

AGENDA

Hailey Planning and Zoning Commission

Monday, August 21, 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:

*****NEW*****

THIS MEETING WILL BE AVAILABLE VIRTUALLY VIA MICROSOFT TEAMS.

Join on your computer, mobile app, or room device.

[Click here to join the meeting](#)

Meeting ID: 249 576 139 181

Passcode: Ge6Z7Q

[Download Teams](#) | [Join on the web](#)

Or call in (audio only)

[+1 469-206-8535,,602369677#](#) United States, Dallas

Phone Conference ID: 602 369 677#

Present

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

Staff: Robyn Davis, Emily Rodriguez, Jessica Parker, Brian Yeager, Chris Simms

5:29:58 PM Call to Order

- [5:30:14 PM](#) Public Comment for items not on the Agenda.

[5:31:05 PM](#) Smith complimented the city for all the flower barrels.

5:31:23 PM Consent Agenda

- [CA 1](#) Motion to approve the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Decision of a Hillside Overlay Modification by Blaine County Recreation District (BCRD), Bureau of Land Management (BLM), and the City of Hailey for trail modifications to the existing Hillside Overlay, which comprises of the installation or modification of two (2) recreational trails: the Olympia Gulch Trail, and the Hangman Gulch Trail. **ACTION ITEM**
- [CA 2](#) Motion to approve the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Decision of a Design Review Application by Benson Property, LLC, for construction of a new 2,192 square foot office space addition, and a new 760 square foot, two-bedroom accessory dwelling unit located above the existing commercial building. This project is located at 14

E. Elm Street (Lots 1 and 2, Block 9, Hailey Townsite) within the Transitional (TN) and Townsite Overlay (TO) Zoning Districts. **ACTION ITEM**

- **CA 3** Motion to approve the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Decision of a Preliminary Plat Application by Pilling Family Trust, represented by Manya Yamada, wherein two (2) cottage lots in Sunbeam Subdivision Phase I (SUNBEAM SUBDIVISION PHASE 1 LOT 41 BLK 3, SUNBEAM SUBDIVISION PHASE 1 LOT 49 BLK 3) are subdivided into ten (10) sublots for cottage units. This project is located along the public streets of San Badger Drive, Eclipse Street, and Sunbeam Street within the Limited Residential (LR-1) Zoning District. This project will be heard concurrently with a Design Review Application for a ten (10) unit cottage development. **ACTION ITEM**
- **CA 4** Motion to approve the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Decision of a Design Review Application by Pilling Family Trust, represented by Manya Yamada, for construction of ten (10) unit cottage development, to be located in Sunbeam Subdivision Phase I (SUNBEAM SUBDIVISION PHASE 1 LOT 41 BLK 3, SUNBEAM SUBDIVISION PHASE 1 LOT 49 BLK 3). This project will be heard concurrently with a Preliminary Plat Application. **ACTION ITEM**

5:31:41 PM Smith motion to approve CA1-CA4. Stone seconded. All in Favor.

Public Hearing

- **5:32:21 PM PH 1** Consideration of a Preliminary Plat Subdivision Application submitted by ARCH Community Housing Trust, Inc., represented by Opal Engineering, to subdivide Lot 64, Blok 5, Sunbeam Subdivision Phase I, into eight (8) sublots, each sublot ranging between 3,935 square feet and 6,998 square feet in size. This project is located off of Gray's Starlight Drive in the Sunbeam Subdivision and is within the Limited Residential (LR-2) Zoning District. This project is to be known as Sunny Townhomes. **ACTION ITEM**

5:32:42 PM Rodrigue introduced this project with brief history of when subdivision was approved and intent of phase 1 of Sunbeam. Rodrigue referenced previous approved cottage development within this Subdivision – Panorama Point. Rodrigue summarized ARCH's proposal and turned floor to applicant team.

5:34:07 PM Simms noted that tonight is the preliminary plat and that a second meeting for the Design Review will be required at a future date.

5:34:58 PM Michele Griffith, stated that was not aware of design review requirement and explained her belief of what took place that required a design review of the Panorama Point application. Discussion took place between Simms and Griffith regarding whether design review is required or not. Griffith explained ARCH's intent is to own all units in perpetuity and intend to rent for work force housing. Griffith stated the project has been approved by the Sunbeam HOA. Simms confirmed no issues to see preliminary plans for design review as it will be re-noticed for a future date for design review. Griffith proceeded to summarized proposed design that will include 2 bedroom and 3 bedroom units with attached garages.

