

BLAINE COUNTY PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
Thursday, March 14, 2019, at 6:30 pm

*Main Meeting Room in the Old County Courthouse
206 First Avenue South, Hailey, Idaho*

MEMBERS PRESENT

Rachel Martin
Pat Murphy
Ned Hamlin
Susan Giannettino
Mike O'Farrell

MEMBERS ABSENT

Mark Pynn
William Ranill

STAFF

Kathy Grotto
Lisa Horowitz

On Thursday, March 14, 2019, Blaine County Planning & Zoning Commission Chairman Rachel Martin called the meeting to order at 6:30 pm.

- I. **ACTION ITEM: Comprehensive Plan – Chapter 8 - Land Use (Continued from January 10, 2019):** Continuation of public hearing and consideration of proposed amendments to Title 8, Ch. 1, Comprehensive Plan, Chapter 8 – Land Use: Little Wood subarea.

Rachel – Are there any disclosures? None

Kathy – Legal notice of the March 14, 2019, hearing was provided as follows: A. Published in the Idaho Mountain Express on February 27, 2019; B. public service announcement request to area media sent February 26, 2019; C. sent to all Blaine County political subdivisions on February 26, 2019; D. posted in at least five (5) public places on February 26, 2019.

Pat - Motion that notice is adequate.

Ned – Second

Agree 5–0

Kathy – Reads some changes that were added.

Susan – The need to deepen several wells, I did not understand that?

Mike – Can the aquifers be affecting the wells south of Carey?

Kathy – Just in terms of making it more costly to drill a well. The density there is low; it isn't a matter of too many wells being close together.

Rachel – I will open up public comment.

Joe Scott – River Rock Road, I would like to thank the county, Lisa, and Kathy for their work

in reaching out into the community and taking the community into consideration.

Rachel – Close public comment.

Susan – Motion to move this chapter to the BCC

Pat – Second

Agree 5-0

- II. **ACTION ITEM: Zoning Regulations – Text Amendment (Continued from January 24, 2019):** Public hearing and consideration of an application by Sun Valley Economic Development to amend Blaine County Code, Title 9, Zoning Regulations, by adding a new chapter, Small Unit Residential District (SUR). This proposed chapter was previously known as “Dual Density.” The text of the proposed chapter has been changed to eliminate the “dual” nature of the zoning district. Other changes include but are not limited to additional criteria for location and applicability, additional design standards, and a provision for residency requirements.

Rachel – Are there any disclosures? None

Kathy – Legal notice of the March 14, 2019, hearing was provided as follows: A. Published in the Idaho Mountain Express on February 27, 2019; B. public service announcement request to area media sent February 26, 2019; C. sent to all Blaine County political subdivisions on February 26, 2019; D. posted in at least five (5) public places on February 26, 2019. Notice was sent to the incorporated cities and county pursuant to the impact agreement on February 14, 2019. The draft was put on the web site on February 28, 2019.

Mike – Motion that notice is adequate.

Susan – Second

Agree – 5-0

Rachel – I will turn it over to the applicant.

Harry Griffith – Sun Valley Economic Development, there were 2 or 3 issues that were raised last time we spoke. One was the design quality, character, etc. - we wanted to put together some examples of some other smaller units that have been developed around the county. (Harry shows a slide of examples.) One example is the Sonitalena Cottages these are units ranging from 800 sq. ft. to 1200 sq. ft. studio style to 2 bedrooms. They have done very well in the market place and primarily occupied units, which was one of the questions raised. Rimrock Cottages is another unit 14 units to an acre, smaller units, and good design approach. Cold Springs Crossing 16 units to an acre, these are rental apartments and occupied by locals. Those are all market rate housing. River Street apartments, affordable housing with a mix of different units with 40 units per acre for seniors and rent controlled. Lastly there is Sweetwater 13 units to an acre, mostly occupied. There are two points here, one we believe smaller units can be attractive and many of these units are ending up being mostly owner occupied. This gets to the questions of residency clause. We cleaned up the dual density nature of it; Kathy provided a number of mapping areas that show what zones could be considered for re-zoning if

this amendment gets adopted. I believe we had ½ mile and a mile from the highway.

