AGENDA
Hailey Planning and Zoning Commission
Monday, December 19, 2022
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:

From your computer, tablet, or smartphone: https://meet.goto.com/CityofHaileyPZ
Via One-touch dial in by phone: tel:+15713173122,,506287589#

Call to Order
- Public Comment for items not on the Agenda

Consent Agenda
- **CA 1** Adoption of Meeting Minutes dated June 6, 2022. ACTION ITEM.
- **CA 2** Adoption of Meeting Minutes dated June 8, 2022. ACTION ITEM.
- **CA 3** Adoption of Meeting Minutes dated July 18, 2022. ACTION ITEM.
- **CA 4** Adoption of Meeting Minutes dated August 1, 2022. ACTION ITEM.
- **CA 5** Adoption of Meeting Minutes dated August 15, 2022. ACTION ITEM.
- **CA 6** Adoption of Meeting Minutes dated October 3, 2022. ACTION ITEM.
- **CA 7** Adoption of Meeting Minutes dated October 17, 2022. ACTION ITEM.

Public Hearing
- **PH 1** Consideration of a City-Initiated Text Amendment to amend the Standard Drawing for Driveways in Title 18, Chapter 18.14, Section 18.14.012.K: Driveway Approach, to include a maximum width for standard driveways. ACTION ITEM.

- **PH 2** Continuation of a City-Initiated Text Amendment to amend the Hailey Municipal Code, Title 17: Zoning Regulations, Chapter 17.08: Supplementary Regulations, Article D: Accessory Dwelling Units, to allow for Tiny Homes on Wheels within all residential zoning districts. ACTION ITEM.

- **PH 3** Continuation of a Design Review Application by Joel Tranter and Laura Nelson, represented by architect David Barovetto, for a new 4,016 square foot single-family residence with an internal 860 square foot accessory dwelling unit at 637 South River Street (Lot 2A, Block 1, Maple Subdivision). The project is located in the General Residential (GR), Townsite (TO) and Downtown Residential Overlay (DRO) Zoning Districts. ACTION ITEM.
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: **January 17, 2023**
  - Rezone and Text Amendment: Silver Creek Living Facility
  - Title 17: DR Tree Percentage
Return to Agenda
AGENDA
HAILEY PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
June 6, 2022
Virtual and In-Person Meeting
5:30 p.m.

From your computer, tablet or smartphone: https://meet.goto.com/CityofHaileyPZ
Via One-touch dial in by phone: tel:+15713173122,,506287589#

Present
Commission: Dan Smith, Janet Fugate, Dustin Stone, Owen Scanlon
Staff: Robyn Davis, Paige Nied, Mike Baledge
Absent:

5:30:25 PM Chair Fugate called to order.

5:30:41 PM Public Comment for items not on the agenda. No comment.

5:31:28 PM Consent Agenda
CA 1 Adoption of Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision of a Design Review Application by Bill and Kris Josey for a new 784 square foot two-bedroom residential unit to be located above an existing commercial building located at 1731 Lear Lane (Lot 4M, Block 4, Airport West Subdivision #2) within the SCI-Industrial (SCI-I) Zoning District. ACTION ITEM.

CA 2 Adoption of Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision of a City-Initiated Amendment to Title 18, Mobility Design, to modify the curb line and sidewalk configuration on the south side of McKercher Boulevard between River Street and Highway 75/Main Street to include a ten-foot-wide (10’) multi-use pathway, and to reduce the existing eight-foot-wide (8’) sidewalk to five feet (5’) in width. Three (3) existing trees will be relocated and one (1) existing tree between River Street and Albertson’s will be removed during the modification of the curb line and sidewalk configuration, and addition of the multi-use pathway. ACTION ITEM.

CA 3 Adoption of Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision of a City-Initiated Text Amendment to the Hailey Municipal Code, Title 17: Zoning Regulations, Chapter 17.07: Supplementary Location and Bulk Requirements, Section 17.07.030.02: Construction Trailers, RVs and ATVs, to allow for licensed, operational RVs to be used on private property when such property is operating under a valid building permit. ACTION ITEM.

CA 4 Adoption of Meeting Minutes dated April 18, 2022. ACTION ITEM.

CA 5 Adoption of Meeting Minutes dated May 16, 2022. ACTION ITEM.

Chair Fugate pulled CA 4.
Scanlon motioned to approve CA 1, CA 2, CA 3 and CA 5. Smith seconded. Stone abstained. Scanlon, Smith and Fugate in favor.

Stone motioned to approve CA 4. Smith seconded. All in Favor.

Public Hearing

PH 1  Consideration of a Design Review Pre-Application by F & G Idaho LLC for two (2) new apartment buildings consisting of 1- and 2-bedroom units with a total of 18 units located at Lots 16-20, Block 5, Hailey Townsite within the General Residential (GR) and Townsite Overlay (TO) Zoning Districts.

Scanlon recused himself from PZ.

Owen Scanlon introduced project, explaining on corner of West Maple and River Street. Scanlon summarized how the project came to be. Project consists of 3 three story buildings, mix of studio and two bedroom units. Scanlon explained color scheme will be very similar to the Luxury Car Rental building – Blue and Gray. Scanlon noted trash enclosure and open area for green space. Scanlon stated using DRO Overlay and will plan to haul snow offsite. Scanlon asked if there are any questions.

Chair Fugate asked if plan to have pergola or something over patios. Scanlon does not know yet, anticipates BBQ area on north and south area possibly area for residents to bring chairs.

Scanlon noted in Staff Report it recommends adding balconies, explained reasoning for none presented in location of buildings.

Chair Fugate asked if bike racks have been added. Scanlon noted locate of bike racks.

Smith asked if there is an elevation site plan from River Street. Scanlon does not at this time. Scanlon stated it will look similar to Silver River.

Chair Fugate asked if he had adjusted the plan to match River Street Plan. Scanlon confirmed. Scanlon is unsure of parking along W Maple, may not have room for head parking but will have room for parallel parking. Smith asked about angled parking. Scanlon confirmed applicant team will research options. Chair Fugate hopes they follow through, thinks angled parking is safer. Smith noted that while it meet DRO, all additional parking will be a benefit the project.

Chair Fugate asked about workforce housing. Scanlon stated he has been working with Michelle Griffith but does not have details of that yet. Scanlon explained applicant has made it clear this is not about profit for them.

Smith asked if possibly considering an 80/20% income. Scanlon stated looking at all options.

Stone has no questions, appreciates 2 bedroom units. Stone stated elevations would have been a benefit, but great to hear applicant proposing housing.
Smith suggested incorporating exterior patio’s on northern side. Scanlon discussed potential patios along River Street buildings.

Chair Fugate opened public comment.

Elizabeth Jeffery, what is the accommodations for winter storage of bicycles and are there any ev charging plans?

Carol Thompson, 709 S River, is the property line where the alley is. She is concerned about the height and with what she thought was beginning of ordinance of sunlight angle for the house that is due north from here. If this is 3 stories they will never see the sun. How many offroad parking spaces are there? Because two bedroom units, maybe 2 cars per space and there is no parking in the winter around there. Thinks sidewalks are drawn in but will they happen? They had to put theirs in, people across the street had to install theirs. She does not understand what DRO is, if someone could enlighten her. She would like to understand what the business is, on the bottom floor? Employees will also need parking in addition to residential parking. Would it be like business on main street?

Robert Richards, 630 S River Street, lives directly north of this proposed project. Be curious to learn more about elevations and building height. Curious as to where the building (unable to decipher). Total building height from River Street would be interesting to know.

Chair Fugate closed public comment.

Scanlon stated there is no business located on this site, business is located where Karl Malone is currently located. Scanlon confirmed sidewalks will be installed per city requirements. Scanlon stated civil engineer is working on grading, Building A will be 1 ft below the alley and Building B will be 1 ft below that. Scanlon stated height of building is approximately 32′, 35′ is allowed. Scanlon stated approximately 20′ from north property line. Scanlon confirmed there will be ev charging options. Scanlon has not discussed bicycle storage with applicant yet.

Davis stated Thompson can contact the office to discuss what the DRO is.

Scanlon stated you can see the stakes for the property lines at this time.

Chair Fugate confirmed this is a pre-application, no motion will be made and there will be another opportunity to speak with more detail.

No Motion.

Scanlon asked if should recuse himself from the Sunby DR as he assisted with their text amendment. Chair Fugate, Smith, and Stone see no issues with Scanlon participating with the Sunby DR

Consideration of a Design Review Application by Ian and Sarah Sunby for a new 3,076 square foot single-family residence to be located at 211 N. 3rd Ave (Lot 6A,
Hailey AM) within the General Residential (GR) and Townsite Overlay (TO) Zoning Districts. **ACTION ITEM.**

**5:54:48 PM** Davis introduced project, summarizing text amendment applicants went through in January that was approved by City Council. Davis turned floor to applicant team.

**5:55:24 PM** Ian Sunby introduced himself, 410 N 4th Ave. Sunby explained this is a single-family residence with an attached ADU. Sunby stated scale of home is consistent with surrounding neighborhood. A physical entrance faces 3rd Avenue. Sunby noted grade change of property, similar to other lots there and will have entrances off alley that are consistent with existing homes. Sunby walked commission through floor plan and entrances proposed along front and rear of property. Sunby explained it is a tight lot but feels it is an appropriate scale and fits with surrounding homes.

**5:58:14 PM** Chair Fugate asked if had material samples. Commissioners reviewed samples provided while Sunby used image to describe each material sample.

**5:59:43 PM** Sunby explained how materials assist in breaking up elevation of building.

**6:00:13 PM** Smith asked if will be putting a finish on? Sunby stated it will be a clear finish, natural as possible.

**6:00:34 PM** Scanlon asks to look at the north elevation. Scanlon asked what the vertical elements are to the right of the landing. Sunby stated it is the same as the siding. Scanlon confirmed it has snow clips and rain gutters. Scanlon asked if considered putting a canopy over the stairway. Sunby explained had not discussed at this time. Scanlon stated concerned about ice buildup, for safety reasons. Sunby stated it is a secondary access, and it will remain to be seen how much it is utilized in the winter, but is definitely a valid point.

**6:02:38 PM** Stone stated in looking at east elevation, you just see the top half. Sunby stated there is an open space, so you see down into the yard area. That it is very similar to existing homes that see down into the flat level where the entry door is. Stone’s only concern is how consistent the 2nd floor is, that view may be a little stark.

**6:04:15 PM** Smith suggested making sure people know ADUs entrance and venting towards top on east elevation, to help break it up. Smith stated that using it on backside, think would be good along the street side as well. Sunby stated from asphalt elevation to peak, it is approximately 14 ft. Sunby confirmed and understands his comments.

**6:06:35 PM** Chair Fugate suggested somehow including cypress trees in the east elevation would be more appealing. Chair Fugate asked if ev charging will be included. Sunby confirmed yes.

**6:07:21 PM** Chair Fugate opened public comment.

**6:07:32 PM** Elizabeth Jeffery, neighbor on the corner, would like to echo what the zoning members have said about the front being better with more detail. Even the Craig
Johnson’s house sunken down like this, has a row of trees to help break it up. Does not see a walkway from the ADU’s parked car to their door. Curious what the path is for the ADU residence to get to the front door.

6:09:12 PM Chair Fugate closed public comment.

6:09:19 PM Sunby noted designated ADU parking accessed is off the alley way, and they would utilize the walkway on the southside of the house.

6:09:55 PM Stone likes the south elevation, stating it’s a great look. Sunby definitely understands comments about the east face and thinks there is an opportunity to extend wood from the northside. Sunby noted wall plan is broken up with change of materials and how it extends.

6:11:06 PM Commissioners complimented applicant on project design.

6:12:07 PM Scanlon asked if solar panels will be going in initially or in the future. Sunby would like to plan on initially but may be future. Scanlon asked if ADU will be for family or rental. Sunby stated it will serve as a mix of work force housing for his employees and also for family.

6:14:34 PM Scanlon motioned to approve the Design Review Application by Ian and Sarah Sundby for a new 3,076 gross square foot single-family residence, which includes an attached 399 square foot Accessory Dwelling Unit and 525 square foot garage, to be located at 211 North 3rd Ave (Lot 6A, Hailey AM), 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 (l) are met. Stone seconded. All in Favor.

PH 3 6:16:08 PM Consideration of a Preliminary Plat Application by TVIV Quigley, LLC where Block 5, Quigley Farm Large Block Plat is subdivided into nine (9) lots. This project is located within the General Residential (GR) Zoning District. ACTION ITEM.

6:16:25 PM Cydna Lewis, introduced herself and applicant – Dave Hennessy. Lewis stated this block is part of the Quigley Large Block plat and they are subdividing it into nine lots. Lewis explained snow storage locations and access points. Lewis did not see anything that needed to be add to staff report other than they will be installing all the necessary utilities, roads, etc for these lots.

6:18:42 PM Dave Hennessy, Quigley Farm, this is the next phase and will mirror the other blocks. Hennessy noted there is an alley that serves the lots and lots 5-9 are duplex lots.

6:19:38 PM Chair Fugate likes intermingling of single-family and duplex lots.

6:19:57 PM Scanlon asked if there are building envelopes. Hennessy stated just the standard setbacks. Hennessy explained he has not marketed these or started selling these lots. Hennessy added there is a sort of park landscape easement in the front.
Stone asked about the staff report stating no alleys proposed. Nied explained it is only called out as a utility easement, it is not noted as an alley on the plat. Hennessy stated it is the intent for that to be access for the lots.

Commission and staff discussed alley vs. easement. Hennessy confirmed HOA will maintain that easement.

Mike Baledge, stated he is having real issue with existing roads out there, there is a school out there with dirt roads. Baledge stated roads needs to be improved before start building on other lots. Hennessy stated it is in the works and on the books for June 23rd to finish whole section to the school and finish improving emergency access. Baledge asked when connecting permanent roads. Hennessy stated permanent road by school is tied to county application and goal is to have it completed by fall. Baledge asked if there is a chance county will not permit the road. Hennessy stated no, as it is in the city.

Chair Fugate opened public comment.

Chair Fugate closed public comment.

Chair Fugate asked if Baledge was comfortable with response or if needed conditions. Baledge is comfortable.

Scanlon asked if dates should be included within the motion. Baledge explained his comments tonight are not related directly to tonight’s public hearing.

Smith motioned to approve the Preliminary Plat Application by David Hennessy, represented by David Patrie, wherein Block 5, Quigley Farms Subdivision (Fox Acres Road and Quigley Farm Road) is subdivided to create nine (9) lots, ranging in size from 9,381 square feet to 13,141 square feet, finding that the application meets all City Standards, and that Conditions (1) through (9) are met. Scanlon seconded. All in Favor.

Cynda Lewis, Benchmark Associates, explained subdividing into 12 lots with frontage on public roadways and easement along back that is almost identical to block 5.

Scanlon has no further questions, this seems to have similar easements and snow storage of other applications. No comments from Stone.

Smith stated this one does not have easement along the frontage. Smith agreed this is part of the original agreed upon annexation. Chair Fugate added she once again likes the intermingle of lots.
6:32:49 PM Chair Fugate opened public comment.

6:33:09 PM Chair Fugate closed public comment.

6:33:13 PM Stone motioned to approve the Preliminary Plat Application by David Hennessy, represented by David Patrie, wherein Block 6, Quigley Farms Subdivision (Fox Acres Road and Quigley Farm Road) is subdivided to create twelve (12) lots, ranging in size from 5,436 square feet to 11,197 square feet, finding that the application meets all City Standards, and that Conditions (1) through (9) are met. Smith seconded. All in Favor.

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: Special Meeting on June 8, 2022 at 5:00 PM and July 18, 2022 at 5:30 PM
  - June 8, 2022: Reconsideration of Saddle Lofts Design Review
  - July 18, 2022: Sweetwater PP Block 2 Phase 2, 525 North Rezone, and Tree Caliber Reduction

Davis confirmed with commissioners of special hearing on Wednesday, June 8th starting at 5 PM. Davis confirmed typo that PZ does have meeting on June 21st. Davis summarized July 18th hearing items.

Davis noted hired new planner, starting June 13th.

6:41:40 PM Smith motioned to adjourn. Stone seconded. All in Favor.
Return to Agenda
Meeting Minutes  
HAILEY PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION  
Special Public Hearing June 8, 2022  
Virtual and In-Person Meeting  
5:00 p.m.  

From your computer, tablet or smartphone: https://meet.goto.com/CityofHaileyPZ  
Via One-touch dial in by phone: tel:+15713173122,,506287589#  
Dial in by phone: United States: +1 (571) 317-3122  
Access Code: 506-287-589  

Present:  
Commission: Dan Smith, Janet Fugate, Owen Scanlon, Dustin Stone  
Staff: Robyn Davis, Jessica Parker, Chris Simms, Paige Nied  

5:01:52 PM Chair Fugate called to order.  

5:02:28 PM Public Comment for items not on the agenda. No Comment. Chair Fugate stated seeing as no consent agenda, will move straight to the public hearing.  

Public Hearing  
PH 1  
5:02:53 PM A Request for Reconsideration submitted by Brad Chinn of the Design Review Application by Kazuko-San ID, LLC, for construction of three (3) multifamily residential buildings, which includes twenty-seven (27) residential units, to be located at Sublot 4B, Block 1, North Hailey Plaza, within the Business (B) and Downtown Residential Overlay (DRO) Zoning Districts. This project will be known as Saddle Lofts. ACTION ITEM.  
   • Staff Memo  
   • Appeal Documentation  
   • Pre-Design Application Documentation  
   • Design Review Application Documentation  

5:05:33 PM Davis provided summarized background of the project, noting when the Pre-App and Design Review hearings were held and when the Findings of Fact were approved. Davis stated when the appeal letter was submitted. Davis explained that Appeal documentation was submitted when as per code it is considered a Request for Reconsideration, that the incorrect appeal code section was referenced and the submittal was past the deadline. Davis explained why the staff still accepted the appeal documentation as his request for reconsideration, and that is also outlined in the letter sent to Mr. Chinn in May. Davis stated in that letter sent to Mr. Chinn in May, staff asked Mr. Chinn to identify where the project is non-compliant or where the commission decision was noncompliant. Davis stated staff in a phone conversation, reiterated to Mr. Chinn they wanted him to submit his letter outlining the deficiencies. 5:06:45 PM Davis stated staff received letter today, June 8, 2022 from Mr. Chinn that outlines his city code provisions that were not followed or complied with. Davis pulled today’s letter up on the screen. Davis explained section 17.06.000h was pointed by Mr. Chinn as insufficient but that said it was determined a traffic analysis was not needed by the City Engineer. Davis explained in conjunction...
with this project City Staff and a Civil Engineer are working on a four-way stop at this intersection. Davis explained this was not brought to Planning and Zoning but that analysis will be brought to City Council in the coming weeks. 5:09:59 PM Davis explained last item brought up in Mr. Chinn’s letter was 17.06.000 L and what she thinks makes this town resilient is that we adapt to changing conditions and we often times have to reinvent the economic basis when necessary. Davis stated this project is compliant under the DRO standards.

5:10:30 PM Chair Fugate asked if it would be appropriate to define property taxes adding to the economic basis to the city,. Chris Simms does not know if that is necessary. Simms stated this is not a new hearing with new evidence. Simms explained this is a matter of process, this is a request of reconsideration. 5:11:39 PM Simms stated in that regard does not believe it is necessary this evening. Davis does not have any additional information to add.

5:12:23 PM Chair Fugate asked if Mr. Chinn could help them under the specific standards he is objecting too.

5:12:41 PM Chinn thanked the commission and Mr. Simms. Chinn’s stated he think his argument and position are stated pretty well. Thinks the previous indication and rendition is accurate. Thinks just have a disagreement on the application and case law and city code and reviewed plan. 5:13:32 PM Chinn stated he agrees with Simms, reconsideration of record with no new evidence provided by himself. Chinn asked if anyone has any comment or rebuttal they can proceed. Simms stated he would provide his guidance before they proceed with motion and recommends opening public comment.

5:14:19 PM Chair Fugate opened public comment.

5:14:47 PM Maria and Jerry Denekas, traveling for a month and lost on the status. Did you approve the apartments? Chair Fugate confirmed yes. What kind of parking? Chair Fugate explained generally take public comment, they ask the questions and respond to after public comment. She is concerned, live right down the street, that parking is a big concern. Wondering about children play area? Underground parking? Size of apartments? Maybe not so many?

5:16:32 PM Chair Fugate closed public comment.

5:16:56 PM Chair Fugate asked staff if could provide Maria a place where she could find more information online. Davis confirmed and could also provide her a copy of the Findings of Fact.

5:17:23 PM Simms recommends that the three of them have some deliberation before consideration. And do as they normally do to see if there is a consensus between the three of them. He has some motion language drafted for their consideration.

5:18:02 PM Chair Fugate stated she can affirm each standard discussed at the meeting.

5:18:26 PM Stone stated he did review the minutes and all the comments quoted by him all were in accordance with what he said and in accordance with the policy as he understands it today. Chair Fugate asked other commissioners if they believe that as well. Scanlon and Smith both confirmed. Smith stated they approved this based off they information they had. Chair Fugate
apologized but that she is not clear on specifics of what he felt they were lacking in their deliberation. Chair Fugate stated in that case will go through the requirements and make sure they all have a consensus reiterated for each item.

5:21:12 PM Simms suggested it could be more effective if simply doing that as a whole and asks if any commissioners did not make a specific finding of approval to any criteria required.

5:21:32 PM Chair Fugate asked Smith if he still is in agreement his comments are in compliance. Smith confirmed and feels he can proceeded with Finding and Conclusions of Law as appropriate. Chair Fugate asked Stone if that was what his comments were. Stone confirmed.

5:22:27 PM Scanlon stated apparently Chinn was concerned they were following the guidelines of staff and not the ordinance and doing their own research. Scanlon stated he himself looked into this and he told Ms. Bundy at the meeting she must have had the codebook right here as he did not find any variations at all.

5:23:38 PM Scanlon stated those guidelines keep the applicant and staff safe and normally they keep the community safe.

5:23:58 PM Chair Fugate stated they used the staff report and they had a pre-application in which he had opportunity to provide input to the applicant. Chair Fugate stated, as said in the minutes, “well designed project and followed code”. Each of them addressed their appreciation for that compliance and responsiveness of applicant before they came in 5:24:41 PM with actual design review.

5:24:51 PM Chair Fugate would also say she would not change her findings. There are times that points are brought up and discussed and there are times they do not agree with everything said in the staff report. But in this case they made a thoughtful deliberation and that each of them take very seriously what mark they are helping to leave on their City. Chair Fugate stated that was her verbose way of saying she still feels comfortable and her feelings are the same.

5:25:55 PM Scanlon motioned to modify the Findings of Fact Conclusions of Law and Decision issued here and reflect unanimous consent with specific findings of compliance and satisfaction with each and every relevant decision criteria and stamp of approval of modified Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law and decision herein to be approved and next regular meeting. Smith seconded. All Favor.

5:26:43 PM Simms stated will see commission at next relative meeting in 10 days. Chair Fugate thanked all for attending. Chinn thanked Chair Fugate’s consideration.

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: July 18, 2022 at 5:30pm.
  • PP: Sweetwater Block 2 Phase 2
  • 525 North Rezone
  • Tree Caliber Reduction Size
Scanlon motioned to adjourn. Smith seconded. All in Favor.
Return to Agenda
Meeting Minutes
HAILEY PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
July 18, 2022
Virtual and In-Person Meeting
5:30 p.m.

From your computer, tablet or smartphone: https://meet.goto.com/CityofHaileyPZ
Via One-touch dial in by phone: tel:+15713173122,,506287589#

Present
Commission: Janet Fugate, Dustin Stone, Dan Smith, Owen Scanlon
Staff: Robyn Davis, Paige Nied, Cece Osborn, Mike Baledge, Chris Simms

5:30:12 PM Chair Fugate called to order.

5:30:32 PM Public Comment for items not on the agenda. No Comment.

5:31:15 PM Consent Agenda
CA 1 Adoption of Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision of a Design Review Application by F & G, LLC, represented by architect Owen Scanlon, for construction of a new 18,849 square foot commercial space to be used for Sun Valley Luxury Car Rental, to be located east of the existing car dealership at Lot 11A, Block 2, Friedman Park Subdivision (960 South Main Street), located in the Light Industrial (LI) Zoning District. ACTION ITEM.

CA 2 Adoption of Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision of a Design Review Application by Lisa Hamilton for a new 624 square foot garage with a 624 square foot one bedroom Accessory Dwelling Unit located above the proposed garage. This project is located at 648 N. 3rd Ave (Lots 16-8 Block 72, Hailey Townsite) within the Limited Residential 1 (LR 1) and Townsite Overlay (TO) Zoning Districts. ACTION ITEM.

CA 3 Adoption of Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision of a Conditional Use Permit Application by Aviation Storage, LLC, for a mixed-use building to include a restaurant space. A restaurant is considered Food Service and requires a conditional use permit. This project is located at Lot 3A, Block 4, Airport West Subdivision #2 (1551 Aviation Drive), located in the SCI - Industrial (SCI-I) Zoning District. ACTION ITEM.

CA 4 Adoption of Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision of a Design Review Application by Aviation Storage, LLC, for construction of a mixed-use building to be located at Lot 3A, Block 4, Airport West Subdivision #2 (1551 Aviation Drive), located in the SCI - Industrial (SCI-I) Zoning District. This project consists of self-storage units, three (3) work force housing units, a restaurant and retail space. ACTION ITEM.

5:31:26 PM Stone motioned to approve CA 1 - CA 4. Smith seconded. All in Favor.

