

**FLATHEAD COUNTY PLANNING BOARD
WHITEFISH ZONING WORKSHOP MINUTES
APRIL 8, 2015**

**CALL TO
ORDER
6:06 pm**

A workshop of the Flathead County Planning Board was called to order at approximately 6:00 p.m. at the Earl Bennett Building, Conference Rooms A and B in Kalispell, Montana. Board members present were Kevin Lake, Jim Heim, Greg Stevens, Jeff Larsen, Ron Schlegel, Mike Horn, Dean Sirucek, Tim Calaway and Marie Hickey-AuClaire. BJ Grieve and Erik Mack represented the Flathead County Planning & Zoning Office.

There were approximately 20 people in the audience.

**PUBLIC
COMMENT ON
MATTERS THAT
ARE WITHIN
THE
JURISDICTION
OF THE
PLANNING
BOARD
(2-3-103 M.C.A.)
6:08 pm**

Charles Davis, 205 Barnes Lane, commented on establishing permanent zoning in the former Whitefish zoning area. He and his wife were speaking in support of the draft permanent zoning submitted for his area. He described the area where his property was located. The proposed R-2.5 zoning was similar to the Whitefish zoning which was in place when they purchased their property and built their home. Maintaining the zoning would protect their investment and preserve their expectations for the use of their home. The zoning was compatible with the residential use of the neighborhood and the surrounding areas. The area has become more residential in the last ten years. They encouraged the board and commissioners to complete the process and establish the R-2.5 zoning as shown in the draft Rural Whitefish Zoning map. He showed the area on the map where his property was located.

Ben Cavin, 2130 Houston Drive, pointed out where his property was located on the map for the board. He read his letter which had been previously given to the board. He was one of three directors of Houston Lakeshore Properties Owners against annexation. The association was formed to resist the threat of annexation by the city of Whitefish. They supported the continuation of R-1 zoning which was the current interim zoning. He had reviewed the details of R-1 and R-2 zoning and summarized the differences. His tract was not typically served by city utilities, lot size was typically around an acre, none of the lots had accessory dwelling units, and therefore R-1 zoning maintained the current character of the neighborhood. With smaller lots and the proliferation of accessory dwelling units (ADUs), there could be more dwelling units with R-2 as opposed to R-1. This would change the character of the neighborhood.

He had reviewed the maps and pointed out several discrepancies as to which jurisdiction regulated the property between their property and Whitefish Lake. He had talked to the directors of Stocking Tracts and they said they advocated for R-1 zoning for their tracts of land. He pointed out where Stocking Tracts was located.

Calaway and Cavin discussed if Cavin had looked at all the options for zoning and what Cavin's preference for zoning was.

Sirucek and Cavin discussed if there were lots smaller than one acre in Houston Tracts and who owned land there.

Cavin reviewed some of the history of the property.

Stevens said ADUs were allowed in R-1 zoning just as they were in R-2.

Cavin said that wasn't what was on the sheet he had received.

Stevens said the board had put ADUs in zoning down to R-1 and as a conditional use on lower zones.

Stevens, Cavin and Grieve discussed when Cavin had received the information from the Planning Office.

Hickey-AuClaire recognized a member of the public who had a question on which zones accessory dwellings were allowed.

Hickey-AuClaire and staff explained which zones allowed ADUs.

Grieve and Cavin clarified Cavin's information.

Rebecca Norton, 530 Scott Avenue, asked if everyone could hear her. She had asked for the microphone because the last time she spoke she was screaming her head off and was embarrassed about it. She was hoping the board could hear her and there was another man who had bilateral hearing aids so she asked if they would keep up the microphone at all times now for that purpose. She wanted to talk a little bit about process. She had some information for the board on spot zoning. As she had said in the past, even though she admired the boards outreach, they had not done any listening sessions in the Whitefish area at all. So, she felt there had been very little input into this process. Some of the board's decision making was based on one or two