Kathy – The options that were discussed were the 1 mile, which was originally proposed, then a second option that was ½ mile from the highway and that one adds also ½ mile from Gannett Road.

Harry Griffith – We also excluded R-10 because we thought that was inappropriate to this type zoning. There are some geographical boundaries and there are some existing zoning boundaries that have been excluded. The third change was we went back and looked at the residency requirements. We consulted with some developers and a variety of people including bankers. We were at 10% residency requirement for 2 years; we are now comfortable with a residency requirement of 20% for 5 years. The considerations we made at arriving at that suggestion is what would work and not impair the market price. Example if I had unit A that is 1000 sq. ft., B is 1000 sq. ft. one is a residency requirement, and the other one isn't, what you could put on that without negative impact the value of the building. There is not a lot of market study of this. In arriving at 20% for 5 years, which is our preferred solution we think there would be a minimum market price impairment for unit A versus unit B. The other potential impairment would be if residency was much higher would this effect mortgage loans. Some lenders will lend on deed restrictions others will not. We did a straw poll of a number of lenders in this community and a majority of them felt that this residency clause was not a clause of significant impairment in terms of their ability to provide a loan or mortgage to the purchaser of property. If someone is going to build a development with 15 – 20 units, obviously we felt like we would see construction loans and the construction loan provider would look at the expected selling price for the units. We feel that 20% for 5 years is a reasonable approach that would not negatively impact that. There are some options, we started at 10% for 2 years, I think there is a tradeoff here in terms of the number of years and percentage, but this is where we rounded out on our proposal to you as it sits in your revised text amendment. We wanted to look at the issue of residency from a cumulative perspective. The concept here is by putting in an additional cluster of 25 units that were built under this zoning, by code there would be five of those being restrictive, basically 20%. You would have ten un-restrictive units, but what we found when looking at Blaine County Housing Authority data you end up with about an average of a person in affordable to middle income housing at around 10 years, that is about the average 10 years of an occupant versus the US average of 7 year before people turn a house over. We have a longer residency time in units in this community. Our speculation is that out of that first group of twenty-five, five would be mandatorily restricted, but with the remaining twenty you would end up selling ten of those to residents, those residents would be staying on an average of 10 years or more. Looking at it on a rolling basis, if you did twenty-five units and you added another twenty-five under this program 3 years down the road and another twenty-five units 3 more years down the road. What you end up doing is ending up building an inventory of housing where residents are actually in there, whether it is restricted or the restricted period has expired. We believe there would be not just the five restricted units there would be the residual that is there in terms of the older restricted units as well as the unrestricted units that people are resident and occupying. It is a little speculative, but it is based on some facts we have on residency time in units. It does show now to do it, so we build clusters of 25, but over 5,10, or 20 years we can actually leverage this zoning text amendment to bring more units on and increase the supply of middle income housing. That is the additional information I would like to give you.

Rachel – Does anyone have any questions for Harry?

Pat – Harry could you give us the sizes of the cottages?

David Patrie – 700 sq. ft. for the smallest to 1150 or 1200 sq. ft. for the 2 bedrooms.

Rachel – Cold Springs Crossing has a residency requirement through the housing authority, correct.

David Patrie – There are 4 income restricted units out of 15.

Rachel – What about the River Street apartments?

David Patrie – Those are 100% income restricted.

Susan – After doing some research of homeowners properties versus where you get your mail. There are probably locals renting these, which is part of my goal. We are looking for housing for local users to use, not vacation homes. Some of this does not get to the question of ensuring that these are being used by people who are living and working here.

Mike – Some of these have a local ownership, but it doesn't say if it was resident or non-resident ownership.

David Patrie – I believe it says owner occupied, which means that it is 100% a resident. That data comes directly from the Blaine County Assessor. If they granted a homeowners exemption they have verified that the person that owns it is living in it. There could be someone that owns a unit that does not occupy it as its primary residence, but rents it out to someone. They don't get a homeowners exemption for that. The percentage that is listed on the slide is a floor, there is at least that many owner occupied.

