

## **LAKESIDE COMMUNITY COUNCIL MEETING -- January 2010**

DATE: January 26, 2010      TIME: 7:00pm

PLACE: Lakeside Sewer District Meeting Room; 253 Bierney Creek Road in Lakeside

NOTICED: DIL Daybook; Posters in the Post Office, Library, and posted to the County P&Z website  
“Calendar Events” page and the LNPC website “Calendar” page.

### AGENDA:

1. Call to order
2. Agenda approval
3. Sign-in sheet
4. Approval of past meeting minutes:
  - a. December 29, 2009
5. Committee Reports or Guest Reports Requested by the Council (listed below, if a representative is available to present information)
  - a. Lakeside Neighborhood Plan Committee
  - b. Josh Townsley – wishes to speak to council about natural gas in Lakeside
  - c. Update on Lakefront park – status & plans
  - d. Parks Committee update on other parks
6. Public Comment
7. Official county business items (listed below, if any are scheduled)
  - a. None received to-date.
8. Procedural discussions or items (listed below, if any are scheduled)
  - a. LCC Bylaws
  - b. Expiring Council member’s terms & election to fill vacant seats
9. Meeting adjourned

### MINUTES:

#### Attendance:

- Council Members Attending: Barb Miller, Gregg Schoh, Keith Brown, Rex Boller, Mike Wilson, Brent Hall, Janet Heinze
- Council Members not in Attendance: none
- P&Z Staff Attending: Andrew Hagemeyer
- Public: Rich & Jan Williams, John Ulrich, Mayre Flowers, Jasmine Linabary (WSN), Courtney Carrier, Mark & Tamara Tanberg, Gene Shellerud, Bruce Ennis, Maggie Davis, Noel Bartlett, Steve Rosso, Sue Handy

1. Meeting called to order at 7:00pm.
2. Barb motioned, Gregg seconded and motion carried unanimously to move the LNPC status update to be last, instead of first of the Committee Reports.
3. Sign-in sheet completed
4. Janet motioned, Brent seconded and motion unanimously passed to approve meeting minutes from 12/29/2009.

5. Committee or Guest reports:

- a. Josh Townsley could not attend, but had sent some notes to Keith, who related them to the Council. Josh is interested in having Northwest Energy bring natural gas to Lakeside. Currently, it is as far as Spring Creek Road. Existing pipe would need expansion to come further south. A proposal is in the early stages of analyzing costs, feasibility, etc. Currently, propane is \$2.70/gallon whereas natural gas is \$1.04/gallon. Cost to bring the pipe to Lakeside is about \$100,000 per mile or about \$500,000 total. Individual hook-ups would be \$1,000-\$1,200 per 100 feet; this would be the property owner's cost. The proposal would be to form a co-op; the co-op gets paid back as lines go in and landowners pay hook-up costs and then NW Energy takes over the system. Josh would like the Community Council to help gauge community interest. Public would need education on the subject. Josh would create a petition for people to sign. Suggest having NW Energy come to February meeting. Publicize this in Lakeside-Somers Voice & on website – maybe some posters around town. Keith will convey to Josh that Council support further action and will assist.
- b. Maggie Davis gave an update on the lakeside park under construction. (See summary at end of meeting minutes.)
  - i. Existing structures have been removed – sections of the motel donated to YWAM and the front building (office, common room, & living quarters), donated to the Lakeside Community Church. They are working with MDT to expand crosswalks (additional striping, etc.) at Adams & Hwy 93. Will have sidewalks on both 93 and Adams. Will be reducing the number of docks from three to two (60 feet in length) and putting in a swim platform. Bathrooms are for seasonal use only (will be winterized & locked in winter). Parks Dept. will maintain the park. Maggie requested a letter of support to the Commissioners from the Council – there is a need to make some improvements on County property. The project only needs a Lakeshore Protection permit; not a variance and this is in process. Barb moved, Rex seconded and motion unanimously carried for the LCC to compose & send a letter of support of the project to the Commissioners.
  - ii. Noel Bartlett, property owner next to the proposed park, expressed the following concerns:
    1. Impacts to current owners in the area – 90 residences adjoin or within ½ block of the park. (NOTE: the number of residences quoted is high for the actual number of single family residences in the area and Council thinks it probably includes the number of individual condo units in the Waterside Condo development and the condos just south of Adams Street).
    2. Concern for property values and owners' ability to enjoy their own property quietly and privately.
    3. Potential for trash, drugs, alcohol; no monitoring or park host
    4. Noise – this will be public – open to all – not just Lakeside
    5. Already have plenty of parks in the Lakeside Somers area & a state park 5 miles south
    6. Increased traffic; lack of parking – could be as bad as Somers where he counted 225 cars & cars not only in lots, but were lining both sides of the road – safety issues.