public comments and that was it. They were impacting a great number of people's investments if they went through this and had one or two people's interest addressed but not a lot of public outreach to let other people know about it and determine whether or not it was going to impact their investment. She sent around a handout to the board. She had researched spot zoning which was very interesting because she had only heard about it at one public discussion in Whitefish. She said there were three criteria the board had to refer to. She had one thing to submit for the record from the office of the city attorney in Missoula. Basically it said you could still do spot zoning on some individual property so it was not always one way or the other. If only one person was benefiting, it could lead to lawsuits. She brought it up again this time because it seemed to her when she read through the commissioners' minutes, they did really want a listening session in Whitefish so that people could get involved and that had not been offered. Even though the board had reached out to the public, in a very nice way, very few people had actually shown up to give comment so she thought very few people knew what was going on. Because the property values in Whitefish were so high, and the people were very invested in how the community grew, she would like them to be cautious of committing to anything without more public outreach specifically in the Whitefish area which would allow people to easily come to the public meetings and look at the impact on their own property. She sent the information around to the board and then left it for the office to make it a part of the public record. The board probably knew a lot about spot zoning but she would like to them to be cautious about it.

Grieve asked Norton if she would like him to take her information and make copies for the board members at this time.

Norton said if Grieve wanted to.

Grieve said he wanted to do what Norton wanted him to do with the information.

Norton briefly summarized what was in the information.

Schlegel said he would like Grieve to take the information and copy it for the board members.

Grieve copied the information for the board.

Norton thanked the board for considering the information.

Steven Gordon, 5938 US Hwy 93 South, owner of the Bridge Medical Center, was here representing his neighborhood. They had, for the last ten years, been stuck in limbo with their planning. They were just finishing up what they were going to propose for light use in their neighborhood. Right now, they were zoned AG-5. He was on a one acre parcel and with the zoning restrictions he had built right out to his property lines. Things were out of wack. The majority of the properties in their district, which was basically Highway 40 to Coffee Traders, were businesses at this point. They were working on plans to protect the area and honor what the transition zones should be. They would be submitting their plans in the near future on behalf of their neighborhood. He felt that was all he needed to share at this point in time.

Calaway and Gordon discussed what Gordon's preference for light business uses along the highway corridor was and not getting back into the properties where it still might be AG-5.

Gordon said he had seen some issues over the 20 plus years he had been there. There were some nice, hundred year old homes in that area and because it was zoned AG-5, and because of the traffic, there was a one hundred year old farm house which had come down. Because the value was poor, this beautiful old house was replaced by a trailer. Having some value there to put quality, in a low volume way, was what they were looking at. They had someone representing what they were doing and would present details. He didn't know the zoning ins and outs to give them a specific answer on that right now.

Calaway and Gordon discussed what acreage Gordon was talking about which was one acre.

Stevens and Gordon discussed when the information would be available. It would be available in two weeks.

Sarah Nargi, 5850 Highway 93 South, owned Whitefish Plastic Surgery which was one of the businesses along the Highway 93 corridor. She wanted to support some of the things Gordon had said and give the board information from Dave DeGrandpre who was working on their project. DeGrandpre could not attend the workshop. He had sent her an email to say he was working on a proposal which was almost done. She read from the email.

'They would like a transitional zoning district providing a transition between agricultural land uses and commercial land uses to encourage appropriate land use along the highway corridor adjacent to urban centers, provide small, attractive, stand-alone professional and service related businesses generating low traffic volume and blending with residential areas to prevent the appearance and function of a commercial strip development.' She had copies of work DeGrandpre had done concerning the 2007 Growth Policy. His current proposal had a lot of the information. She wanted to give a couple of highlights. As of 2007, 38 percent of the lots were commercial use, ten percent were churches, schools and service related enterprises. She gave examples of the businesses along the corridor. It was obvious if they drove down the one mile strip the commercial properties looked nice and they were taken care of. A lot of the residential homes looked like trailers. She gave examples of the noise along the highway. No home owner would live there. She thought they would like something to be done about this. DeGrandpre would submit a proposal. She thought his ideas were good and everyone that was a property owner along that one mile strip agreed with probably every single word. If not, then at least 99 percent of the text in the proposal. Sewer, water and electricity were all supported by smaller acre sizes. She had needed to go through the process for a conditional use permit for her business and traffic was taken into consideration. It was not a hassle to enter and exit businesses along the strip.

