

**FLATHEAD COUNTY PLANNING BOARD  
WORKSHOP MINUTES  
MARCH 12, 2014**

**CALL TO  
ORDER  
8:17 pm**

A workshop of the Flathead County Planning Board was called to order at approximately 8:17 p.m. Board members present were Marie Hickey-AuClaire, Noah Bodman, Jim Heim, Tim Calaway, Greg Stevens, Ron Schlegel and Jeff Larsen. Gene Shellerud had an excused absence. BJ Grieve and Erik Mack represented the Flathead County Planning & Zoning Office.

There were no people in the audience.

**DISCUSSION ON  
THE ZONING  
TEXT  
AMENDMENT  
PROPOSED BY  
THE PLANNING  
BOARD AND  
PREPARED BY  
STAFF  
REGARDING  
“HOME  
OCCUPATIONS”  
PER 76-2-204  
M.C.A.  
8:18 pm**

Grieve reviewed what the board had discussed at the last workshop. He referred to the handout before the board which was a draft of what the board decided at the last workshop concerning a text amendment for ‘home occupations’.

The board, Mack and Grieve discussed the wording of the text amendment, wording which concerned outdoor storage and the process of moving the text amendment forward. They also discussed the lawsuit over the Growth Policy and having the changes marked. They discussed at length members of the family as employees and number of employees which needed to be met for a conditional use permit (CUP) for home based occupations, and different home occupations.

**CONTINUED  
DISCUSSION ON  
“ACCESSORY  
APARTMENTS”  
AS A LAND USE,  
HOW THEY ARE  
REGULATED BY  
THE FLATHEAD  
COUNTY  
ZONING  
REGULATIONS,  
AND WHETHER  
OR NOT ANY  
REVISIONS TO  
THE  
REGULATIONS**

Grieve said as evidenced by the handouts given to the board at the last workshop, there were several ways to handle ‘accessory apartments’ or accessory dwelling units (ADUs). Some jurisdictions had detailed requirements. To be consistent with the regulatory level in Flathead County, there needed to be several levels of discussion. The first would be to determine if ADUs were desirable to be added to the Flathead County Zoning Regulations. This was why research was gathered from other counties concerning ADUs.

The board and Grieve discussed if the board wanted to proceed with ADUs in the Zoning Regulations and how the people who would be living in the apartments affected how the community dealt with the issue. They talked about the differences between Flathead County and other jurisdictions, the differences between the different types of accessory dwelling units and how to deal

**ARE DESIRED  
BY PLANNING  
BOARD, PER  
76-2-204 M.C.A.  
8:36 pm**

with the different types of dwellings. They discussed how the size of lots for the dwellings affected impacts, the issue of property rights and the differences between an attached ADU and detached ADU and issues with both.

The board, Grieve and Mack discussed what the size of the ADU should be. They returned to an in depth discussion of the differences between the different types of ADUs and what the definitions were. They also discussed appropriate zones for ADUs, exceptions to the lot size and how they would be handled. They discussed what was needed which was a definition of an ADU and to adopt performance standards. They discussed when a CUP was needed, the differences between different building descriptions such as duplex, townhouse and accessory apartment and how to deal with unique zones.

Grieve clarified Stevens' concern with the definitions of attached ADUs and interior ADUs.

The board and Grieve discussed the definitions of attached and interior ADUs and how to draft definitions.

Grieve said staff had enough to rough draft a text amendment to run by the board at a future workshop.

The board and Grieve discussed parking, separate entrances and what else they wanted included in the definition. They also discussed what the goal of the text amendment was, how large the lots needed to be to have ADUs permitted and zoning where ADUs would be allowed.

Stevens wanted to say for the record, he had read all the information the Planning Office had assembled. What he had read was put out by the United States Department of Housing, Urban Development, The Public Policy Institute with the cooperation of AARP and the American Planning Association. Other literature included issues and options on accessory dwelling units by Municipal Research Services Center of Washington which had different regulations from coast to coast. It seems that in many places ADUs were being done without any heartburn. He was surprised by that fact because of the hullabaloo in Missoula. The college atmosphere was what messed up the situation. That was why he was focused on the R-2 zoning and up. He thought allowing ADUs in those zones would give people relief from the parking issues and close

neighbors.

Grieve reviewed zoning where it made sense to have ADUs allowed. He would leave the special zoning alone. If the text amendment passed and people in the future in special zoning wished to have ADUs, then they could come to the board and ask to have a text amendment done for ADUs for their unique zoning. They may possibly have to amend their plan. He continued to explain which high density developments in the valley the text amendment would affect. He said the board had given him enough information to have an amendment drafted by the next workshop.

The next workshop was scheduled for after the April 9, 2014 Planning Board meeting.

Grieve reviewed the process which would be followed for the text amendments.

**ADJOURNMENT** The workshop was adjourned at approximately 9:43 pm.  
**9:43 pm**

---

Marie Hickey-AuClaire, Chairman

---

Donna Valade, Recording Secretary

APPROVED AS **SUBMITTED**/CORRECTED: 4 / 9 / 14