and 10-12, Block 34, Hailey Townsite) within the Transitional (TN) and Townsite Overlay (TO) Zoning Districts. ACTION ITEM

[6:58:42 PM](#) Michelle Griffith, ARCH, summarized history of application and made note of changes proposed.

[7:00:06 PM](#) Stahlnecker summarized changes made to the design, and referenced memo submitted. Stahlnecker confirmed public works has reviewed the proposed design.

[7:01:27 PM](#) Chair Fugate asked if there will be a problem plowing the gravel driveway. Stahlnecker noted driveway will now be asphalt.

[7:01:54 PM](#) Marti Kaplin, architect, explained the changes proposed since the first hearing.

[7:06:03 PM](#) Scanlon complimented applicant on change to building appearance. Scanlon expressed concern of heat tape and ice dams. No questions from Stone.

[7:07:02 PM](#) Smith believes this keeps with the area more, and does also have concern of ice dams. Smith asked if that was an awning/roof. Kaplin confirm it is a roof, an indentation. Smith asked if will be incorporating snow rails. Kaplin confirmed there will be snow protection. Smith thanked applicant again for modifying their design to fit within the area. Smith expressed concern of spillage/ice forming in certain areas.

[7:11:10 PM](#) Sauerbrey also complimented the applicant for addressing the concerns from last hearing. Sauerbrey echoes concern of ice dam issue, recommends increased insulation.

[7:12:46 PM](#) Chair Fugate reiterated appreciation of applicant being responsive to comments received.

[7:13:32 PM](#) Chair Fugate opened public comment.

[7:14:01 PM](#) Yes, I would like to comment, this is Laura Camplin, 123 2nd Ave South. All right. Thank you. First of all, I'd like to thank our choosing as well as Emily in helping answer a lot of questions and getting us to where we're at and listening to our feedback. What I'd like to talk about is the coordination going forward with regards to the utilities to date for the water and sewer. We hired a locating company. They were unable to locate our water and sewer fully, and Emily has helped us out and contacted the courthouse to see if there are records there could shed any light as to exactly where our water and sewer goes. And then I think there's also an ongoing project to map the water and sewer. So one of my questions would be as part of that

project, could the city of Hailey prioritize the water and sewer for our location? The second one is Idaho Power. We have not heard back from Idaho Power yet I do know that they are working on it, but it's we just need to close the loop on that in terms of the options that we have for our property to move the power lines and then the third one is the gas line.

We did reach out to the gas company and we found that they will not come out and locate the gas line unless we are actually digging. So my request there would be when the project is ready to ramp up that we are. Contacted for weeks before all you know before anything happens. So we have an opportunity to understand what the plans are if they do in fact impact us. So thank you.

[7:16:25 PM](#) Chair Fugate closed public comment.

[7:16:29 PM](#) Davis responded to public comment, noting can contact City Staff but not able to guarantee can prioritize this.

[7:17:20 PM](#) Stahlnecker summarized utility plan for proposed work.

[7:19:14 PM](#) Stone asked about flower beds out front. Discussion continued regarding flowerbeds. Stone went through previous notes of requests and concerns. Stahlnecker explained what and why truncated domes are proposed. Discussion ensued regarding truncated domes, all agreed to amended condition and discussion to take place with staff. [7:27:05 PM](#) No further comments from applicant regarding the conditions of approval. Commission reviewed conditions again, Smith noted needs to provide hanging baskets. Discussion took place regarding requirement for flowers.

[7:32:45 PM](#) Laura Camplin, wanted to emphasize locating the water and sewer is important to this project. Chair Fugate explained public comment was closed and that will take these comments into consideration.

[7:33:51 PM](#) Smith suggested options for locating water and sewer. Smith has no further questions. Smith thanked the applicant team. Sauerbrey agreed, no further comments.

[7:35:43 PM](#) Stone motioned to approve the Design Review Application submitted by Blaine County School District (BCSD) c/o ARCH Community Housing Trust, Inc (ARCH), for the construction of one (1) two-story residence consisting of one (1) two-bedroom residential unit and one (1) attached garage with one (1) one-bedroom Accessory Dwelling Unit located directly above, for a total of two (2) residential units on approximately 0.10 acres, located at 111 E Croy Street, finding that the project does not jeopardize the health, safety or welfare of the public and the project conforms to the applicable specifications outlined in the Design Review Guidelines, applicable requirements of the Zoning Ordinance, Title 18, and City Standards, provided conditions (a) through (m), as amended are met. Scanlon seconded. All in Favor.