5:45:30 PM Samantha Stahlnecker, Opal Engineer, discussed proposed plat layout. Stahlnecker explained the design of landscape plan and open space. Stahlnecker explained 3 bedroom units will have 2 car garages, 2 bedroom units will have 1 car garage with additional

parking proposed for guest. Stahlnecker summarized grading, drainage, and utility design proposed. Stahlnecker asked if there were any questions on civil.

[5:50:08 PM](#) Scanlon asked if the fire marshal has signed off this design. Stahlnecker summarized their conversation with the fire department. Stahlnecker noted location of existing fire hydrant.

[5:51:42 PM](#) Stahlnecker explained proposed snow storage.

[5:52:13 PM](#) Smith noted snow storage is also part of the common area. Stahlnecker confirmed and that proposed landscape is hearty for snow storage. Smith asked distance to park. Stahlnecker does not have off top of her head, estimates two lots width. Staff pulled map of location up to show parcel and park location.

[5:53:25 PM](#) Sauerbrey asked if parking access lane is at minimum width. Stahlnecker confirmed. Stahlnecker noted would prefer to keep lane without an additional sidewalk. Sauerbrey confirmed this lot was called out in the original subdivision development as a cottage unit. Staff confirmed. Stahlnecker noted park requirement was also addressed in the Sunbeam Subdivision.

[5:56:45 PM](#) **Chair Fugate opened public comment.**

[5:57:05 PM](#) Unknown speaker, expressed concern of setbacks, lack of buffer, increase traffic and lack of visibility. Agrees design review is needed.

[6:00:30 PM](#) **Chair Fugate closed public comment.**

[6:00:43 PM](#) Stahlnecker confirmed did review all required setbacks by the City, noting proposed residences on north boundary are 20 ft from property line and will have additional landscape there for a buffer. Stahlnecker confirmed this project was presented to the Sunbeam Design Review committee. Stahlnecker explained the traffic study was completed with the development of Sunbeam Subdivision. Stahlnecker confirmed plantings around the monuments will be below the required visibility requirements. Staff agrees.

[6:03:13 PM](#) Scanlon believes applicant has crossed their T's and dotted their I's and does not see reason why this should not go forward with the platting process.

[6:04:37 PM](#) Stone asked what conditions regarding HOA were concerning. Commission, Staff and applicant discussed language of proposed condition i – all agreed to language change and addition of new condition. Discussion continued to easement condition, applicant does not see an issue. Scanlon asked if ARCH maintains all their properties in relation to as painting. Griffith confirmed ARCH does. Stone does not have an issue with the proposed plat.

[6:09:12 PM](#) Smith complimented applicant for including garages and additional parking.

[6:09:54 PM](#) Sauerbrey complimented applicant on design of space and believes this will compliment the original subdivision design.

[6:10:40 PM](#) Chair Fugate agrees with commission.

[6:11:25 PM](#) Davis suggested commission approve the preliminary plat with condition of applicant coming back through for their design review.

[6:12:29 PM](#) Scanlon motion to approve a Preliminary Plat Application by ARCH Community Housing Trust, Inc., wherein one (1) lot is subdivided into eight (8) sublots for cottage townhouse development (SUNBEAM SUBDIVISION PHASE 1 LOT 64 BLK 5). This project is located along the public streets of Gray's Starlight Drive and Sunbeam Street within the Limited Residential (LR-1) Zoning District, finding that the application meets all City Standards, and that Conditions (a) through (n) are met, as amended. Smith seconded. All in Favor.

- [6:13:26 PM PH 2](#) Consideration of a City-initiated Annexation Application to annex a 55-foot-wide section of Quigley Gulch Road, along the southern boundary of the Marvin Gardens No. 1 Subdivision, and adjacent to Quigley Road (A parcel of land falling within the North West ¼ of Section 10 Township 2 North Range 18 East, B.M., and said parcel also falling within the Plat of Marvin Gardens No.1 Subdivision recorded under instrument number 209065 records of Blaine County, Idaho, and said parcel being more particularly described as follows: Commencing at a brass cap marking the center ¼ corner of Section 10, said point falling South 89°52'19" East 2653.92 feet from a Brass cap marking the West ¼ corner of Section 10, thence proceeding North 0°17'59" West 977.11' along the center section line to a 5/8" rebar marking the South East most corner of said plat and also being the South East corner of the Quigly Road Dedication, and said corner being the True Point of Beginning; Thence North 0°17'59" West 56.73' to a ½" rebar monument marking a point common to the North East corner of the Quigley Road dedication and the South East corner of Lot 3; Thence South 75°30'18" West 1366.67' to a ½" rebar monument marking a point common to the North West corner of the Quigley Road dedication and the South West corner of Lot 4; Thence South 0°08'08" East 56.77' to a 5/8" rebar monument marking the South West corner of the Quigley Road dedication; Thence North 75°30'18" East 1366.84' to the True Point of Beginning, said parcel containing 1.76 acres or 75,166 square feet, more or less), to complete the portion of Quigley Gulch Road that is owned and maintained by the City of Hailey. A copy of the Annexation Plan can be found at www.haileycityhall.org/community-development/.