Mike – Is there a tracking method? Some of these properties are more for retired people, how many are actually designed for families not just a couple?

David Patrie – I believe River Street seniors are all 1 & 2 bedroom apartments. The cottages in Old Cutters are 1 & 2 bedroom townhomes. Cold Springs Crossing has a mix of 1, 2, & 3 bedrooms units in it. Sweetwater ranges from 1 – 3 bedroom townhomes.

Pat - Does the assessed value factor in the homeowners exemption?

David Patrie – No, that is the assessed value. There are tables in the county data showing the assessed value, then there is a subtraction for the homeowners exemption, and there is a taxable value. It is based on the full market value.

Harry Griffith – We wanted to show you some projects that we think have been successful. The question of insuring residency and limiting short terms rentals. What we wanted to do is something that provides enrichment in a way that is bringing on clusters of these units over a period of 5 – 10 years, which results in more than just the 20 residency.

Mike – Are these all in the municipalities?

David Patrie – Cold Springs Crossing is in the unincorporated county, the other ones would be in the municipalities. Part of that is because the county outside of the CHPUD does not have zoning that allows for that, which is one of the goals to be able to allow this type of zoning in the county.

Mike – The comprehensive plan tracks where they are now, recommending that most of the housing be developed within the cities not the county.

Susan – One of the maps showed a mile wide all the way up and down Highway 75, I expressed some concern that it could end up with high density all the way up and down the entire corridor. I was told don't worry about that because there are other constraints that would affect the zoning and the ability to build, such as avalanche zone and riparian area, etc. In the map you just gave us, it shows a half-mile wide area, did you take that consideration out or did you try to show it?

Kathy – The discussion was that the R-10 zone was out because R-10 zoning district are mainly mountain overlay. The other constrained land is the flood plain and the MOD, they are shown as that, but weren't necessarily taken out of consideration for this zoning district. Any development that would be proposed within one of those overlay districts has to meet the requirements. Since they were overlay districts it wasn't very possible, mapping wise, to take them out.

Rachel – Public comment is now open.

Joe Scott – 102 River Rock Ct., all these developments look nice, but I noticed the densities, except for one were all within city limits. The one that isn't is at Cold Springs Crossing is hooked up to central water and sewer through Sun Valley Water and Sewer. Sawtooth Development for attempting to develop the Bramble Patch property already stated that they have to do individual septic systems, which they are not going to be able to do that kind of density, which will restrict the number of units that can be built.

Don Wonnell – Director of the Southern Comfort Homeowners Association and director for the Citizens for Responsible Development. Citizens for Responsible Development is a non-profit Idaho Corporation organized by local residents bordering the south Gateway properties involved in these proceedings. We have been organized not to block development to these properties, but rather to bring consideration to such issues, when issues can be identified, analyzed, and addressed. We have had comments in this proceeding and invited participants here. We need to consider whether are there better ways of getting your solutions, which would result in development that all of us could live with. It is necessary to distinguish between opposing this application and the process that it represents, which we do. The nominal objective of this process, which is a provision of some form of low income, middle income, high density, or affordable housing. These things we do not oppose, we ask rather that it be reasonably and responsibly addressed up front so the impact can be identified, adjusted, or minimized in a reasonable way before development. From that perspective this current process is a series of repetitive, narrow gage, zoning proposals that do not start with a comprehensive analysis of problems. So it is highly unlikely to result in a comprehensive set of solutions. This focus is solely and exclusively on housing. These other considerations are important in their own right. Highway 75 and traffic, fire code requirements, clean drinking water and safe sewage disposal. This is at a time when the subjects are known to everyone in this room and substantial information is presently available or obtainable to assess some of the effects of development. The application side steps the comprehensive plan requirements that touched on these issues. These issues happen to be the issues our residents think are extremely important now. Our members see no evidence of consideration by the county in the current process because simply this is the wrong process. There is a better process imminently available and that process is currently in review of the county's comprehensive plan. Our homeowners and others in the

Gateway area been active participants in multiple and effective staff sponsored meetings. As a participant I believe those meetings were promoting useful discussions about how differences on these subjects might be clarified and a combination proposed as specific policy alternatives. This is a process which should be favored by this commission. Such a process will contribute not just to the comprehensive plan, but also to better understanding and therefore acceptance by residents. Our members see the references to high densities, to individual wells and septic systems and to adjusting regulations, which require clean water and sewage treatment infrastructure. They see cross references to a more at risk scenario; they do not see anything about traffic congestion, bike path interruptions, impacts on the water table, the depth of their existing wells, potential pollution of the aquifer they rely on, or the impact on natural scenic patterns. It is because they don't see these things we organized Citizens of Responsible Development.