Public Hearing
Consideration of a Preliminary Plat Application by Kilgore Properties, LLC, represented by Matt Watson, where Phase II of Block 2, approximately 3.77 acres in size, is subdivided into eight (8) sublots, consisting of eighty (80) condominium units, and Parcel A, approximately 5,982 square feet in size, to host a tot lot and other amenities. This project is located along Shenandoah Drive, in Section 15, T.2N., R.18 E., B.M., City of Hailey, Blaine County, Idaho, within the Limited Business (LB) Zoning District. **ACTION ITEM.**

Cece Osborn introduced the project and turned the floor over to applicant team. Matt Watson.  
**5:33:49 PM** Watson summarized have signed this before under the design review and how this is a continuation of what they have already seen in Phase 1. Watson stated have 26 off street parking spaces as well as street parking, confirming will have ev outlets and roughing in solar ability. Watson explained trail connection going from Shenandoah to existing trail and how it can also be an emergency access. Watson asked if there were any questions.

**5:36:14 PM** Scanlon asked what the closest setback to property line is. Watson stated the closest they have is 13 feet.

**5:36:39 PM** Stone asked if the trail is 12 ft paved and another 8 ft of gravel. Watson confirmed materials and that it will be maintained by the HOA. Stone asked Baledge if that is acceptable by the fire department. Baledge confirmed, explaining that it is more of a turnaround than an access. Baledge confirmed will monitor HOA to be sure maintained correctly.

**5:38:43 PM** No questions from Smith or Chair Fugate.

**5:38:55 PM** Chair Fugate opened public comment.

**5:39:15 PM** Chair Fugate closed public comment.

**5:39:29 PM** Chair Fugate stated appreciation for them adding the tot lot and additional amenities.

**5:40:00 PM** Scanlon stated believes neighbors have found this application acceptable since no one attended. Scanlon believes this is a good application. No comments from Stone.

**5:40:40 PM** Smith recommended landscaping that minimizes water usage.

**5:41:17 PM** Scanlon motioned to approve Phase II of the Preliminary Plat Application by Kilgore Properties, LLC, represented by Matt Watson, to be located at Block 2, Sweetwater P.U.D. Subdivision (vacant lot along Shenandoah Drive), finding that the application meets all City Standards, and that Conditions (a) through (h) are met. Smith seconded. All in Favor.

Davis asked the Commission to hear PH 3 before PH 2. Commission agreed.

Consideration of a City-Initiated Text Amendment to Title 17, Section 17.06.080: Design Standards to Align with Street Tree Guidelines, and Title 18, Section...
18.06.026: Street Tree Guidelines and Standards, to reduce the caliper sizes of street trees and tree standards from four-inch (4”) caliper to a range of two-and-one-half inch (2 ½”) to four inches (4”), and no greater than four inches (4”). ACTION ITEM.

Davis explained the intent for this amendment is to allow for reduction of caliper requirements for the street trees.

5:43:23 PM Linda Ries, Hailey Tree Committee chair, complimented staff on write up. Ries emphasized that this will allow for more effort to plant a diversity of trees. Ries commented under the pros, smaller trees can sometimes be planted by hand but others may need equipment. Ries asked for questions.

5:45:24 PM Scanlon asked if she felt like it would have a better range of healthy trees. Ries believes that larger trees lose approximately 95% of roots. Ries explained smaller trees tend do to better.

5:46:27 PM Stone concerned about stating can’t go greater than 4in caliper. Stone asked why we would recommend stopping them. Ries explained for a street tree, it’s much better off with smaller trees. Ries explained that unless trees have a special setup, records show that larger tree not likely to survive. Stone is hesitant to create an ordinance that specifically mandates cannot go larger, does not understand why we would want to stop it. Chair Fugate stated believes part of the concern is larger caliper trees not surviving. Davis added that when building permits come through, staff does zoning reviews on all of them and majority of time landscape plans are included and staff does not see trees. Davis explained they do have a lot of people ask for smaller trees. Stone can see that, but that changing an ordinance that did not have a maximum that is now going to have a maximum. Stone stated it seems unnecessary thing to mandate. Davis stated staff would be happy to remove if the commission decides too.

5:51:16 PM Smith can see Stone’s point, and that he agrees with him as a long-term situation not sure if need to limit that. Smith explained what he has heard and understood from dealing with landscaping companies a few years ago. Smith does not have a problem with the 2.5 minimum, that hopes to provide more variety. Smith asked about specified streets. Davis confirmed that it has grown. Smith asked what the number of allowable species are. Ries believes it is closer to 20, that it is broken up into 3 different size classes. Smith supports the idea of not putting a cap on it.

5:55:08 PM Chair Fugate can agree with that. Chair Fugate asked if Ries has issue concern with removing the maximum limit of 4.

5:56:00 PM Chair Fugate opened public comment.

5:56:29 PM Chair Fugate closed public comment.

Chair Fugate and Stone thanked Ries for her commitment to the city.

5:57:14 PM Smith moved to recommend approval to the Hailey City Council an Ordinance amending Hailey Municipal Code, Title 17: Zoning Regulations, Chapter 17.06: Design Review, Section 17.06.080: Design Standards, to reduce the required tree caliper size to be no less than
two-and-one-half (2 ½) inches, and to support a diverse and resilient urban forest by including street trees as part of the landscaping plan, in which a maximum of 20% of any single tree species may be planted, finding that essential public facilities and services are available to support the full range of proposed uses without creating excessive additional requirements at public cost for the public facilities and services, that the proposed uses are compatible with the surrounding area, and that the proposed amendment will promote the public health, safety and general welfare. Scanlon seconded. All in Favor.

PH 2 5:58:45 PM Consideration of a Rezone Application by 525, LLC, represented by Opal Engineering, to rezone 525 North 1st Avenue (Lots 1-4, Block 64, Hailey Townsite) from General Residential (GR) and Townsite Overlay (TO) Zoning Districts, to General Residential (GR) and Townsite Overlay (TO) Zoning Districts and located within the Downtown Residential Overlay (DRO). ACTION ITEM.

5:59:11 PM Paige turned floor to applicant team. 5:59:33 PM Samantha Stahlnecker, Opal Engineering, provided plan showing existing property and surrounding issues – restaurants, gas stations, fencing, residential homes. Stahlnecker stated property currently has 4 apartment units that developed up to roughly 25% of property and under the DRO could be developed up to 35%. Stahlnecker explained applicant is requesting to add this property to the DRO, that there are no current plans to develop this property but that there is potential. Stahlnecker when through how the application complies with the comprehensive plan, referenced previous water study completed on property north of this and that this property is better connected and disbursed. Stahlnecker continued to go through each standard, explaining how the project complies.

6:05:13 PM Scanlon asked if said could increase density by 10%. Stahlnecker apologized, stated has not done any studies showing what the increase could be. Stahlnecker continued going through each standard. Stahlnecker explained the reason why only pursuing rezone of this property. Stahlnecker stated the applicant team feels there are no negative impacts, but that the additional residential units could be a benefit.

6:07:09 PM Nied stated as explained in staff report, staff believes it would be best practice to include the northern properties.

6:07:37 PM Chris Simms, stated has not property noticed any other rezones than the subject property. Simms encouraged the commission to discuss putting the DRO further along on 1st street.

6:08:49 PM Smith believes that would be a good thing. Smith asked if they have concurrence from Uhrig for potential rezone. Smith asked about the small GR parcel. Davis explained staff would also recommend including that parcel and have spoken with that owner who is agreeable.

6:10:01 PM Scanlon no questions at this time.

6:10:08 PM Stone asked if received emails from the businesses. Stone asked how the staff conversation went with the potential option to rezone. Stone asked for clarification on Simms comments. Simms clarified suggesting have an in-depth conversation about
including other potential properties, that any motion other than the subject property cannot have action due to lack of motion. Stone asked commission on thought process of how DRO was created, and boundaries determined. Smith summarized process. Smith suggested taking a more expansive look at the DRO. Stone asked if they have access to map to see DRO boundary. Staff provided a zoning map, showing location of existing DRO boundary.

6:16:30 PM Commission reviewed existing boundary of the DRO. Stone asked if they have information on the impact. Davis explained that standard is for when changing to LB or Transitional. Davis explained staff did not feel that was applicable as not changing underlying zoning. Davis explained idea behind the DRO as an overlay; the underlying zoning does not change so the bulk requirements will remain the same. Stone asked if they have seen adverse effects of DRO. Smith provided examples along River Street that used the DRO. Smith thinks they want to have some thought involved how they define that boundary. Davis explained that the parcels currently built under the DRO are built within the business zoning districts, that this is a completely different zoning.

6:21:19 PM Chair Fugate confirmed that they should be discussing this property, not others if understood correctly. Simms stated encouraging discussion of DRO boundaries tonight that may notice for a future meeting. Scanlon stated as a designer, the biggest advantage of the DRO is the parking. Scanlon asked if possible for the City to take a survey to show how many properties could be affected by this change and how many of them have development that will not change and how many could be expanded on. Commission further discussed the need for a survey, all agreed.

6:25:29 PM Chair Fugate opened public comment.

6:25:45 PM Ned Williamson, owner of 525, his main point, thinks there is a negative connotation of the term spot zoning. This is what the Supreme Court said: a request for spot zoning has no negative connotation. Supreme Court 1977 case, there are several cases about spot zoning. The question is, is the zone change in accordance with the comprehensive plan. This is the question and this is what he would like them to focus on. And if it is, it should be approved and if it isn't, it should not be approved. They think it is, they state the reasons. So hopefully they look at the comp plan and think it will improve housing in a very small way. Good location right by Main Street, bus stop, etc. He thinks this is a good time for it and would like to take advantage of it and that would have to come back through design review later of course. Urges them to look at the comp plan.

Davis explained the intent of DRO. Simms added he agrees with Judge Williamson’s point on spot zoning. Simms stated if this property qualifies, then certainly others do also. Chair Fugate stated that is a new take on rezoning, asked if she could find it in the code. Commission discussed spot zoning impacts and whether they have enough information to make a large-scale zoning change.

6:32:53 PM Stone asked if Simms thought there was a way to move forward with motion 2. Simms explained the procedural way would be to continue this on the record. Davis stated only issue would be if included northern parcels, would need to re-notice and looking at September.
Applicant referred to code section on page 8 of the staff report. Simms recommended better practice would be to re-notice. Scanlon asked Stahlnecker her thoughts on re-notice. Stahlnecker deferred to her client. Williamson expressed concern of re-notice, that he believes the project should be discussed on its merits alone. Scanlon agrees but also thinks it makes sense to include norther properties staff discussed.

Commission discussed how the best way to proceed would be. Davis explained that utilizing the DRO is up to the developer, that it does not need to be used. Commission and staff discussed motion options.

Chair Fugate closed public comment.

Chair Fugate would like to follow through and have notice on the northern properties if follow through with this application. Chair Fugate liked Scanlon's comments about whether we modify or if allow to change organically. Stone believes property owner should be able to access to the overlay, Stone does not like idea of holding applicant back when commission has clean up to do. Stone is in favor of granting rezone to project.

Smith thinks comp plan wise it is ok but expressed concern about allowing for it to change organically. Smith does not think he has a reason to say it should not be approved but that if approved this should definitely be looking at long term. Smith summarized he does not have problem with this, but definitely thinks they need to look at area to the north. Smith suggested re-notice and bring the other properties into the DRO. Commission discussed approving this project tonight and noticing it at a future date for northern lots. All agreed. Stone asked if staff was comfortable. Staff confirmed. All in agreement to approve this project and notice to have the northern lots rezoned.

Stone to approve the Rezone Application by 525, LLC, represented by Opal Engineering, for an amendment to the City of Hailey Zoning District Map, Section 17.05.020. The proposed change includes amending 525 North 1st Avenue (Lots 1-4, Block 64, Hailey Townsite) from General Residential (GR) and Townsite Overlay (TO) Zoning Districts to General Residential (GR) and Townsite Overlay (TO) Zoning Districts and located within the Downtown Residential Overlay (DRO), finding that the changes are in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan, essential public facilities and services are available to support the full range of proposed uses without creating excessive additional requirements at public cost for the public facilities and services, the proposed uses are compatible with the surrounding area, and the proposed amendment will promote the public health, safety and general welfare. Scanlon seconded. All in Favor.

Smith noted error on side-yard setback, should be 8’.

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 1, 2022
  • DR: Bullard
  • DR: Yueh
• DR: McKenna
• DR: 40 McKercher

Davis summarized the upcoming projects.

6:56:52 PM Smith motioned to adjourn. Scanlon seconded. All in Favor.
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Present
Commission: Dan Smith, Janet Fugate, Dustin Stone, Owen Scanlon
Staff: Robyn Davis, Paige Nied, Cece Osborn, Jessie Parker

5:30:06 PM Chair Fugate called to order.

5:30:27 PM Public Comment for items not on the agenda. Chair Fugate reminded all to mute any
devices that can disrupt the meeting and if attending virtually to stay muted until public
comment. No comment.

5:31:25 PM Consent Agenda
CA 1 Adoption of Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision of a Preliminary Plat
Application by Kilgore Properties, LLC, represented by Matt Watson, where Phase II of Block 2,
approximately 3.77 acres in size, is subdivided into eight (8) sublots, consisting of eighty (80)
condominium units, and Parcel A, approximately 5,982 square feet in size, to host a tot lot and
other amenities. This project is located along Shenandoah Drive, in Section 15, T.2N., R.18 E.,
B.M., City of Hailey, Blaine County, Idaho, within the Limited Business (LB) Zoning District.
ACTION ITEM.

CA 2 Adoption of Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision of a Rezone Application by
525, LLC, represented by Opal Engineering, to rezone 525 North 1st Avenue (Lots 1-4, Block 64,
Hailey Townsite) from General Residential (GR) and Townsite Overlay (TO) Zoning Districts, to
General Residential (GR) and Townsite Overlay (TO) Zoning Districts and located within the
Downtown Residential Overlay (DRO). ACTION ITEM.

CA 3 Adoption of Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision of a City-Initiated Text
Amendment to Title 17, Section 17.06.080: Design Standards to Align with Street Tree Guidelines,
and Title 18, Section 18.06.026: Street Tree Guidelines and Standards, to reduce the caliper sizes
of street trees and tree standards from four-inch (4") caliper to a range of two-and-one-half inch
(2 ½") to four inches (4"), and no greater than four inches (4"). ACTION ITEM.

5:31:32 PM Smith motioned to approve CA 1- 3. Scanlon seconded. All Favor.

Public Hearing
PH 1  5:31:55 PM Consideration of a Design Review by West of First, LLC, represented by Opal
Engineering, for construction of a new 44-unit apartment building, to be located at 40 McKercher
Boulevard (Lot 1B, Block 2, Northridge Subdivision X). This parcel is located within the Business (B) and Downtown Residential Overlay (DRO) Zoning District. ACTION ITEM.

5:32:18 PM Davis introduced project with brief summary of previous hearing and removal of PUD. Davis noted previous requests by commissioners – deed restricted units and reduction of building height, Davis confirmed applicant has done that. Davis turned floor to applicant team.

5:33:59 PM Brett Marshall, Architect, introduced himself and Samantha Stahlnecker, Opal Engineering. Marshal provided PowerPoint presentation, explaining ambition of project is to provide housing and to provide a green building. Marshal discussed how project meets design review guidelines. Marshall stated project has dropped to 44 units that include variety of studios, one-bedroom and two-bedroom units, that each apartment has a storage unit and parking. Marshall discussed access proposed to be off McKercher and how new access opens up green space. Marshall went through proposed floor plans for each unit style noting which units had skylights and or balconies. Marshall explained proposed materials to be used and provided elevation plans.

5:43:06 PM Nathan Schutte, landscape architect, summarized goal is to blend existing surrounding landscape. Schutte explained proposed plan providing drought tolerant plants, planters along parking stall and other screening landscape to help provide buffer. Schutte noted seating picnic area for residents. Schutte listed various trees proposed to be planted.

5:46:51 PM Marshall provided elevation plan from viewpoint off McKercher with landscape proposed and elevation from viewpoint from 1st Ave.

5:48:48 PM Scanlon asked Marshall if new how many rooms are in the hotel as appear to be similar size buildings. Marshall does not. Scanlon asked about crossing lane between their building and LL Greens. Stahlnecker noted location of pedestrian access is where the bike path crosses. Scanlon asked the depth of the decks. Marshall stated the decks are 4.5 feet. Scanlon asked where they are counting the height point of the building. Marshall stated measuring to the top parfaits, which are the highest points of the building.

5:51:25 PM Stone asked what the purpose of the easement between their building and LL Greens. Stahlnecker explained that access will be used to collect trash and to access two parking stalls. Stone asked if just asphalt. Stahlnecker stated there is a small landscape strip to the west of the building. Stone asked if the units would have AC. Marshall confirmed and stated need both accesses for emergency services. Stone asked about gated parking permitted within Hailey that believes there is a plan to install a gate. Staff will verify if code. Stone stated it was mentioned that cannot store snow in open space, if that was common to not allow that. Staff confirmed. Stone asked about the water pressure study. Stahlnecker stated they have hired a consultant to do an analysis of the water study and they are working on it, pending the model from the City Engineer. Stahlnecker expects to have that study within next two weeks and will address any concerns with the City Engineer.

5:58:59 PM Smith asked if considered putting a berm along McKercher to assist with sound deafening and to provide more privacy. Commission asked if there is a sample rock or will be contracting with a local quarry. Marshall confirmed working on that now. Smith asked if they are taking in account what will experience when winter shows up in regarding to drainage and snow
load. Marshall confirmed applicant is aware of drainage and structural requirement needed. Smith asked about the white material proposed in the elevation. Marshall stated it is the gray concrete sample.

6:04:05 PM Chair Fugate asked where the covered walkway is located. Stahlnecker stated it is between the proposed parking and structure. Chair Fugate asked if the parking spaces will be designated per units. Marshall stated offering at least one parking space per unit and guest parking, that how those spaces are allocated are still under discussion. Chair Fugate stated plan is calling for larger caliper trees, if they are willing to adjust the caliper. Schutte confirmed, will adjust for that and that would actually help if were smaller caliper.

6:07:26 PM Simms noted code provision of gate 16.04.080 and that does not apply. Marshall addressed security access regarding the gate – noting access locations. Stahlnecker stated the storage access is available through the parking garage. Chair Fugate asked how applicants would access the garage. Stahlnecker explained potential options of access to covered parking but that the fine details are still being worked out.

6:11:10 PM Chair Fugate opened public comment.

6:11:49 PM Jason Shearer, live in adjacent neighborhood, wanted to remind them that started this conversation before the larger lot was subdivided and zoned all residential. When LL Green went through with their application, they received significant pushback. In between meetings the lots were subdivided, making curb cuts. Now have a large shopping area that is going to draw traffic into a residential neighborhood. And when see pictures of AmericInn next to this new apartment building, show them in align with each other but that is not the case, this apartment building is going to be directly behind neighborhood so being boxed into the corner and now must chose between housing which is needed and undesirable outcome. This housing thinks isn’t the best location of all locations; think do need apartment but want to say sort of going from situation from situation sliding backwards into original design that people didn’t like. His biggest point about this current piece, is in a neighborhood with a middle school – walking distance from the middle school with children. Building an apartment complex built for adults that is single unit. That is not affordable, most people who live in affordable housing in this community have a roommate maybe their share the kitchen, but they are not living in a single bedroom unit. This isn’t the right place, should have two-bedroom apartments that are not higher than the homes right behind them. Should be in align with the same height, should be accessible to people with people who have children in middle school.

6:14:16 PM Tim Richards, Winterberry Loop, have 50 neighbors that are supportive of his opinion, its 64 units in hotel. January 2003, same company wanted to rezone it and one of their statements were due to recent development on west side of Albertsons it’s made the property on the eastside undesirable for residential development talk about the garage going up and down and light pollution, *unclear what said about 20 singles*, talk about parking spots. Look at you, have two cars now have guest coming over all of sudden need 8. You have about 100 parking spots need for this space, this unit and yeah Albertsons has little table and chairs out front where people can communicate but this isn’t developing a community, this isn’t a neighborhood. If go on to the east going to see a neighborhood. And you’re throwing in this is a 3-story building that trying to say is Affordable housing is now in the upscale area. It creates sense of community on a human scale, smaller size, inclusive configuration, allows people to feel and live and act like
neighbors. Disagrees this is not the kind of building this is going to be, understand have a housing crisis here but there are lots of opportunities out there but putting 22 singles right next to LL Greens and the hotel is really not a transition.

**6:16:31 PM** Katie Craig, lives directly in the view of this waiver to allow the apartment building to be higher. If the zoning is 35 feet, it should be 35 feet. Chair Fugate confirmed it is 35 ft, Craig stated couldn’t get online so thank you. If its 35 feet, does feel better about it but the density and the noise from traffic its really going to impact McKercher and First St. The noise is a big deal. Bout that property and it was residential, and it was changed by Planning. Agrees with Tim, just not the right place, density is way to big and it does affect their neighbor and does not think it’s fair to them. Did talk to a contractor and can get contractors up here, does not think he is being honest about that. Thinking its way to dense and really oppose it.

**6:18:21 PM** Keith Winnivoch, lives in Northridge, moving his daughter into there, one thing he thinks that needs to be done quickly talking about water study, water comes from Indian Creek Indian Springs its 2.62 cubic feet per second if take about 70% of that number due to blockage and changes to prevent overpressure have a real flow problem. If he takes a shower can’t do the dishes, stuff needs to be really reviewed accurately to make sure, gone from architectural planning and now have to do resource management, has to go through public works to make sure have resources to support these types of things. Personally, thinks it looks terrible.

**6:20:38 PM** Steve Dodd, lives in adjacent neighborhood, looking at road cuts and design but see have no traffic calming measures. Would like to see that in place. He is pro this development thinks we need the housing.

**6:21:24 PM** Breanna Dodd, E Winterberry, also in support of this development, desperately need housing wants to avoid being the person of not in my backyard.

**6:22:17 PM** Elizabeth Jeffery, N 3rd, certainly understand neighbors’ problems with density has another thought, noticed that building solar ready and at same time have lots of openings in roof for lighting but those two would not be compatible. Love idea of interior lighting from the solar, but second piece second questions there is 3-4 months roofs covered in snow, and not providing light and rest of year its open so if hallways are lighted at night, can’t imagine if hallways are lighted if they are dark sky complaint.

**6:24:08 PM** Jason Steel, Winterberry Loop, can’t see development from his house so his comments are more as a concerned citizen. Commend design team for beautiful renderings and presentation his biggest concern is how starkly unfriendly when it comes to the ground level, pedestrian experience. Confused on how commercial parking structure is allowed in this zone. When looks at 17.05.040 District Use Matrix parking structures and facilities are not allowed in zone; garages are allowed but pretty sure that’s a garage with a single-family residence. Think can all agree that a 44 unit multifamily is a commercial structure, therefor a commercial parking structure as is proposed should not be allowed. When they argue that the parking structure is an accessory use to the apartments, he is not aware of any portion of code that allows for commercial parking structures. Steel reads definition of accessory definition from code. Not aware of multi family structure that incorporated parking structures at their ground level. There are many examples of multifamily structures built in Hailey, none of these other projects include above ground parking structure. It’s worth noting that a portion of the River Street Senior
housing has an above ground parking structure, but this is located within the Business District where it’s a conditional use. Interested in how the city staff interprets the parking structure with this development. Whole heartedly support the need for housing, density, and affordable housing. Just does not want to live in community of ground level parking structures.

**6:27:50 PM** Chair Fugate closed public comment.

**6:28:14 PM** Stahlnecker thanked commissioners and public for comments. Stahlnecker stated this property was rezoned from LB to B, though would argue that the structure is not a parking structure the parking is subordinate to the principal use and that the front of the structure does have human scale elements. Stahlnecker understands building height and density, noting that the zoning to the east is GR and it does permit 35 ft explaining this project will not be looming over the town as the tallest structure. Stahlnecker explained that the property was not rezoned to DRO it has been part of that overlay since it was adopted. Stahlnecker explained noting is prohibiting families from living and benefits for the density and location. **6:31:53 PM** Marshall noted that there are two-bedroom units and part of their previous feedback received was to include more variety. Marshall confirmed all lighting will be dark sky compliant. Stahlnecker explained this is not a modular construction; the panels will be developed onsite and local contractors working on this project. Stahlnecker referenced article published today in NY Times regarding the housing crisis. **6:34:00 PM** Marshall clarified materials to be used and construction plan for the project. No further comments from staff, Davis confirming project does comply with the code. Chair Fugate asked Stahlnecker to address comment about traffic calming measures. Stahlnecker discussed potential options, confirming can certainly look into signage. Smith suggested temporary speed bumps that can remove during winter months. Stahlnecker will look into signage and be sure landscaping does not interfere with visual.

**6:40:37 PM** Chair Fugate asked if water pressure study was a condition of approval. Staff confirmed it is not yet. Commission and staff discussed whether to make water study a condition of approval or bring back to Planning and Zoning. Applicant suggested continuation. Commission agreed to continue to a date certain. **6:47:34 PM** Chair Fugate stated other issue need to discuss is gating the parking area. Discussion ensued, all in agreement will further discuss at next hearing. Scanlon stated deed restricted housing should be part of the next discussion. Smith suggested to applicant to minimize short term rentals, perhaps something where hospital could rent for traveling nurses. Chair Fugate confirmed gate parking, potential deed restricted or workforce accommodation, water model, and specifics on traffic calming is what they would like to discuss at next hearing. Stone asked if could have water model prior to hearing.

