

Agenda
Hailey Planning and Zoning Commission
Wednesday, November 13, 2024
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:

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#](tel:+14692068535602369677) United States, Dallas

Phone Conference ID: 602 369 677#

Present

Commission: Owen Scanlon, Jordan Fitzgerald, Sage Sauerbrey, Dan Smith

Staff: Robyn Davis, Emily Rodrigue, Ashley Dyer, Jessie Parker

Absent: Janet Fugate

Call to Order

- Public Comment for items not on the Agenda. No comment.

New Business(s)

- [NB 1](#) Sneak Peak: Draft Comprehensive Plan Discussion

[3:36:01 PM](#) Davis explained hoping for this to be a more causal discussion to gather feedback from the commission on the current draft form. Davis summarized steps taken previously and upcoming steps. Davis stated focused tonight on the content. Davis asked commission for their opinions.

[3:38:57 PM](#) Davis explained how the basis for each section were formed.

Vision Statement & Land Use:

Fitzgerald believes social realm is not included within the vision statement, that needs to include something about the community social life needs to be included. Davis confirmed can include community engagement within one of the areas in the vision statement.

Sauerbrey wants to look highlighting the small town character, that it can be tied more directly to people living in the community. That wants to be aware of housing stock. Davis explained reasoning for not using term small town, and that used in place sense of place, close knit community.

Smith believes term small town is a nebulous thing, suggested sense of place, strong community etc.

Scanlon expressed concern of using term closeness that could bring up density concerns.

Fitzgerald suggested referring to more than just Quigley. Davis confirmed tried to use more broad references and will update.

Sauerbrey is unsure on how can further align city goals with Blaine County, especially with areas like Peregrine Ranch. Davis confirmed can expand that in policy section.

Fitzgerald found page 12 to be confusing. Davis explained that this is a to provide a background on the different areas within or near Hailey and how these areas interact.

Smith noted it was interesting to look at Intermountain Gas and Idaho Power areas for developable areas.

Sauerbrey expressed potential concern of development of Flying Heart Ranch.

Smith thinks that there are areas adjacent to LI development that would provide opportunity for additional business and diversity, and would like to think can incorporate some of these areas to help diversity the business. That needs better and other opportunities that not wholly concentrate on housing. Thinks that housing can be accommodated without necessarily having to tie up all future development areas.

Davis explained how the City has never done economic development as in recruiting businesses to come to the area and that are looking at what that may look like. Davis also noted that the city has hired firm to review the LI and if there is a balance for our populations and will use this to determine if need more LI and how can incorporate it. Scanlon asked how they determine the ratio of neighborhoods vs. LI.

Fitzgerald expressed concern of incorporating residential into our limited residential. Davis confirmed staff will not be bringing that text amendment back.

Sauerbrey suggested changes if create new LI. Sauerbrey asked if there was a further breakdown of numbers of people coming and leaving Hailey for work. Davis explained where numbers were pulled. Sauerbrey believes if had more details, could be beneficial in directing where we should direct our energies.

Fitzgerald believes infill could use more clarification. Fitzgerald asked about which neighborhoods are intended for infill, each neighborhood goals.

Smith asked about minimum densities within certain zoning areas, if had certain zones would apply that too. Davis stated they have not gotten that specific. Smith asked if there is a minimum density want to see in downtown core. Davis explained where minimum density idea came from. Davis asked commission if should discuss minimum commercial space in all development within downtown. Sauerbrey likes this idea. Davis confirms if can be general in neighborhoods can include. Fitzgerald suggested something prioritizing mixed use. Sauerbrey agrees, what options are available to help get away from one or the other use. Smith suggested case by case. Smith suggested model of live work units. Smith and Davis discussed return and investment of spaces.

Fitzgerald asked if could use open space for an incentive.

Sauerbrey is realizing, that some of the biggest issues is density and parking, restrictions on what can require for housing and restrictions on energy requirements. Sauerbrey asked if worth maintaining goal but using it as an incentive. That if required more parking, and if wanted to reduce parking applicants would have to bring something as to the table. Fitzgerald "raise the requirement, so it's easier to reduce for incentive". Davis referenced similar idea used with the DRO & PUD process. Davis believes incentivizing developers to provide community housing a concertation worth taking place. Sauerbrey would like to see something like this explored at greater detail.

Scanlon asked what can do to incentive commercial development.

Smith agrees that LI adjacent to existing would be beneficial.

Davis noted running out of time and asked commission what chapter they would like to discuss next.

Smith asked what short, mid and long term is. Davis confirmed will define those.

Smith asked about recreational space and suggested staff review that.

Transportation:

Smith asked about pathway on west side of SH-75. Rodrigue explained it is part of the Blaine County Community Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan. Smith confirmed it is north of Hailey. Rodrigue confirmed.

Sauerbrey asked for more clarity on Main Street. Sauerbrey asked if the city has a preferred direction from Downtown Master Plan. Davis summarized design council leaned towards.

Smith asked about cycling on Main Street. Davis does not recall if cycling on Main St was a priority.

Sauerbrey requested more specify on what the intent is for Main St.

Fitzgerald asked what the plan is for Second Street. Davis stated staff does not have a plan as of today but that the other master plans such as Transportation Master Plan gets more in detail. Fitzgerald suggested having an index with a list of all the master plans. Fitzgerald asked how 1st

and 2nd relate together. Fitzgerald asked about public transit, longer terms or goals for Mountain Rides. Sauerbrey agrees, especially for the growth reserves. Sauerbrey really liked neighborhood business in the growth reserves. Davis noted conversations within and how trying to determine without detracting from downtown. Davis and Smith noted limited development within neighborhood business zoning district.

Davis explained that don't see a lot of live work or duplexes.

Sauerbrey asked about Sustainability being pushed. Rodrigue and Davis explained plan for Sustainability.

Overall, commission complimented draft plan.

Fitzgerald circled back to re3quest for more specified per neighborhood, explained understand and suggested including vague explanation to help guide density to where we may or may not want.

Smith would like to have an informal meeting again after public input.

Davis stated next survey runs from 11/21 to 12/12.

Staff Reports and Discussion

- **SR 1** Discussion: Upcoming Projects, Code Changes, Next Planning and Zoning Meeting:
 - **Monday, December 2, 2024:**