- iii. Several members of the Council expressed the significant support from the community including both comments received personally by Council members, letters to the editor appearing in local news media, and 2008 survey results (650 households and almost 1500 residents & property owners supporting additional parks & open space and public lake access)
    - c. Tamara Tanberg gave a brief update on the Parks Committee.
      - i. The committee is getting great feedback on the proposed park on the lake.
      - ii. Playground equipment installed at Ben Williams & is being used.
      - iii. Committee is looking at tennis courts for Ben Williams – fund raising will be necessary.
      - iv. In the future, it may be possible for the County to have a Parks Host that could handle both the lakefront park and Ben Williams park.
    - d. Barb Miller highlighted updates made to the Neighborhood Plan between the October 7, 2009 Planning Board Workshop and now. A detailed list of changes made appears at end of these minutes. Discussion ensued regarding next steps and whether to amend the Plan as recommended and send to the County now or wait until the February meeting. Keith read a letter from Bruce Young (attached at end of minutes), expressing his concerns over the Suburban Mixed land use designation in the Plan. After much discussion, Brent called the question, Gregg seconded it and unanimously passed to call the question. Gregg motioned, Janet seconded and motion carried unanimously to:
      - i. Incorporate list of changes into the plan document
      - ii. Make disc copies of the plan (both tracked changes on and changes accepted versions and the list of changes) and give to LCC members well in advance of 2/23 meeting
      - iii. Publish same on website and advertise via Lakeside-Somers Voice and news media that the revised Plan is available on LNPC’s website for the community to view and if they have comments to send them to the LCC – this is NOT a formal comment period, but if any comments are submitted, Council will consider them.
      - iv. LCC members will review the plan and will consider approval of the Plan and forwarding it to the County in the February 23 meeting.
6. Public Comment: Mayre Flowers announced a seminar “Sustaining Water Quality Through Land Use Planning”, Feb. 8-9, 9am-4pm, Red Lion Inn; \$15/day to cover lunch. Also, there will be a free public presentation at the Lakeside Community Chapel, 7-9pm on February 9. On February 10, also at the Red Lion, 8:30-12:15pm, is a session on “Lessons from Lake Tahoe: Aquatic Invasive Species”
7. Official County Business: none
8. Procedural items
- a. Barb motioned, Mike seconded and motion carried unanimously to defer discussion on By-Laws to February 23 meeting of LCC.
  - b. Keith summarized the seats expiring in May and the election process. Several people have either already filed for candidacy or are planning to.
9. Greg motioned, Brent seconded and motion unanimously passed to adjourn the meeting.

Lakeside Community Council meeting – 26 January 2010, 7 pm.

Park in Lakeside plans and update.

The proposed park at the NE corner of Hwy 93 S and Adams St. was first presented to the LCC at its 28 Oct 2008 meeting. Here is a quote from the information sheet that was passed out then.

\*\*\*\*\*

*The following elements are important to the donors of this parkland:*

1. *Paved sidewalks on Hwy 93 and Adams St.*
2. *Paved passenger vehicle parking, NO boat trailer parking*
3. *Separate access and egress to the parking from Adams St*
4. *NO boat dock, boat launch, swim platform, or major structure on the Mattson shoreline unless the park were to have substantially more contiguous frontage on the lake.*
5. *ADA accessible paths and parking*

*This information was presented to the Lakeside Parks Advisory Committee on Aug 7, 2008. At that meeting, the committee members voted to support the concept of a park on the Mattson property.*

\*\*\*\*\*

I am pleased to report that this park plan meets those goals. The most significant change from the earlier proposal was been the addition of the Bayshore Resort Motel property. Together with the existing Adams St. ramp/swim area and public dock, the park will have approximately 190 contiguous front feet on the lake, compared to the 2008 concept that had 68+ front feet.

Bruce Boody Landscape Architects of Whitefish in cooperation with Robert Peccia & Associates and Architects Design Group, both of Kalispell, have developed plans that meet the permitting requirements of a wide range of government agencies. However, foremost were the needs and expectations of the Lakeside community for a safer, larger, more versatile, and pleasant public park on Flathead Lead.