Earl Engelmann – Ketchum Rural Fire District, what is being proposed is a very high density within our jurisdiction. We are not equipped for that type of incidence. We would like to be included in this conversation earlier rather than later.

Rachel – Are you aware that this area is already zoned for high density and affordable housing?

Earl Engelmann – I am pointing out that the fire department is not prepared for this, so we want to be involved early on. What will be required in terms of water flows, etc. so you are aware up front that this is not going to be cheap or easy. We may need new equipment depending on the development to be able to protect the properties and people that live there. We would like some type of taxing or impact fee considered that will allow us to purchase new equipment. This is going to require some substantial water flows. I would like to see proof of that water flow prior to any permitting.

Tom Ancona – Assistant fire chief for Ketchum, I have looked at 3 projects of the unincorporated areas of Blaine County in the last 2 years. There seems to be one common note, once we try to meet fire code requirements for the project or decrease the fire flow requirements by sprinkling the building or if we go over 30 units of residency we have to have 2 separate exits to the project by the International Fire Code. That no longer becomes low-income housing, we have seen this in the last couple of projects I have looked at and they haven't gone through. In wood frame construction, under the International Fire Code the minimum flow rate that they would accept under any circumstances is 1200 gallons a minute. The only way to decrease that by fire code is by sprinkling the building, then once we do that they are no longer low-income homes. I can decrease the fire flow by code by 50% by fire sprinklers in the building. It makes it difficult to continue the low-income housing when we start talking about those types of things. 600 gallons a minute is very close to what the Cold Springs subdivision has in their system. If we look at the other rules that are in our county ordinances, if we have more than 1 structure on 1 building lot that are closer than 50' we have to add them all in as one single building. If we have a building lot and build 5 structures on it closer than 50' all those structures add up to 1 structure of square footage. If they are on separate building lots then they don't have to.

Rachel – Including the distance between them or no?

Tom Ancona – If you own a building lot and it's a single building lot and you build a home on it, then you decide you want an ADU on it. If that ADU is within 50' of your structure then it is considered 1 structure and that is by Blaine County Ordinance. If we have one project, it is one piece of property, and it is 20 units that are closer than 50' together then we have to add all the structures square footages up and consider them as 1 unit.

Rachel – What is Cold Springs water flow?

Tom Ancona – Between 500 & 600 gallons a minute. It is difficult to get fire flows around 600 gallons a minute from a well system. I keep seeing these projects come over my desk where people have these types of proposals. What we end up with is by the time we add in all the requirements that it is going to take to make this safe and legal; it is no longer low-income housing.

Pat – What did you say the requirement is for GPM?

Tom Ancona – The International Fire Code goes by size and structure, from 0 – up to 1,200 sq. ft. of a wood frame house, the minimum they require is 1,200 gallons a minute. The only way we can reduce that International Fire Code requirement is if we can decrease it by 50% by sprinkling.

Pat – Is that what you did with Cold Springs?

Tom Ancona – When Cold Springs was built I am not even sure we were under the International Fire Code.

Pat – Was Cold Springs different because it is not stick?

Tom Ancona – It is stick buildings; Cold Springs Subdivision not Cold Springs Crossing.