**6:55:14 PM** Scanlon motioned to continue on record to September 19, 2022. Stone seconded. All in Favor.

**PH 2 6:55:59 PM** Consideration of a Design Review Application by Michael and Brooke McKenna, for a 1,248 square foot two-story addition, consisting of an attached garage and bedroom, to an existing single-family residence. This project is located at 319 East Croy Street (Lot South ½ of 10, Lots 11 and 12, Block 36, Hailey Townsite within the Limited Residential (LR-1) and Townsite Overlay (TO) Zoning Districts. ACTION ITEM.

**6:56:49 PM** Osborn introduced project and turned floor to applicant team.
6:57:47 PM Stone disclosed he is a friend of Mike McKenna but has no business dealings and feels comfortable moving forward he does not foresee any biasedness.

6:58:23 PM Linda Bergersen, Architect, explained applicant desires for addition. Bergson explained proposed materials to be used, that will be matching existing materials. Bergson explained proposed changes to side landscaping. Bergson used photos of existing home to explain material look, that the addition will look like existing materials. Staff confirmed visited site and material is shake and it is blue.

7:03:42 PM Scanlon confirmed north evaluation material. Bergeron stated south elevation is going to be shake and bringing it around either side of the garage and transition to lap on north side and portion of eastern side will also be lap siding. Bergeron stated gable ends will match existing.

7:05:13 PM Chair Fugate confirmed access will be off alley. Bergeron noted snow storage area and existing lawn.

7:06:13 PM Stone suggested the bottom half may need something more. Bergeron stated texture of shake will make a difference. Stone agreed.

7:06:38 PM Chair Fugate opened public comment.

7:07:21 PM Chair Fugate closed public comment.

7:07:28 PM Scanlon stated project makes since and good thing to do. Stone agrees would consider this an improvement. Smith agrees with previous commissioner’s comments, really nice addition. Chair Fugate agrees with commissioners’ comments.

7:08:44 PM Stone to approve the Design Review Application by Michael and Brooke McKenna, represented by architect Linda Bergson, for a new 1,344 square foot addition to an existing 1,406 square foot house. The project is located at 319 East Croy Street (Lots All 8 and N. 15’ of 9, Block 16, Hailey Townsite), in the Limited Residential (LR-1) 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 (j) are met. Smith seconded. All in Favor.

Chair Fugate called for 2-minute break. 7:10:16 PM

7:16:27 PM Chair Fugate called meeting back to order.

PH 3 7:16:41 PM Consideration of a Design Review Application by Maureen Fries Yueh Revocable Trust, represented by Craig Lawrence, for an addition to the existing residence, as well as an addition of a detached, 585 square feet garage with a one-bedroom Accessory Dwelling Unit, approximately 833 square feet, above. This project is located at 506 North 1st Avenue (Lot 18A, Block 63, Hailey Townsite) within the General Residential (GR) and Townsite Overlay (TO) Zoning Districts. ACTION ITEM.
Nied turned floor over to applicant team. Craig Lawrence, architect, stated coming in for design review for whole project but at present this fall want to build garage ADU on back and next year will do the primary residence. Lawrence provided summary of original residence and new additions to existing residence including covered porch and second story. Lawrence explained in back, there is an existing shed that is being proposed to be removed and build a garage with a single bedroom ADU above the garage. Lawrence showed proposed parking for residence and ADU. Lawrence noted additional detail proposed on porch to keep with old feeling of Hailey and other proposed materials to keep feel of old Hailey. Lawrence went into detail on proposed floor plans for ADU, garage and primary residence. Lawrence noted ADU would be used for family at times. Lawrence confirmed will use similar siding to blend into the house and that the garage ADU will be stained a char wood color. Lawrence explained how would like to use existing material from shed but that may need to be augmented.

Stone asked if plan to keep snow on roof. Lawrence explained locations of snow clips and snow locations. Lawrence stated area with fireplace has a cricket that goes towards downspouts. Scanlon asked if the downspouts are internal on flat surface of roof. Lawrence confirmed internal.

Scanlon asked if on the south elevation if would consider putting a window to help break up the height and plainness of that side of the building. Lawrence confirmed can do that, it is just the garage. Lawrence explained that wall faces the fence and existing landscaping, that was trying to save some money. Commission and applicant discussed distance of southern wall to fence and how the shrubs would help hide that side of the building.

No comments from Stone. Smith thinks house addition will be very nice, give a lot better look and believes ADU will be a good addition as well can always utilize increased amount of density in town. Smith stated it will be interesting, that know black is becoming more popular. Lawrence stated the character of wood comes out in the black stain.

Chair Fugate asked about snow on uncovered portion of terrace. Lawrence stated it would just have to be removed.

Chair Fugate opened public comment.

Chair Fugate closed public comment.

Smith asked if there was EV charging. Nied confirmed one stall in the garage will be wired.

Chair Fugate asked about long term occupancy term of 31 days that would like to follow up with staff on. Stone asked if ADU parking was designated. Lawrence confirmed.

Davis suggested commission could extend design review approval deadline from 1 year to 18 months. Commission agreed good idea. Lawrence confirmed 18 months would be sufficient.

Scanlon motioned to approve a Design Review Application by Maureen Fries Yueh Revocable Trust for a 1,070 square foot addition to the existing residence, as well as a new 585
square foot detached garage with a one-bedroom Accessory Dwelling Unit, approximately 833 square feet in size, located above. This project is located at Lot 18A, Block 63, Hailey Townsite (506 North 1st Avenue) 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 (n) are met. Smith seconded. All in Favor.

PH 4  7:39:13 PM Consideration of a Design view Application by Spring Bullard, represented by Steve Cook, to convert an existing 350 square foot shed to a one-bedroom Accessory Dwelling Unit. This project is located at 210 North 2nd Avenue (Lots 19, North 20’ of 20, Block 47, Hailey Townsite) within the General Residential (GR) and Townsite Overlay (TO) Zoning Districts.

ACTION ITEM.

7:39:33 PM Osborn introduced the project, stated it is to convert existing shed to one-bedroom ADU. Osborn noted improvement of vehicular access off alley. Osborn turned floor over to the applicant team. 7:40:17 PM Steve Cook, architect representing Spring Bullard, stated Bullard is wanting to covert shed to an ADU that materials, footprint, lot coverage will all stay the same. Cook asked if commission has any questions.

7:41:36 PM Scanlon agrees project is straightforward, no qualms think good use of unused space. Cook stated staff did point out will probably need snow clips and that the roof peak may increase putting height to 13’ 4.5”.

7:43:45 PM Stone asked for clarification of living space square footage. Spring Bullard, owner, stated exterior storage is accessible from outside. Stones concern is compliance of minimum regulations of 300 sq. ft. Davis stated they could add an interior door to that space and would meet code. Commission discussed square footage. Applicant confirmed would be willing to add door to ensure compliant. Commission and staff made note to revisit minimum square footage.

7:48:55 PM Chair Fugate asked where the green house is located that is being removed. Cook noted location, that it is attached to southside of shed. Bullard noted plan is to move to west end.

7:50:35 PM Chair Fugate opened public comment.
7:50:44 PM Elizabeth Jeffery, neighbor across the alley and just wanted to express her approval.

7:51:07 PM Chair Fugate closed public comment.

No further discussion.

7:51:21 PM Smith motioned to approve the Design Review Application by Spring Bullard for the renovation and conversion of an existing 348 square foot shed into a studio Accessory Dwelling Unit. This project is located at Lot 19, Block 47, Hailey Townsite (210 North 2nd Avenue) in 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 (k) are met. Scanlon seconded. All in Favor.

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 15, 2022
   DR: ARCH Shenandoah Phase 3
   DR: Wallace
   CUP: Mountain Athletics
   DR Pre-App: Spruce and River Workforce Housing

Davis summarized upcoming projects for next hearing. Davis asked commission input of allowing housing in LI zoning districts. Commission recommended staff peruse the potential amendment. Davis confirmed RV ordinance was approved by City Council and should be published Wednesday.

8:01:55 PM Stone motioned to adjourn. Scanlon seconded. All in Favor.
Return to Agenda
AGENDA
HAILEY PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
August 15, 2022
Virtual and In-Person Meeting
5:30 p.m.

From your computer, tablet or smartphone: https://meet.goto.com/CityofHaileyPZ
Via One-touch dial in by phone: tel:+15713173122,,506287589#

Present
Commission: Dan Smith, Janet Fugate, Dustin Stone, Owen Scanlon
Staff: Robyn Davis, Paige Nied, Jessica Parker

5:30:03 PM Chair Fugate called to order.

5:30:17 PM Public Comment for items not on the agenda.

5:31:14 PM Smith thanked City Staff for installing flashing crossing lights on Maple near ARCH, very happy to see that in place and would like to thank them for their efforts there.

5:31:43 PM Consent Agenda
CA 1 Adoption of Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision of a Design View Application by Spring Bullard, represented by Steve Cook, to convert an existing 350 square foot shed to a one-bedroom Accessory Dwelling Unit. This project is located at 210 North 2nd Avenue (Lots 19, North 20’ of 20, Block 47, Hailey Townsite) within the General Residential (GR) and Townsite Overlay (TO) Zoning Districts. ACTION ITEM.

CA 2 Adoption of Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision of a Michael and Brooke McKenna, for a 1,248 square foot two-story addition, consisting of an attached garage and bedroom, to an existing single-family residence. This project is located at 319 East Croy Street (Lot South ½ of 10, Lots 11 and 12, Block 36, Hailey Townsite within the Limited Residential (LR-1) and Townsite Overlay (TO) Zoning Districts. ACTION ITEM.

CA 3 Adoption of Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision of a Maureen Fries Yueh Revocable Trust, represented by Craig Lawrence, for an addition to the existing residence, as well as an addition of a detached, 585 square feet garage with a one-bedroom Accessory Dwelling Unit, approximately 833 square feet, above. This project is located at 506 North 1st Avenue (Lot 18A, Block 63, Hailey Townsite) within the General Residential (GR) and Townsite Overlay (TO) Zoning Districts. ACTION ITEM.

5:31:54 PM Stone motioned to approve consent agenda CA 1-3. Smith seconded. All in Favor.

Public Hearing
PH 1 5:32:15 PM Consideration of a Design Review Application by Arch Community Housing Authority, represented by Opal Engineering, for construction of three (3), four-plex multifamily buildings, for a total of twelve (12) additional residential units on proposed
Lot 3. When combined, Lots 1-3 will contain a total of 20 residential units. The project is to be located at 2711 and 2721 Shenandoah Drive (Lots 1 and 2, Block 21, Woodside Subdivision #6) within the Limited Business (LB) Zoning District. Eight (8) residential units currently exist on Lots 1 and 2. **ACTION ITEM.**

5:32:54 PM Nied thanked commission and introduced project, reminding commission they saw this as a pre-application back in March. Nied turned floor to applicant.

5:33:32 PM Samantha Stahlnecker, provided site plan showing location of proposed buildings noting change to outdoor space, landscaping and balconies. Stahlnecker questioned condition of approval c2, proposing minimum slope allowed and she is not sure what the reasoning behind the 1% slope recommended by staff. Stahlnecker stated they would like to keep at the proposed percentage. Stahlnecker suggested amending condition c4 by removing verbiage public access. Stahlnecker turned floor to Michelle Griffith.

5:35:51 PM Michelle Griffith, ARCH Community Housing Trust, stated the 1st four units will be for St. Luke’s Hospital, 2 units of next available will be made available to City of Hailey employees, and remaining units undesigned at this time. Griffith provided samples of turf that they have been working with, that likely to select variety designed for pets but cooler to the touch. Griffith explained there are two styles for the proposed buildings and proposing complimenting colors.

5:39:43 PM Scanlon asked which styles are proposed for the end. Griffith stated had not decided, open to suggestions. Scanlon prefers the gabled style for the end. Scanlon complimented project, and asked for clarification for Stahlnecker’s question regarding sewer drainage. Stahlnecker clarified why would prefer to stay at percentage proposed.

5:41:09 PM Stone asked staff for comment on sewer drainage. Davis confirmed it is a recommendation by the city but suggested keeping the condition vague so applicant team and wastewater team can work together. Stone asked applicants input regarding noise and airport items. Griffith stated would welcome more clear direction, specifically the noise. Stone asked how to make it black and white. Davis confirmed happy to follow up with the Airport, that they have documents that outline this criteria. Davis explained the airport wants the residents notified about potential subject to noise and odors. Griffith stated would do an addendum to the standard lease.

5:45:04 PM Smith asked if applicant did a solar study. Griffith stated they did not. Smith suggested doing a solar study and why. Griffith explained typically use internal shades. Smith does like the mission, appreciates taking into consideration of artificial turf. Smith does not see any issue with removing term public from the access. Staff agrees no issue.

5:47:24 PM Chair Fugate complimented project, agrees with Scanlon’s regarding the gabled buildings. Chair Fugate stated regarding the airport, it seems to her the basic the airport wants is tenant awareness. Davis confirmed.

5:48:25 PM Chair Fugate opened to public comment.

5:49:42 PM Chair Fugate closed public comment.
5:50:00 PM Commission and staff discussed conditions of approval, agreeing change to C 2 condition regarding slope percentage. Scanlon offered to provide Griffith contact information he has regarding the Airport requirements. All commission and staff agreed to amend condition M to include as required. 5:53:38 PM Smith thanked applicant for incorporating some of their suggestions. Chair Fugate asked staff if Chris Pomeroy is also someone the applicant can contact regarding Airport requirements.

5:55:39 PM Scanlon motioned to approve the Design Review Application by ARCH Community Housing Trust, Inc., for construction of three (3), four-plex multifamily residential buildings, for a total of twelve (12) additional residential units on proposed Lot 3, to be located at 2711 and 2721 Shenandoah Drive (Lots 1 and 2, Block 21, Woodside Subdivision #6) within the Limited Business (LB) 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 18, and City Standards, provided conditions (a) through (m), as amended, are met. Smith seconded. All in Favor.

PH 2 5:57:00 PM Consideration of a Design Review Application by Eric and Stephanie Wallace, for a new 1,755 square foot single-family residence with at attached garage and a detached 686 square foot one-bedroom Accessory Dwelling Unit. This project is located at 602 North 1st Avenue (Lot 19A, Block 70, Townsite) within the Limited Residential (LR-1) and Townsite Overlay (TO) Zoning Districts. ACTION ITEM.

5:57:26 PM Davis thanked commission and turned floor to applicant team.

5:57:44 PM Chip Maguire, explained project is for a new residence with ADU on 1st avenue. Maguire described layout of project and confirmed access for both units are off the alley. Maguire stated landscape was kept simple with addition of shrubs and trees, noting existing trees to remain onsite. Maguire described floor plans of primary residence and ADU. Maguire stated both units materials will match, describing materials proposed to be used.

6:01:19 PM Scanlon asked if image of color rendering on bottom right is just an example but that will have a break between. Maguire confirmed, explaining that was just an image of materials to be used. Maguire described elevations and provided comparisons to how it will compare to surrounding homes.

6:04:05 PM Scanlon asked to go back to the site plan. Scanlon asked where the alley comes in at and where it comes out of. Maguire stated it comes in off Myrtle, and possible ends near Natural Grocers. Scanlon asked if have survey showing how close Plowman’s existing residence. Maguire does not, only surveyed project site.

6:06:23 PM Stone asked if were to bring entrance off 1st, what would they do for the ADU parking. Maguire stated it will depend on City preference. Stone asked if staff evaluated the access off the alley. Davis confirmed staff did consider it heavily. Davis does not disagree with Plowman’s comments, the alley is a functioning alley. Stone noted existing power pole. Stone is concerned about ADU parking.
Smith likes the materials proposed, and regarding alley would like to uphold city code requirements.

Chair Fugate complimented project and agreed with alley access. Chair Fugate did not see new water connection listed in the conditions of approval. Staff confirmed can add.

Chair Fugate opened to public comment.

Rory Tong, owners of 600 N 1st, only concern about alley access is that it is a pretty narrow space seems like it would be better to come off 1st street. That space is really really narrow. Snow removal piece, that alley gets pretty full with snow during the winter time.

Chair Fugate closed public comment.

Chair Fugate asked staff to clarify who sent in the written comment, is her understanding correct that that person is encroaching in the alley and that is why it is narrow. Staff confirmed.

Scanlon understands the alley is narrow and understands the neighbors concern, but if Baledge does not have concerns about access and snow is everywhere, he thinks need to stand by the ordinance. Scanlon complimented project and does not see an issue with it moving forward as proposed.

Stone summarized application is for design as it sits, does believe that just because we enforced it prior doesn’t mean enforce in all situations this board is here to find the nooks and crannies. That a house built in 1910 all of a sudden finds it lot lines outside of his home. He does take in consideration that the city has already thought about this topic and addressed it and this is the recommendation that came forth. That it has been looked at, that the application is for it to come off the alley does not have a problem with the application.

Smith appreciates Stones comments, and if there were some extenuating concerns to make him override the ordinance would reconsider. Smith agrees with the design as it stands.

Chair Fugate is comfortable, and thinks it is appropriate that this confirms for with preferred access. Chair Fugate complimented the project.

Davis proposed new condition n) applicant shall install new water connection and vault per city standards where none is existing. Commission approved new condition. Chair Fugate asked what would be required by the airport for this project. Davis explained similar situation as above. Applicant asked who determines if meet notification criteria area. Staff can send the form to the applicant.

Smith motion to approve the Design Review Application by Eric and Stephanie Wallace, for construction of a new single-family residence of 2,342.5 square feet and a new detached ADU of 686 square feet on Lot 19A, Block 70, Hailey Townsite (602 N. 1st Avenue), 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 (n), as amended are met. Stone seconded. All in Favor.

PH 3  6:23:57 PM Consideration of a Conditional Use Permit Application by Mountain Athletics, LLC, for approval of a fitness facility/gym (Health and Fitness Facility), to be located in the Airport Tech Center Condos Unit C 18.7161% (1030 Business Park Drive, Unit C), within the Technological Industry (TI) Zoning District. ACTION ITEM.

6:24:23 PM Davis turned floor to applicant team. 6:24:40 PM Casey Scherer and Jen, explained moving existing business approximately 100 meters from current location, not really anything is going to change.

6:25:23 PM Scanlon thinks this is very straight forward, as no reason to have any doubts about what is happening.

6:25:54 PM Stone asked if going to have some down time during the move. Casey stated may have to close for a day or two.

6:26:14 PM Smith stated this is very straight forward, has a lot of support. Smith does not have any issue.

6:26:41 PM Chair Fugate also does not have a problem with this, noting such great support.

6:27:05 PM Chair Fugate opened to public comment.

6:27:36 PM Chair Fugate closed public comment.

Chair Fugate confirmed no further discussion needed by commission.

6:27:51 PM Scanlon motioned to approve the Conditional Use Permit Application request by Mountain Athletics, LLC, represented by Matt Bogue, for approval of a fitness facility and gym (Health and Fitness Facility), to be located at located at 1030 Business Park Drive, Suite C (Airport Tech Center Condos, Unit C 18.7161%), within the Technological Industry (TI) Zoning District, finding that the application meets each of the Criteria for Review (a) through (h) cited in Title 17.11 of the Hailey Municipal Code, that the Conditional Use Permit complies with the Comprehensive Plan, and that the Conditional Use Permit is subject to Conditions (a) through (c) noted above. Stone seconded. All in Favor.

6:29:21 PM Chair Fugate called for 5 minute break.

6:34:37 PM Chair Fugate called meeting back to order.

PH 4  6:34:44 PM Consideration of a Design Review Preapplication by River Lane, LLC, represented by GGLO Design, for construction of a multifamily building comprising of forty-three (43) one-bedroom residential units and eight (8) two-bedroom residential units, for a total of fifty-one (51) residential units, to be located at 403, 417 and 419 North River Street (Lots 1-10, Block 55, Hailey Townsite) within the Business (B),
Downtown Residential Overlay (DRO) and Townsite Overlay (TO) Zoning Districts.

**ACTION ITEM.**

6:35:21 PM Davis turned floor to applicant team. **6:35:30 PM** Mark Sindell introduced himself and John Hall. Sindell stated did hold a neighborhood meeting onsite. Sindell noted this location is really nice with its proximity to the downtown core and just north enough for outdoor recreation. Sindell explained how the views played into how the building was oriented, that under the maximum height limit, 51 units and a coffee shop proposed. Sindell explained easement and wellhead on each side that help create buffers. Sindell summarized results from studies completed that assisted in determining the design of the building. Sindell described the proposed site plan including onsite parking and open area.

6:49:27 PM John Hall, discussed floor plans, elevations and proposed materials to be used. Scanlon asked what the fins material is. Hall stated it is a metal prefinished product. Scanlon asked what the wall surface is. Hall stated there is a metal panel behind it. Hall continued to discuss elevations and views.

6:55:13 PM Scanlon asked Sindell how many office locations. Sindell stated other locations. Scanlon asked how many other locations have built this design at. Sindell stated none. Scanlon likes the building, finds it attractive and complimented the applicant team. Scanlon stated the only issue he has is the number of single units compared to 2 bedroom units. M Sindell ark stated always congzant of cost, and that did bring on CSDI to help be measured about cst.

6:58:05 PM Stone asked how long the building is facing River Street. Stone stated it is highly redundant 130 feet. Stone asked how people are going to access the parallel parking spots. Hall stated the spaces are designed wide enough. Stone expressed concern of parallel parking. Stone agrees with Scanlon’s concern about lack of 2 bedroom units. Stone asked if AC is proposed with the buildings. Hall stated still working on that. Stone encourages ac. Stone asked if had an idea of how many people attended the neighbor meeting. Sindell estimated a dozen and half. Stone asked about deed restricted housing. Sindell believes will focus on work force. Stone encourages thinking about that. Stone asked about revocable easement. Staff explained revocable easement is between the City of Hailey and the property to the north. Sindell explained they were very careful in designing to avoid having structural parts in that easement. Stone asked if snow will remain on garage roof. Applicant confirmed snow will remain on garage roof. Sindell mentioned will have EV [parking stalls.

7:05:22 PM Smith asked if the revocable easement is the city ROW for the street. Davis confirmed it is not, it appears to be for landscape. Smith likes the retail component. Smith would recommend taking a real hard look at providing AC. Smith asked about amenity area for the mail, if conversed with the post master. Hall stated not yet. Smith agrees would be nice to have additional 2 bedroom, but due to current parking ordinance glad to not see 3 or 4 bedroom units. Smith suggested designating parallel parking for compact only. Smith would hope the chain link fence would be a point of discussion. Smith suggested extending or amending gap between roof of garage and carport. Smith thinks Stone has a good point; think there may be opportunity to break up the expanse facing River Street. Smith thinks the deed restriction option would be viewed as very valuable by the community and this commission. Smith complimented the project. Sindell confirmed will relay the comments back to Trent.
7:15:09 PM Scanlon having a divide between the garage and carport.

7:16:00 PM Chair Fugate appreciates they met with the neighbors and complimented applicant on the design. Chair Fugate suggested addition of color to help provide a pop and help break up the building. Chair Fugate asked if there are any ADA parking. Hall confirmed. Chair Fugate asked location of trash and recycling plan. Hall noted the corner on River Lane where the enclosures are located. Chair Fugate asked if there are any kind of separation between open space and sidewalk. Sindell confirmed no, that attempting to use landscaping to help provide some privacy, but it is open. Chair Fugate agrees about the comments regarding parallel parking. Chair Fugate agrees would be great bonus if redid fencing around the well house and also agrees comments about providing AC. Chair Fugate complimented the project design.

7:20:37 PM Chair Fugate opened public comment.

7:20:54 PM Bergan Palmer, neighbor, had a chance to meet with the developer early on and get all their questions answered then. Did see this was recently dubbed as Spruce and River Workforce housing project, as speak looking at market rates and they are not affordable. Concerns are 1) pricing, how are going to believe product is actually going to be affordable; 2) parking, main concern, most of these one and two bedrooms will be shared by couples and roommates needing multiple parking spaces other area is retail shop will require more parking spots 3) water usage, did see recent proposal regarding impact of water from 40 McKercher resident. Wanted to ask what impact to water this would have. Feel 51 units is too high in density.

7:24:03 PM Kelsie Choma, live in Calumet Way area, really appreciate the effort going into this but there are some concerns from the neighbors. 1) snow storage, they have their own private snow storage area knows the city struggles to have snow storage on Spruce there has been quite a few accidents because can’t see around the snow piles. Also with the parking, like Palmer said, directly behind them and by Les Schwab already in right of way there’s at least 12 cars consistently parked parallel there. Most people are going to have two vehicles, possibly more. Choma expressed concern of strain of additional vehicle police will have to try to move in snowstorms. Drainage as well for additional snow storage, most melts all the way down to Angela in Northstar. Pedestrian access is great for this area, but City needs to continue to make this a priority because it is not safe in this area. Would prefer City make it safer for pedestrians and traffic. Concerned for those people going in there, highly encourage AC, whoever gets the upper units would be pretty miserable. It’s a lot of density already in a very small area, not against it would like to see work force housing put in there that is affordable.

7:29:02 PM Chair Fugate closed public comment.