In the past 18 months we have enjoyed productive working relationships with the Lakeside Parks Advisory committee, Flathead County Parks Board and staff, Lakeside Water and Sewer, other local and state officials, and Lakeside residents. Many constructive ideas have been considered along the way.

We are requesting that the Lakeside Community Council go on record in support of the plans presented this evening. A letter to the County Commission supporting both the Lakeshore improvements, which include work on the county-owned Adams St. site, and Flathead County's acquisition and maintenance of a public park at this location would facilitate the timely construction of the park's amenities.

Bruce L Ennis & Margaret S Davis, PO Box 788, Lakeside MT 59922, blems@aol.com

## CHANGES MADE TO NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN DOC SINCE 10/7/2009 PLANNING BOARD WORKSHOP

CHANGE	SUGGESTION FROM or REQUESTED BY...
(1) Miscellaneous grammar, spelling, verb tense throughout	LNPC
(2) Change year in document title & throughout to 2010 (“Lakeside Neighborhood Plan 2010”); Change document effective date from October 7, 2009 to January 25, 2010 on title page and in footnotes throughout.	LNPC
(3) Add statement that Plan is non-regulatory (adopted same language as in Bigfork Plan). Statement added in both “Preface” and “Land Use” chapters of the Plan.	Planning Board Workshop
(4) Add a table that compares requirements specified in the county’s Growth Policy to contents of the 1994 and contents of the 2010 Plan to illustrate the changes needed in the 2010 Plan to comply with the Growth Policy	LNPC
(5) Dates were added to the description of the process used by the LNPC to gather input and create the Plan.	Planning Board Workshop
(6) Added a step to the process used regarding the creation and use of the Yahoo Group as a mail distribution list, scheduling tool, and document sharing tool.	Planning Board Workshop
(7) Corrected the survey statistics regarding number of surveys sent and returned and the rate of return.	Based on updated input received from the Mail Room regarding the first mailing of the survey.
(8) Added emphasis regarding the proposed community-wide zoning effort: It is aimed areas that are currently unzoned and existing zoning districts would not be impacted with the exception that downtown zoning district would be re-evaluated by a sub-committee (Town Center Development Plan Committee) of the Community Council.	A citizen from the Community.
(9) Corrected labels and percents reported in the chart depicting the GAP between importance and satisfaction ratings of 20 features of the Lakeside Community that were input to the Community Vision Statement. Also added an explanation of the Gap results and how they should be interpreted.	A citizen from the Community
(10) Added explanation regarding seeming conflict between aging population and overcrowding of schools (large area covered by the school district – more students come from Somers and areas south of Kalispell than from the Lakeside Planning area.	Planning Board Workshop
(11) Revised Policy 1.1: a. FROM: Discourage any further commercial development along Hwy 93 north or south of the downtown Lakeside area b. TO: Protect views and promote safety along Hwy 93 by promoting commercial development off the highway and encouraging mitigation of commercial development using typical techniques such as minimizing mass & soze, appropriate signs, clustering.....etc.	Planning Board Workshop

(12) Added several policies for commercial development encouraging frontage roads, encouraging commercial development in existing nodes but not in “strip” patterns, and placing light industrial in areas where safety & quality of life of residents is not adversely impacted, and discouraging heavy industrial development in the planning area.	Adapted from the Bigfork plan.
(13) Deleted policies (2.2 & 2.3), which discouraged business types not supported by the community and which recommended improving the appearance of the town center.	Planning Board Workshop
(14) 5.1.4.1 A) I): added statement that community desires connectivity of roads from Deer Creek to Blacktail to reduce local traffic on Hwy 93.	LNPC
(15) 5.1.4.2 1): Changed “neighborhood commercial” to “home-based businesses” in statement below and throughout the Plan: “Home-based businesses”, (small in scale and compatible with the neighborhood in which it resides), is acceptable anywhere in the plan area except along Highway 93.”	LNPC
(16) Roads & Highways chapter 5.2: delete the reference to future county improvements to Grayling Hill Rd. – this work has now been completed.	LNPC
(17) Roads & Highways chapter 5.2: reference the county draft transportation plan. Note that it was found that this transportation plan did not study the Lakeside area and contains no recommendations for the area. LNPC did send the engineers a copy of the Roads and Highways chapter from the Lakeside Plan.	Planning Board Workshop
(18) 5.2: In implementation strategies for Roads & Highways, added reference to subdivision regulations regarding requirement for bike & pedestrian easements for collector and arterial roads.	Planning Board Workshop
(19) Parks, Lake & Recreation chapter 5.3: Added reference to the new lakefront park donated by a couple in Lakeside.	LNPC
(20) Emergency Services Chapter 5.4: Added reference to the land donated for a new facility for the QRU.	LNPC
(21) Figures 16, 17, 18 in section on Water/Sewer supplied by LCWSD: requested to add a legend or text explaining the blue, white and pink areas in these three charts. <b>(NOTE: When verifying this with Jim Heim, he has indicated that these charts were made before the economic downturn and reflect more aggressive growth than we are experiencing – he may ask that we drop these charts or come up with other information.)</b>	Public comments at the 1/25/2010 LNPC meeting
(22) 5.5.1.2: reference to new development connecting to District sewer was expanded to add “or connect to a centrally implemented and shared system” in this section of the plan and throughout the document.	LNPC
(23) 5.5.1.2: reference to agreement with Eagle’s Crest system deleted and replaced by a general statement that LCWSD prefers an approach where the developer implements the sewer system to LCWSD specifications and then annexes the system to LCWSD for operation and maintenances.	Citizens for a Better Flathead (CBF)
(24) 5.5.3.3 Goals/Policies for solid waste: reference and adopt the Growth Policy Goal 26 and its policies regarding provision “of cost effective solid	CBF