ACTION ITEM

[6:16:33 PM](#) Davis introduced annexation application explaining intent is to annex in remaining portion of Quigley Road that abuts city road Quigley Road and that the City already maintains informally agreement with Blaine County. Davis summarized the cities intent to further pedestrian access, completing pathway between Sunbeam Subdivision and Quigley Rd. Yeager has no further comments.

[6:18:31 PM](#) No questions by Scanlon. Stone asked what it means informally. Staff explained city has maintained this section of road but has to go through this process to make a public city street. Smith asked if Staff has been in communication with Blaine County. Staff confirmed.

[6:20:18 PM](#) Smith asked Yeager to address questions and concerns from public comment. Yeager stated believes concern was more for the proposed pathway then the annexation. Yeager addressed questions could recall related to the pathway. Smith stated big concern was snow clearance and maintenance. Yeager explained it is not their intention to remove snow but if

directed and able snow could be removed using a blower blowing into road, possibly center section if able. Smith asked about drainage. Yeager explained proposed drainage. Yeager explained city has been maintaining this, clarifying this annexation is more of a cleanup. Yeager stated pathway is out for bid.

[6:25:29 PM](#) No questions by Sauerbrey. Sauerbrey asked noticing requirement. Staff explained notice process – published in paper, mailed and posted onsite.

[6:26:28 PM](#) Chair Fugate opened public comment.

[6:26:59 PM](#) Chair Fugate closed public comment.

[6:27:34 PM](#) Scanlon asked to see civil plan of proposed bike path, noting curved areas. Yeager explained reasoning for curves.

[6:29:31 PM](#) Smith asked if utility boxes are subsurface. Yeager stated subsurface but may need adjusted.

[6:30:09 PM](#) Stone complimented Yeager. Commission agreed. Yeager summarized pathways working on throughout the city.

[6:32:54 PM](#) Commission reviewed proposed conditions, confirming meets city standards.

[6:33:25 PM](#) **Sauerbrey motion to approve the Annexation Application by the City of Hailey, wherein the parcel of land as previously described is annexed into the City of Hailey for the development of a share-use path, finding that the application meets all City Standards and signed condition a is met. Smith seconded. All in Favor.**

- [6:34:21 PM PH 3](#) Consideration 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 and/or create definitions and code standards for detached townhouse and cottage housing developments in Hailey **ACTION ITEM**

[6:35:08 PM](#) Davis referenced previous two hearings of this item, summarizing suggested changes requested from those meetings.

[6:35:57 PM](#) Rebecca Bundy, contracted employee by city, summarized intent of this amendment and the changes made. Bundy explained other areas of code that will be reviewed at a future time. Bundy disclosed she is working in Hailey on projects that do not conflict with this project in any way. Bundy asked commission if would prefer to go through item by item or in question answer way.

[6:39:05 PM](#) Smith asked if townhouse should be included on page 2. Bundy confirmed it can be removed, that staff did not want cottages lumped in with townhouses even though they will be platted as townhouses. Bundy explained did not make changes. Bundy explained proposed

changes made. [6:42:47 PM](#) Stone asked if approved how this would affect developments like Sunbeam. Staff explained Sunbeam Subdivision allows for cottage developments/townhouses through its PUD. Staff explained how that typically unless incentivized cottage developments generally don't happen. Stone asked if reading correctly, if approved it would no longer require a PUD in LR 1. [6:48:02 PM](#) Sauerbrey asked where the minimum maximum square footage limits came from. Bundy explained this ordinance was modeled based off prototypes in other communities and staff reasoning of minimum maximum sizes. Discussion continued regarding size limits.

[6:51:58 PM](#) Stone expressed concern of not fitting in LR zone. Bundy explained it is reduced density proposed in LR district. Davis explained potential need to amend zones as the community grows. Discussion continued regarding density vs. existing code and priority of incentivize energy efficiency.

[7:09:24 PM](#) Chair Fugate asked Simms if he sees a problem to allow potential density bonus in LR. Simms explained his thoughts, noting many cities have lots similar size to what he calculates based off numbers proposed. Simms addressed Smith's concerns.

[7:11:16 PM](#) Stone likes idea of energy efficiency ideas. Discussion continued regarding density and potential of unintended consequences.