7:29:36 PM Chair Fugate stated the work force housing is huge. Chair Fugate asked applicant if there were any questions or clarification of feedback provided. Sindell stated it was what they hoped for and the commission has been really clear. Stone asked if applicant would like to address the public comment made. Chair Fugate asked staff that water usage issue mentioned was due to a water pressure issue in Northridge that does not impact this situation. Chair Fugate stated other issues brought up – work force housing which they have discussed, parking which is compliant, snow storage. Chair Fugate confirmed recreation parking would be off site. Sindell thanked the public for their comments. Sindell gave kudos to City for improvements along River
Street that will help increase pedestrian safety. Stone asked if there were stop signs at these intersections. Staff confirmed no. Stone expressed concern of backing out of the parking spaces along River Street. Scanlon suggested staff be sure backing out is permitted on River Lane. Scanlon suggested potential of parking doubling. Chair Fugate suggested the City review. Davis referenced results from analysis completed for River Street and Empty Saddle and creating 4 way stop and how it was determined best to relocate existing stop signs to stop East and West traffic and allow traffic to flow on River Street. Stone suggested bike racks. Applicant confirmed.

**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: September 6, 2022

- River Street Parking Lot
- Text Amendment for SolSmart Recommendations
- Rezone for Haven Armstrong

Davis summarized upcoming meeting.

*7:40:57 PM* Smith motioned to adjourn. Scanlon seconded. All in Favor.
Return to Agenda
Meeting Minutes
HAILEY PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
Monday, October 3, 2022
Virtual and In-Person Meeting
5:30 p.m.

From your computer, tablet or smartphone: https://meet.goto.com/CityofHaileyPZ
Via One-touch dial in by phone: tel:+15713173122,,506287589#

Present
Commission: Janet Fugate, Dustin Stone, Owen Scanlon, Dan Smith
Staff: Robyn Davis, Cece Osborn, Jessica Parker

5:30:11 PM Chair Fugate called to order.

5:30:21 PM Public Comment for items not on the agenda.

Davis stated there is a guest here to talk about Silver River Residences. Davis introduced John Gilmore, Manager, at Silver River.

5:31:52 PM John Gilmore, owns Sawtooth Property services. Gilmore manages Silver River Residences that consists of 16 units. Gilmore thinks this has been a great attribute to the community, those who have stayed in the community have all renewed their leases, signing up to 3 year leases. Gilmore believes rents are affordable in the workforce market. Gilmore does not believe there is much that could be done differently for that apartment size, does recommend to any developer planning a project think hard to help mitigate the noise transmission. Gilmore believes this project did a good job in sound proofing. Gilmore stated parking has been good, would say 50% of tenants have work vehicles that have to park on the street and knows in the winter months it’s a challenge. Gilmore stated the amount of vehicles that come around with the crowd is probably more than what’s calculated. Gilmore stated when the city reaches out, he makes notice to ensure the cars are out of the way. Gilmore stated he will see how it progresses with River Street. Gilmore stated overall it’s a great success; it’s a beautiful thing to be able to have your dog, be in downtown Hailey, and covered parking. Gilmore stated his recommendation of building with mitigation of noise transmission and that more than one vehicle comes per unit.

5:39:02 PM Smith asked if sound transmission is more floor to floor than walls. Gilmore confirmed. Gilmore provided examples of how to mitigate sound transmission. Smith asked if saying 1.5 parking spots per resident would suffice. Gilmore confirmed.

5:41:02 PM Consent Agenda
CA 1 Adoption of Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision of a Design Review Application by West of First, LLC, represented by Opal Engineering, for construction of a new 44-unit apartment building, to be located at 40 McKercher Boulevard (Lot 1B, Block 2, Northridge Subdivision X). This parcel is located within the Business (B) and Downtown Residential Overlay (DRO) Zoning District. ACTION ITEM.
CA 2  Adoption of Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision of a Text Amendment to Title 17: Zoning Regulations, Chapter 17.09: Parking and Loading Spaces, Section 17.09.040.02: Commercial, Professional, Service, Recreation, and Entertainment to change the parking requirement for theatres from one (1) parking stall per 4.5 persons to one (1) parking stall per one thousand (1,000) square feet of gross building area. The Applicant requests the text amendment to support the viability of a movie theatre business at 801 N. Main Street (Lots 2, Block 2) in the Business (B) and Downtown Residential Overlay (DRO) Zoning Districts. **ACTION ITEM.**

5:41:05 PM  Stone motioned to approve CA 1 and CA 2. Smith seconded. All in favor.

Public Hearing

PH 1  5:41:20 PM  Consideration of a Preliminary Plat Application submitted by Elevation Builders, Inc., to subdivide Lot 4, Block 6, Old Cutters Subdivision (550 Doc’s Hickory Drive) into two (2) sublots, Sublot 4A, comprising of 5,001 square feet and Sublot 4B, comprising of 5,000 square feet. This project is located within the General Residential (GR) Zoning District. **ACTION ITEM.**

Staff typo stating this was a continuation, it is a consideration.

5:42:05 PM  Osborn introduced project, stating this has been done before in Old Cutters subdividing duplex lots allowing for them to be sold separately and turned floor over to applicant team. 5:43:07 PM  Bruce Smith stated this is pretty straight forward and available for questions.

5:43:28 PM  Scanlon stated he has a letter from Christine, asked if there is anything in CC&Rs addressing her concern. Bruce Smith does not understand any of her concerns that this has been done several times before. Davis stated that when Old Cutters was created, certain lots were created as duplex lots. Davis believes there are 3-5 that have gone through this process.

5:45:35 PM  Brian Bothwell, owner, believes there was a project on the north. Chair Fugate asked if Bothwell knows what her concerns are. Bothwell believes it’s an issue with him.

5:47:06 PM  Smith asked about snow storage areas, and if given special exceptions. Davis explained those were established with Old Cutters Subdivision.

5:47:53 PM  Chair Fugate opened public comment.

5:48:21 PM  Chair Fugate closed public comment.

5:48:37 PM  Smith does not see a problem, doesn’t really increase density and gives more flexibility with ownership.

5:49:00 PM  Stone thinks it is the best thing for the neighborhood, that owners seem to provide better care than renters.

5:49:34 PM  Scanlon stated if not violating ordinances and rules does not see any reason cannot maximize the property.
5:50:02 PM Chair Fugate agrees with the comments made, does not see anything prohibiting this from recommending this.

5:50:20 PM Scanlon to recommend approval to the Hailey City Council, the Preliminary Plat Application to subdivide the Duplex Lot at 550 Doc’s Hickory Drive (Lot 4, Blk 6, Old Cutters Subdivision Duplex Lot) into two (2) 0.115 acres Townhouse Sublots (Sublots 4A and 4B), finding that the application meets all City Standards and conditions (a) through (g) are met. Stone seconded. All in favor.

PH 2 5:51:21 PM Consideration of a City-Initiated Rezone Application, to rezone Lots S. ½ of 8, Lots 9-10, Block 69, Lots 4-7 and N. ½ 8, Block 69, Hailey Townsite, as well as Lots 1-3, Block 69, Hailey Townsite from Limited Business (LB) and Townsite Overlay (TO) Zoning Districts, to Limited Business (LB), Townsite Overlay (TO) Zoning Districts, and located within the Downtown Residential Overlay (DRO). ACTION ITEM.

5:51:57 PM Davis introduced project, explaining that in August 2022 heard a similar application for 525 LLC to rezone 525 N 1st Ave and it was recommended for approval and that Hailey City Council recently recommended that approval. Davis explained like Planning and Zoning Commission, City Council also recommended the rezone of these parcels into DRO. Davis stated it is important to note that the underlying zoning districts will remain the same unless a separate application comes in.

5:53:48 PM Chair Fugate asked if there are any current plans to redevelop these parcels. Davis stated not at this time, summarizing existing conditions of the properties.

Scanlon asked if 619 has apartments on it. Davis confirmed. Scanlon asked if staff has reviewed how this would increase the density. Davis explained that at this time would not be able to exceed 10 units.

Stone asked about rezoning the underlying zoning districts of these parcels. Davis explained underlying zones will remain the same.

5:56:11 PM Smith asked if there are any other LB in that area. Davis confirmed there is not.

5:57:08 PM Chair Fugate opened public comment.

5:57:32 PM Chair Fugate closed public comment.

5:57:41 PM Chair Fugate asked if there was further discussion needed. Commission thanked staff for the fast turn around and contacting the property owners.

5:58:15 PM Stone to recommend for approval by the Hailey City Council a City-initiated Rezone Application for an amendment to the City of Hailey Zoning District Map, Section 17.05.020. The proposed change includes amending Lots 1-3, Block 69, Hailey Townsite (619 N 1st Avenue) from General Residential (GR) and Townsite Overlay (TO), to remain in the GR and TO, and to be added within the Downtown Residential Overlay (DRO), and Lots 4-7 and N. ½ of 8, Block 69, Hailey Townsite and Lots S. ½ of 8, 9-10, Block 69, Hailey Townsite (17 E Myrtle Street) from Limited Business (LB) and Townsite Overlay (TO), to remain in the LB and TO, and to be added
to within the Downtown Residential Overlay (DRO), finding that the changes are in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan, essential public facilities and services are available to support the full range of proposed uses without creating excessive additional requirements at public cost for the public facilities and services, the proposed uses are compatible with the surrounding area, and the proposed amendment will promote the public health, safety and general welfare. Smith seconded. All in Favor.

PH 3  6:00:02 PM Consideration of a City-Initiated Text Amendment to Title 18: Mobility Design, Chapter 18.14: Standard Drawings, Section 18.14.014: Miscellaneous, to add the River Street Concept Plan as a Standard Drawing within the Hailey Municipal Code. This addition would create a new item, item G. River Street Concept Plan. ACTION ITEM.

6:00:27 PM Davis explained as the commission knows staff has been prioritizing the text amendments, that have been using a River Street Design Concept plan and that bringing to them tonight to codify this concept. Davis explained how this would still allow for staff to work on individual situations on a case by case scenario.

6:02:35 PM Stone asked what it means when say slow speed signs. Davis explained referring to 20mph speed limit. Chair Fugate stated in otherwise it’s a main artery but want to keep it slow so not the same speed as Main Street. Stone asked where this drawing will be added. Davis explained will be under roads, noting typo on drawing and should read 18.014.012 F.3.

6:04:51 PM No questions or comments from Scanlon or Smith.

6:05:00 PM Chair Fugate opened public comment.

6:05:14 PM Chair Fugate closed public comment.

6:05:24 PM Smith noted that report code section is correct. Chair Fugate believes this will be very helpful for clarification in the future and appreciates fact that it still allows for flexibility. Smith stated this should hopefully alleviate some of the issues staff has had to deal with, maintain core concepts. Scanlon believes it’s time we spoke for it.

6:07:11 PM Smith to recommend approval by the Hailey City Council an Ordinance amending Hailey Municipal Code, Title 18: Mobility Design, Section 18.14.012: Street and Drainage, to include new F.3. River Street Typical Section, which adds the River Street Concept Design as a Standard Drawing within the Hailey Municipal Code. This also includes the revision of the Index in Section 18.14.000.0, finding that essential public facilities and services are available to support the full range of proposed uses without creating excessive additional requirements at public cost for the public facilities and services, that the proposed uses are compatible with the surrounding area, and that the proposed amendment will promote the public health, safety, and general welfare. Scanlon seconded. All in favor.

PH 4  Consideration of a City-Initiated Text Amendment to Hailey Municipal Code Title 17, Chapter 17.08, Article D: Accessory Dwelling Units, proposing minor amendments to various sections, which would allow for greater flexibility in designing and constructing an Accessory Dwelling Unit. THIS ITEM WILL BE RE-NOTICED AND HEARD AT A FUTURE HEARING. ACTION ITEM.
Staff Reports and Discussion

SR 1 Discussion of current building activity, upcoming projects, and zoning code changes.

6:09:00 PM Stone asked if have noise transmission building code between floors. Davis stated what was done was approved by the plan reviewer by the State. Stone asked if there is some tentative plan to allow the commission to address parking for multi-family units. Davis asked if referring to DRO or all multi-family. Stone believes should be addressed for all multi-family. Davis stated multi-family parking city wide varies, but that outside of DRO it is 1.5 per unit and those current projects such as Sweetwater and Lido’s are going above that requirement. Davis stated only place really varies is in the DRO. Davis explained how which text amendments are brought forward are determined. Chair Fugate thinks it is very critical that when someone leases one of these units are made aware of the parking. Chair Fugate believes it would be interesting to know how many cars in the area are towed this winter. Stone likes the concept of DRO but it’s not functioning. Smith believes it is not practical for number of bedrooms in units. Smith asked Scanlon about sound transmission requirements within code. Scanlon stated there is a national standard but it is not within the code.

SR 2 Discussion of the next Planning and Zoning Meeting: October 17, 2022
- DR Tranter
- DR River Lane
- TA Solsmart Recommendations

Staff summarized upcoming projects.

6:20:48 PM Smith motioned adjourn. Scanlon seconded. All in Favor.
Return to Agenda
Meeting Minutes  
HAILEY PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION  
Monday, October 17, 2022  
Virtual and In-Person Meeting  
5:30 p.m.

From your computer, tablet or smartphone: https://meet.goto.com/CityofHaileyPZ  
Via One-touch dial in by phone: tel:+15713173122,,506287589#  
Dial in by phone: United States: +1 (571) 317-3122  
Access Code: 506-287-589

Present  
Commission: Dan Smith, Janet Fugate, Dustin Stone, Owen Scanlon  
Staff: Robyn Davis, Paige Nied, Cece Osborn, Brian Yeager, Chris Simms, Christian Ervin, Mike Baledge, Jessica Parker

5:30:15 PM Chair Fugate called to order.

5:31:03 PM Public Comment for items not on the agenda. no comment.

5:31:23 PM Consent Agenda

CA 1 Adoption of Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision of a Preliminary Plat Application submitted by Elevation Builders, Inc., to subdivide Lot 4, Block 6, Old Cutters Subdivision (550 Doc’s Hickory Drive) into two (2) sublots, Sublot 4A, comprising of 5,001 square feet and Sublot 4B, comprising of 5,000 square feet. This project is located within the General Residential (GR) Zoning District. ACTION ITEM.

CA 2 Adoption of Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision of a City-Initiated Rezone Application, to rezone Lots S. ½ of 8, Lots 9-10, Block 69, Lots 4-7 and N. ½ 8, Block 69, Hailey Townsite, as well as Lots 1-3, Block 69, Hailey Townsite from Limited Business (LB) and Townsite Overlay (TO) Zoning Districts, to Limited Business (LB), Townsite Overlay (TO) Zoning Districts, and located within the Downtown Residential Overlay (DRO). ACTION ITEM.

CA 3 Adoption of Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision City-Initiated Text Amendment to Title 18: Mobility Design, Chapter 18.14: Standard Drawings, Section 18.14.014: Miscellaneous, to add the River Street Concept Plan as a Standard Drawing within the Hailey Municipal Code. This addition would create a new item, item G. River Street Concept Plan. ACTION ITEM.

5:31:35 PM Stone motioned to approve CA 1, CA 2 and CA3. Smith seconded. All in Favor.

Public Hearing

PH 1 5:31:55 PM Consideration of a Design Review Application by Joel Tranter and Laura Nelson, represented by architect David Barovetto, for a new 3,374 square foot single-family residence with an internal 900 square foot accessory dwelling unit at 637 South
River Street (Lot 2A, Block 1, Maple Subdivision). The project is located in the General Residential (GR), Townsite (TO) and Downtown Residential (DRO) Overlay Zoning Districts. **ACTION ITEM.**

5:32:24 PM Osborn stated that staff recognizes that items are not compliant with the code but recommends commission review presentation with applicant.

5:33:14 PM Joel Tranter, introduced himself and provided brief history of him and his family. Tranter introduced his team – David Barovetto, architect. Tranter explained reasoning behind ADU design. Tranter stated was informed today that house is too large per code. Tranter explained reason why asked to have hearing tonight even though project currently does not meet code.

5:37:03 PM Tranter explained that lot is narrow, summarized existing surrounding home designs and reasoning by decided not to locate garage on the rear. Tranter explained reasoning for lowering roof height on rear of home. 5:41:39 PM Tranter explained adu would be blocked off, shared garage space, and how does not intend to park on street/driveway. Tranter stated they can go back to reduce home size to meet lot coverage requirements. Tranter turned floor to David Barovetto.

5:44:06 PM David Barovetto, introduced himself and provided summary of his history. Barovetto stated house designed is about 38% lot coverage, and summarized how this house is not really a 2-story home by explaining floor plan. Barovetto explained reasoning for driveway design due to access and fire hydrant location. Barovetto stated no alley in rear of property, explaining potential difficulties with putting garage in rear.

5:49:41 PM Scanlon asked how the Tranters access the 2nd floor without going through the ADU. Tranter explained area that area is to be an attic storage area, that it will not be used as livable space.

5:51:19 PM Barovetto described exterior materials to be used.

5:53:26 PM Chair Fugate referenced design review guidelines for garage designs. Barovetto explained garage design. Chair Fugate asked if Barovetto felt the design was subordinate. Barovetto felt it did.

5:55:06 PM Smith is surprised so many designs were ignored, that it’s a nice design but does not meet the guidelines for this area. Barovetto asked for which guidelines. Smith noted applicable code section. Smith does not believe the guidelines with the city have been met, and believes the project needs to be redesigned. Barovetto agrees can reduce the house to meet lot coverage requirements. Barovetto explained why did not design the garage in the rear, asking if guideline or requirement. Chair Fugate stated it states shall, which means it needs ot be followed.

6:00:19 PM Osborn stated has grouped the issues in 4 categories: Wall plain, lot coverage, dark sky requirements, and garage/parking. Osborn stated staff has requested applicant work with the streets department internally regarding curb cuts.
Davis added that public works department also does not like the idea of 2 curb cuts. Chair Fugate asked if the City is willing to relocate the fire hydrant. Staff confirmed.

Tranter stated spoke with the fire department and water department, and was told that the city was not able pay or do the labor to relocate the hydrant.

No further questions at this time.

Chair Fugate opened public comment.

Chair Fugate closed public comment.

Chair Fugate stated it seems to her not able to move forward when something is not compliant with the guidelines.

Stone stated its unfortunate that the applicant made it this far with the discrepancy but that it does fall onto the applicant to follow the guidelines. Stone is not opposed to the garage upfront but does think it needs to match the Townsite Overlay guidelines.

Scanlon stated it’s a nice house, thinks have done with good job of design and agrees with lack of alley putting the garage in the rear. Scanlon suggested potential design changes to make garage in front disappear. Scanlon thinks has strong start just need to finesse a few things.

Smith thinks it is a nice looking house, sorry go to this point before issues were pointed out. Smith referenced code requirement for front facing garage in Townsite. Smith appreciates applicants desire to provide ADU.

Chair Fugate agrees design of home is very appealing. Chair Fugate encourages applicant to take in consideration when code says shall, it is a requirement. Chair Fugate believes the lot coverage is the least of what is holding this project back. Chair Fugate encourages applicant to work with City Staff.

No action required by commission, project will be tabled.

Consideration of a Design Review Application by River Lane, LLC, for construction of a fifty-one (51) residential unit, multifamily building, comprising of: forty-three (43) one-bedroom residential units and eight (8) two-bedroom residential units. This project is proposed to be located at 403, 417 and 419 North River Street (Lots 1-10, Block 55, Hailey Townsite), within the Business (B), Downtown Residential Overlay (DRO), and Townsite Overlay (TO) Zoning Districts. ACTION ITEM.

Davis thanked commission, summarized recommendations from Pre-Application Design Review: minimize mass, parking, addition of ac to units, more 2 bedroom units, community housing, and mail delivery, drive access, to connect with clear creek, replace fence and provide a water study. Davis turned floor to applicant team.
Mark Sindell, GGLO, and John Hall, GGLO, introduced themselves. Sindell, using an updated presentation, recapped the overall project design, how project conforms to code requirements, how working with Public Works on River Street design, and elevation of building. Sindell noted new elevation plan showing how proposed project compares to surrounding projects. Hall continued using presentation to discuss changes to exterior materials of the building.

Scanlon asked for clarification on color, Scanlon prefers the brown color shown in picture vs. gray color on material board. Hall confirmed can change. Hall continued to discuss materials proposed.

Hall confirmed carport has been extended, removing the gap. Hall noted location of aspen grove, and how the lighting will be dark sky compliant. Applicant team confirmed if there is concern, they can remove lights on trees all together. Sindell explained desire of creating plant community, how if setback building slightly allows them to create this. Hall summarized how they addressed each commissioners concerns.

Smith asked about water and traffic impacts. Hall confirmed a study was provided. Davis confirmed Brian Yeager is available, and confirmed it was determined water use would be negligible. Hall confirmed next step is to finalize the traffic study, anticipates having it ready within next several weeks. Yeager does want the traffic memo to form conclusion of traffic impacts, Yeager expects the impacts to be minimal and comfortable conclusion will be minor but wants applicant team to provide that. Smith asked if River Street is arterial. Yeager explained designation of River Street.

Chair Fugate confirmed that memo is what is requested in Staff Memo. Staff confirmed.

Smith suggested concrete filled bollards to protect columns.

Stone asked about community housing units. Trent Graber, owner, stated want to build for locals but not ready to committing to deed restricting. Graber explained they are looking at possible solutions to make sure who live there work here and reside in this valley. Stone asked about lighting for trees. Davis explained this would be her 1st project have seen them. Davis stated has discussed with applicant potential of just removing them and applicant is amenable to that idea. Stone asked where the playground is located. Sindell explained play area that is natural inspired.

Scanlon asked if counting that in open area percentage. Sindell provided plan showing how achieve open area requirement.

Stone asked what does it mean by coming to a conclusion when referring to traffic study. Davis confirmed it’s a summary, whether can handle the change. Yeager went into more detail, that the study provides data conclusion summarizes if area can handle increase of traffic. Stone asked if having to provide anything else to the water study. Davis confirmed all large projects of this scale staff is pursuing a traffic study.
Scanlon asked how many compact spaces. Hall believes there are 5 or 6. Sindell confirms have 5. Scanlon asked if have 3 ADA spaces in addition. Sindell confirms.

Chair Fugate asked if there’s a way for emergency responders to locate each unit. Christian Ervin stated how addresses are usually assigned, that it is not really a concern of theirs. Hall confirmed building will also be fully sprinklered.

Chair Fugate asked if there’s some interest vending machines. Davis confirmed that is just a standard in code, does not believe applicant is proposing vending machines.

Chair Fugate asked about an easement. Davis confirmed there is a revocable easement along the north, and there is a condition in the packet regarding the release of this condition. Chair Fugate confirmed applicant is protective of the well house.

Chair Fugate opened public comment.

1720 Heroic, thinks this is awesome, as parent of 2 young ladies looking to live here, this is an awesome product and with an elderly mother who is also looking to live here this is awesome. All know needs of housing. He likes the dark sky ordinance, think up lighting would be beneficial, playground is awesome however its close enough to the park does not think lack of size of playground is an issue. Coffee shop is awesome, as far as traffic goes having a conclusion on traffic, if aren’t going to put density in core where else would it go. Yeager summarized several components that are taken into consideration when a traffic study is completed. Yeager stated currently have trip generation portion of traffic study and have asked the applicant to prepare a conclusion. Yeager explained how the engineer refers to land use code and code requirements within in ITD and how they take

Bergin Palmer, sounds like people are very excited about affordable housing portion of this and still hard to digest this is actually going to be affordable housing for the workforce. Has friends and family in the market as well. His biggest concern is general issue of density. Thinks in general 51-unit apartment building is too big for our valley, impacts neighbors directly. Asked if there were more details in traffic study if based off one car per unit? Think assumption is that no matter what, there’s going to be more than 1 car per unit. In looking at nearby neighborhoods, that this is essentially doubling the occupancy of both neighborhoods. Have a hard time *unable to decipher*. Thinks in general looks great, well thought out. Overall, density is where finds concern.

Chair Fugate closed public comment.

Chair Fugate asked if the traffic study was based on one car per unit or how does that work. Yeager summarized several components that are taken into consideration when a traffic study is completed. Yeager stated currently have trip generation portion of traffic study and have asked the applicant to prepare a conclusion. Yeager explained how the engineer refers to land use code and code requirements within in ITD and how they take
that data to draw the trip generation information. No further comments from staff or applicant.

6:59:40 PM Smith is glad that the applicant responded to their concerns from the previous hearing, agrees with Scanlon that the brown looks better than the concrete color, hopes the owners will be able to come up with way to ensure these don’t end up as a ski locker for people outside o the area. Smith stated do want to encourage local residency. Smith thinks this is a nice addition, do want the density in the core of the town. Smith still thinks need to have review of some aspects of that. Smith thinks this is a good project and thanked applicant for what they have done.

7:02:56 PM Stone noted a lot of public comment via email, some pretty formal. Stone stated unfortunately, some of the items included in those comments are not something that can be addressed by PZ, items that PZ can be addressed have been addressed. Stone stated the number of units is determined by the ordinance. Stone does believe the applicant has gone above and beyond and feels better about that. Stone stated they will continue to look at water usage, but that feels pretty good about the water usage with the location of this building. Stone stated the traffic study is the question, is curious and would be interested if the stipulation for the coffee shop were addressed in the traffic study. Stone likes to ask the applicants for deed restricted units but agrees with public comment, that need inventory and if can encourage city/county residents. Stone really enjoyed the presentation and complimented applicant team.

7:07:31 PM Scanlon loves this project, it’s an attractive building, and applicant has been very receptive to changes. Scanlon agrees with Stone’s comments about inventory. Scanlon discussed DRO purpose and if meeting those purposes. Scanlon explained why he is conflicted, that it’s a great project but maybe need just a little less density.