waste collection, transport, and safe, environmentally responsible disposal to all communities”.	
(25) Add consideration of incorporation into the plan document... added the following: “The 1994 Plan considered Incorporation of the area as a possible alternative to the Community Council approach, but opted for the Council because it was elected and might have more standing with county officials. There was no community support for incorporation.  Since the 1994 Plan, the Lakeside Community Council has discussed possible incorporation on several occasions, but found that it did not make economic sense due to population density and the tax base. Future reviews of the Plan should continue to revisit the possibility in case conditions or criteria change to make incorporation more viable.”	Planning Board Workshop
(26) 5.8 Community Council section: #10 under 1994 Plan recommendations: Revised the wording regarding a golf course in Eagle’s Crest to : “The developer of The Lakeside Club (a.k.a., Eagle’s Crest) has included a golf course in the master plan for further development, but an application for subdivision is not currently in process for these future phases of development.”	CBF
(27) 5.8 Community Council section issue #1, statement regarding monitoring & enforcing zoning regulations: corrected to say: “The county Planning and Zoning office is responsible for the enforcement of zoning regulations, but they do not have resources for monitoring compliance. Community citizens can report incidents to P&Z, but action may or may not be taken.”	Planning Board Workshop
(28) 5.8 Community Council section issue #5: Add an update on the status of past LCC minutes: “In the fall of 2009, the Council collected past minutes where available and copies are now updated and maintained in the Library in Lakeside. In addition, The Council is now sending copies of their approved meeting minutes to the Planning and Zoning department so they are easily available to the Planning Board, Commissioners, and the public.”	LNPC
(29) 5.8 Community council Policy 10.2... add the sentence “The Council is responsible to post notice of meetings per county policies and MT Open Meeting Laws.”	CBF
(30) 5.9 Natural Resources: Add some statistics from survey results regarding the percentages of respondents to identified natural resources in their list of top three features of Lakeside: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lake access and quality ranked 1st with 35.5% of respondents placing it in their top 3.</li> <li>• Bike/walk paths ranked 4th with 20.7%</li> <li>• Views ranked 7<sup>th</sup> with 12.9%</li> <li>• Open spaces and parks ranked 9<sup>th</sup> with 11.5%</li> <li>• Nature and wildlife ranked 13<sup>th</sup> with 8.9%</li> <li>• Availability of recreation ranked 17<sup>th</sup> with 5.6%</li> </ul>	LNPC and CBF
(31) 5.9 Natural Resources: Added/adopted some introductory text from the Bigfork Plan regarding the importance of natural resources and its potential	LNPC