Hickey-AuClaire and Nargi discussed what information Nargi had and if it was pertinent now.

Gene Lamb, 1535 Karrow Avenue, wanted to see his area zoned 2.5 acres. When the county had jurisdiction of the area, it was zoned 20 acres agriculturally. When the city took over it was 15 acres agricultural. Interim zoning was ten acres agricultural. Most of the places out there were a half acre unless you had enough money to take care of it. He had 34 acres and there was no way he could take care of it. He would like it to be zoned 2.5 acres.

**REVIEW OF
OPTIONS FOR
ZONING OF
HOUSTON
TRACTS AND
KARROW**

Review of options for zoning of Houston Tracts and Karrow Avenue, including review of the research paper that was distributed to the Planning Board on February 11, 2015 and posted to the website February 6, 2015.

Mack said the options included three different options. The first

AVENUE
6:38 pm

one was leaving zoning at R-1 for Houston Tracts and then R-2 across the street. Option two was to zone it all R-2. Option three was to zone it all R-1.

The board and Mack discussed the differences and similarities between the Whitefish zoning and the proposed options, what was serviced by water and sewer, requirements for septic and wells and the benefits of R-1.

Grieve said R-1 was typically not served by water or sewer services. R-2 was generally served by either water or sewer lines.

The board discussed what the options for subdividing the property with either R-1 or R-2 were, the benefits for R-1 or R-2 for sewer and water services, what was good for consistency sake, what made more sense for long range planning, options for a community water system and the amount of city around the properties.

The board gave the office the direction of option number two which was zoning the area all R-2.

The board and staff discussed lot size of the Whitefish zoning around the area.

Heim said R-2 zoning made sense for the long term and for those who prefer R-1, there would not be small lots until water and sewer was available.

Larsen said the sewer line came up Houston Drive with a low pressure main. He explained a design he had done for an individual who had problems fitting both a well and septic system on his lot. Whitefish was happy to work with the people to provide sewer service to them. It made it more cost effective if there were smaller lots where people could get together and share the cost. Part of the Growth Policy was if there were those types of services available, they should encourage the use of them. Smaller lots would utilize the services and make it affordable. It made sense because the tracts were adjacent to smaller lots and it was difficult to develop the smaller lots with both septic and wells.

Stevens and Larsen discussed if Whitefish had required annexation from his client, the elimination of a drain field on the lake and how R-2 would have helped the situation.

Calaway said over and over, the recommendation for zoning in that area from public comment was R-2.

Mack explained the three options for Karrow Avenue. The first option was to leave the zoning as is. The second option was to take some of the SAG-10 zoned area and change it to R-2.5 and SAG-5. He illustrated on a map where the changes would occur. This option would make the zoning consistent on the east side of Karrow Avenue with the SAG-5 zoning. Option three would be to take the property adjacent to the R-3 and zone it R-2.5 and leave the rest of the property as is. These options were to start the conversation on this area.

Calaway said it seemed pretty much common with all the people who had commented they wanted to get down to R-2.5. A person could have a nice piece of property and manage it well or they could have a nice piece of property which turned into a weed patch because it was too big to take care of.

Heim and Lamb discussed the location of Lamb's property.

Lamb said he had gotten his property rezoned 2.5 acres and gave a brief history of the property.

Stevens pointed out zoning he did not like on the map. He preferred option two and explained why.

The board discussed option two and the benefits of that option.

The board and staff discussed if there were any agricultural use in the area.

The board, staff and Lamb discussed the history of and what could have caused an apparent spot zone issue in the area.

Several members of the board voiced support of option two.

Sirucek said he liked option two as well. The area was next to a lot of R zoning and if it was 2.5 it would match up closer to surrounding zoning.

The board and Mack discussed surrounding zoning and if Mack knew what businesses were currently in place close by.

Grieve explained how many properties and owners would be affected.

Hickey-AuClaire liked option two as well.

Horn and Grieve briefly discussed how many owners and parcels would be affected.

Schlegel had concerns about people's investments. He was for option two.

Lamb explained how many acres were in his family in that area.

Horn said in that area, 2.5 looked appropriate.

The board asked Mack to pursue option two.