7:12:30 PM Chair Fugate appreciates the owners objectives and compliments their team. Chair Fugate also appreciates the owners responsiveness, loves the way the building looks now. Chair Fugate does like idea of up lighting as long as it complies with code. Chair Fugate understands this project is way out as far as completion and encourages applicant to find a way to make this available to valley residents’ workers here. Chair Fugate understands what Scanlon is saying about density, but to her its ideal that it makes sense with the projects facing this one, that it makes sense. Chair Fugate stated there is a lot within walking distance form this location, hopes whatever goes in is well patronized but not sure if it would be a destination point. Chair Fugate believes it will well serve those walking.

7:16:54 PM Davis asked if looking at continuation this item. Chair Fugate would like to move this forward but would like the traffic study in hand. Stone suggested moving forward under stipulation that is reviewed and approved by City Engineer. Smith explained that there is rating provided, and that there are adjustments that could be made depending on rating. Yeager stated from engineer standpoint can review data but that need reviewing body to re-evaluate impact of traffic study. Simms suggested a more detailed deliberation to drill down on the concerns and that its recommended commission review traffic conclusion. Simms suggested focusing criteria on design review criteria.
Jeff Loomis, Galena Engineering, prepared traffic trip generation study. Loomis stated it is difficult to lock in a date certain. Loomis stated would need to collect data unless the City has back data history. Yeager stated they do not have that data history Loomis would need. Stone asked how long it would take to collect data. Yeager explained process. Chair Fugate asked what would be a reasonable time. Sindell believes can make the 21st. Chair Fugate asked what happens if they cannot make that date. Davis stated it could be continued on record at that hearing or re-noticed.

Smith motioned to continue the public hearing to November 21, 2022. Scanlon seconded. All in Favor.

Chair Fugate called a 5 minute break.

Chair Fugate called to order.

Consideration of a City-Initiated Text Amendment to the Hailey Municipal Code, Title 17: Zoning Regulations, Chapter 17.02 Definitions, Section 17.02.020: Meaning of Terms or Words, to add definitions related to solar energy development; Chapter 17.05 Official Zoning Map and District Use Matrix, Section 17.05.040: District Use Matrix, to amend height requirements for solar systems and to allow for freestanding solar in all zoning districts except the Recreational Green Belt (RGB); as well as to add a new chapter, Chapter 17.08E, entitled Solar, to provide specific standards concerning the development of solar resources. ACTION ITEM.

Nied summarized previous hearing with SolSmart and how this proposed amendment came to be. Nied explained changes to definitions, and district use matrix. Nied explained the new proposed chapter.

Scanlon asked what the G above A for allowed means. Staff clarified that is C for conditional use and that is crossed out.

Stone asked if FAA has concerns of solar panels installed. Stone is curious about language stating may have to submit to the FAA, that it would be reviewed by airport director and he will determine if needs to proceed to the FAA. Davis explained airport director would like to review all solar within city of Hailey but specifically within the Airport area. Nied stated after discussing with him, there were still concerns about proximity to airport area. Smith asked if this is a blanket for entire city or if just going to hold it to the airport influence area. Smith suggest may need conditional review of freestanding solar panels that can go up to 15’. Commission discussed concern of 15’ height limit, all in agreement to encourage use of solar but has concern of height and criteria of review. Davis confirmed happy to take this back and do further research.

Stone asked what it means to be structurally integrated. Smith noted applicable design review criteria requiring it be incorporated within the design. Commission and staff discussed proposed definitions – all agreed to remove “curtain wall”. Stone asked what previous discussion of small, medium, large. Nied explained the small, medium and large scale systems. Smith suggested including something along lines subject to Idaho power. Nied noted that is included within j.
7:57:25 PM Chair Fugate asked if continued to date certain, which date would that be. Staff confirmed November 21st.

7:58:09 PM Chair Fugate opened public comment.

7:58:41 PM Chair Fugate closed public comment.

7:58:47 PM Scanlon motioned to direct staff to continue reach and bring back at the November 21, 2022. Stone seconded. All in Favor.

**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: **November 7, 2022**
- ACI Amendment
- PUD Albertsons
- THOW

7:59:55 PM Davis summarized upcoming projects.

8:02:23 PM Smith motioned to adjourn. Scanlon seconded. All in favor.
Return to Agenda
To: Hailey Planning and Zoning Commission

From: Paige Nied, Community Development Resiliency Planner / City Planner

Overview: Consideration of a City-Initiated Text Amendment to the Hailey Municipal Code, Title 18: Mobility Design, Chapter 18.14: Standard Drawings, Section 18.14.012.K: Street and Drainage, Driveway Approach, to include additional language to provide clarity regarding driveway approach width allowances and to add information regarding snow removal procedures.

Hearing: December 19, 2022

Applicant: City of Hailey

Notice: Notice for the public hearing was published in the Idaho Mountain Express on November 29, 2022 and mailed to public agencies on November 29, 2022.

Background: City Planning Staff has identified the modernization of Hailey Municipal Code as a priority for 2022 and moving forward. As such, Staff is proposing to amend Title 18: Mobility Design, Chapter 18.14: Standard Drawings, Section 18.14.012.K: Street and Drainage, Driveway Approach, to include additional language to clarify the required minimum and maximum driveway widths and to add a footnote regarding city snow removal procedures.

City Staff is proposing to amend the language of Note #1 of the drawing entitled “Typical Driveway Approach” to clarify what the minimum and maximum driveway approach width allowances are for residential, joint use, and other zones. Further, Staff is proposing to add an additional note, Note #7, which references the City’s snow removal policy in hopes to reduce existing operational obstacles regarding snow clearing.

The following text amendment to Title 18: Mobility Design, Chapter 18.14 Standard Drawings, Section 18.14.012.K Street and Drainage, Driveway Approach could read as follows:

Chapter 18.14 Standard Drawings

Section 18.14.012: Street and Drainage

K. 1. Driveway Approach:

1. All driveway approaches require special approval of the City Engineer before construction. A culvert may be substituted for the swale with prior approval. Minimum culvert size shall be 12" diameter.

2. Minimum and Maximum approach width for standard driveways:
   - Residential 12 feet minimum to 20 feet maximum
3. Driveway approaches to be the responsibility of the developer or lot owner.

4. Residential approaches shall not be constructed closer than 10 feet from extended Property lines, **UNLESS STORM DRAINAGE, INCLUDING DRIVEWAY SWALE, IS INFILTRATED ONSITE.**

5. Individual lot owners are responsible for maintenance of driveway and driveway shoulder. Any surface repair due to utility maintenance is at owner expense.

6. Crushed aggregate shall meet the requirements of the current edition of the ISPWC standards-section 802-crushed aggregate.

7. **Obstacles in this and other areas may result in reduced City snow "peeling" and "plowing" benefits. Refer to "Winter Information" on the city website under Public Works - Streets for snow operations and how to plan for maximum benefit from City snow removal efforts.**

**Standards of Review:**

**Criteria for Review.** Section 17.14.060(A) of the Hailey Municipal Code provides “[w]hen evaluating any proposed amendment under this chapter, the hearing examiner or commission and council shall make findings of fact on the following criteria:*

1. **The proposed amendment is in accordance with the comprehensive plan;**
2. **Essential public facilities and services are available to support the full range of proposed uses without creating excessive additional requirements at public cost for the public facilities and services;**
3. **The proposed uses are compatible with the surrounding area; and**
4. **The proposed amendment will promote the public health, safety and general welfare.**

1. **The proposed amendment is in accordance with the comprehensive plan;**
   The Comprehensive Plan does not go into the specificity that this code section contemplates; however, it is anticipated that the city will annually update the applicable plans to guide necessary infrastructure. The following goals from the Comprehensive Plan are relevant to this text change:

   **Section 9: Public Facilities, Utilities, and Services**
   **Goal 9.1: Plan for the long-term utilities, service and facility needs of the City while minimizing impacts to the greatest extent possible.**

   The proposed text amendment seeks to provide further clarity regarding the minimum and maximum widths for driveway approaches and provide additional information concerning the City’s snow removal requirements and policies.

2. **Essential public facilities and services are available to support the full range of proposed uses without creating excessive additional requirements at public cost for the public facilities and services;**
   The proposed amendments will not result in a change in allowed uses nor will they create excessive additional requirements at public cost for services. The proposed amendments are intended to avoid
any potential misinterpretations of minimum and maximum allowances for driveway approaches and to include language regarding the City’s snow removal procedures.

3. **The proposed uses are compatible with the surrounding area; and**
   The proposed text amendments will not impact compatibility.

4. **The proposed amendment will promote the public health, safety, and general welfare.**
The proposed amendments are consistent with the Hailey Comprehensive Plan, and they will not result in a change in allowed uses.

**Motion Language:**

**Approval:** I move to recommend approval to the Hailey City Council an Ordinance amending Hailey Municipal Code, Title 18: Mobility Design, Chapter 18.14: Standard Drawings, Section 18.14.012.K: Street and Drainage, Driveway Approach, to include additional language to provide clarity regarding driveway width allowances and to add information regarding snow removal procedures, finding that essential public facilities and services are available to support the full range of proposed uses without creating excessive additional requirements at public cost for the public facilities and services, that the proposed uses are compatible with the surrounding area, and that the proposed amendment will promote the public health, safety and general welfare.

**Denial:** Motion to deny a recommendation for approval to the Hailey City Council an Ordinance amending the Hailey Municipal Code, Title 18: Mobility Design, Chapter 18.14: Standard Drawings, Section 18.14.012.K: Street and Drainage, Driveway Approach, to include additional language to provide clarity regarding driveway width allowances and to add information regarding snow removal procedures, finding that _________________ [the Commission should cite which standards are not met and provide the reason why each identified standard is not met].

**Continuation:** Motion to continue the public hearing to _________________ [the Commission should specify a date.]
EXISTING:

TYPICAL DRIVEWAY APPROACH

NOTES
1. All driveway approaches require special approval of the City Engineer before construction. A culvert may be substituted for the swale with prior approval. Minimum culvert size shall be 12" diameter.

2. Minimum approach width for standard driveways:
   - Residential 12-20 feet
   - Joint use 30 feet
   - Other zones 20-48 feet

3. Driveway approaches to be the responsibility of the developer or lot owner.

4. Residential approaches shall not be constructed closer than 10 feet from extended property lines, UNLESS STORM DRAINAGE, INCLUDING DRIVEWAY SWALE, IS INFILTRATED ONSITE.

5. Individual lot owners are responsible for maintenance of driveway and driveway shoulder. Any surface repair due to utility maintenance is at owner expense.

6. Crushed aggregate shall meet the requirements of the current edition of the ISPWC standards-section 802-crushed aggregate.
PROPOSED:

TYPICAL DRIVEWAY APPROACH

NOTES
1. All driveway approaches require special approval of the City Engineer before construction. A culvert may be substituted for the swale with prior approval. Minimum culvert size shall be 12” diameter.

2. Minimum and Maximum approach width for standard driveways:
   - Residential: 12 feet minimum to 20 feet maximum
   - Joint use: 30 feet maximum
   - Other zones: 20 feet minimum to 40 feet maximum

3. Driveway approaches to be the responsibility of the developer or lot owner.

4. Residential approaches shall not be constructed closer than 10 feet from extended property lines, UNLESS STORM DRAINAGE, INCLUDING DRIVEWAY SWALE, IS INFILTRATED ONSITE.

5. Individual lot owners are responsible for maintenance of driveway and driveway shoulder. Any surface repair due to utility maintenance is at owner expense.

6. Crushed aggregate shall meet the requirements of the current edition of the ISPWC standards-section 502-crushed aggregate.

7. Obstacles in this and other areas may result in reduced City snow "peeling" and "plowing" benefits. Refer to "Winter Information" on the City website under Public Works - Streets for snow operations and how to plan for maximum benefit from City snow removal efforts.
Return to Agenda
To: Hailey Planning and Zoning Commission

From: Cece Osborn, Community Development City Planner

Overview: Consideration of a City-Initiated Text Amendment to amend the Hailey Municipal Code, Title 17: Zoning Regulations, Chapter 17.08: Supplementary Regulations, Article D: Accessory Dwelling Units, to allow for Tiny Homes on Wheels (THOW) within all residential zoning districts.

Hearing: December 19, 2022

Applicant: City Staff

Location: General Residential (GR), Limited Residential (LR-1, LR-2), Neighborhood Business (NB), Limited Business (LB), Transitional (TN), Business (B), Service Commercial Industrial (SCI), and Service Commercial Industrial Sales and Office (SCI-SO)

Notice: Notice for the public hearing was published in the Idaho Mountain Express and mailed to public agencies on November 30, 2022.

Background: The need for housing in the Wood River Valley is longstanding, yet it has grown to crisis levels in recent years, nationally and locally. A variety of conditions in the City of Hailey challenge the availability and affordability of housing, including:

- A historically seasonal and resort-based economy;
- Prices driven by second-home owners and newer remote workers; and
- Underbuilding, nationally and locally.

Core to its identity, the City of Hailey prides itself in being the “locals’ community” of the Wood River Valley. Housing maintains its own section of the City’s Comprehensive Plan and is central to two other sections— the Land Use, Population and Growth Management and the Demographics, Cultural Vitality, Social Diversity & Well-Being sections. Listing the economic, environmental, and social benefits, as well as the challenges posed by the over-development of high-cost homes in the early 2000s, the Plan acknowledges a trend that remains true today, “…market home prices continue to exceed affordability standards for many working families in the community…” (page 37). With the lack of availability and diversity of housing options, the City of Hailey is experiencing the following trends:

- The entire community faces higher housing costs;
- Many people are living in overcrowded conditions and increasingly distant locations;
- Long-time residents are leaving Hailey to live and retire in more affordable communities, in and out of state;
- Local businesses and essential public services, like the school district, are stressed by understaffing; and
- Traffic congestion, especially on our Main Street/State Highway 75, has increased with vehicle commute times and distances.
These consequences—the externalized costs of the housing crisis—detract from the City’s vision and the cherished character of Hailey. The Comprehensive Plan warns that the “...impacts resulting from growth pressure, such as environmental degradation, inadequate social and infrastructure services, and loss of small-town character are concerns associated with unrestricted growth of the community,” and thereafter advises that “...it is the responsibility of the city to plan for potential future population growth” (page 26). City Staff are keenly aware that Hailey’s population growth is intertwined with local, regional, statewide, and national trends—we cannot stop nor prevent it. However, the City can manage population growth through various measures that make efficient use of resources, like land and municipal infrastructure, and minimize the undesired consequences of expansion.

For example, the Comprehensive Plan and the current City Council advise Staff to pursue creative growth measures, including:

- planning for increased density and infill development in strategic locations;
- increasing flexibility and convenience for residents, especially local employees, seeking housing; and
- allowing for a greater diversity of housing units, like Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs).

In the past five (5) years, Staff has pursued these measures through the following Text Amendments to the Municipal Code:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code Amendments</th>
<th>Applicable Zoning District</th>
<th>Date Approved by Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Establishment of Small Residential Overlay (SRO)</td>
<td>Downtown Core: Business (B)</td>
<td>8/7/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishment of Downtown Residential Overlay (DRO)</td>
<td>Downtown Core: B, L8, GR</td>
<td>6/13/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amendment: Building Height Increase in Floodplain</td>
<td>Residential Parcels in Floodplain</td>
<td>12/26/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension to Timeline for Submittal of Final Plat</td>
<td>All Zoning Districts</td>
<td>12/9/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishment of Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) Code</td>
<td>All Residential Zoning Districts</td>
<td>1/25/2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasonal RTV Amendment</td>
<td>All Zoning Districts</td>
<td>6/28/2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing Base Setbacks</td>
<td>General Residential (GR)</td>
<td>8/29/2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing Lot Coverage for Lots Smaller than 4,500 sq. ft.</td>
<td>Townsite Overlay: GR and LR</td>
<td>3/14/2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revision to Planned Unit Development (PUD) Code</td>
<td>All Zoning Districts</td>
<td>5/9/2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adoption of Appendix Q (Tiny Homes)</td>
<td>All Residential Zoning Districts</td>
<td>5/23/2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RV: Allow for Occupancy with active Building Permit</td>
<td>All Zoning Districts</td>
<td>7/11/2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rezone: S25 North First Avenue into DRO</td>
<td>Townsite Overlay: GR</td>
<td>8/22/2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To elaborate on one example—the Hailey City Council and Planning and Zoning Commission prioritized Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) from an array of feasible housing solutions presented by Staff in 2016. ADUs were (and still are) considered a desirable mechanism for by-right infill development and managing the City’s sustainable growth. Henceforth, the ADU section of Code was created, developed, and embraced by the community. The popularity and effectiveness of ADUs in City limits are apparent to City Staff. Property owners have built and transformed living spaces into ADUs to rent for new sources of income and to accommodate family members, for example. The city appreciates the community’s assistance in increasing the quantity of housing units within city limits—making efficient and sustainable use of existing infrastructure and public services. Thus far, the impact of ADUs has been steady and gradual. Staff expects the trend to continue with ADUs, as well as the other Text Amendments.

This proposed Text Amendment, to allow for Tiny Homes on Wheels (THOW) in the City of Hailey, is a continuation of the development of the Municipal Code for Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs). Under the same provision of Accessory Dwelling Units—in Title 17: Zoning Regulations, Chapter 17.08: Supplementary Regulations, Article D: Accessory Dwelling Units— the Text Amendment proposed here
seeks to allow for Tiny Homes on Wheels (THOWs) within all residential zoning districts. Staff concurs that THOWs, like ADUs, can be woven into the existing built environment and character of Hailey’s residential zoning districts without detracting from Hailey’s charm. THOWs further present a new housing type with benefits that expand beyond those of ADUs—most notably adding to the diversity of Hailey’s housing stock and offering anew path to home ownership.

Since 2002 and 2003, ADUs have been permitted in Hailey’s Townsite Overlay (TO) and General Residential (GR) Zoning Districts only. From 2002 to 2020 approximately fifty (50) ADUs were constructed, an average of three (3) ADUs per year. Since adoption of the ADU section of code in 2021, which allows for ADUs in all residential zoning districts, approximately thirty (30) ADUs have been certified in the City—an average of fifteen (15) ADUs per year. As stated above, the adoption and benefits of ADUs have been incremental. Most ADUs in Hailey have been constructed concurrently with new single-family residences or new garages. The high cost of constructing or remodeling for ADUs is apparent and presumably prohibitive for some property owners. Between January and October 2022, the average building cost for an ADU in Hailey was approximately $153,000.

Alternatively, Tiny Homes on Wheels (THOW) cost less to build than ADUs, and therefore, cost less to own. The moveability of THOWs make them more affordable than ADUs by precluding or lowering the costs of buying or renting land, building permit fees, and building a structural foundation. With moveability and greater affordability, THOWs can lower the threshold and increase the accessibility of home ownership. Distinct from ADUs, THOWs can offer a new path to home ownership in Hailey.

Over the past two months, Community Development Staff have reviewed State Law, conferred with Blaine County, and held internal discussions about how to define Tiny Homes on Wheels (THOW). On November 7, 2022, Community Development Staff presented the Commission with a draft THOW definition and ordinance that defined THOW as a type of Recreational Vehicle (RV). Under the direction of the Commission and guidance of the City Attorney, Staff has reworked the language to instead define THOW as a type of “accessory structure.”

Of relevance, Hailey’s existing Municipal Code includes the following definitions:

ACCESSORY STRUCTURE: A structure containing the accessory use upon a lot.

STRUCTURE: Anything constructed or erected, the use of which requires location on the ground or attachment to something having a fixed location on the ground.

In the attached Draft Ordinance, Staff proposes to define Tiny Homes on Wheels (THOW) as such:

TINY HOMES ON WHEELS (THOW): an accessory structure with a footprint between 100 and 400 square feet in size that provides seasonal or year-round independent living facilities, including provisions for living, sleeping, eating, cooking, and sanitation, and has been certified to meet the required building standards.

Regarding building standards—Blaine County’s Tiny Homes on Wheels Ordinance (adopted in 2021) relies on guidance from the National Organization of Alternative Housing (NOAH), an entity that coordinates voluntary standards and conformity assessment systems for alternative housing types. NOAH has compiled a set of THOW building standards that is referred to as the NOAH+ Standards. The NOAH+ Standards include building standards from multiple entities, including NOAH, the American
National Standards Institute (ANSI), the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA), National Electric Code (NEC), the International Residential Code (IRC) the American Wood Council (AWC), and the Engineered Wood Association (APA).

In addition to the NOAH+ Standard, City Staff proposes that THOW in the City of Hailey adhere to the snow load standards required for all other residential structures and dwelling units in Hailey—as they are specified in Hailey’s Municipal Code, the International Energy Conservation Code (IECC), and the International Residential Code (IRC).

In deliberating the insulation requirements to propose for THOW, City Staff consulted with Blaine County Staff, NOAH, and THOW manufacturers in the region. The discussions balanced several considerations:
- the overarching goal of THOW: to support housing accessibility;
- the importance of ensuring the livability of THOW; and
- energy efficiency in small structures.

In the end, Staff decided to align with Blaine County’s insulation requirements, which can be understood as a middle ground. Blaine County’s insulation requirements are less than those required for ADUs and other dwelling units. However, the proposed requirements are greater than those required for Park Model RVs, which are a temporary or seasonal living facility on wheels permitted by State Law and Blaine County. The proposed requirements for THOW differ from those required for Park Model RVs and ADUs as such:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Insulation Requirements</th>
<th>Park Model RV Blaine County</th>
<th>THOW Proposed &amp; Adopted by Blaine County</th>
<th>ADUs &amp; Other Dwelling Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walls</td>
<td>R-5</td>
<td>R-19</td>
<td>R-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor</td>
<td>R-5</td>
<td>R-20</td>
<td>R-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof/Ceiling</td>
<td>R-7</td>
<td>R-28</td>
<td>R-49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After reviewing energy efficiency reports from THOW built with the proposed insulation requirements, Staff determined that lower insulation requirements for THOW could maintain energy efficiency and lower the building costs. Furthermore, Staff concurred that striking a balance between the considerations is key to the overarching goal of THOW.

The proposed amendments, which incorporate Tiny Homes on Wheels to Title 17: Zoning Regulations, have been included in the attached Draft Ordinance for further review.

Standards of Review:
Criteria for Review. Section 17.14.060(A) of the Hailey Municipal Code provides “[w]hen evaluating any proposed amendment under this chapter, the hearing examiner or commission and council shall make findings of fact on the following criteria:

1. The proposed amendment is in accordance with the comprehensive plan;
2. Essential public facilities and services are available to support the full range of proposed uses without creating excessive additional requirements at public cost for the public facilities and services;
3. The proposed uses are compatible with the surrounding area; and
4. The proposed amendment will promote the public health, safety, and
general welfare.

1. The proposed amendment is in accordance with the comprehensive plan;
Tiny Homes on Wheels addresses multiple goals laid out in the Hailey Comprehensive Plan, they are listed and organized by the sections of the Comprehensive Plan below:

**Section 5: Land Use, Population and Growth Management**
The Comprehensive Plan specifically identifies the need to, “...accommodate population growth through a balanced combination of two means, with one being ‘infill’ development or redevelopment of existing land within the current City limits in accordance with existing zoning and density allowances without necessitating the use of density bonuses or waivers” (page 20). Further goals and desired trends include:
5.6 Manage and accommodate population growth by infill development and, when appropriate, minimal expansion by annexation and/or density increases. (page 30)
   - Increase: Citywide land use efficiency (U/A)
5.7 Encourage development at the densities allowed in the Zoning Code. (page 30)
   - Decrease: Acres of vacant land within city boundaries

Similarly to Accessory Dwelling Units, Tiny Homes on Wheels offer a by-right mechanism for infill development. Creating additional opportunities for by-right infill development is compatible with the Future Land Use Map, which encourages a variety of residential development styles and densities that are not fully realized today.

**Section 7: Demographics, Cultural Vitality, Social Diversity & Well-Being**
7.1 Encourage a variety of projects and programs that meet the needs generated by various segments of the population, especially the needs of those who risk suffering effects of discrimination or are socially or economically disadvantaged. (page 36)
   - Decrease: Percentage of renters paying more than 30% of income on housing

**Section 8: Housing**
8.1 Encourage development that provides opportunities for home ownership and rental homes for individuals and families of all socio-economic levels. (page 39)
   - Increase: Supply of Affordable Rental Housing
   - Decrease: Percent of Income for Housing Costs
   - Increase: Home Affordability
   - Decrease: Housing Costs in Relation to Income

The Housing Section also elaborates on the economic, environmental, and social benefits of increasing housing options within Hailey City Limits. Accessible housing is important for:
   - “The growth potential and sustainability of local businesses”;
   - lowering carbon emissions and road maintenance costs; and
   - “a greater vibrancy and sense of unity” in the community (page 38).

2. Essential public facilities and services are available to support the full range of proposed uses without creating excessive additional requirements at public cost for the public facilities and services;
Thus far, all studies related to recently proposed and approved housing projects have affirmed that 1) infill development and increased residential densities most efficiently use public facilities and services,
they do not increase excessive additional requirements at public cost; and 2) Hailey’s municipal services are capable of servicing infill development and high-density projects.

As verified by City Staff from the Public Works Department, Tiny Home on Wheels (THOW) can be accommodated with existing water, wastewater, and other municipal services. The City has yet to meet its maximum densities in the Zoning Districts, especially where they are desired near public transit and activity centers. Water and wastewater Staff confirmed the feasibility of THOW hooking up to municipal services. Administratively, the process would be similar to ADUs and offer an additional tracking mechanism for THOW.