PH 2 [7:37:54 PM](#) Consideration of a Design Review Application submitted by Lyn Holt for construction of a new 1,344 square foot garage in conjunction with a two (2) bedroom Accessory Dwelling Unit above, to be located at 519 South River Street (Lots S 23' of 9, all of 10, Block 10, 20 ft. adj. vacated Chestnut St., Hailey Townsite) within the General Residential (GR) and Townsite Overlay (TO) Zoning Districts. ACTION ITEM



[7:38:21 PM](#) Emily introduced this project and turned floor to applicant team.

[7:38:37 PM](#) Charlie Holt, owner, summarized design of project and location. Holt addressed each question mark noted in the Staff Report.

[7:42:42 PM](#) Scanlon asked what materials are proposed for the exterior stairs. Holt explained material and noted stairs are covered. Scanlon asked about guardrails. Holt explained it would be frame, wood and mesh.

[7:44:25 PM](#) Stone asked if there are windows on top of the garage doors. Holt has not planned on it, but could. Stone suggested it to save on light conservation. Stone asked about snow storage. Staff confirmed it is a condition of approval. Stone asked about caliper of trees to be replaced. Staff confirmed 2.5. Holt explained proposed trees to be removed and replaced. Holt expressed concern of health of Elm tree in right of way. Staff will inspect.

[7:47:43 PM](#) Smith asked if the cover over stairway slopes over stairway. Holt confirmed it does not. Smith suggested flipping floor plan. Smith confused what doing to house. Holt provided plan for remodel to existing house. Staff explained design review for the addition to the existing house.

[7:51:44 PM](#) Sauerbrey thanked applicant for additional plan of existing home remodel. Sauerbrey verified with staff not exceeding any thresholds. Staff will confirm. Sauerbrey asked about snow clips. Holt explained snow plan.

[7:53:56 PM](#) Chair Fugate opened public comment.

[7:54:24 PM](#) Chair Fugate closed public comment.

[7:54:31 PM](#) Commission and staff reviewed proposed conditions of approval.

[7:56:09 PM](#) Sauerbrey motioned to approve a Design Review Application by Lyn and Charlie Holt for new construction of a 672 square foot, two (2) bedroom Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) located above a new 672 square foot first-floor area that will contain garage, office, and workshop space, located at 519 S. River Street (Lots S. 23' of 9, all of 10, Block 7, and 20 feet adjacent to the vacated portion of Chestnut Street, Hailey Townsite) within the General Residential (GR), Downtown Residential Overlay (DRO), 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 (o) are met, as amended. Scanlon seconded. All in Favor.

[7:57:48 PM](#) Chair Fugate called 5-minute break.

[8:03:58 PM](#) Chair Fugate called meeting back to order.

PH 4 [8:04:13 PM](#) Consideration of a Design Review Pre-Application submitted by Gary Poole, owner's representative for Calgal Properties, LLC, for a five (5) unit mixed-use building with industrial garages on the ground floor, accessory dwelling units, and associated office spaces in

the second floor, to be located at Lot 2A, Block 5, of the Airport West Subdivision #2 within the Service Commercial Industrial District, Sales and Office Subdistrict (SCI-SO) Zoning District.

#### ACTION ITEM

[8:04:49 PM](#) Davis turned floor to applicant team.

[8:04:57 PM](#) Rebecca Bundy introduced herself, disclosing she is doing some contract work with the City and that there is no conflict. Bundy introduced project team. Bundy provided a presentation (on record with City of Hailey) that explained the applicants vision of the proposed project, the potential uses, business opportunities, and spaces needed. Bundy explained how has worked with staff and airport team extensively to make sure the project complies. Bundy explained restrictions of HOA and FFA. Bundy explained providing conceptual design that meets Hailey Code, HOA Requirements and FFA requirements. Bundy continued to use presentation to explain proposal. Bundy reiterated this is a very conceptual plan and asked commission feedback/input on snow storage, materials, color board, sidewalk in lieu – etc., explaining they need feedback on the basic concept. Bundy asked if there are any questions.