**DISCUSSION ON
THE PRE-2005
ZONING
INCLUDING
THE AREAS
THAT WERE
PREVIOUSLY
UNZONED AND
ZONED WA
UNDER
WHITEFISH
7:10 pm**

Discussion on the pre-2005 zoning including the areas that were previously unzoned and zoned WA under Whitefish. To include:

- a. Review the total acreage that was zoned by Whitefish.
- b. Maps showing areas that were previously unzoned

Mack showed the board and explained a map of the unzoned areas previous to 2005. The total area which had been unzoned prior to the inter-local agreement was approximately 6,839 acres. A lot of the area was now zoned SAG-10.

The board and Mack discussed if what had been unzoned had been zoned WA and what portions had remained unzoned.

Grieve reminded Mack of a member of the public who had a concern about her property and had subsequently come to the office to gather more information about her concerns.

Mack reviewed for the board the outcome of the conversation which included her being in favor of keeping the SAG-10 designation.

The board briefly discussed the benefits of her having the SAG-10 zoning.

The board and Mack discussed if there were any public comments from people who wanted to be unzoned who had been zoned.

Stevens asked about a letter from Stoltz concerning a 20 acre parcel which they felt had been zoned wrongly.

The decision was made to discuss the letter under the next agenda item.

Grieve asked if the board had any guidance for staff concerning the issue of the previously unzoned and WA zoned areas.

Calaway said he didn't hear any comments on that issue and staff had done a good job in matching the interim zoning to what had been in place.

Larsen agreed with Calaway. He did not think there was any basis to change the current zoning.

Grieve said for draft purposes, subject to public hearings later on, there were no major red flags.

Sirucek had mapped the soils on the north end of Whitefish Lake and liked the SAG-10, because if you were traveling on a road system in that area, there were a lot of cliffy, rocky, wet sites. To lay out any kind of rational road system took a little bit of area to be able to build a grade. If it was zoned any smaller than SAG-10, there would be zig-zags which were going up the hill similar to the west side of Flathead Lake. He liked what was in place now because of how it would look if it was developed. It could be developed in a more ecological way.

Grieve said all they were doing was seeking general guidance as a result of the discussion. Any type of zoning map in the future would go through a public hearing process and could be further discussed or changed ad nauseum.

Horn asked how much of the area had been agricultural.

Hickey-AuClaire said she did not know the answer. Mack had broken down the areas into sections and had broken down the acreage as to what had been unzoned previously to 2005.

Stevens said a lot of it might be timberland.

The board briefly commented how much might be timberland.

Grieve said there was a map in the Growth Policy which showed

agricultural land based on taxation. He showed what was not blacked out due to being under Whitefish control to the board around the Whitefish area.

Stevens said the agricultural taxation designation could apply to forest land as well.

**REVIEW OF
DRAFT COUNTY
ZONING TEXT
WHICH WOULD
CREATE
COUNTY ZONES
SIMILAR TO
THE PREVIOUS
WHITEFISH
ZONING
DESIGNATION
7:20 pm**

Review of draft county zoning text which would create county zones similar to the previous Whitefish zoning designation. To include: WBSD, WRR-1, WBMRR, WBBMV, and WB-2.

Mack explained they had taken the five Whitefish zones and tried to draft what a county equivalent zone would look like using language which already existed in the county zoning regulations and removing some of the things the county did not look at such as architectural standards. The big thing was the list of permitted and conditional uses was modified from what they would be under Whitefish. He gave an example of the differences. On a suggestion from one of the board members, he had created a comparison of the draft Business Service District (BSD) and the Whitefish BSD and how the language differed between the two. He had done that for all five of the zones. The Rural Residential (RR-1) and BSD zones were the same as adopted under interim zoning. He created the Secondary Business Whitefish (B-2W), Big Mountain Village Whitefish (BMRR-W) and Big Mountain Village Whitefish (BMV-W) based on WBBMV, WBRR and WB-2. He wanted to note BMRR-W and BMV-W referenced the Big Mountain Neighborhood Plan under bulk and dimensional requirements. He gave an example.

Stevens and Mack discussed the definition of BMRR-W and permitted uses, where the definition came from and possible alternate wording.