3. The proposed uses are compatible with the surrounding area; and

The proposed uses are compatible with the surrounding area and other areas throughout Hailey: Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU) have been considered in the long-term planning of the residential zoning districts and their municipal services, and Staff considers this proposed Text Amendment in the same vein as ADUs. The difference between the impact of Tiny Homes on Wheels and ADUs on adjacent properties would be minimal to non-existent—especially with the proposed THOW standards that limit their size between 100 and 400 square feet and maintain the existing setbacks of underlying zoning districts.

5. The proposed amendment will promote the public health, safety, and general welfare.

Through years of community engagement for the Comprehensive Plan creation and updates (as recent as 2020), the Commission and Council have found that there is strong community support and rationale for increasing and diversifying housing options within Hailey City limits. Access to housing is key to supporting public health, safety, and general health. The census in the Wood River Valley community—including non-profit social service organizations and fellow municipalities—is that the current need for housing is an emergency. The Mayor and Council support a city-initiated THOW Ordinance as, “...there currently exists a housing emergency and amending some of the regulations regarding permissible types of housing units to include Tiny Home on Wheels may help to ease this housing emergency...” (Blaine County Ordinance No. 2022-03).

Motion Language:
Approval: I move to recommend approval by the Hailey City Council an Ordinance amending the Hailey Municipal Code, Title 17: Zoning Regulations, Chapter 17.08: Supplementary Regulations, Article D: Accessory Dwelling Units, to allow for Tiny Homes on Wheels (THOW) within all residential zoning districts, finding that essential public facilities and services are available to support the full range of proposed uses without creating excessive additional requirements at public cost for the public facilities and services, that the proposed uses are compatible with the surrounding area, and that the proposed amendment will promote the public health, safety and general welfare.

Denial: I move to deny recommendation of the attached revisions amending the Hailey Municipal Code, Title 17: Zoning Regulations, Chapter 17.08: Supplementary Regulations, Article D: Accessory Dwelling Units, to allow for Tiny Homes on Wheels (THOW) within all residential zoning districts, finding that _________________ [the Commission should cite which standards are not met and provide the reason why each identified standard is not met].

Continuation: Motion to continue the public hearing to _________________ [the Commission should specify a date].
Attachments:
  i. Draft Ordinance
  ii. NOAH+ Standard for Tiny Homes on Wheels
HAILEY ORDINANCE NO. 2023-__

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF HAILEY, IDAHO, AMENDING TITLE 17 OF THE HAILEY MUNICIPAL CODE, CHAPTER 17.02: DEFINITIONS, TO DEFINE TINY HOMES ON WHEELS (THOW); AMENDING CHAPTER 17.04: ESTABLISHMENT, PURPOSES AND USES WITHIN ZONING DISTRICTS, SECTION 17.04M.060 ITEM F, TO INCLUDE TINY HOMES ON WHEELS; AMENDING CHAPTER 17.05: OFFICIAL ZONING MAP AND DISTRICT USE MATRIX, SECTION 17.05.040, TO ADDRESS TINY HOMES ON WHEELS WITHIN THE DISTRICT USE MATRIX AND FOOTNOTES; AMENDING CHAPTER 17.06: DESIGN REVIEW, SECTION 17.06.010 ITEM A, TO EXEMPT TINY HOMES ON WHEELS FROM A FULL PLANNING AND ZONING DESIGN REVIEW, AS WELL AS MODIFY ACCESSORY DWELLING UNITS FROM A FULL PLANNING AND ZONING DESIGN REVIEW TO AN ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW ONLY; AMENDING CHAPTER 17.08: SUPPLEMENTARY REGULATIONS, ARTICLE D, TO INCLUDE TINY HOMES ON WHEELS IN THE TITLE; AND AMENDING THE FOLLOWING SECTIONS TO INCORPORATE PROVISIONS FOR TINY HOMES ON WHEELS –

• SECTION 17.08D.010: PURPOSE AND INTENT, ITEM A, ITEM 2, AND ADD ITEM 4
• SECTION 17.08D.020: APPLICABILITY
• SECTION 17.08D.030: GENERAL PROVISIONS, ITEMS B, C, AND D, AND ADD ITEMS E AND F
• SECTION 17.08D.040: REGISTRATION REQUIRED, ITEM A, AND ADD ITEM B,
• SECTION 17.08D.050: OCCUPANCY RESTRICTIONS – SHORT TERM OCCUPANCY, ITEM A AND ADD ITEM B,
• SECTION 17.08D.060: SUBORDINATE SCALE AND SIZE, ITEM A AND ADD ITEM B,
• SECTION 17.08D.070: LIVABILITY, ITEM A,
• ADD A NEW SECTION 17.08D.080: TINY HOMES ON WHEELS, WHICH INCLUDES THE FOLLOWING NEW ITEMS:
  A. BUILDING STANDARDS
  B. INSPECTIONS
  C. ESTABLISHING THE THOW;

PROVIDING FOR A SEVERABILITY CLAUSE; PROVIDING FOR A REPEALER CLAUSE; AND PROVIDING FOR THE EFFECTIVE DATE OF THIS ORDINANCE UPON PASSAGE, APPROVAL AND PUBLICATION ACCORDING TO LAW.

WHEREAS, the Commission and Council have determined that municipal code changes which expand housing opportunities in Hailey are a priority;

WHEREAS, the Council finds that the proposed changes to allow for Tiny Homes on Wheels (THOW) will encourage modest and necessary infill housing development to meet the needs of the community as contemplated in the 2010 Hailey Comprehensive Plan;
WHEREAS, the changes proposed will address supplemental design and quality of life for Tiny Homes on Wheels (THOW) with the intent of reinforcing the following statements and goals contained within the Comprehensive Plan:

1. Land Use, Population, and Growth Management
   a. The City seeks to accommodate population growth through a balanced combination of two means, with one being “infill” development or redevelopment of existing land within the current City limits in accordance with existing zoning and density allowances without necessitating the use of density bonuses or waivers.
   b. Land Use Implications of Population Growth Scenarios: Impacts resulting from growth pressure, such as environmental degradation, inadequate social and infrastructure services, and loss of small-town character are concerns associated with unrestricted growth of the community; therefore, it is the responsibility of the city to plan for potential future population growth.
   c. Lessen dependency on the automobile.

2. Demographics, Cultural Vitality, Social Diversity, and Well-Being
   a. Social Diversity and Social Well-Being: Sustainable communities offer equal opportunity, social harmony, and mutual respect for a diverse population. Diversity means an inclusive community of people with varied human characteristics, ideas, and worldviews and whose interactions both benefit and challenge each other to grow.
   b. While many factors influence both the existence and perception of discrimination and unequal treatment, income is an important element, as are education, occupational status, and life expectancy.

3. Housing
   a. Affordable employee housing is a key element in the decisions of business owners to create new enterprises or expand their businesses. If affordable housing for employees to purchase and/or rent cannot be provided, it will limit the growth potential and sustainability of local businesses. To the extent that attractive, affordable housing is available, employees can better be recruited and retained.
   b. The ongoing local spending and taxes generated because of homes being occupied by the working community are significant.
   c. Productivity of the workforce improves when commutes are shortened.
   d. Long commutes are not only costly to the workers, but to the environment as well. Carbon emissions are reduced, and air quality is improved when employees live close to work. In addition, fewer commuters will alleviate the demand for more highway lanes and asphalt.
   e. Many social benefits are realized when workers live in their own community. Quality of life and safety improve when critical care employees live within close responding distance. Children do better in school when parents are at home in the mornings and evenings. Homeowners are more active in their communities, creating a greater vibrancy and sense of unity.

WHEREAS essential public facilities and services are available to Tiny Homes on Wheels (THOW) without excessive public cost;

WHEREAS the proposed Tiny Homes on Wheels (THOW) use is compatible with surrounding areas and Zoning Districts where Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) are permitted; and
WHEREAS the text set forth in this ordinance will promote the public health, safety and general welfare by addressing ongoing and outstanding housing needs.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF HAILEY, IDAHO, AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. Chapter 17.02 of the Hailey Municipal Code is hereby amended by the addition of the underlined language, as follows:

TINY HOMES ON WHEELS (THOW): an accessory structure with a footprint between 100 and 400 square feet in size that provides seasonal or year-round independent living facilities, including provisions for living, sleeping, eating, cooking, and sanitation, and has been certified to meet the required building standards.

Section 2. Chapter 17.04 of the Hailey Municipal Code is hereby amended by the addition of the underlined language, as follows:

17.04M.060.F. Accessory Dwelling Units: Accessory Dwelling Units shall have a minimum gross floor area of three hundred (300) square feet and a maximum gross floor area of one thousand (1,000) square feet.; Tiny Homes on Wheels are exempt. Supplemental standards for Accessory Dwelling Units and Tiny Homes on Wheels are contained in Chapter 17.08, Article D. Accessory Dwelling Units and Tiny Homes on Wheels.

Section 3. Section 17.05.040 of the Hailey Municipal Code is hereby amended by the addition of the underlined language and/or the deletion of the stricken language, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description (Excerpt)</th>
<th>RG B</th>
<th>LR-1</th>
<th>LR-2</th>
<th>GR</th>
<th>NB</th>
<th>LB</th>
<th>TN</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>LI</th>
<th>TI</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SCI-SO</th>
<th>SCI-I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accessory dwelling unit (ADU) and Tiny Homes on Wheels (THOW)</td>
<td>1 accessory dwelling unit or 1 tiny home on wheels, accessory to a single-family dwelling unit or to a nonresidential principal building. Primary vehicular access to any ADU or THOW shall be from a City Street or alley. All accessory dwelling units and tiny homes on wheels shall have adequate water and sewer services installed to meet City standards</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>PA23</td>
<td>PA23</td>
<td>PA23</td>
<td>PA23</td>
<td>PA23</td>
<td>PA23</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>PA23</td>
<td>PA23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### BULK REQUIREMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description (Excerpt)</th>
<th>RGB</th>
<th>LR-1</th>
<th>LR-2</th>
<th>GR</th>
<th>NB</th>
<th>LB</th>
<th>TN</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>LI</th>
<th>TI</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SCI- SO</th>
<th>SCI-I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Height</td>
<td></td>
<td>35(1,22)</td>
<td>30(11,22)</td>
<td>30(21,22)</td>
<td>35(21,22)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35(24)</td>
<td>35(24)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>See note 12</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum side yard setback</td>
<td></td>
<td>10(1,20)</td>
<td>10(1,20)</td>
<td>10(1,20)</td>
<td>10(1,20)</td>
<td>10(1,20)</td>
<td>10(1,20)</td>
<td>10(1,20)</td>
<td>10(1,20)</td>
<td>See note 12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum side yard setback</td>
<td></td>
<td>10(1,20)</td>
<td>10(1,20)</td>
<td>10(1,20)</td>
<td>10(1,20)</td>
<td>10(1,20)</td>
<td>10(1,20)</td>
<td>10(1,20)</td>
<td>10(1,20)</td>
<td>See note 12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total lot coverage</td>
<td>Total maximum coverage by all buildings, which includes 1 accessory dwelling unit or 1 tiny home on wheels (percentage)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30(10)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>See note 12</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) and Tiny Homes on Wheels (THOW) are subject to Administrative Design Review or Design Review, depending on the zoning district and/or applicable overlay zones and Supplementary Regulations. See Chapters 17.06, Design Review and 17.08, Article D, for regulations.

**Section 4.** Chapter 17.06: Design Review, Section 17.06.010.A, Table 1, of the Hailey Municipal Code is hereby amended by the addition of the underlined language and the deletion of the stricken language, as follows:

17.06.010.A. Design Review Approval or Exemption: No person shall build, develop, or substantially remodel or alter the exterior of the following buildings without receiving design review approval or exemption pursuant to this chapter, as outlined in the matrix below:

### TABLE 1

#### PROJECT TYPES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Use</th>
<th>Exempt (PZ Chair And Administrator)</th>
<th>Hearings Examiner</th>
<th>Full PZ Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New construction:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All zones: Nonresidential buildings</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All zones: Residential of 3 or more units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-4-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All zones: other than Townsite Overlay District: Accessory Dwelling Units and Tiny Homes on Wheels</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Townsite Overlay District: New single-family or duplex</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townsite Overlay District: Accessory structures (including excluding Accessory Dwelling Units and Tiny Homes on Wheels.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section 5.** Chapter 17.08, Supplementary Regulations, of the Hailey Municipal Code is hereby amended by the addition of the underlined language and the deletion of the stricken language, as follows:

**Article D. Accessory Dwelling Units and Tiny Homes on Wheels**

*17.08D.010: Purpose and Intent*

A. Purpose: The City of Hailey recognizes that land use, population growth, and community character are interrelated, and that social well-being and diversity are tied to the availability of an array of housing types and sizes available for sale and for rent at various price points. Accessory Dwelling Units and Tiny Homes on Wheels, when thoughtfully designed, can simultaneously complement the fabric of existing neighborhoods, increase the supply of available housing, and sustainably accommodate population growth.

The purpose of this section is to address supplemental design and quality of life for Accessory Dwelling Units and Tiny Homes on Wheels with the intent of reinforcing the preceding and following statements, which are reflective of statements and goals expressed in the Comprehensive Plan:

1. Hailey is a community that believes livability and quality of life can be maintained and enhanced only with strong, diverse residential neighborhoods. Further, the community recognizes its identity to include being a place primarily comprised of full-time residents and being a community where the workforce can reside.

2. The City of Hailey seeks to accommodate population growth in a balanced manner, with “infill” development and redevelopment of existing lands in City limits being two strategies. Accessory Dwelling Units and Tiny Homes on Wheels provide opportunities for infill development and redevelopment.

3. Many social benefits are realized when workers live in their own community. Quality of life and safety improve when critical care employees live within close responding distance. Children do better in school when parents are at home in the mornings and evenings. Homeowners are more active in their communities, creating a greater vibrancy and sense of unity.

4. Accessory Dwelling Units and Tiny Homes on Wheels add to the diversity of housing unit types, additionally supporting the flexibility and convenience for residents seeking housing within the City.
17.08D.020: Applicability
A. The standards of this section apply to all Accessory Dwelling Units created after February 10, 2021, whether created by new construction, addition, or conversion of an existing building or area within an existing building—(Ord. 1275, 2021); and to all Tiny Homes on Wheels established after <insert date of adoption of code amendments>.

17.08D.030: General Provisions
A. Accessory Dwelling Units may be located within, or attached to, a principal building or may be located within a detached accessory building. Detached Accessory Dwelling Units may comprise the entirety of the accessory building or may comprise part of the floor area of an accessory building with another permitted accessory use or uses comprising the remaining floor area.

B. Only one (1) Accessory Dwelling Unit or one (1) Tiny Home on Wheels is permitted on a lot.

C. Accessory Dwelling Units and Tiny Homes on Wheels are only permitted in conjunction with single-family residences in residential zones. In the Townsite Overlay, Transitional and SCI zones, Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted in conjunction with commercial buildings. In Business, Limited Business and Neighborhood Business, one or more residential unit(s) are considered mixed-use.

D. Accessory Dwelling Units and Tiny Homes on Wheels in the Special Flood Hazard Area (SFHA) shall have the top of the lowest floor elevated no lower than the flood protection elevation as defined in section 17.04J.020, "Definitions", of the Hailey Municipal Code. For new construction or substantial improvements in the SFHA, all applicable requirements of Article 17.04J. Flood Hazard Overlay District (FH) shall apply.

E. Tiny Homes on Wheels are subject to the same standards as Accessory Dwelling Units, except where specifically noted herein.

F. If Tiny Homes on Wheels (THOW) are removed from Hailey’s Municipal Code as an allowable use, no THOW structure shall be considered legally non-conforming.

17.08D.040: Registration of Accessory Dwelling Units Required
A. All Accessory Dwelling Units created after <insert date of adoption of code amendments> February 10, 2021 and all Tiny Homes on Wheels established after <insert date of adoption of code amendments> shall be issued an Accessory Dwelling Unit Compliance Certificate as a prerequisite for a Certificate of Occupancy.

B. Tiny Homes on Wheels shall be registered or permitted annually with the Idaho Transportation Department Division of Motor Vehicles.

17.08D.050: Occupancy Restrictions – Short Term Occupancy
A. Accessory Dwelling Units
   i. Where a lot contains both a primary dwelling unit and an Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU), only one dwelling unit shall be utilized for Short-Term Occupancy; and
B. ii. When one dwelling unit is utilized for Short-Term Occupancy, the other dwelling unit shall be owner-occupied or utilized as a long-term rental, with long-term occupancy being a period of thirty-one (31) days or more.

B. Tiny Homes on Wheels (THOW)
   i. THOWs are restricted for long-term use (31 days or longer) only.

17.08D.060: Subordinate Scale and Size
A. Accessory Dwelling Units
   i. Scale: The floor area of an Accessory Dwelling Unit is limited to no more than 66% of the gross square footage of the principal building, or the maximum floor area permitted for an ADU based on the lot size or zone, whichever is less.

B. ii. Maximum floor area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot Size (square feet)</th>
<th>Minimum Gross Floor Area (square feet)</th>
<th>Maximum Gross Floor Area (square feet)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Up to 7,000</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,001 – 8,000</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lots 8,001 and greater</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Gross square footage calculations for Accessory Dwelling Units do not include exterior, uncovered staircases. Interior staircases and circulation corridors are included.

C. iii. Number of bedrooms: Accessory Dwelling Units may have a maximum of two (2) bedrooms.

B. Tiny Homes on Wheels (THOWs)
   i. The footprint of Tiny Homes on Wheels shall be limited between 100 to 400 square feet in size.

17.08D.070: Livability
A. Outdoor Access: All Accessory Dwelling Units and Tiny Homes on Wheels shall have a designated area to access the outdoors. Examples include a balcony, porch, deck, paver patio, or yard area delineated by fencing, landscaping, or similar treatment to provide for private enjoyment of the outdoors. This area shall be no less than 50 square feet in size. The Outdoor Access area shall be approved through the Administrative Design Review process.

17.08D.080: Tiny Homes on Wheels
A. Building Standards
   i. All Tiny Homes on Wheels shall meet the NOAH+ Standards, in addition to and except where they are superseded by the requirements for Hailey’s climatic conditions, listed herein.
   ii. Additional requirements for Hailey’s climatic conditions:
      a. Insulation
         i. Minimum Insulation R-values:
1. Walls: R-19
2. Floors: R-20
3. Roof/ceiling: R28
b. Vapor retarders shall be in accordance with the International Residential Code (IRC).
c. Windows and doors shall have a maximum 0.30 U-factor.
d. Roof snow loads shall meet the site-specific requirements set forth in Chapter 15.08: Building Code, Section 15.08.020: Amendment of Codes.

B. Inspections:
i. Inspection of the THOW building requirements or standards—including the NOAH+ Standardsii and the requirements for Hailey’s climatic conditions—shall be completed and approved by the National Organization of Alternative Housing (NOAH) or another inspection agency that is approved by the Administrator.
ii. A Certificate of Approval from the inspector shall be submitted to the Community Development Department for further review, approval, and issuance of the Compliance Certificate.

C. Establishing the THOW
i. Location/placement:
   a. The THOW shall meet the setbacks for the Zoning Districts in which it is located.
   b. The THOW shall adhere to the minimum separation distances for buildings, as articulated in Table R302.1(1) of the International Residential Codei.
ii. Blocking and anchoring:
   a. Tiny Homes on Wheels shall be blocked and anchored to the ground so that the THOW chassis is level.
   b. Only a tongue jack shall be used on a full-time basis. No other jacks shall be used on a long-term (31 days or more) basis.
iii. Exterior attachments:
   a. Exterior attachments such as porches, decks, lean-tos, or sheds are permitted; however, they must be affixed in a manner that is freestanding or removable and allows for towing where appropriate.
   b. Porches and decks shall be lower than eighteen (18) inches unless located in any flood hazard plain.
   c. Detached or attached accessory structures (e.g., sheds) shall comply with the regulations outlined in Chapter 17.07 of Hailey’s Municipal Code.
iv. Skirting:
   a. Skirting is required and shall be installed to enclose all open space between the THOW and the ground.
   b. The skirtings shall screen the wheels and aesthetically compliment, or continue the THOW siding, as approved through Administrative Design Review.
v. Municipal service and utility connections
   a. All municipal and utility connections are subject to City standards, inspections, and policies.
   b. Water and wastewater
      i. Tiny Homes on Wheels shall connect to municipal water and wastewater systems through the connection serving the primary
residence, or via an additional, separate connection to the water or wastewater main lines.

ii. Water connections serving THOW shall remain separate from all secondary connections (e.g., irrigation lines).

iii. Insulating THOW water and wastewater connections, to prevent freezing, is the sole responsibility of the THOW owner.

Section 6.
Severability Clause: Should any section or provision of this Ordinance be declared by the courts to be unconstitutional or invalid, such decision shall not affect the validity of the Ordinance as a whole or any part thereof other than the part so declared to be unconstitutional or invalid.

Section 7.
Repealer Clause: All City of Hailey ordinances or parts thereof, which are in conflict herewith, are hereby repealed.

Section 8.
Effective Date: This ordinance shall be in full force and effect from and after its passage, approval, and publication according to law.

PASSED AND ADOPTED BY THE HAILEY CITY COUNCIL AND APPROVED BY THE MAYOR THIS ___ DAY OF ______________, 2023.

Martha Burke, Mayor, City of Hailey

Attest:

Mary Cone, City Clerk

i. International Residential Building Code, Table R302.1(1): https://codes.iccsafe.org/content/IRC2018/chapter-3-building-planning#IRC2018_Pt03_Ch03_SecR302

ii. NOAH+ Standards: https://noahcertified.org; https://haileycityhall.sharepoint.com/:w:/g/c/EkdzB-X4FznZEd5O9_zGrGABt_i-VT3QpPvaNnMOCx1_g?email=robyn.davis%40haileycityhall.org&ex=WF5hM

THE NOAH+ STANDARD

NOAH+ STANDARD

ANSI 119.5 covers:
1. Fuel Systems and Equipment,
2. Health, Fire and Life Safety
3. Plumbing Systems and

NFPA 70 (National Electric Code)
Used for the electrical with special attention to Article 551 and 552 (RVs and PMRVs).

NFPA 1192

We “plus” these with structural and energy guidelines.

PLUS:

- R 13 INSULATION IN WALLS AND FLOOR
- R 19 INSULATION IN CEILING.
- STUDS 16” OC (24” O.C. with advanced framing method) MINIMUM, 2X4 WOOD OR METAL STUDS, OR SIP PANELS
- ½ CDX OR 7/16 – 9/16” OSB SHEATHING NAILED 4” ON EDGES AND 8” IN FIELD FOR WALLS. 8 D RING SHANK OR SCREWS WITH METAL STUDS ALL EDGES WITH SOLID BACKING
- HOUSE WRAP OR ZIP BOARD
- ROOF SHEATHING ½ CDX OR 7/16 (OR 9/16 FOR 24” OC RAFTERS) OSB SHEATHING NAILED 3” ON EDGES AND 6” IN FIELD FOR WALLS. 8 D RING SHANK.
- INSULATED WINDOWS AND DOORS.
- ROOF/WALLS ANCHORED TO THE TRAILER WITH ½” ANCHOR BOLTS 4’ OC AND STRAPPING. (EX SP1 & SP2 SIMPSON HANGERS ON TOP AND BOTTOM STUDS, H 2.5 SECURING RAFTER TO THE TOP PLATE.
- PROPERLY SIZED HEADERS AND JACK STUDS.
- UNDERLAYMENT AS NEEDED.
- AIR EXCHANGER OR OTHER MOISTURE CONTROL.
- UNDERLAYMENT AS NEEDED.
- AIR EXCHANGER OR OTHER MOISTURE CONTROL

4. INSPECTION SERVICES

Inspections are performed at all critical stages of construction for compliance to The NOAH+ Standard. NOAH inspectors are Certified Professional Inspectors. NOAH utilizes InterNACHI CPI’s, Engineers, General Contractors, Plumbers, Electricians & Building Inspectors.

Inspections are performed by licensed individuals, in-person or remotely, using an expert mobile application which can be hosted anywhere. Live stream video & audio allow the inspector to guide the builder through each Inspection Stage. Inspectors can also take snapshots/photos during the Inspection Video & make annotations to thoroughly document specific details.

NOAH maintains all inspection records for each NOAH Certified Structure using AES-256 encryption of data which is stored in world class secure facilities that meet PCI, HIPAA, Military, and other regulatory requirements. Records are stored and retrievable by the following identifiers:

- VIN – Vehicle Identification Number/or Other Identifier
5. STANDARDS ENFORCEMENT

If the build does not pass inspection at a Stage, a one-time re-inspection can be performed, at no additional fee. After the second inspection, if the build does not pass, there will be a re-inspect fee for each additional inspection performed. Builders failing or refusing compliance are subject to disciplinary action ranging from membership probation (resulting in more frequent inspections & re-inspection fees) to expulsion from NOAH Membership.