[8:16:28 PM](#) Scanlon asked if some units have 3 parking spaces. Bundy explained proposed blanket. Bundy expressed question of access and why believe guaranteed access off original plat. Bundy confirmed parking requirement 1 per 1000 sq ft and 1 per ADU. Bundy explained existing cull-de sac and that may someday connect to Broadford.

[8:19:53 PM](#) Stone asked how many lots are proposed. Bundy stated one with proposal of five commercial condominium unit with commercial and ado space. Davis confirmed each unit will be a separate lot. Stone likes the building as see it now. Stone expressed concern for families to recreate as no park in that area. Stone likes idea, concept.

[8:22:29 PM](#) Smith likes design and thinks going to fit. Smith believes looking at something that there is going to be a demand for. Smith does not believe there will be to much problem with the recreational side. Smith stated will be interesting to see in detail. Smith likes overall concept. Smith thinks plaza out-front will be nice.

[8:25:26 PM](#) Sauerbrey agrees and likes look of building. Sauerbrey asked about Category L. Bundy explained reasoning why does not believe its applicable due to HOA requirements and that Airport does not allow for waivers. Bundy noted City is discussing having this project build a portion of the bike path along Broadford.

[8:28:04 PM](#) Gary Poole, explained idea of this project that it is a business and it's up to the business to provide housing to the employee. Sauerbrey suggested addressing safety related to types of business uses with residential uses. Christian Ervine explained that is addressed by Fire Code. Bundy summarized what the Zoning Code allows for uses.

[8:33:50 PM](#) Chair Fugate stated all the windows were attractive. Chair Fugate believes this is a great concept. Chair Fugate asked if these would be owned or rented. Bundy stated they would be owned.

[8:35:30 PM](#) Jason Roth, summarized how ownership/rental would work.

[8:36:23 PM](#) Chair Fugate asked if Mountain Rides goes there. Applicant stated they go to St. Lukes. Chair Fugate believes this is something needed.

[8:37:40 PM](#) Chair Fugate opened public comment.

[8:37:56 PM](#) Chuck Christopher, I built the building a few years ago. Umm, it's basically that rusted building thats sandwich between Evans plumbing and the sheriff station, a couple of big boxes. I had a 1900 square foot apartment upstairs in that building and at the time I came through, it was right before the pandemic. It just seemed like I got a lot of friction with the idea of someone actually living in the airport, and there was some buildings that were put into years before me at the end. Those green that grow, those green ones, there was a whole bunch of them at the end and those things weren't really configured that well for the upstairs and how the living space is work. The building I built ended up really awesome and some of the staff has been through it. Umm, when it got done, it was like a light bulb went off in their head that I could make this work. I could live here and I still feel that from a little bit sitting at this meeting on all the housing questions, this was like a city, just like living in the city. It's not that big a deal. We're all used to wanting a yard now house and if you and all this, this is an out of line, this is this is a good idea. The one I have built went over really well done. It's just a hard concept for people to see. It again, the other thing I question is when you label it ADU because accessory dwelling unit, is that right? Right. It is the dwelling unit. Its not accessory. You know, so. So I see it fits into a funny category and and just throwing it out there for further thought that these types of designs aren't accessories. This is the dwelling unit, so it just seems like over the course of how you use wording and how you worded it all it becomes kind of confusing to make it work right. And there'd be a better way to do it if you organized a little better, you know, go easy on. But just the idea that it is the dwelling unit that people can actually make this work as a living space.

[8:40:35 PM](#) Chair Fugate closed public comment.

[8:40:41 PM](#) Chair Fugate explained why it is referred to as an accessory dwelling unit. Commission summarized their feedback to the applicant team. No action required.

#### Administrative Reviews

AR 1 Design Review Modification submitted by Silvercreek Living, LLC, c/o Mark Caplow, West of First to increase onsite parking. ACTION ITEM

[8:47:16 PM](#) Staff summarized modification.

#### 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: August 7, 2023 at 5:30 PM.

PP & DR: Panaroma Point

DR: Benson ADU

Hillside Overlay BCRD

[8:45:56 PM](#) Staff summarized upcoming projects.

[8:48:35 PM](#) Smith motioned to Adjourn. Stone seconded. All in Favor.