Grieve explained why staff referenced the Big Mountain Neighborhood Plan under BMRR-W.

Calaway and Grieve discussed adopting the neighborhood plan.

Grieve showed the board and explained part of the land use map contained in the Big Mountain Plan, when the document was put together and that it was not currently adopted.

Horn and Grieve discussed what the process would be if, in the future, the plan would be updated or changed.

Sirucek, Mack and Grieve discussed the BMV-W designation concerning sub-lots.

Sirucek voiced a concern on the wording.

Hickey-AuClaire said basically what they had now worked for them. She asked if there were any other questions and said the information before them was just a draft.

**FOLLOW-UP ON
MARCH 11,
2015
WORKSHOP
REGARDING
THE GROWTH
POLICY
DESIGNATED
LAND USE MAP
7:32 pm**

Follow-up on March 11, 2015 workshop regarding the Growth Policy Designated Land Use Map. A draft designated land use map would be presented to the Planning Board for input.

Mack referred to the draft designated land use map and explained the differences. They had replaced the Whitefish Growth Policy map with zones which reflected the rest of the county.

Stevens and Mack discussed what the map showed currently.

The board and Grieve discussed what the map represented, the current court ruling and what the tentative plan was for the Highway 93 south corridor after the dust settled from the ruling.

Hickey-AuClaire said it would be challenging to work on a certain area before the two year time limit was up and deciding on which area was most important.

Grieve went on to discuss the transition and the goal of getting zoning in place then pivoting and taking care of privately initiated projects. He explained the benefits of taking care of the transition in that order.

Mack noted the SAG-5 zoning was not in the interim zoning but the Blanchard Lake district.

Grieve said that issue had been going on for a long time and the office was sympathetic to the issue. Attempting to address that area with all the other transition areas was more than could be handled at once. Right now the focus was getting the transition done.

Mack asked if the board could discuss the text of the Growth Policy.

Hickey-AuClaire said absolutely.

Mack discussed the neighborhood plans which would need to be updated along with the designated land use map. At that time, Big Mountain West, Big Mountain and the South Whitefish neighborhood plans could be added to the list. He explained the location of the table in the Growth Policy.

Grieve said the '96 Whitefish City-County Master Plan was currently a master plan on the list.

Mack said the list was of neighborhood, local and regional plans in the unincorporated area of Flathead County.

Grieve said the '96 plan was on the list so the amendment would be to remove the plan. The '96 plan had a handful of neighborhood plans listed in it which were desirable. One was the Big Mountain West neighborhood plan which covered about 80 acres west of the Big Mountain Plan and got back to the comment from Stoltz.

Mack pointed out where the Big Mountain Plan covered.

Grieve said if the '96 plan was removed from the list, the South Whitefish and Big Mountain West neighborhood plans would need to be added back to the list as neighborhood plans recognized by the Flathead County Growth Policy. Then also add to the list the 2006 Big Mountain Neighborhood Plan which the county had not adopted but was adopted by the city of Whitefish. It was the neighborhood plan upon which the BMRR and the BMV zoning were based.

Mack and Grieve said there were footnotes concerning the county and Whitefish being in litigation which would need to be removed.

The board suggested moving forward with the text suggestions.

**DISCUSSION ON
A DRAFT
ZONING MAP
FOR RURAL
WHITEFISH
7:43 pm**

Discussion on a draft zoning map for rural Whitefish.

Mack showed the draft map on a visual aid to the board and explained it and the changes. The comment by Stoltz concerned a 20 acre piece which should have been zoned BR-4 when the initial zoning was adopted for Big Mountain West in 2003. He explained the research he had done which supported the zoning

designation of BR-4.

The board and Mack discussed if it was a mapping error and if the affected people could be informed when it was changed.

Mack raised public comment concerning a zone change done by Whitefish at 610 Highway 93. Part of the property was outside of the interim zoning district and part was inside. He explained the zone change on the property which should be R-2.5 on the whole property. He showed the property on the map individually to the board.

The board and Mack discussed which map would be adopted into the Growth Policy.

Grieve said based on earlier discussion, the board wanted to go ahead with option two for Karrow and Houston Tracts.

