

**Meeting Minutes
Hailey Planning and Zoning Commission
Tuesday, February 18, 2025
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#](#) United States, Dallas

Phone Conference ID: 602 369 677#

Present

Commission: Dan Smith, Janet Fugate, Michael Smith, Sage Sauerbrey, Jordan Fitzgerald

Staff: Robyn Davis, Emily Rodrigue, Jessie Parker, Mike Baledge

Absent: Ashely Dyer,

5:30:20 PM Call to Order

- Public Comment for items not on the Agenda.

5:31:20 PM Consent Agenda - ACTION ITEM

- **CA 1** Motion to approve Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Decision of a City-Initiated Text Amendment amending Hailey's Municipal Code, Title 16: Subdivision Regulations, Chapter 16.01 Definitions to modify, refine, remove, and/or add various definitions to the title **ACTION ITEM**
- **CA 2** Motion to approve meeting minutes dated January 21, 2025. **ACTION ITEM**

Dan Smith and Michael Smith abstained.

5:31:45 PM Sauerbrey motion to approve CA 1 and CA 2. Fitzgerald seconded. All in Favor.

Public Hearing(s) - ACTION ITEM

- **5:32:07 PM PH 1** Consideration of a Design Review Application submitted by Overland West, Inc., represented by Jay Cone, for a commercial building, consisting of two (2) cleaning bays, one (1) tunnel wash bay, storage and a multi-purpose room with a two-

bedroom Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) located on the second floor. This project is located at 1551 Aviation Drive, (Lot 3A, Block 4, Airport West Sub #2) within the SCI-Industrial (SCI-I) Zoning District. **ACTION ITEM**

[5:32:30 PM](#) Davis noted heard this item as a pre-app in December and provided suggestions. Davis turned the floor to the applicant team.

[5:33:10 PM](#) Jay Cone, Architect, explained changes since the commission saw the plans as a pre-app. Changes include ADA Deck location, overhead door to storage and exit to the bays face south. Cone estimates fuel tank to be fueled 6 times a year, keypad system to be used for security of fuel tank in addition to the fencing on property, reduced number of trees around the fuel tank to eliminate cover of potential vandals, and reduced height of fuel tank to be below the fence. Cone noted addition of glass panels on west elevation. [5:38:03 PM](#) Cone went into further detail on proposed fuel tank beginning with proposed locations, explaining why he believes should keep the proposed tank location. Cone discussed the requested secondary containment, explaining reasons why should not install additional curb containment as the proposed tank already includes secondary containment and meets required code.

[5:42:49 PM](#) Baledge confirmed code requirements for secondary containment.

[5:44:17 PM](#) Cone provided material board showing materials to be used and explained material location on proposed structures. Cone noted coloring of light fixtures and locations.

[5:48:12 PM](#) Fitzgerald asked what the best practical approach for the gas tank and if Baledge is recommending it is fine as is. Baledge confirmed, and that it have quite a few near residential neighborhoods. To this day, he has never seen them link and that will follow required codes. Baledge stated basically following same code as regulated gas stations. Fitzgerald asked how to make the north access clear, noting feels like user would still drive over gravel. Cone noted the location of fence, clarifying there's no user just staff. Cone explained intent for access, and that south entrance would be used as the primary.

[5:53:41 PM](#) D. Smith asked about estimated level of activity, for seeing 200 parking spaces. Cone explained intent and expected use. Smith asked if would continue to use existing parking near Airport. Cone explained process and when additional cars would be brought in, confirming no customers will be on this site. Smith noted utilization of storage area seems to be sporadic. Smith asked about proposed setbacks of 10' on each side. Davis confirmed setbacks proposed, confirming typo on page 17 of staff report. Sauerbrey confirmed setbacks are met for the proposed building. Smtih asked about ADU parking. Cone confirmed ADU parking. Cone confirmed motion sensor by fuel tank. Smith expressed concern of leakage while loading/unloading, strongly recommends provides some type of curb to assist any potential leakage. Smith agrees tank it self is probably bullet proof, the associated hardware and equipment is not. Smith suggests plan for if someone accidently dumps gas.