Wally Huffman – 101 River Rock Rd. I am not opposed to the concept of trying to create middle-income housing. After we got through, which thought was low-income housing, once we got to middle-income housing I thought that was a pretty nice solution. The problem is we are mapping areas in the county that would be subject to this zoning regulation. All of the high-density projects that were presented already have water, sewer, & infrastructure solutions. They have either city water or sewer. What is happening here is you have heard the fire people talk about 1 aspect of infrastructure that would be needed. The problem with doing this in the county is that there is not infrastructure on those properties that would make this economically feasible. I am talking about roads, fire, water, and access to highways. Are you just going to kick all of those infrastructures decisions down the road and create all of these decisions about access, bike path, water, sewer, fire protection, or some other county dept. There probably isn't a way to deal with them. It isn't the concept that bothers me; it is we are doing this on the wrong pieces of land. It needs to be done by the cities in the cities where all those infrastructure problems have already been addressed. You go ahead and do this, it is going to create all kinds of problems down the road when we start talking about access to the highways, fire, water, sewer, and impacts on neighboring properties that are rural and have played by the rules for the last 50 years.

Joe Fritsch – I live in the Southern Comfort subdivision, we have encountered various proposals over a lot of years to develop, in our case this South gateway triangle area. I am not against affordable or middle-income housing I think what has happened to housing nationally is it is out of control, it is very disadvantageous to young families. What has bothered me throughout this process is the idea that on 80 or 90-acre parcel we would effectively create an environment that would double the residence size of Ketchum, which would be its main service area. This ties into what someone prior was saying, the infrastructure that is needed to do that is huge. On 13 units per acre on 80 or 90 acres you are putting in about 1,200 family units. If Ketchum is at all

like the rest of the country about 2.7 people per unit that's over 3,000 people going in that little area. That vision is troublesome I don't know how the community would accommodate that.

Larry Schoen – Could the staff put up the GIS map and click the wellhead protection area and the public wells. I am speaking against this proposal. (His 2 ½-page public comment letter is on file with the application. He read the letter in its entirety.)

Sarah Michael – Former County Commissioner who lead the Blaine County 2025 during a time when former commissioner Schoen was on the chair for Planning & Zoning Commissioner then became County Commissioner. At the time we amended 18 zoning ordinances to make it clear, except in the South Gateway area where potentially there could be central sewer and water, that high-density housing and planned unit developments were not appropriate in the unincorporated county. Affordable housing was a crisis then just as it is now. The Planning & Zoning Commission and the County Commissioners looked all over the county including these areas as opportunities. We rejected all of them except for the Gateway because they were too far from schools, fire, no central sewer, impact on roads, and the cost of services. The Gateway area was the only area that could possibly meet the criteria of the Comprehensive Plan and it is still the only area. In the staff report on page 8 it states, a positive recommendation on the proposed SUR district requires a finding that is in general conformance with the Comprehensive Plan and that there is no adverse impacts on public services. Here are a few areas where the Comprehensive Plan states that housing should be close to jobs and services. Where small residential units are appropriate in areas of light industrial and close to hospital, school, and a reasonable distance to major transportation corridors, Mountain Rides and the Wood River trail. The transportation section of the Comprehensive Plan states, new land use development should be within or adjacent to cities, to increase the opportunities for walking, bicycling, transit ridership, and to reduce the impact on vehicle use. The plan states that denser housing should be located in and near areas where municipal and private infrastructure and services such as water, sewer, and transit exists. I pulled those statements out of the Comprehensive Plan. The proposal should be voted down; there is no amount of edits that can make this conform to 45 years of history where the county has said urban density is in the cities. From my experience it doesn't come close. It doesn't guarantee our current workforce will have affordable places to live; there is no matrix that demonstrates having a residency requirements will result in reasonably priced housing. Old Cutters with 1200 sq. ft. units started out at \$194,000.00 and went up to \$320,000.00. We know deed restrictions keep housing affordable for generations. We need to have zoning districts that are clear to all interested parties. The Cove Ranch was a 360-units PUD. It claimed it would result in affordable housing; we looked at the comprehensive plan and said that type of density does not belong in the county. Our zoning ordinances are clear. If this passes how many developers will say we can build in all these areas, the P&Z Commission and the fire district say we can't service that unless you build a new fire department. These are in the wrong places and I would encourage the applicants to focus their energy working with the city of Bellevue, they have 2-annexation requests. They are working to allow tiny homes on smaller lots, work with Sun Valley sewer and water district to consider sewer to the Gateway area and commit to deed restricted housing. Ask Tim Graves for a legal assessment whether these areas can possibly meet the standards of the comprehensive plan. Ask the city of Hailey, Bellevue, and their staff do they want to have this level of density in their area north and south of them with the potential water quality. I hope you vote this down.