The board and Mack discussed if they wanted to proceed with the proposed change to the Stoltz land or do more research.

Mack reviewed the research he had conducted on the property and zoning error.

The board, Grieve and Mack discussed the property, the error, if the resolution was operable now, if they needed to do more investigation and how to remedy the situation.

**DISCUSSION OF
HOW TO
PROCEED WITH
ZONING IN THE
RURAL AREA
AROUND
WHITEFISH
7:54 pm**

Discussion of how to proceed with zoning in the rural area around Whitefish.

The board and Mack discussed the options for proceeding, what else needed attention for permanent zoning and where they were in the process.

Hickey-AuClaire clarified if the board wanted to hold another workshop to consider the proposal which was being assembled for the Highway 93 South corridor.

The board agreed they would like to see the information.

Grieve asked for clarification.

Stevens thought the issue of the 93 South corridor would not be addressed until after the permanent zoning was in place.

Grieve said that was what he thought as well.

The board discussed when they wanted to review the information and if they wanted to review the information before permanent zoning was in place or after.

Grieve explained the outer boundary of the current interim zoning and the map of interim zoning. The current section of Highway 93 and Highway 40 was not currently part of the interim zoning. If someone from that area came in and wanted to change the zoning, the office would accept the application because it was not part of the interim zoning. If they were to bring in a proposal by a private contractor a month from now and submit it at a Planning Board workshop to do anything in that area, it would be like apples and oranges to the project of the transition from interim zoning to permanent zoning.

The board and Grieve discussed if they could come in at any time for a zone change because they were not part of interim zoning, what the process would be for a privately initiated zone change versus a publicly initiated one and what the options were for the area concerning the board.

Hickey-AuClaire said where they were in the process and knowing the area was outside of interim zoning, they should entertain moving on with the process.

**SCHEDULING
OF NEXT
WORKSHOP OR
MEETING
8:03 pm**

The board discussed if there was a need to schedule additional workshops.

The board and Grieve discussed what the timeline for the transition would be if there were no more workshops held and the process involved. There could be one hearing for the necessary Growth Policy amendment and adoption of a new zoning district and five zoning texts to be added to the zoning regulations. Or they could be staggered. If the board wanted to have all three at once, it would require a little more time. If the board wanted to stagger the hearing, they could have the Growth Policy amendment in July, the map and the text could be done in August or September. September was the end of the first year. They continued to discuss which items could be heard together.

The consensus was to hear the Growth Policy amendment in July and the text amendment and zoning district in September.

Grieve and the board discussed how public notification would be handled.

The decision was made to notify people whose zoning would change from interim zoning and people 150 feet adjacent to the property the same as a standard zone change.

The board discussed how process would be followed and what would be included on the notice.

**PUBLIC
COMMENT ON
MATTERS THAT
ARE WITHIN
THE
JURISDICTION
OF THE
PLANNING
BOARD
(2-3-103 M.C.A.)
8:11 pm**

Ben Cavin, 2130 Houston Drive, wasn't happy with the board's decision. He got the idea at the end of discussion that it would save the board a lot of paperwork if they left the Houston Lakeshore zoned R-1. Now all of his neighbors would be involved and disappointed in him for not doing better at this meeting. He had a more serious concern which was that they were surrounded by Whitefish. He wanted to get on the record that they were not legally surrounded by Whitefish.

Rebecca Norton, 530 Scott Avenue, was glad Grieve brought up direct notification because Mr. Lamb had not notified the other neighbors other than the church and his family that were involved. There were Whitefish Hills parcels which were ten or 20 acre minimum and were very valuable properties at that size. Some people might not think subdividing down to 2.5 was advantageous to them. She thought everyone should be included if they were going to go through this process. All the water from the Bohemian Grange comes down to Whitefish River down Karrow so there were lots of high ground water issues and underground streams which went right through there. There were some other considerations for building in that area as well. Overall, she liked what the board was doing. She thought it would work. She was disappointed how the corridor study thing had gone however she did have an idea that the city would offer architectural review services for free to those people so that it could tie into Whitefish and make their properties more valuable as they went into commercial development. That way they would still get the benefit of looking like Whitefish. She would ask about that because they had a really great architectural review committee that was made up of architects and designers and they had done an amazing job building out Whitefish so it looked congruent. It added quite a bit of value to properties when they looked at the design and helped people design it. It was mostly a collaborative thing, it was not punitive whatsoever. People