[6:00:03 PM](#) Sauerbrey agrees D. Smith regarding fuel tank. Sauerbrey asked what containment measures are proposed to limit ground spilling onsite. Cone explained his comments were related to the wall as required to address 4-6,000 gallons. Cone offered to present to his client a low curb to address potential ground spillage for 10-15 gallons. Cone noted he addressed the "swimming pool" created by wall. Sauerbrey believes the environmental factors remain, and

suggests a smaller easier curb is put in place to address ground spillage. Cone confirmed can consider low curb. Sauerbrey asked about number of trees proposed. Cone noted location trees removed from landscape plan. Sauerbrey agrees with Cone's statements about the tank. Sauerbrey suggested trees on eastside. Sauerbrey asked why decided to locate building on south side vs. north. Cone explained reasoning for building location including lot size and distance to airport. Sauerbrey asked about glazing all on north side, and how to accommodate comfort of building. Cone explained intent how believes the sun will impact the building. Sauerbrey does like the look of the building.

[6:09:12 PM](#) M. Smith confirmed location of motion sensor with Cone. M. Smith asked how often the tank would be used during dark hours. Cone does not have an estimate, but believes it will be sporadic. Cone explained how the light pole was a tough one but was to address the neighbors concern. M. Smith asked if specific reason picked lighting. Cone confirmed would be happier to make the light warmer. M. Smith asked tank location. Cone explained reasoning for tank location. M. Smith asked if applicant would consider low level plantings or some way to help break up mass of proposed fence. Cone noted existing landscape on parcel A, that does not think more than a third of the fence will be visible. Cone and M. Smith continued to discuss landscape.

[6:15:35 PM](#) Chair Fugate asked if the Business Park is the HOA. Cone believes it came from the person who manages the HOA. Cone confirmed has completed the HOA design review. Chair Fugate discussed additional containment. Chair Fugate asked how much gas could spill on proposed concrete pad. Cone does not know. Chair Fugate asked if there was some kind of removal curb, that that could be appropriate and easier to move in and out when tank is in use. Chair Fugate explained her location preference of the tank. Cone suggested maybe doing a concave to address quite a few gallons. Cone believes there are options and they will think about something. Discussion continued about potential options. Chair Fugate asked Cone if would be willing to have a condition saying will have some type of measure put in place to address accidental spillage during use. Cone confirmed.

[6:22:23 PM](#) Chair Fugate opened public comment.

[6:22:47 PM](#) Steve Daniels, 830 Broadford, not opposed to the project. Previous fuel farm owner, his only concerns are the plumbing. Does like idea of changing shape of concrete pad, recommends spill kits and fire extinguishers.

[6:24:20 PM](#) Chair Fugate closed public comment.

[6:24:30 PM](#) Baledge confirmed requirements and containments. Baledge confirmed employees will be educated.

[6:25:24 PM](#) Fitzgerald asked how everyone feels about light pole, that she is not worried about vandals. Fitzgerald explained her concerns with fuel tank location, and that she is in favor of option a. Fitzgerald does not believe there is a reason to not have something to address a spillage.

[6:27:54 PM](#) D. Smith believes it should be possible to put some type of shield on the light pole to minimize exposure on the west. Cone confirmed shields are available but noting potential issues with available shields. Cone noted issues run into with pole location, a minimum of 20' away.

Discussion continued regarding light pole and potential light trespass. Cone confirmed acceptable to condition of customized light shield. Commission discussed potential vandalism.

[6:33:17 PM](#) D. Smith confirmed amended size of fuel tank. Cone confirmed reduced size. D. Smith noted potential of utilizing option a with smaller size. Cone noted other potential concerns. D. Smith complimented design of building. D. Smith suggested additional landscape in certain areas including along the fence.

Sauerbrey complimented project, noting concern of open gravel and agrees with additional landscape suggested. Sauerbrey agrees with light pole suggestions. Sauerbrey explained his opinion of tank location and why he believes it suffices. Sauerbrey believes main concerns were safety and environment, and thinks should make it a condition some sort of spillage plan.

[6:40:34 PM](#) M. Smith is more comfortable of current location. M. Smith encourages use of similar moves of treatment on Airport West side to be used on the Broadford side.

[6:42:03 PM](#) Fitzgerald expressed concern of elevation change and why believes its another reason to address the fence.

[6:42:33 PM](#) Chair Fugate believes the tank will have less impact with the current proposed location. Chair Fugate's agrees with the suggested additional landscape on aviation but noted concern of additional planting near fuel tank.

[6:44:04 PM](#) Davis confirmed new conditions. Cone confirmed amendable to new conditions. Cone suggested new condition of maximum of 6' and minimum of 4' of fence and he may be able to reduce height in some locations. Davis confirmed could add to the findings but would not make a condition. Chair Fugate suggested maintaining 6' on westside. Commission discussed potential change of fence height. All agreed to maintain 6' fence.