Rachel – Has everyone spoken that wants to before I close public comment? Public comment is closed.

David Patrie – As a 20 year proponent for low and middle income housing I wish I had a dollar for every responsible citizens committee I met with and for every person I have come across and told me there is a better way to do this affordable housing thing. This is a problem in Blaine County and we have to find a way to overcome this. The zoning & development process covers a lot of concerns. There is no risk in passing this tonight, if you pass this tonight there is nothing that can happen until someone comes in and does a re-zone application. This is enabling legislation and enables a landowner to come to you as long as they meet the descriptive requirement of where this zone can be applied. Then they come to you with a re-zone requirement, and then it goes through the process. We can't do that because every property has its own characteristics. If you pass this tonight no one can develop anything tomorrow or anytime in the future until this body takes further action to do a zoning map amendment and grants a re-zone. These are some things you will be required to do during that. The applicant will need a site-specific re-zone application and that is where this body and the BCC as well will evaluate the appropriateness, project location, and the characteristics of the project. We think this is where the design review standards should come in because we think if there is a proposal from a group of business in the light industrial area, we think different design standards should be applied there opposed to an applicant in the Pergine Ranch area. Two different parts in the county where different standards are required. You are going to be able to do that because under your own code in order to approve a re-zone this is where you consider things like locations, elevations, traffic, parking, open space, and other public spaces. You have 12 different criteria in that, one is what extent are the public health, safety, and welfare adversely effected by the reclassification. If it is adversely affected you can throw it out based on that one criteria alone. You can say this is going to be conditioned on a development agreement. This is where a lot of concerns are coming from, the additional standards for a development agreement re-zone says will not adversely impact public services such as fire, water sewer, police, schools, transportation, or other entities or where the impact requirements need to be added beyond those required by any other county ordinances. Until someone comes in with an application, that's when you review all the materials. We are under supplied on every type of housing except for high end. We have eliminated the remoteness, within a mile of the highway, which is not very far. By definition those areas are currently served by public services. A 1/3 of the housing stock is in the unincorporated Blaine County that is true as far back as the 1980's census. We have a housing problem and we are not going to solve it if we say this is the cities' problem. There are deed restrictions in the county, which do not have income related to them they are solely occupancy requirements. They work and they are 100% enforceable and exist in the county now.

Rachel – Would the Blaine County Housing Authority enforce that for the county?

David Patrie – They do, an annual survey of all homes in their stewardship asking the people are you living in your home. If [eople lie they find out and take enforcement action.

Rachel – Are there required payments to Blaine County Housing Authority to cover cost?

David Patrie – The County does support the housing authority financially, which is part of the contracted services, yes.

Pat – What would be an enforcement action?

David Patrie – They start at restricting the appreciation value requiring specific performance through the legal system to the contract. If it goes on, it makes its way to a sell. The housing authority has that ability in the covenants if someone is not living up to the terms of it. The area in the Gateway is roughly 40 acres, about 10 of it are developed, and about 25 of it is developable.

You also take off the scenic highway overlay and other setbacks. I heard public comment about the feasibility. That is not this commission's job.

Harry Griffin – I think we have been responsive to public input we have had. We have crafted an ordinance which reflects what we believe the concerns are. Before we even drafted our first version of this we ran a lot of numbers looking at different pieces of property. We believe smart development, new technology, and this proposal can provide the platform for middle-income housing. The proposed process provides for citizens input, there are checks and balances throughout the process. The reason we pursued this is we need some new tools, new ways of thinking, and we need to stop living in the past.

Rachel – Kathy can you let us know what protections the wellhead district provides.

Kathy – (Shows a slide of wellhead properties.) The wellhead protection district regulates proposals mostly for conditional use permits that are non-residential.