seemed to do well with that. Otherwise she thought everything went great at the meeting and she appreciated the members working hard to keep Whitefish as much Whitefish as they could. She knew it had been a battle between many different sides but most people who lived in the county that were in the surrounding areas consider Whitefish their home. The more consistent they could be with the appearance and the way they did things, the better. She thanked the board.

Maureen Cordoza, 150 Lost Coon Trail, had been at the property since 1993. One of her concerns was the 2.5 zoning. She had ten acres but she knew that was zoned so she could have smaller lots. They did not have to go down to whatever the minimum was. If they had 34, like Mr. Lamb did or ten like she did, they could keep that in the family or sell it like that. She knew that a lot of her neighbors would not be happy that she was in favor of some of these changes of getting it pulled together in that area so that they had a more cohesive area versus the different zonings all around. She was very glad because the SAG-10 area was surrounded by various R zoning designations and lots of city. She was really happy the board had chosen options two. She thought that looked really good. Also there was the subject of the people of Whitefish not being able to be at the meetings. Mostly, not all, but mostly that was their problem. That's their responsibility. She lived up there but she was at the meeting. She thought if that was the only thing they were talking about was a small thing in Whitefish then maybe the board wanted to... Maybe Whitefish would be happy to let the board use their facility. She was just kidding. She appreciated what the board was doing and thought it was going on the right path. She was a little concerned in that they had long horn cattle, some pigs, almost 200 chickens, a lot of animals. She thought they were the only ones with so many animals, except a couple of horse owners. She was a little concerned about the new people, as she was 22 years ago, but she knew that was why she moved here... but the new people moving in and having smaller land in the R-3 area... of what that would do to her and the complaints they would have against them. She asked if she could come to the Planning Office and get a list of what was allowed on R-3 because she had been unable to find the information on the website. The website was confusing and the map was poor. She didn't even see the three options for Karrow and she was on there and had downloaded stuff. She would go to the office and get copies of what was allowed.

Grieve said she didn't have to stop by. She could call the office and staff could help her over the phone and talk her through the website to save her the trip.

Cordoza said that would be great. Her other concern was her husband was older, her children did not live in the area and didn't want to raise cows and chickens like her husband. She did not deal with the animals. Her concern was, if her children did move to the area with her husband and her to live for the rest of their lives, they could not have an in-law unit if she understood correctly. Was that something she could get through a conditional use permit? That was one of her concerns. How was she going to be taken care of later if she didn't want to move into town?

The board, staff and Cordoza discussed her zoning.

She thanked the board very much for their concern for the property owner's investment.

Stevens didn't know if an accessory dwelling unit was available in an R-3 zone...

Mack said it was an administrative conditional use.

Stevens said she could get a conditional use permit for a dwelling unit. There were size restrictions but the other option was if she had ten acres it was not all that complicated to do a family transfer so that the kids could have a parcel. If she didn't want to split her land, then there may be other options.

Grieve confirmed her address and said she had all kinds of options.

Cordoza wanted to thank the board again about their discussion concerning the resident's investment. They did not know what that meant to them. They bought their property twenty two years ago. To be able to sell was important.

Stevens said there was a number of right to farm provisions. He said in Montana Code Annotated, there was one. He did not know if it applied in her case and didn't know her situation.

Stevens and Cordoza discussed if her property was classified as agricultural, what would happen since she was classified as

agricultural and what protections might be in place.

Cordoza said she did support the change to 2.5 which was south of her. She again thanked the board and for their time.

Hickey Au-Claire and Grieve confirmed the next scheduled meeting was May 13, 2015 and what was on the agenda.

ADJOURNMENT The workshop was adjourned at approximately 8:24 pm.

Marie Hickey-AuClaire, Chairman

Donna Valade, Recording Secretary

*APPROVED AS **SUBMITTED**/CORRECTED: 5 / 13 / 15*