[6:47:44 PM](#) **Sauerbrey motion to approve the Design Review Application, submitted by Overland West Inc., for the construction of a new 6,654 gross square foot mixed-use building consisting of 5,657 square feet of commercial space and a 997 square foot Accessory Dwelling Unit, to be located at 1551 Aviation Drive (Lot 3A, Block 34, Airport West Subdivision #2) within the SCI - Industrial (SC-I) Zoning District, 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 Hailey Municipal Code, Title 17, and City Standards, provided conditions (a) through (q) are met, as amended. D. Smith seconded. All in Favor.**

- [6:49:07 PM PH 2](#) Consideration of a Design Review Application, submitted by Spud Locker, LLC, represented by Chad Blincoe, for the construction of a new 22,443 square foot storage building that would replace the existing storage units onsite. This project is located at 1140 Airport Way (Lot 3, Block 2, Friedman Park Subdivision) within the Light Industrial (LI) Zoning District. **ACTION ITEM**

[6:49:47 PM](#) Rodrigue noted heard this project as a pre application last fall under different ownership. Rodrigue confirmed 22 parking spaces provided, noting right of way section not fully developed due

to the City being in the middle of the Airport Way Master Plan. Rodrigue turned floor to applicant team.

[6:51:26 PM](#) Chad Blincoe, architect, thanked staff and commission. Blincoe highlighted the changes made since the pre application, including changes to loading zone. Blincoe explained use of carts in place of trucks backing in. Blincoe noted addition of windows to help break up the façade. Blincoe explained materials proposed to be used. Blincoe confirmed proposed trees and locations. Blincoe confirmed submitted original designs to the FAA and associated agencies, confirmed received approval. Blincoe confirmed proposed wooden fence. Blincoe noted additional details to gate. Blincoe explained doing what can to improve pedestrian walkway and right of way parking, noting believes that address the requirement of in lieu fee. Blincoe expressed concern of condition of approval for transformer to screen something that could be moved, and that is not on their property.

[7:02:44 PM](#) Davis explained condition of approvals and factor of typical section in design for Airport Way. Davis explained that if the utilities are to serve that site specifically, they would need to be relocated onsite. Commission and staff continued to discuss location of utility in right of way and associated conditions. Staff confirmed can adjust condition of approval related to utility.

[7:07:33 PM](#) Blincoe asked if there were any questions from the commission.

[7:08:12 PM](#) Chair Fugate confirmed number of parking spaces with Blincoe.

[7:09:16 PM](#) Fitzgerald asked about signage in Airport Way, feels like there is a lack of signage. Blincoe noted potential locations for signage. Fitzgerald does not believe sidewalk onsite is a substitute for the in lieu fee, thinks the in lieu fee is very typical in this situation. Fitzgerald asked others opinions, that feels like has been seeing utilities relocated onto private property. Blincoe expressed concern of requiring utilities to be relocated onsite if serve multiple properties. Fitzgerald recommended requiring Idaho Power approval with Design Review. Blincoe explained potential issues in requiring more of construction plans than design review. Fitzgerald stated ultimately believes utilities effect the design.

[7:14:40 PM](#) D. Smith asked staff for time line for standard design for Airport Way. Davis summarized what has happened, and estimates that planning and zoning will be seeing it in the next few months. D. Smith asked Blincoe their construction timeline. Blincoe estimates mid-summer. Blincoe explained that the applicant may be willing to adjust design, noting it's a partnership with the city. D. Smith noted ability applicant could have ability to modify plan to accommodate new design. D. Smith suggested amending crab apple trees to be persistent crab apples so do not end up with debris on streets. D. Smith asked about layout. Blincoe confirmed it's a work in progress. D. Smith about floor plan. Blincoe explained design in work. D. Smith suggested reviewing depth of storage for vehicles or recreation vehicles. D. Smith explained why he does not consider the transformer mechanical, but electrical. D. Smith noted if its servicing multiple sites, the applicant could be looking at significant expense. D. Smith noted there are options for underground transformers that may want to discuss with Idaho Power. Blincoe noted on of those is for phone. D. Smith suggested modifying ordinance to include electrical equipment as it does not speak to him that way as it reads now. D. Smith noted appreciation of landscape. D. Smith asked about materials proposed. Blincoe clarified materials. D. Smith suggested a greater separation and hue.