Five Inspection Stages (Note: Skoolies/Vehicle Conversions/ RV Rehabs omit Stages 1 & 2)

Stage 1 Inspection
Trailer frame
- VIN permanently attached
- Dimension of frame and tongue metal
- Cross-member spacing
- Total trailer weight rating or axle weight rating
- Number of axles, lug pattern, brakes, coupler size
- Length and width of frame

House length & required trailer capacities:


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Average finished weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18’</td>
<td>7,000 – 9,000 lbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24’</td>
<td>9,000 – 12,000 lbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32’</td>
<td>12,000 – 16,000 lbs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If your trailer doesn’t have a total weight rating tag on it or a weight rating tag on the axles, here’s a guideline to assist you:

Typical Axle Diameters Based on Axle Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Axle Capacity</th>
<th>Axle Diameter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3,500-lb axle:</td>
<td>2 3/8-inch diameter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,000-lb – 7,200-lb axle:</td>
<td>3-inch diameter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,000-lb axle:</td>
<td>3-1/2-inch diameter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9,000-lb axles:</td>
<td>4-inch diameter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000-lb or more axles:</td>
<td>5-inch diameter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stage 2 Inspection
Stage 2A:
Frame up with trailer mounts, all hold down straps and headers.
Sheathing – Proper size & nail/screw pattern for rack bracing.
Framing – proper headers supported by jacks and proper stud spacing.
Anchors – house frame to trailer frame, no more than 10ft apart.
- 1/2” bolts
- 1/2” thread rod
- flat hold down straps

Note: Prior to installing siding, an inspection of the house wrap (if used) is required. Prior to installing roof covering, an inspection of the underlayment is required. These inspections can be done separately or in conjunction with a Stage 3 or 4 inspection.
Stage 2B
Stage 2B will be the dry in stage consisting of the House wrap and the taping of the seams & the installation of the windows including the flashing and taping around windows and doors. Also, we will be inspecting the roof covering before the installation of either metal or shingles. This will be either Ice & Water Shield or Felt paper.
All roofs 2/12 or less shall have Ice & Water Shield or equivalent covering the entire roof or a double layer of felt paper.
Measure the total height and width of the unit. The maximum width is 8’ 6”; maximum height is 13’6”.
Be sure to include overhangs and protrusions. This measurement will be done at the Stage 3 framing and the Stage 5 final inspection.
Note: If these measurements are exceeded you will need a special permit to move the home.
Note: if floor plywood will cover floor insulation or trailer attachment, a separate partial inspection of these items must be performed prior to installing plywood. Then frame up the home and schedule the Stage 2 Framing inspection.
The following is what to expect the inspector to look for.

- Attachment to trailer (example: ½” all thread welded to the trailer 1’ from each corner and every 6’ of exterior wall)
- If welding is not an option then the ½” bolt or all thread will have to go through the frame with a lock washer and nut.
- Floor (example: 3/4” pressure treated plywood screwed to the trailer cross members)
Walls (example: nominal 2×4 no.2 or better studs 16” o.c. with single bottom and double top plates, ½” zip panel sheathing or equivalent, glued and nailed 4” on the edges and 8” in the field with 8D rink shank nails.)
Ceiling/roofs (example: nominal shed roof, 2×6 rafter/ceiling joists 24” or 16”o.c. with maximum span 7’6”; ½” OSB sheathing nailed 3” o.c. on the edges and 6” o.c. in the field with 8D rink shank nails. If using 24” o c then ½” H clips at the plywood joints between rafters will be needed.
Rafter Ties
Strapping. (example: Optional, GoBolts connected to each anchor bolt with 2” long Needs connectors, 1’ from each corner, every 6’ of wall and on either side of all openings greater than 6’, penetrating the double top plate with a 3”x3” washer, a lock washer and ½” nut. The rafters attach to the top plates with a Simpson H2.5 strap on the end of each rafter. 10D galvanized hanger nails 1 ½” long were nailed into each nail hole of each strap.)

**Framing wall to bottom plate connection.**
In addition to the rafter ties (Hurricane ties) you will also have to mechanically attach all exterior king wall studs to the bottom plate. This is only the studs that go from the bottom plate unbroken to the top plate. This can be done by using Simpson H2.5 twist rafter ties or equivalent.

Go Bolts
Simpson hangers
hurricane straps
Simpson strong ties
- Headers: A properly sized header must be used in all bearing walls including the span over the wheel well.
● Shear/rack walls: (example: The exterior walls with the above plywood, studs, nails and nail pattern create the shear walls of the home, however the rear wall with the entrance door and window does not have enough plywood area to create a sufficient shear wall. A 3 ½” by 12” glue lam header is installed under the window for added shear strength.)

● A builder may also use engineered sip panels, engineered metal framing or engineered trusses in the build. The inspector will need engineer’s specifications to insure proper use and installation of these systems.

When framing a roof the collar tie is a 2x connecting the two opposing rafters in the upper third of the roof and a rafter tie is a 2x connecting the two opposing rafters in the lower third of the roof. A ceiling joist, rafter or truss usually sits atop and is fastened to the top plate. If there is a single top plate, I.E. Advanced Framing, the rafter or truss must be directly above a stud or header.

Tyvek is no longer needed when using the new zip panel sheathing. What is the thickness and nail pattern of the sheathing? Make sure all wall sheathing has a framing member behind the joint. Make sure 24” o.c. rafters use an H clip or framing at the joints.

T111 or ½” exterior plywood with batten boards will not require sub sheathing.

Stage 3 Inspection (Skoolies/Vehicle Conversions/RV Rehabs begin Inspections here)

● 3A Rough plumbing
  ○ Pressure test (100psi)
  ○ Hanger straps every 3ft., and proper sizes
  ○ Drain lines should have 1/4” drop per 12”
  ○ Water heater needs overflow pipe to outside
  ○ Supply lines should be pressurized with air or water to a minimum of 80 lbs. PSI for this inspection. To accomplish this many builders are attaching a pressure meter to the hose bib. The inspector will check the pressure before and after the inspection.
  ○ Also the waste water line should hold a 10’ column of water during the inspection. Builders can fill the vent pipe with water to meet this requirement.
  ○ Question about “Studor” vents, Air Admittance Valves or vents. They can be used and however there must be one vent to the outside to vent the methane gas.
  ○ According to NFPA 1192 the gas piping must hold 3 lbs. of pressure for 10 minutes.

● 3B Rough electrical
  ○ Proper stapling of wire to studs/nailer plates
  ○ Placement of panel (not in bathroom)
  ○ Externally run wires in conduit or UF
  ○ Proper gauge wire for service supply
  ○ See Article 551 NEC
Electric Service.

- Up to 5 circuits may be on a 30A service. 6 circuits or more will require a 50A service.
- **Main Disconnect.** A Main disconnect is required where there are more than six circuits, i.e. if you only have two 20A circuits in the unit you will not need a main disconnect.
- **Length of power cord:** 25’ if on the side 30’ if on the rear. If the entrance of the cable into the vehicle is more than 3’ from the ground, add that distance to the length of the power cord.
- **Spacing of outlets:** Any wall 2’ or more will require a receptacle outlet, and an outlet is required so no point along the floor line is an outlet more than 12’ away.
- Each side of the sink, adjacent to the refrigerator or range if it is a gas fired appliance.
- Any counter 12” or more wide.
- You are required to have 2- 20A circuits for the kitchen & 1- 20A circuit for the bath if it has a sink in it.
- **GFCI**
  - Within 6’ of the kitchen sink or the bathroom sink.
  - Any area occupied by a toilet, shower or tub.
  - On a roof top deck at least one outlet is required.
  - At least one outside outlet is required.
  - An outside light is required at each exit door.
- **Other Notes**
  - A hard wired smoke detector is required to be mounted as high as possible either outside or inside the sleeping area.
  - No outlet is to be installed in the face up position.
  - Each Tiny House must have only 1 main power supply.
  - Working clearance for the electric panel 24” wide 30” deep.
- **Cable supports (staples)**
○ If the box has cable connectors; provide cable supports every 12” from the box and every 4.5’.
○
○ If the box has no connectors; provide cable supports every 8” from the box and every 4.5’.
○
○ Metal roof/siding panels must be grounded with 8 AWG copper to the trailer frame only.
○
○ Electric panel ground bus bar must be isolated from the neutral bus bar and grounded to the trailer frame with 8 AWG copper.
○
○ Gas, water and waste pipe get bonded to the chassis.
○
○ 3 Way Switch

Stage 4 Inspection
Insulation
● Insulation – Vapor barrier and insulation depth
● Windows and seal tape around windows
● Exterior door(s) – proper door(s) with weather stripping
● Minimums R-13 walls; R-19 ceiling; and R-13 floors
● Closed cell Spray foam or ventilation in ceiling/rafters
Stage 5 Inspection
Final complete product
● The Title or Certificate Of Origin for trailer
● Roof ridge caps, drip edge, rakes, screw pattern, flashing
● Siding – proper trim and seal

Electrical
● Check panel for proper breakers, gauge, and loads
● Check for GFCI outlets near sinks and shower
● Check for external wire in conduit wire mold

Accommodations
● Toilet, shower, refrigerator, cooking unit and sink
● Heating and cooling source
● Windows must be tempered glass, covered with safety film, or have shutters or means of covering for travel (which can simply be 1/4” plywood, or plastic panels)
● Smoke detectors
● Fire extinguisher(s)
● Gas and CO detectors
• Window protection
Each sleeping area must have a primary and a secondary means of egress. The secondary can be an Egress window. Please have the builder measure the secondary egress. It should be an elliptical 24” wide and 17” high minimum. NFPA 1192- Figure A.6.2.5.1 That opening is clear open area. If a roof widow is used it must also have a rope ladder or other means to get down. Label properly. (red handle and red letters EXIT)

Protect water supply from freezing. NFPA 1192-7.3.6.2 to 7.3.6.3
Check the location of the potable water supply inlet. NFPA 1192-7.3.8.3 This will apply ONLY if we are inspecting the home as an RV.

Swinging shower doors open out. NFPA 1192-7.2.4.8

Final complete product—including picture of title or certificate of origin for trailer
Roof—ridge caps, drip edge, rakes, screw pattern, flashing
Siding—proper trim and seals
Electrical—check panel for proper breakers and loads, check for GFCI outlets, switches, external wire in conduit or UF
Accommodations—toilet, shower, cooking source and sink

Heating and/or cooling source
Windows must be tempered glass, covered with safety film, or have shutters or means of covering for travel, (Can simply be 1/4” plywood, or plastic panels.)
Smoke detector and Dangerous gas detectors if gas is being used
Moisture Control System
Fire Extinguisher Requirements:
Use a standard ABC fire extinguisher; must be in plain view and mounted within 2 feet from the entrance door.

Additions to NOAH’s ANSI + code as of Aug. 2022

When ANSI standard is silent on matters, Inspector may address the matter utilizing commonly available standard/code such as but not limited to IRC latest edition, AWC, APA or other related and current standards/codes.

• Electric water heaters may be installed in the bathroom in a closed cabinet.
• Propane water heaters may not be installed in the bathroom unless they are installed in a sealed enclosure so that combustion air will not be taken from the living space, or it is a Direct-Vent type. IRC M2005.2
• Air exchanger or other moisture control must be implemented within the home.
• Ice & Water Shield underlayment shall be installed as indicated and inspected prior to covering during the Dry-In of Stage 2.

*Roof pitch of 4/12 or less, entire roof shall be covered.
*Roof pitch greater than 4/12, roof eaves up a minimum of 3 feet into building line shall be covered.

- “A” frame style roofs require one of the following at framing. Collar ties placed at maximum distance of 48” OC OR Metal Ridge Strap, min 24” in length.
- All homes with a loft over 24” high must have a guardrail installed. (ANSI 5-10.7)
- A loft measuring 35sq ft or greater shall have a primary and secondary means of egress. (Example: Window 24” X 17” or Outdoor Passage 18” X 48”) (ANSI 3-2.1)
- All open sided stairs are required to have a Guard rail 34” high with openings no greater than 4”. (ANSI 5-10.7)
- Cantilevered floor systems supporting exterior walls shall have solid full depth blocking placed in every joist bay over the metal trailer frame.
- C. Section AQ104 LOFTS(1)Section AQ104.1 Minimum loft area and dimensions. Lofts used as a sleeping or living space shall meet the minimum area and dimension requirements of Sections AQ104.1.1 through AQ104.1.3. (a)Section AQ104.1.1 Minimum area. Lofts shall have a floor area of not less than 35 square feet (3.25 m²). (b)Section AQ104.1.2 Minimum dimensions. Lofts shall be not less than 5 feet (1524 mm) in any horizontal dimension. (c)Section AQ104.1.3 Height effect on loft area. Portions of a loft with a sloping ceiling measuring less than 3 feet (914 mm) from the finished floor to the finished ceiling shall not be considered as contributing to the minimum required area for the loft. Exception: Under gable roofs with a minimum slope of 6:12. portions of a loft with a sloping ceiling measuring less than 16 inches (406 mm) from the finished floor to the finished ceiling shall not be considered as contributing to the minimum required area for the loft.
- Properly sized headers and jack studs are required.

Examples of properly sized headers:

* 4”x4”, up to 4ft span.
* double 2”x4”, up to 4ft span.
* single 2”x6”, up to 4ft span.
* double 2”x6”, up to 6ft span.
* single 2”x10”, up to 6ft span.
* double 2”x8”, up to 8ft span.
* double 2”x10”, up to 9ft span.
* double 2”x12”, up to 10ft span.
Spans Greater than 10ft. are handled on a case-by-case basis.

Loft minimum floor system for loft spans 7’ 10” or less

*single 2”x4” @12”OC
*double 2”x4” @24”OC
*single 4”x4” @ 24”OC
*single 2”by6” @ 24”O

- All designs must meet 140 mph wind loads.

**Example:** All king studs require mechanical fastener’s (No L brackets), spacing 6’ for 140”, Studs 16” on center and 24” on center when using the advanced framing method. This is only the studs that go from the bottom plate unbroken to the top plate. This can be done by using (Simpson H2.5 twist rafter ties or equivalent). Nail patterns ½ CDX OR 7/16 – 9/16” OSB sheathing nailed 4” inches on edges and 8” in field for walls. 8 D ring shank or screw with metal studs all edges with solid backing. Roof sheathing ½” CDX or 7/16 for 16” on center (or 9/16” for 24” on center rafters) OSB Sheathing nailed 3” on edges and 6” in field. Roof/Walls must be anchored to the trailer with ½” anchor bolts 4’ on center and strapping (EX SP 1 & SP 2 Simpson hangers) on top and bottom studs, H 2.5 securing rafter to the top plate. Properly sized headers and jack studs are required. Equivalent to the above example.

- Exterior weather resistant barrier (house wrap or similar product) shall be placed on walls unless zip board or other approved product is utilized.
- Insulation Requirements are Roof R-19 or greater, Wall R-13 or greater and Floor R-13 or greater. A vapor barrier must be installed between the insulation and the subfloor.

Exception to Floor Insulation, Hawaii.

Idaho, follow state/county guidelines.

- **Trailer/metal chassis:** IF there is a metal pan, venting must be installed in every bay of the metal pan before installing the insulation.
- A thermal break must be installed between metal trailer and subfloor.
- All windows and doors must be insulated. All windows and doors jambs must be insulated full depth
- All penetrations of the bottom and top plates shall be sealed using fire rated sealant, fire chalk or equal.
- Electric panels may not be installed in a bathroom, closet or stairs and wet area.
- Smoke detectors shall be hard wired and interconnected with battery back up
• Builders will now have the option of using International Plumbing Code 903.6 Extension Through the Walls. Vent Terminals through the wall shall terminate not less than 10” above ground and not under an overhang with soffit vents. Side wall vents shall be protected against birds or rodents from entering the vent. You must terminate 4’ below, 3’ above and 10’ horizontal of an opening or air intake.

ANSI 119.5 covers:

1. Fuel Systems and Equipment
2. Health, Fire and Life Safety
3. Plumbing Systems and

And

NFPA 70 (National Electric Code) is used for the electrical with special attention to Article 551 and 552 (RVs and PMRVs).

*Dielectric tests are required (NEC551 and 552) prior to NOAH certificate and seal being issued*
Return to Agenda
To: Hailey Planning and Zoning Commission

From: Cece Osborn, Community Development City Planner

Overview: Continuation of a Design Review Application by Joel Tranter, represented by architect David Barovetto, for a new 3,190 square foot single-family residence with an internal 896 square foot accessory dwelling unit at 637 South River Street (Lot 2A, Block 1, Maple Subdivision). The project is located in the General Residential (GR), Townsite (TO) and Downtown Residential (DRO) Overlay Zoning Districts.

Hearing: December 19, 2022

Applicant: Joel Tranter, represented by architect David Barovetto

Location: Maple Subdivision, Block 1, Lot 2A, (637 South River Street)

Zoning & Size: General Residential (GR), Townsite (TO) and Downtown Residential (DRO) Overlay Zoning Districts; 8,840 square foot or 0.2 acre lot.

Notice: Notice for the public hearing was published in the Idaho Mountain Express and mailed to property owners within 300 feet on the same day, November 10, 2022. The item was continued on the record to December 5, 2022, and again, for an additional review, to December 19, 2022.

Application: The Applicant is proposing the construction of a new 3,190 square foot single-family residence with an internal 896 square foot accessory dwelling unit (ADU) at 637 South River Street (Lot 2A, Block 1, Maple Subdivision). The gross square footage of the entire proposed structure is 4,086 square feet.

The first, main floor includes two (2) bedrooms, two and one-half (2.5) bathrooms, an open layout kitchen and living room, office room, two-car garage, entryway, plus access to three (3) outdoor areas and a staircase to the second floor. The internal ADU is located on the upper floor and comprises of 896 square feet. The ADU includes a balcony facing River Street; open layout kitchen, living, and dining room; two (2) enclosed bedrooms; and one (1) full bathroom. The remainder of the upper floor is a 550 square foot loft that is open to the first, main floor. The main entrance is north-facing and accessed via a covered entry walkway on River Street. The entry walkway also services a secondary exterior entrance to the internal ADU.

At the October 17, 2022 public hearing, the Planning and Zoning Commission suggested that the Applicant relocate or minimize the garage on the street frontage. Per code, the Commission recommended any garage door on the street frontage be one-car in width and setback. Additionally, the
Commission suggested that the Applicant adhere to the required lot coverage and outdoor lighting standards.

For the second Public Hearing of this project on December 5, 2022, the Applicant revised the original design to a) adhere to the 30% lot coverage, b) pronounce the entry walkway on the River Street frontage, c) reduce the driveway curb cuts to one (1), and d) adjust the light fixtures to be Dark Sky compliant. However, the Applicant maintained the two-car garage frontage on River Street in their proposed plans. The Applicant claimed that a garage is not feasible in any other location nor facing any other side of the property because the lot dimensions are narrow and preclude him from turning his truck. No alley services the lot.

At the December 5, 2022 Public Hearing, the Applicant argued that the garage could not be located anywhere else on the lot aside from the River Street frontage due to the turning radius of his truck. Several Commissioners disagreed and voiced that the design could be reconfigured to locate the garage on the north, south, or west side of the property. The Commissioners reminded the Applicant that City Standards are to be considered in the creation of a project’s design.

When discussing the appearance of the proposed garage on the public street side and front wall plane, the Applicant debated the meaning of the term “parking area” in Section 17.06.090(C)4 of the Hailey Municipal Code: When garages and/or parking must be planned on the street side, parking areas are preferred to be one car in width. While some Commissioners felt that the term “parking area” includes garages, the term is not defined in Hailey Municipal Code and the standard articulates a preference not a requirement. The Applicant also argued that the garage door was subordinate to the front wall plane— as required by Section 17.06.090(C)4: When garages must be planned on the street side, garage doors shall be set back and remain subordinate to the front wall plane. Most of the Commissioners disagreed and found the garage door to be large and in the main line of sight on the front wall plane.

When discussing potential solutions, the Commissioners offered several pieces of feedback and advice as to how the Applicant might amend the design to make the garage subordinate. Specifically, the Commissioners suggested that the Applicant:

- cantilever the second story front wall plane over the garage,
- pronounce the overhead wall plane of the main entry walkway so that it might be considered the front wall plane, or
- screen the garage doors with landscaping.

The project’s Public Hearing on December 5, 2022 lasted approximately 1 hour and 15 minutes.

On December 14, 2022 the Applicant submitted a fourth design or plan set for the project, which is discussed herein. The fourth design for this project narrowly incorporates the Commission’s feedback. The site plan incorporates a reconfigured driveway and landscaping, which proposes to screen the garage. However, the driveway does not adhere to the required property line buffer. The latest design includes an illustration on the elevations page which appears to extend the deck and pronounce the wall plane above the entry walkway; however, those changes are not reflected in the measurements of the plan. The measurements and layout of the building plan appear identical to the
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plan set considered on December 5, 2022. Below is a table of the elevation sketches, plus the plans for the driveway and structural elements related to the front wall plane. The measurements show no change in the design or plan set submitted for the December 5th and 19th Public Hearings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>December 19, 2022</th>
<th>December 5, 2022</th>
<th>October 17, 2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Elevation Sketch" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Elevation Sketch" /></td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Elevation Sketch" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Plan Sketch" /></td>
<td><img src="image5" alt="Plan Sketch" /></td>
<td><img src="image6" alt="Plan Sketch" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When Staff addressed the Applicant team about incorporating the Commission’s feedback to a greater extent, the Applicant team argued that the remaining lot coverage in the current design prevents them from cantilevering the front wall plane over the garage. The Applicant also voiced their unwillingness to reconfigure other aspects of the building’s design as to alleviate the lot coverage constraint. The Applicant insisted on their desire to bring the latest design forth to the Commission for a vote. Staff requests that this project be voted on for approval or denial, not for a continuation. This project has assumed an inordinate amount of Staff time, relative to other projects of its size and scale.

**Procedural History:** On October 17, 2022 the Planning & Zoning Commission held a Public Hearing on the Applicant’s first design for this project, the Commission provided feedback but took no action. After the first public hearing, the Applicant submitted a second and third plan set for this project. On December 5, 2022 the Planning & Zoning Commission held a Public Hearing on the Applicant’s third design for this project, the Commission provided feedback but took no action. A third Public Hearing before the Planning and Zoning Commission for approval or denial of the fourth design for this project will be held on December 19, 2022 in the Hailey City Council Chambers and online via Go-To Meeting.

**General Requirements for Accessory Dwelling Units**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compliant</th>
<th>Standards and Staff Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>City Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>City Standards and Staff Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>☒</th>
<th>☐</th>
<th>☐</th>
<th>17.04D.030</th>
<th>General Provisions.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>A.</td>
<td>Accessory Dwelling Units may be located within, or attached to, a principal building or may be located within a detached accessory building. Detached Accessory Dwelling Units may comprise the entirety of the accessory building or may comprise part of the floor area of an accessory building with another permitted accessory use or uses comprising of the remaining floor area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Staff Comments | The proposed residence includes an upper-level interior ADU of 896 square feet in size. |

| ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | B. | Only one (1) Accessory Dwelling Unit is permitted on a lot. |

| Staff Comments | Only one (1) ADU is proposed onsite. |

| ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | C. | Accessory Dwelling Units are only permitted in conjunction with single-family residences in residential zones. In the Townsite Overlay, Transition and SCI zones, Accessory Dwelling Units are permitted in conjunction with commercial buildings. In Business, Limited Business and Neighborhood Business, one or more residential unit(s) are considered. |

| Staff Comments | The proposed ADU is in conjunction with a proposed single-family residence in the General Residential (GR), Townsite Overlay (TO), and Downtown Residential Overlay (DO) Zoning Districts. |

| ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | D. | Accessory Dwelling Units in the Special Flood Hazard Area (SFHA) shall have the top of the lowest floor elevated no lower than the flood protection elevation as defined in Section 17.04J.020, “Definitions”, of the Hailey Municipal Code. For new construction or substantial improvements in the SFHA, all applicable requirements of Article 17.04J. Flood Hazard Overlay District (FH) shall apply. |

| Staff Comments | N/A – The proposed ADU is not located within the Special Flood Hazard Area. |

| ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | 17.08D.040: Registration of Accessory Dwelling Units Required | A. All Accessory Dwelling Units created after February 10, 2021, shall be issued an Accessory Dwelling Unit Compliance Certificate. |

| Staff Comments | Upon completion of construction for the proposed ADU, a Compliance Certificate will be issued. |

| ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | 17.08D.050: Occupancy Restrictions - Short Term Occupancy | A. Where a lot contains both a primary dwelling unit and an Accessory Dwelling Unit, only one dwelling unit shall be utilized for Short-Term Occupancy; |

| Staff Comments | The owner intends to rent the ADU on a long-term basis. The owner will reside in the primary residence full-time. This standard has been made a Condition of Approval. |

| ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | B. | When one dwelling unit is utilized for Short-Term Occupancy, the other unit shall be owner-occupied or utilized as a long-term rental, with long-term occupancy being a period of thirty-one (31) days or more. |
### Staff Comments
See Section 17.08D.050A, the Applicant’s occupancy plan meets this standard, and it has been made a Condition of Approval.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>☒</th>
<th>☐</th>
<th>☐</th>
<th>17.08D.060: Subordinate Scale and Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A.</td>
<td>Scale: The floor area of an Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) is limited to no more than 66% of the gross square footage of the principal building, or the maximum floor area permitted for an ADU based on the lot size or zone, whichever is less.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff Comments</td>
<td>The gross floor area of the primary residence is 3,190 square feet in size. The 896 square foot ADU is approximately 28% of its size. As such, the proposed design meets this standard.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>☒</th>
<th>☐</th>
<th>☐</th>
<th>B. Maximum Floor Area:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lot Size (square feet)</td>
<td>Minimum Gross Floor Area (square feet)</td>
<td>Maximum Gross Floor Area (square feet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Up to 7,000</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7,001 – 8,000</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lots 8,001 and greater</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gross square footage calculations for Accessory Dwelling Units does not include exterior, uncovered staircases. Interior staircases and circulation corridors are included.

| ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | Staff Comments | The Applicant meets this standard—the lot size 8,840 square feet and the proposed ADU is 896 square feet. |

| ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | C. Number of bedrooms: Accessory Dwelling Units may have a maximum of two (2) bedrooms. |
|   | Staff Comments | The proposed ADU has two (2) bedrooms. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>☒</th>
<th>☐</th>
<th>☐</th>
<th>17.08D.070: Livability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. Outdoor Access: All Accessory Dwelling Units shall have a designated area to access the outdoors. Examples include a balcony, porch, deck, paver patio, or yard area delineate by fencing, landscaping, or similar treatment so as to provide for private enjoyment of the outdoors. This area shall be no less than 50 square feet in size. The Outdoor Access area shall be approved through the Design Review process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff Comments</td>
<td>Through annotation on the plans and e-mail correspondence, the Applicant has designated 50 square feet of ADU outdoor access on the upper-level balcony.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Chapter 17.09: Parking and Loading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>☒</th>
<th>☐</th>
<th>☐</th>
<th>17.09 020.05.B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parking areas and driveways for single-family, accessory dwelling unit, and duplex residences may be improved with compacted gravel or other dustless material.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff Comments</td>
<td>The Applicant proposes a driveway on River Street, improved with compact gravel or paved.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The driveway design will be further discussed upon receipt and review of the Civil Plans, maintenance of the required ten foot (10’) buffer against a property line, and the decision whether or not to move the fire hydrant located in the City Right-of-Way. The Applicant will work internally with Staff to identify any revisions to the proposed driveway, where necessary, prior to issuance of a Building Permit.
Mitigation for Accessory Dwelling Unit parking spaces: Parking stalls for Accessory Dwelling Units shall be reviewed to assess light trespass into residential indoor living areas on adjacent properties. Mitigation measures may include fencing, landscaping, screening, landscape walls, and similar treatments.