[7:13:45 PM](#) **Chair Fugate opened public comment.**

[7:14:02 PM](#) Michelle Griffith, ARCH Community Housing Trust, explained her understanding of intent for cottage lot development. Griffith explained her thoughts and opinions of cottage developments. Griffith expressed concern of not allowing for garages. Griffith urged commission to not prescribe that parking being separate. Griffith asked commission to consider limits to difference between ground floor and second floor units, suggesting 1400 square feet total with a 700 ground floor. Griffith asked them to consider what processes going to require of the owners of these lots – a subdivision within a subdivision or a lease lot description. Griffith asked to consider ways in which affordable units could be incentivized through less process.

[7:23:00 PM](#) Samantha Stahlnecker, Opal Engineering, suggests looking at map of what it looks like to waive the park dedication. Stahlnecker does think proposed open space requirement of 400 ft per unit is appropriate. Stahlnecker expressed concern of not allowing detached townhomes in LR. Stahlnecker expressed concern of affect of proposed changes to the Sunbeam PUD. Stahlnecker expressed potential concern of utilities, specifically sewer capacity. Stahlnecker wonder why's density bonus is higher in LR then GR.

[7:29:41 PM](#) **Chair Fugate closed public comment.**

[7:30:10 PM](#) Bundy thanked Sam and Michelle. Bundy believes community housing should be looked at across the city and would be hesitant to do that piecemealed. Davis appreciates the comments, and that thinks it is worth re-evaluating some of the things. Davis addressed concern of park requirements. Davis thinks with the reduction of the park requirement is helpful, she is not sure staff or council would be supportive of completely removing the park the requirement. Davis stated open to feedback in terms of detached townhomes. Davis stated again numbers are

arbitrary and could be modified. Davis explained reasoning of why not addressing housing incentive with this amendment.

[7:33:31 PM](#) Smith asked if could really tell the difference between detached townhomes compared to future detached cottages. Smith also shares concern of floor size limit, asked if trying to drive an aesthetic. Bundy explained staff thought process for floor size. Commission continued to discuss proposed amendment regarding density, floor size, and energy efficiency incentive.

[7:43:25 PM](#) Scanlon asked for examples of areas where modeling this from besides Seattle. Bundy stated not many and where these are primarily occurring. Scanlon asked if diving into these areas and what they would do different, if they are working. Bundy explained cottage units with attached garages are not going away. Bundy explained what she found during her research of these areas for the detached townhouses.

[7:47:13 PM](#) Michelle Griffith, stated as she understood limits number of units per access point. Griffith believes it is difficult to prescribe how the garages fit. Griffith explained her thoughts on if going to incentivize cottage units. Griffith explained her experience with successful cottage development in Minneapolis. Scanlon asked how can ensure energy efficiency will take place with blower door test. Bundy explained process. Bundy addressed Griffith concern of limiting units per access, explaining has not been more restrictive.

[7:55:50 PM](#) Chair Fugate explained why she is hesitant to go forward without more components of what doing with cottages. Chair Fugate explained that need to think about what really want. Chair Fugate explained what she thinks is important and that thinks need to address these issues more specifically.

[8:00:16 PM](#) Sauerbrey summarized what this was at the beginning. Sauerbrey thinks it's looks like it achieved the objective but that there are some specific issues that need addressed. Sauerbrey discussed areas thinks need more review and areas he is worried about.

[8:06:54 PM](#) Smith noted housing keeping correction where it is requiring 4" caliper tree. Smith asked reasoning of why 7 parking space clusters were determined. Bundy explained staff thought process on how parking was determined. Discussion took place regarding ADA accessibility. Smith asked to see relative cost for energy efficiency. Smith expressed concern of prescriptive requirements.

[8:12:49 PM](#) Commission summarized what commission would like to see again and additional data would like to see.

[8:20:54 PM](#) Staff confirmed will renote for future date.

Administrative Reviews (No Action)

- [AR 1](#) Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) Administrative Design Review Application by Nicholas and Kathleen Gyurkey Living Trust, for an attached one-bedroom, 670 square foot Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) to be located at ground-level. The project is located

at 1250 Queen of the Hills Drive (Lot 20, Block 1, Della View Subdivision). This project is located within the Limited Residential-1 (LR-1) Zoning District.

Staff Reports and Discussion

- **SR 1** Discussion of building activity, upcoming projects, and zoning code changes.
- **SR 2** Discussion: Next Planning and Zoning Meeting: **September 5, 2023 at 5:30 PM.**
 - PP & PUD: Starlight
 - DR PreApp: RZR North
 - DR: Heitzman

[8:21:19 PM](#) Staff summarized upcoming projects.

[8:23:37 PM](#) Smith motion to adjourn. Saurbrey seconded. All in Favor.