[7:24:59 PM](#) Sauerbrey thanked applicant for preliminary process and changes made. Sauerbrey asked for clarification on material. Blincoe explained proposed materials. Sauerbrey asked about irrigation for landscape. Blincoe confirmed will have a drip system. Sauerbrey confirmed plan is to move most of the snow offsite. Blincoe confirmed this facility will have to haul snow away. Sauerbrey agrees with D. Smith on in lieu fees, that does not fulfill continuity city is going for. Sauerbrey stated if transformer is feeding just this site it should be moved on site. Blincoe agrees, if the design develops and applicant team can figure out a way to make it work. Sauerbrey believes what staff has proposed is appropriate. Sauerbrey asked if applicant team has notified current tenants. Blincoe stated tomorrow after receives approval. Sauerbrey recommends the applicant consider allowing tenants to be allowed to reserve a unit.

[7:35:12 PM](#) M. Smith asked about ADA parking. Blincoe stated they do, pointing out location. M. Smith asked about exterior lighting. Blincoe explained reasoning for proposed lighting locations. M. Smith suggested reconsidered lighting on south side. Blincoe asked if recessed lighting in exclude from dark sky ordinance. Staff stated no. M. Smith suggested applicant team to work with staff on right of way improvements. Blincoe stated could use of gravel if preferred.

[7:39:35 PM](#) Chair Fugate asked about seasonal plantings. Blincoe noted locations of seasonal plantings. Chair Fugate asked about tree requirements near the airport, asked if airport saw the landscape plan. Blincoe stated the airport did not, but could go with a non **fruit bearing tree**. Chair Fugate believes it is appropriate to wait until typical section is done, noting previous project that is now completed who agreed to wait. Discussion ensued regarding in lieu fee, staff suggesting modifying condition to give option to pay in lieu fee or install the infrastructure as required by approved typical section. [7:45:13 PM](#) Chair Fugate asked if parking spaces count if used as storage, staff confirmed.

[7:45:32 PM](#) D. Smith asked if the building is temperature controlled. Blincoe confirmed and fully sprinklered. D. Smith asked if the downspouts are exterior to the wall. Blincoe confirmed, and would have catch basins; that will have three drywells. Blincoe confirmed heat tape on all downspouts. D. Smith verified fire access with Baledge.

[7:47:44 PM](#) Chair Fugate agrees need more contrast, not just the different textures.

[7:48:37 PM](#) Blincoe addressed lighting on south side, expressing concern of creating light out of balance. Discussion ensued regarding lighting on south side.

[7:51:52 PM](#) Chair Fugate opened public comment.

[7:52:21 PM](#) Chair Fugate closed public comment.

[7:52:33 PM](#) Chair Fugate confirmed new condition for irrigation to be included, amendment to in lieu condition to be either or, and amending condition o regarding the transformer screening and relocation.

[7:54:40 PM](#) Fitzgerald has no further comments.

[7:54:51 PM](#) D. Smith appreciates applicant coming in for comments, recommending to take in consideration some of the suggestions tonight and hopes can come to some agreement to help ease pain to existing tenants.

[7:55:50 PM](#) Sauerbrey complimented design and conditions of approval are appropriate.

[7:56:04 PM](#) M. Smith agreed with comments made. Chair Fugate recommended applicant to check with airport regarding trees.

[7:56:21 PM](#) Staff confirmed changes to conditions of approval.

[7:57:16 PM](#) **D. Smith motion to approve the Design Review Application submitted by Spud Locker, LLC, represented by Blincoe Architecture, for the construction of a new 22,443 gross square foot commercial building consisting of one hundred and fifty (150) interior storage lockers, to be located at 1140 Airport Way (Lot 3, Block 2, Friedman Park Subdivision) within the Light Industrial (LI) Zoning District, 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 Hailey Municipal Code, Title 17, and City Standards, provided conditions (a) through (p), as amended are met. Sauerbrey seconded. All in Favor.**

[7:58:32 PM](#) Chair Fugate called for 2-minute break.

[8:03:36 PM](#) Chair Fugate called meeting back together.

- [8:03:40 PM PH 3](#) Consideration of a City-Initiated Text Amendment amending Title 17: Zoning Regulations, Chapter 17.04: Establishment, Purposes and Uses within Zoning Districts, Section 17.04M.60: Bulk Requirements to allow increased flexibility to certain bulk requirements for development projects that preserve a historic commercial or residential structure within the Townsite Overlay (TO) Zoning District. **ACTION ITEM**

[8:04:09 PM](#) Rodrigue clarified only exploring changes to lot coverage, maximum height and other potential incentives to help restore the structures within the Townsite Overlay.

[8:05:24 PM](#) Chair Fugate confirmed reading correctly, only able to get one. Staff confirmed.

[8:05:56 PM](#) Fitzgerald asked what the expedited review. Davis summarized process would allow the application to be heard as soon as possible after proper notice. Fitzgerald asked if this could be approved administratively. Davis clarified the language, that Administrator review would come in to play with design review modifications.