conflict with development.	
(32) 5.9 Natural Resources – paragraph on Groundwater: a. The detailed statements on groundwater need a source statement. The info came from Bruce, and he has been asked to supply us with the source for these details, but has not yet responded. Without a source, we should not print these specific details but could be more general in the statement – e.g., groundwater depth varies greatly throughout the planning area. b. Added information on the Bigfork implementation of a storm water runoff district and added information that LCWSD is exploring a similar implementation for Lakeside. c. Added reference to county requirements for developers to handle run off.	LNPC
(33) 5.9 Natural resources: added a map depicting potential areas for steep slopes along with statements: “The map below depicts areas within the community where steep slopes may be encountered. The map is intended as illustrative only. Specific sites should be evaluated individually to determine actual degree of slope.”	CBF
(34) 5.9.1.4 Wildlife section: Added statement that the plan concedes that the entire planning area is sensitive to wildlife of one kind or another and therefore a wildlife habitat map is not needed in the plan. Added: “Growth and development must be sensitive to preserving wildlife habitat and winter and summer ranges of wildlife in the planning area. Developers, residents and visitors alike are encouraged to visit the Fish, Wildlife and Parks website and explore information and guidelines provided there - <a href="http://fwp.mt.gov/default.html">http://fwp.mt.gov/default.html</a> . Various statewide maps are also available on this website.”	Dept of Fish Wildlife & Parks
(35) Added Goal 12 and policies regarding storm water run off and encouraging developers to mitigate & comply with county/state regs.; added policy to consider implementation of a water quality overlay district for the planning area.	CBF
(36) Added Goal 13 and policies regarding clustering to leave open space and protect wildlife	CBF & LNPC
(37) 5.9.4 Natural Resources, Implementation Strategies: added actions for community council to support the storm water run off district, support implementation of a water quality overlay district, review development apps with critical assessment of Lake impacts and environmental impacts with a critical eye toward mitigation of impacts.	CBF
(38) 5.10.1.4 Anticipated housing growth: added “It is important to note that the current economy may cause the growth rate to be less than 3-4%. This plan should be reviewed (at least every 5 years, per Growth Policy guidelines), and the growth rate should be re-evaluated based on actual data available.”	Planning Board Workshop
(39) Table 5-15 – Corrected housing counts for subdivisions with preliminary approval to reflect withdrawal of Eagle’s Crest Phases 5-9.	CBF
(40) 5.10.3 Goals policies for housing referencing affordability and adding several policies adapted from the Bigfork plan regarding residential development that protects open spaces, promotes roadway connectivity, maintains Lakeside character, protects wildlife & water quality, use of public or centralized/shared water/sewer, avoid flood plains and steep slopes,	Planning Board Workshop & LNPC

encourage clustered design.	
(41) 6.1.7: Revised the description of current status for Eagle’s Crest and included description of compromises the developer is willing to make. Max number of dwelling or commercial units to 941 with a max average density of the whole area to be 1 unit per 2.4 acres; public sewer & community water system throughout, use of clustered design for open space, keeping higher density closer to Hwy 93, implement zoning in support of the Neighborhood Plan, continue use of covenants specifying guest houses cannot be leased.	LNPC
(42) 6.2 Land Use Issues/Opportunities, #1: added characteristics of “small town atmosphere” as provided by input given in community workshops.	Planning Board Workshop
(43) 6.2 Issue #9 – added Baldy fire as example wildfire risk in the area	Planning Board Workshop
(44) Figure 6.3: Clarified that the Wildland Urban Interface map is 2005 map	CBF
(45) 6.2 Issue #16: rephrased issue: “Unzoned Land is unprotected from development incompatible with the Community vision and small town, rural character.”	Planning Board Workshop
(46) 6.3 Land Use Goals & Policies: repeated that an NP is non-regulatory.	Planning Board Workshop
(47) Goal 15 & policies: referenced future zoning and the future results of the Town Center Development Plan as providing guidelines for these policies	Planning Board Workshop
(48) Changes policy 18.2 (old # 16.3): FROM: “Discourage PUDs on the waterfront.” TO: “Discourage high density development on the waterfront to preserve site lines through properties and protect the lake”	Planning Board Workshop
(49) Goal 21 (old #19) added phrase at end: “Improve community involvement in the development review and approval process so that it more effectively addresses the concerns of the Lakeside Community <b>by involving the community in a community-wide zoning effort following county processes for zoning.</b> ”	Planning Board Workshop
(50) 6.4 Future Land Use: added statement to recognize that some shifting of boundaries may occur when moving from NP to zoning. Soften the statement about use of the NP in decisions to read: “To the extent possible, however, this plan proposes that decisions made are based on the future land use descriptions and the future land use map in this neighborhood plan.”	Planning Board Workshop
(51) 6.4 Future Land Use: Acknowledge that the north border of the planning area splits the Spring Creek Zoning district and clarify that the NP to which a landowner defers to is solely based on location of the property – south of Spring Creek is Lakeside; north is Somers (should they ever get an NP and Advisory committee)	Citizen of the Community
(52) Through out 6.4 future land use and Land Use Designations: change “average” density to “maximum” density. Acknowledge that land use boundaries on the Land Use Map are based on parcel boundaries.	Planning Board Workshop
(53) Replaced the Future Land Use map, incorporating two changes: a. Add to Suburban Mixed designation (tan) the small triangle of land at the east side of Eagle’s Crest and the west side of Hwy 93. b. Add detailed parcel layouts to Eagle’s Crest and other subdivisions with preliminary approval.	LNPC
(54) Land Use Designations:	Planning Board Workshop