Larry Schoen – Is this not a text amendment to Title 9 Zoning Code of Blaine County?

Rachel – Yes it is.

Larry Schoen – There was a statement made that if you pass this language and the BCC passes this language then you would seek a re-zone before you started a development application, a re-zone application, or a development agreement. Is this not a re-zone?

Rachel – This is only an adoption of a section of the code. If you want to have this zoning district applied to your property you would have to apply for a re-zone map amendment. If we were to adopt this chapter it would not apply to any property in Blaine County. If you wanted it to apply to your property you would have to apply for a re-zone.

Larry Schoen – Is it an overlay district?

Rachel – No

Pat – I spent a lot of time with staff, I went from being opposed to a text amendment to being gray. It isn't a re-zone it is the opportunity to re-zone. None of the arguments has changed so I want to factor that out, because we need community housing. Tonight I heard the ACI question; I heard Tom Ancona's concern that they can't provide services. That is one of our concerns with the comp. plan. When the comp. plan says that housing is supposed to be located close to jobs and services. Some areas are not even close to jobs or services. We have had a discussion provided by Craig at South Central Public Health. What I heard him say was it is possible to look at something with septic in the South Gateway area. There are variances with everything, but there are not variances with the requirement under our current community-housing overlay, it has to be hooked to sewer and water, no variances. If we change that zoning it changes the code and puts us in an unknown area. I would be leaning against any changes.

Ned – I thought we were going to see something new to the county in the form of tiny homes or something. After looking at it deeper these are regular market rate homes. Those are not small homes including garages, carport, and storage areas. If you add a garage to a 1500 sq. ft. home and I think a lot of middle-income people would like a 2-car garage. When you add in all the driveways, space between the houses, you don't get very many units on an acre. I am not convinced that this is a good solution to the affordable housing crises we have. I am concerned

about the lack of any sort of deed restriction and also water quality. I would not like to see this go forward.

Susan – The public comment has varied from meeting to meeting depending on who is in the room and how much background they have on the discussions we have had. I think we have provided guidance to what we would be comfortable with and I don't think the deed restriction requirement is the way of ensuring that these small, affordable homes are truly going to be for people who work and live in this valley. I think there has to be some greater requirement than what you have on residency. I think if someone is in a small house and has a family they may want to move out. I struggle with the map with the zones stretching up and down the corridor; I do believe the higher density housing needs to be more concentrated in the urban area. I agree with David, it is not happening very fast and to a great extent. There needs to be some collaboration between the communities and the county on this topic. You could end up with high-density housing outside of the urban areas without annexation, which to me is a problem. It seems to me if this was honed in tighter it might work. I don't think the south Gateway area is the only place this is good for, things have changed, there are new developments in the county, but it seems to me tightening up the zones that would be part of the text amendment and dealing with the residency requirement would make sense to me. My decision tonight would be no based on this proposal.

Rachel – Do you think it could be amended?

Susan – I said that before, but I think they struggle with a county prospective versus them trying to filter through with what they see as economically viable.

Mike – A lot of the decisions that were made with annexations, now the developer is looking for a way out of it and the cost to the residents goes up. My main point is I have a problem with who is going to cover the cost of all of the infrastructure that is needed in these areas. The septic issues are a big problem. There was talk about getting away with septic system and having their own water and waste systems. I don't see adequate water and pressure happening on individual wells, I think that can only happen on municipal systems. I am not seeing anyway of modifying these to get close to what is needed.

Rachel – I personally feel that with some tweaks and a little honing in on the map I would be comfortable with approving it. I feel like a development agreement would cover a lot of our concerns about services and I would make some tweaks to the septic.

Pat – I make a motion to deny this text amendment.

Mike – Second

4 -1 agree (Rachel nay.)

Reports & Business

- A. Next meeting dates:** Special March 21, April 11 starts at 6:00 p.m., April 25
- B. Findings to be signed:**
- C. Determination of notice:**
- D. Discussion**

Adjourn

Pat - I make a motion to adjourn.

Susan – I second the motion.

Agree 5-0

The meeting adjourned at 8:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by:

Karen Osborne
Recording Secretary