**Staff Comments**

The proposed parking for the primary residence and ADU is on River Street, due to the lack of an alley and the narrow lot constraints. As such, light trespass into the Applicant’s and the neighbors’ living spaces is not a concern.

Accessory Dwelling Units and all dwelling units less than 1,000 square feet require one (1) parking space per unit. A site developed with both a primary dwelling less than 1,000 square feet in size and an Accessory Dwelling Unit shall provide a minimum of 2 spaces. Parking for Accessory Dwelling Units must be provided on site. Existing parking in excess of the required parking for a single-family unit shall count towards the total required parking.

**Staff Comments**

The proposed design includes space in the driveway for one (1) to two (2) parking spaces, in addition to the two (2) car garage.

---

### General Requirements for all Design Review Applications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compliant</th>
<th>Standards and Staff Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17.06.050 Complete Application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Department Comments Engineering: In-lieu fees for the design and installation of the sidewalk along the property frontage (River Street) shall be collected. Two contractor estimates shall be provided, and in-lieu fees shall be paid prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy. This has been made a Condition of Approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Life/Safety: A fire hydrant is located approximately twenty feet (20’) off River Street, presumably on the edge of the City Right-of-Way and the Applicant’s property line. While the fire hydrant is accessible where it is located, the Fire Department welcomes a new location for the fire hydrant that is closer to River Street. Regardless, access to the fire hydrant shall be maintained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Water and Sewer: The Applicant needs to establish water service and install a meter vault. If the fire hydrant is moved, the Applicant will be held responsible for the associated costs—including but not limited to cutting off and restarting the main water line and testing the water for drinkability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building: A civil plan set is required prior to issuance of a Building Permit.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|           | Streets: A buffer of at least ten feet (10’) shall be maintained between the driveway curb cut and the abutting property lines, per Municipal Code, unless storm drainage is infiltrated onsite. See for the Standard Drawing for the Typical Driveway Approach, as well as the Typical or Direct Entry
**Drywells.** Any landscaping or improvements in the City Right-of-Way shall go through the Encroachment Permit application process.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lot Coverage: 30%

- Proposed Building Height: 27.6’
- Proposed Setbacks:
  - Front Yard (West): 28 to the front entry; 32’ to the garage
  - Side Yard (South): 12’
  - Side Yard (North): 12’ 11”
  - Rear Yard (East): 18’
- Proposed lot coverage: 29.86%

The proposed building footprint is 2,640 square feet, amounting to approximately 30% lot coverage.

The building height varies with the outcropped star window, and the roof slopes downwards towards the north and south side yards. As such, Staff found the proposed design to meet the required setbacks.

17.06.070(A)1
Street Improvements Required

Sidewalks and drainage improvements are required in all zoning districts, except as otherwise provided herein.

Staff Comments:
City Staff requests that the Applicant provide in-lieu fees for future Right-Of-Way improvements. Two contractor estimates shall be provided, which include design and installation of concrete sidewalks, along the property’s frontage – River Street. In-lieu fees shall be paid prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy. This has been made a Condition of Approval.

17.06.070(B)
Required Water System Improvements

Water Line Improvements: In the townsite overlay district, any proposal for new construction or addition of a garage accessing from the alley, where water main lines within the alley are less than six feet (6’) deep, the developer shall install insulating material (blue board insulation or similar material) for each and every individual water service line and main line between and including the subject property and the nearest public street, as recommended by the city engineer.
(Ord. 1191, 2015)

Staff Comments:
Staff will review civil plans and water line connections and improvements when they are updated. This standard shall be met.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compliant</th>
<th>Standards and Staff Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>City Code 17.06.090(C)1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Site Planning Guideline: The pattern created by the Old Hailey town grid should be respected in all site planning decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff Comments: The lot is existing and rectangular; however, there is no alley in the rear. Vehicular access is only possible via River Street.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Guideline: Site planning for new development and redevelopment shall address the following:

- scale and massing of new buildings consistent with the surrounding neighborhood;
- building orientation that respects the established grid pattern of Old Hailey;
- clearly visible front entrances;
- use of alleys as the preferred access for secondary uses and automobile access;
- adequate storage for recreational vehicles;
- yards and open spaces;
- solar access on the site and on adjacent properties where feasible, and where such decisions do not conflict with other Design Guidelines;
- snow storage appropriate for the property;
- underground utilities for new dwelling units.

**Staff Comments**

- The scale of the proposed residence is consistent with the scale and massing of buildings in the neighborhood.
- Because no alley is available to service the lot, vehicular access is only possible via the public street at the front of the parcel (River Street).
- A covered exterior walkway clearly leads from the east, front side of the lot to the main entrance on the north side. However, the front entrance is not visible from River Street.
- N/A – there is no alley abutting the property.
- The proposed two-car garage and driveway leave adequate storage for recreational vehicles.
- The proposed residence incorporates three (3) large outdoor leisure areas—an upper-level balcony for the ADU, southside patio, and rear deck—surrounded by yard space; in addition to the covered entry walkway.
- Snow storage is identified onsite, on the north and south side yards.
- Staff will review civil plans once they are updated, to ensure that utilities are buried underground.

**Guideline:** The use of energy-conserving designs that are compatible with the character of Old Hailey are encouraged. The visual impacts of passive and active solar designs should be balanced with other visual concerns outlined in these Design Guidelines.

**Staff Comments**

The proposed residence incorporates south-facing windows to increase natural light and heating.

**Guideline:** The perceived mass of larger buildings shall be diminished by the design.

**Staff Comments**

The proposed residence incorporates trim, as well as varying roof lines, materials, and windows to break up the perceived mass of the building. The gable roof, star window, and outdoor leisure areas also diminish the size of the residence.

**Guideline:** Architectural Character

**Staff Comments**

a. General
Guideline: New buildings should be respectful of the past, but may offer new interpretations of old styles, such that they are seen as reflecting the era in which they are built.

**Staff Comments**
The proposed residence is reflective of the traditional aesthetics of Old Hailey, yet modern in its materials, incorporation of outdoor leisure areas, and the star window. The various materials— dark grey sheet metal roof, jade stucco upper exterior, cedar siding lower exterior, and ground level masonry block— are common and reflective of the present.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>17.06.090(C)3b</th>
<th>b. Building Orientation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guideline: The front entry of the primary structure shall be clearly identified such that it is visible and inviting from the street.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff Comments</strong></td>
<td>The entry walkway in the proposed design is inviting and clearly visible from the front of the lot on River Street.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>17.06.090(C)3c</th>
<th>c. Building Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guideline: The use of building forms traditionally found in Old Hailey is encouraged. Forms that help to reduce the perceived scale of buildings shall be incorporated into the design.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff Comments</strong></td>
<td>The proposed gable roof, window trim, and cedar siding are consistent with the styles and forms found in Old Hailey. As detailed in Section 17.06.090(C)2, various elements break up the perceived mass of the building.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>17.06.090(C)3d</th>
<th>d. Roof Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guideline: Roof forms shall define the entry to the building, breaking up the perceived mass of larger buildings, and to diminish garages where applicable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff Comments</strong></td>
<td>The layered gable roofs break up the perceived mass of the building; the saltbox shape of the entry walkway roof identifies the route to the main entrance; and upper-level balcony detracts from the garage doors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>17.06.090(C)3d</th>
<th>Guideline: Roof pitch and style shall be designed to meet snow storage needs for the site.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Roof pitch materials and style shall retain snow on the roof, or allow snow to shed safely onto the property, and away from pedestrian travel areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Designs should avoid locating drip lines over key pedestrian routes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Where setbacks are less than ten feet, special attention shall be given to the roof form to ensure that snow does not shed onto adjacent properties.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff Comments</strong></td>
<td>All the proposed roof pitch, materials, and forms will shed snow and runoff away from entries and pedestrian travel areas. Snow clips and gutters are planned, snow will be stored in the side yards and is not expected shed onto adjacent properties.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 17.06.090(C)3d | Guideline: The use of roof forms, roof pitch, ridge length and roof materials that are similar to those traditionally found in the neighborhood are encouraged. |
### Staff Comments

The proposed gable roof forms, pitch, ridge lengths, and sheet metal material are similar to those found in Hailey and the immediate neighborhood.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guideline</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17.06.090(C)3d</td>
<td>The roof pitch of a new building should be compatible with those found traditionally in the surrounding neighborhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.06.090(C)3e</td>
<td>Wall Planes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guideline</td>
<td>The proposed structure’s primary wall plane is perpendicular to the front lot line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Comments</td>
<td>The proposed structure’s primary wall plane is perpendicular to the front lot line. As described in Section 17.06.090(C)3b, the lot dimensions pose challenges to meeting this guideline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.06.090(C)3e</td>
<td>Wall Planes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guideline</td>
<td>Wall planes shall be proportional to the site and shall respect the scale of the surrounding neighborhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Comments</td>
<td>The wall planes are proportional to the lot and comparable to the scale of buildings in the surrounding neighborhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.06.090(C)3e</td>
<td>Guideline: The use of pop-outs to break up longer wall planes is encouraged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Comments</td>
<td>The proposed design incorporates pop-outs on all four (4) wall planes. Most notably, a unique star window pop-out is designed for the north facing wall as part of the main entrance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.06.090(C)3f</td>
<td>Windows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guideline</td>
<td>Windows facing streets are encouraged to be of a traditional size, scale and proportion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Comments</td>
<td>Aside from the north-facing star window, the windows on the remaining three (3) wall planes of the proposed residence are traditional in size, scale, and proportion. They are rectangular, framed with trim, and sometimes incorporated into gable pop-outs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.06.090(C)3f</td>
<td>Guideline: Windows on side lot lines adjacent to other buildings should be carefully planned to respect the privacy of neighbors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Comments</td>
<td>A fence on the southern side of the property offers a visual barrier between neighbors, and the windows on the northern side of the proposed residence are ornamental and minimal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.06.090(C)3g</td>
<td>Decks and Balconies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guideline</td>
<td>Decks and balconies shall be in scale with the building and the neighborhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Comments</td>
<td>The four (4) proposed outdoor leisure areas are to scale with the proposed residence, ADU, and surrounding neighborhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.06.090(C)3g</td>
<td>Guideline: Decks and balconies should be designed with the privacy of neighbors in mind when possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Comments</td>
<td>The proposed decks and balconies do not peer into neighboring residences. Outdoor leisure areas and large windows between the neighboring residences and proposed design are staggered and protected by fences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.06.090(C)3h</td>
<td>Building Materials and Finishes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guideline</td>
<td>Materials and colors shall be selected to avoid the look of large, flat walls. The use of texture and detailing to reduce the perceived scale of large walls is encouraged.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Staff Comments

**A variety of materials, textures, and colors create engaging wall planes, as do the windows and trim. See Section 17.06.090(C)3a and 17.06.090(C)3f for more details.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guideline</th>
<th>Staff Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17.06.090(C)3h</td>
<td>Guideline: Large wall planes shall incorporate more than one material or color to break up the mass of the wall plane. The proposed design meets this standard. A variety of materials, textures, and colors break up the wall planes, as do the windows and trim. See Section 17.06.090(C)3a and 17.06.090(C)3f for more details.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>17.06.090(C)3i</th>
<th>i. Ornamentation and Architectural Detailing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guideline: Architectural detailing shall be incorporated into the front wall plane of buildings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Comments</td>
<td>The front wall plane on River Street incorporates window trim, an upper-level balcony, and framed entry walkway.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>17.06.090(C)3i</th>
<th>Guideline: The use of porches, windows, stoops, shutters, trim detailing and other ornamentation that is reminiscent of the historic nature of Old Hailey is encouraged.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff Comments</td>
<td>As described above, the proposed design incorporates three (3) outdoor leisure areas, windows on every wall plane, trim detailing, and a unique pop-out star window on the north wall plane. See Sections 17.06.090(C)3a for examples of how the proposed design is reminiscent of the historic nature of Old Hailey yet consistent with contemporary designs in Hailey.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>17.06.090(C)3i</th>
<th>Guideline: Architectural details and ornamentation on buildings should be compatible with the scale and pattern of the neighborhood.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff Comments</td>
<td>As described in Sections 17.06.090(C)3d, 17.06.090(C)3e, 17.06.090(C)3h, and 17.06.090(C)3i the outdoor leisure areas, wall plane pop-outs, two-tone siding, trim detailing and roof forms and materials are compatible with the scale and pattern of the neighborhood.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>17.06.090(C)4</th>
<th>4. Circulation and Parking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guideline: Safety for pedestrians shall be given high priority in site planning, particularly with respect to parking, vehicular circulation, and snow storage issues.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Comments</td>
<td>The covered entry walkway protects pedestrian access from snow storage and vehicular circulation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>17.06.090(C)4</th>
<th>Guideline: The visual impacts of on-site parking visible from the street shall be minimized.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff Comments</td>
<td>As described in Section 17.06.090(C)3b, the lot dimensions and lack of a rear alley pose challenges for minimizing the visual impacts of on-site parking and garages. Staff requested that the Applicant relocate the garage; however, the Applicant insists that the River Street location is necessary to accommodating the turning radius of his truck. The Applicant is also unwilling to reconfigure the layout of the proposed building to free up allowable lot coverage and cantilever the second story wall plane over the garage, an idea offered by the Commission at the Public Hearing on December 5, 2022. While the Applicant proposes trees to screen the garage, the garage must be reconfigured to respect the required ten foot (10’) buffer with the property line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guideline</td>
<td>Staff Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 17.06.090(C)5 | **Guideline:** Alleys are the preferred location for utilities, vehicular access to garages, storage areas (including recreational vehicles) and accessory buildings. Design and placement of accessory buildings that access off of alleys is encouraged.  
N/A – This lot is not serviced by an alley. |
| 17.06.090(C)5 | **Guideline:** Generally, the driving surface of alleys within Limited Residential and General Residential may remain a dust-free gravel surface, but should be paved within Business, Limited Business, and Transitional. The remainder of the City alley should be managed for noxious weed control, particularly after construction activity.  
N/A – This lot is not serviced by an alley. |
| 17.06.090(C)5 | **Guideline:** Landscaping and other design elements adjacent to alleys should be kept simple, and respect the functional nature of the area and the pedestrian activity that occurs.  
N/A – This lot is not serviced by an alley. |
| 17.06.090(C)6 | **Guideline:** Accessory buildings shall appear subordinate to the main building on the property in terms of size, location and function.  
N/A – The proposed design does not incorporate an accessory building. |
| 17.06.090(C)6 | **Guideline:** In general, accessory structures shall be located to the rear of the lot and off of the alley unless found to be impractical.  
N/A – This lot is not serviced by an alley, and the design does not include an accessory building. |
| 17.06.090(C)7 | **Guideline:** All projects shall be required to provide 25% snow storage on the site.  
Snow storage that is at least 263 square feet in size or the required 25% of the improved parking and circulation areas, which make up 1,050 square feet. The proposed design incorporates 150 square feet of snow storage on the north and south side yards of the proposed residence, totaling to 300 square feet. |
| 17.06.090(C)7 | **Guideline:** A snow storage plan shall be developed for every project showing:  
- Where snow is stored, key pedestrian routes and clear vision triangles.  
- Consideration given to the impacts on adjacent properties when planning snow storage areas.  
Ample space on the side yards will accommodate snow storage without impacting pedestrian routes nor adjacent properties. |
| 17.06.090(C)8 | **Guideline:** Existing mature trees shall be shown on the site plan, with notations regarding retention, removal or relocation. Unless shown to be infeasible, a site shall be carefully planned to incorporate existing mature trees on private property into the final design plan.  
The lot contains two (2) large shrubs that are planned to be removed. |
| 17.06.090(C)8 | **Guideline:** Attention shall be given to other significant landscape features which may be present on the site. Mature shrubs, flower beds and other significant landscape features shall be shown on the site plan and be incorporated into the site plan where feasible.  
The lot contains two (2) large shrubs that are planned to be removed. Snow storage is planned for their location. |
<p>| 17.06.090(C)8 | <strong>Guideline:</strong> Noxious weeds shall be controlled according to State Law. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Staff Comments</strong></th>
<th><strong>This standard shall be met.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>17.06.090(C)9 9. Fences and Walls</td>
<td>Guideline: Fences and walls that abut public streets and sidewalks should be designed to include fence types that provide some transparency, lower heights and clearly marked gates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Staff Comments</strong></td>
<td>N/A — The proposed design does not include a fence.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|   |   | ☒ | 17.06.090(C)9 10. Historic Structures | General Guidelines: Any alteration to the exterior of a Historic Structure requiring design review approval shall meet the following guidelines:  

- The alteration should be congruous with the historical, architectural, archeological, educational or cultural aspects of other Historic Structures within the Townsite Overlay District, especially those originally constructed in the same Period of Significance.  
- The alteration shall be contributing to the Townsite Overlay District. Adaptive re-use of Historic Structures is supported while maintaining the architectural integrity of the original structure. |
|   |   |   | **Staff Comments** | N/A — The lot is empty and does not include a historic structure. |
|   |   | ☒ | 17.06.090(C)10 Specific Guidelines. Any alteration to the exterior of a Historic Structure requiring design review approval shall meet the following specific guidelines:  

- The design features of repairs and remolds including the general streetscape, materials, windows, doors, porches, and roofs shall not diminish the integrity of the original structure.  
- New additions should be designed to be recognizable as a product of their own Period of Significance with the following guidelines related to the historical nature of the original structure:  
  - The addition should not destroy or obscure important architectural features of the original building and/or the primary façade;  
  - Exterior materials that are compatible with the original building materials should be selected;  
  - The size and scale of the addition should be compatible with the original building, with the addition appearing subordinate to the primary building;  
  - The visual impact of the addition should be minimized from the street;  
  - The mass and scale of the rooftop on the addition should appear subordinate to the rooftop on the original building, and should avoid breaking the roof line of the original building;  
  - The roof form and slope of the roof on the addition should be in character with the original building;  
  - The relationship of wall planes to the street and to interior lots should be preserved with new additions. |
|   |   |   | **Staff Comments** | N/A — The lot is empty and does not include a historic structure. |

**17.06.060 Criteria.**

A. The Commission or Hearing Examiner shall determine the following before approval is given:

1. The project does not jeopardize the health, safety, or welfare of the public.
2. The project conforms to the applicable specifications outlined in the Design Review Guidelines, as set forth herein, applicable requirements of the Zoning Title, and City Standards.

B. Conditions. The Commission or Hearing Examiner may impose any condition deemed necessary. The Commission or Hearing Examiner may also condition approval of a project with subsequent review and/or approval by the Administrator or Planning Staff. Conditions which may be attached include, but are not limited to those which will:
   1. Ensure compliance with applicable standards and guidelines.
   2. Require conformity to approved plans and specifications.
   3. Require security for compliance with the terms of the approval.
   4. Minimize adverse impact on other development.
   5. Control the sequence, timing and duration of development.
   6. Assure that development and landscaping are maintained properly.
   7. Require more restrictive standards than those generally found in the Zoning Title.

C. Security. The applicant may, in lieu of actual construction of any required or approved improvement, provide to the City such security as may be acceptable to the City, in a form and in an amount equal to the cost of the engineering or design, materials and installation of the improvements not previously installed by the applicant, plus fifty percent (50%), which security shall fully secure and guarantee completion of the required improvements within a period of one (1) year from the date the security is provided.
   1. If any extension of the one-year period is granted by the City, each additional year, or portion of each additional year, shall require an additional twenty percent (20%) to be added to the amount of the original security initially provided.
   2. In the event the improvements are not completely installed within one (1) year, or upon the expiration of any approved extension, the City may, but is not obligated, to apply the security to the completion of the improvements and complete construction of the improvements.

The following conditions are suggested for approval of this application:
   a) All applicable Fire Department and Building Department requirements shall be met.
   b) Any change in use or occupancy type from that approved at time of issuance of Building Permit may require additional improvements and/or approvals. Additional parking may also be required upon subsequent change in use, in conformance with Hailey’s Municipal Code at the time of the new use.
   c) All City infrastructure requirements shall be met. Detailed plans for all infrastructure to be installed or improved at or adjacent to the site shall be submitted for Department Head approval and shall meet City Standards where required. Improvements include but are not limited to:
      i. Driveway configuration. Upon receipt and review of the Civil Plans, Staff and the Applicant will work internally to refine the driveway design prior to issuance of a Building Permit.
d) The Applicant shall supply two (2) contractor estimates for engineering design, materials, and sidewalk installation along the property frontage of River Street. Sidewalk in-lieu fees shall be paid prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.

e) The Applicant shall establish water service and install a meter vault.

f) The Applicant and City Staff—including but not limited to Fire and Water Department Staff—shall determine a plan to maintain access to the fire hydrant. If the fire hydrant is moved, the Applicant will be responsible for the associated costs—including but not limited to cutting off and restarting the main water line, as well as the required water testing for drinkability.

g) The project shall be constructed in accordance with the application or as modified by these Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Decision.

h) All new and existing exterior lighting shall comply with the Outdoor Lighting requirements according to 17.08C.

i) Except as otherwise provided, all the required improvements shall be constructed and completed, or sufficient security provided as approved by the City Attorney before a Certificate of Occupancy can be issued.

j) This Design Review approval is for the date the Findings of Fact are signed. The Planning & Zoning Administrator has the authority to approve minor modifications to this project prior to, and for the duration of a valid Building Permit.

k) An Encroachment Permit shall be applied for and approved for any work completed within the City Right-of-Way. The Encroachment Permit and Building Permit shall be applied for concurrently.

l) Construction staging and storage shall not be within the City Right-of-Way. All construction impacts shall occur within the property boundary.

m) All utilities shall be located underground, consistent with 17.06.080(A)3h.

n) The lot contains a primary dwelling and an Accessory Dwelling Unit. Only one (1) dwelling unit shall be utilized for short-term occupancy. If one (1) dwelling unit is utilized for short-term occupancy, the other unit shall be owner-occupied or used as a long-term rental (31 days or longer).

Motion Language

Approval:
Motion to approve the Design Review Application by Joel Tranter, for a new 3,190 square foot single-family residence with an internal 896 square foot accessory dwelling unit, to be located at 637 South River Street (Lot 2A, Block 1, Maple Subdivision) in the General Residential (GR), Townsite Overlay (TO), and Downtown Residential Overlay 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 (n) are met.

Denial:
Motion to approve the Design Review Application by Joel Tranter, for a new 3,190 square foot single-family residence with an internal 896 square foot accessory dwelling unit at 637 South River Street (Lot 2A, Block 1, Maple Subdivision) in the General Residential (GR), Townsite Overlay (TO), and Downtown Residential Overly Zoning Districts, finding that ____________________ [the Commission should cite which standards are not met and provided the reason why each identified standard is not met].

Continuation:
Motion to continue the public hearing to _________ [Commission should specify a date].
LOT 1
MAPLE SUBDIVISION AMENDED

LOT 2A
2,845 Sq. Ft.
13,200 A.
5,000 X 5,000
ALREADY CONNECTED

LOT 1
MOUNTAIN RIM TOWNHOMES

LOT 2
ANATOMIA SUBD.

LOT 2A
2,845 Sq. Ft.
13,200 A.
5,000 X 5,000
ALREADY CONNECTED

LOT 1
MOUNTAIN RIM TOWNHOMES

LOT 2
ANATOMIA SUBD.

NOTES
1. Bank of America is United States Farm Credit System, loan number 961304361.01, at 8935. Calico Street, Chino, California 91710. Vertically
2. Boundary information is from the report on Lot 2. Surveys are performed by John Parrish, a registered licensed surveyor in the State of California. All surveys are
   performed in accordance with the American Society of Surveyors, Transplant Number (GS07) by the County Surveyor of Riverside County, California.
3. Refer to the Plot Notes, Conditions, Covenants, and Restrictions on Original Plat.
4. Utility locations shown are based on civil records. These are approximate and should be verified to actual locations before any excavation.
5. Current Zoning appears to be General Residential. Please refer to City of Menifee zoning regulations for more information about the area including building setbacks.
6. Not all trees and vegetation are shown, some locations are approximate.
Return to Agenda