[8:08:30 PM](#) Sauerbrey asked if this would allow for ADUs. Davis explained were not considering accessory structures, but that this open for discussion. Sauerbrey sees ADUs being a ripe option for this. Discussion ensued regarding including outlying structures such as historic garages and whether this would apply to ADUs even if not attached to outlying structures.

[8:11:48 PM](#) Fitzgerald suggested defining certain words that are used repeatedly, including out building. Discussion continued regarding outlying buildings/structures.

[8:13:16 PM](#) Fitzgerald confirmed reviews would not be done administratively. Davis confirmed would not be done administratively unless coming back for a design review modification. Fitzgerald clarified basically would be allowing nonconforming structures to bulk requirements, but then down the road a new owner could maintain the non-conforming structures and potentially remove historic structure.

[8:15:29 PM](#) D. Smith suggested changing language to allow this once per lot. Chari Fugate agrees.

[8:16:21 PM](#) Discussion ensued regarding potential for non-conforming with removal of historic structures at future point.

[8:18:14 PM](#) Fitzgerald asked if the HAHPC has seen this. Davis stated not yet.

[8:18:40 PM](#) M. Smith asked how this would be tracked. Staff proposed ideas for tracking, suggesting filing similar to how ADUs are tracked.

[8:20:23 PM](#) Fitzgerald asked if 50 years is significant designation to define a building as historic. Davis explained reason included as case by case review.

[8:21:46 PM](#) D. Smith believes there is a way to track and believes one per lot is the way to go. Commissioners agree. D. Smith agrees need flexibility in age for designation of historic.

[8:23:16 PM](#) Chair Fugate thinks it helps fulfill sustainable part the City is trying to do, in addition to preserving the historic structures.

[8:23:44 PM](#) Sauerbrey recommended simplifying maximum building. Davis confirmed can do that.

[8:24:38 PM](#) Chair Fugate opened public comment.

[8:24:57 PM](#) Thomas Howland, thinking about tracking, if set amount of additional lot percentage can get why do we need to track it and if remove historic structure it would negate the ability to have the additional percentage. Believes those concerns are covered, that have a simple and elegant way to restrict what people can do. Howland complimented staff on putting this together.

[8:26:55 PM](#) Chair Fugate closed public comment.

[8:27:02 PM](#) M. Smith biggest concern would be someone trying to double dip, that's where he thinks the tracking is important.

[8:28:07 PM](#) Fitzgerald asked if it would be two applications per lot or exemptions. Staff confirmed one exemption per lot. Discussion ensued regarding one exemption per lot or one application per lot. All agreed one exemption per lot.

[8:34:09 PM](#) Fitzgerald suggested requiring a narrative explaining historic nature. Fitzgerald asked about historic trees.

[8:36:16 PM](#) Chair Fugate confirmed one waiver/exemption per lot. Chair Fugate asked about adding flexibility to number 6 to give the applicant to the chance to make their case. Discussion ensued on how to amend the language.

[8:38:15 PM](#) Sauerbrey would like to hear the HAHPC comments on this. All agreed to review again after with HAHPC comments.

[8:39:56 PM](#) M. Smith asked what happens if someone removes the historic portion of the property. Davis explained it would still be nonconforming and they would have to comply with current standards.

[8:43:40 PM](#) Commission discussed adding flexibility to number 6. Rodrigue suggested developing objective standards. All agreed to amend it to approximate 50 years.

[8:47:07 PM](#) Davis requested the commission to continue this to March 17, 2025 so the commission can review the proposed guidelines. Davis confirmed will present to HAHPC and bring any of their comments to the March 17, 2025 hearing.

[8:48:28 PM](#) **D. Smtih motion to continue the public hearing to March 17, 2025. Sauerbrey seconded. All in Favor.**

Administrative Review – NO ACTION ITEM

- [AR 1](#) Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) Application by Mark Cosslett for the proposed addition of an internal 463 square foot ADU. This project is located at 1050 Red Elephant Drive (Lot 6, Block 4, Della View Subdivision).

Staff Reports and Discussion

- **SR 1 Discussion: Upcoming Projects, Code Changes, Next Planning and Zoning Meeting:**
 - **Monday, March 3, 2025 – Meeting to begin at 5:00pm:**
 - DIF – Study Prep
 - Comp Plan
 - DR 637

Davis summarized the upcoming meeting.

[8:50:22 PM](#) Sauerbrey motioned to adjourn. D. Smith seconded. All in favor.