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Change wording on PUD’s in all designations to “Planned Unit Developments may be acceptable, if zoned, per county zoning regulations.”</li> <li>b. Change “average” to “maximum” density.</li> <li>c. Change suburban mixed to reflect part of section 20 included, maximum of 1 unit per 2.4 acre density, use of clustered design, connection to public sewer and community water, light commercial development associated with private airport &amp; golf course allowed, multi-family limited to 10% of the total units allowable in the designation.</li> </ul>	<p>&amp; LNPC</p>
<p>(55) Delete the summary comparison chart of land use designations due to confusion in interpretation.</p>	<p>LNPC</p>
<p>(56) 6.5.1. Community Council Action # 3 changed:  FROM: Implement a neighborhood-wide zoning or facilitate zoning by individual group.  TO: Lakeside Community Council to lead a neighborhood-wide zoning effort or facilitate zoning by individual groups as proposed in 6.5.2 below</p>	<p>Planning Board Workshop</p>
<p>(57) Delete appendix A (1994 Plan)</p>	<p>P&amp;Z</p>
<p>(58) Appendix B (old C): change to delete links and state the docs can be obtained from P&amp;Z</p>	<p>P&amp;Z</p>
<p>(59) Added appendix H – timeline for committee work to develop plan</p>	<p>LNPC</p>
<p>(60) Added appendix I – evolution of the plan document depicting when the various sections of the plan were first drafted</p>	<p>LNPC</p>

Lakeside Community Council,

Public Process-Planning for Lakeside January 26, 2010

The Lakeside Neighborhood Plan being submitted attempts to negotiate with one large land owner a suburban density for an area of land that is clearly by all standards, rural residential. In the neighborhood surveys, a large majority of those who responded on a blank page said "No" to the now failed proposal of Eagle Crest 5-9. There is no plan submitted for that area.

Nowhere in the survey does it show that the people of Lakeside support such a large suburban development locating on a critical winter game range that could create a city the size of Polson and yet have no interior roads connecting to the community of Lakeside.

The proposal to make the area suburban residential is proported to be a compromise offered by the developer. My question is how does a neighborhood planning group enter into such an agreement when no plan has been submitted and where did we get that authority to do so?

This so called "compromise", on a plan that has not been submitted, puts the cart before the horse.

This land is rural residential land, as are its neighboring lands, and should be one house per 10 acres. This still leaves the developer an option to make this project a Planned Unit Development with densities as low as one home per 2.5 acres. This process assures a better preview of the major issues that come with massive development.

There currently is a glut of building lots available valley wide estimates are that there is a 20 to 30 year supply. There is no pressing need to sprawl Lakeside to the southwest with high density growth and our already unanswered traffic problems.

I hope that this community council supports a fair public process of planning where the developer submits a plan and the public has ample time to respond to said plan. So far there has been political planning with only one land owner. Offering a compromise to a neighborhood planning group, before any plan is submitted to the county planning office and public review, makes no sense. What standard of practice is this?

Last but not least is the need to make sure that Flathead Lake is protected from Storm drainage from all development. In Lake Tahoe they are now spending 3 plus Billion dollars to clean up that lake. A major pollution of Tahoe's clarity problems come from fine silt associated with roadbuilding and excavation for homesites. Storm drainage.

If this council is to error, please error on the side of caution when it comes to high density development on marginal soils with steep slopes along Flathead Lake.

When it comes to water ..... an ounce of prevention is worth a hundred pounds of cure.

Please send this plan back to the neighborhood planning group with the suggestion that planning boards at the county level do compromising with developers when and after a plan and information has been submitted in writing that allows public review and time to participate in the planning process. Thank You.

Member of Lakeside Neighborhood Planning Group

Bruce Young, Box 91, Lakeside, MT  
406-249-9787