

**WHITEFISH PLANNING BOARD
MINUTES OF MEETING
July 21, 2022**

<p>CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL</p>	<p>Vice Chair John Ellis called the regular meeting of the Whitefish Planning Board to order at 6:00 pm. Board members present were Councilor Rebecca Norton, Whitney Beckham, and Toby Scott. Chair Steve Qunell, Scott Freudenberger, Chris Gardner, and Allison Linville were absent. Planning Director David Taylor, Senior Planner Wendy Compton-Ring, and Planner Nelson Loring represented the Whitefish Planning & Building Department.</p> <p>There were approximately 34 people attending in addition to the board members and staff.</p>
<p>AGENDA CHANGES <i>6:00 pm</i></p>	<p>None.</p>
<p>APPROVAL OF MINUTES <i>6:01 pm</i></p>	<p>Beckham made a motion, seconded by Scott, to approve the June 16, 2022 minutes without corrections. The motion passed unanimously.</p>
<p>COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC (ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA) <i>6:02 pm</i></p>	<p>None.</p>
<p>UNFINISHED BUSINESS: <i>6:02 pm</i></p>	<p>None.</p>
<p>PUBLIC HEARING 1: OBR MANAGEMENT, LLC CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT REQUEST <i>6:02 pm</i></p>	<p>A request by Vincent Rimmel, on behalf of OBR Management, LLC, for a conditional use permit (elevated from an administrative CUP) to open a marijuana dispensary at 333 Baker Avenue. The subject property is developed with an existing commercial building and is zoned WB-3, General Business District. The property can be legally described as Lot 14 of Block 53, WHT, in S36 T31N R22W, P.M.,M., Flathead County, Montana.</p>
<p>STAFF REPORT WCUP 22-18 (Taylor)</p>	<p>Director Taylor reviewed his staff report and findings. As of the writing of WCUP 22-18, one comment was received from the Whitefish Credit Union that the City Attorney felt raised issues that could not be mitigated by conditions of approval and therefore caused the administrative CUP to be elevated to a full CUP. Ten comments opposing the dispensary have been received in total, including one from Calvary Chapel with a petition signed by</p>

	<p>64 members, which also includes two separate comments from the Whitefish Credit Union. One letter in support was also received.</p> <p>Staff recommended adoption of the findings of fact within staff report WCUP 22-18 and for approval of the conditional use permit to the Whitefish City Council.</p>
<p>BOARD QUESTIONS OF STAFF</p>	<p>Councilor Norton asked, and Director Taylor explained this project was "upped" from an ACUP to a full CUP because the way the Conditional Use Permit section in the Code reads, a project shall be elevated to a full CUP if there are complaints from somebody who contends it will adversely or injuriously affect their personal or legal interests and that we cannot place a condition on that that would remediate the concern. In this situation, City Attorney Angela Jacobs suggested we elevate this and let the applicant address the concerns the Credit Union raised factually. The applicant provided additional materials which are in the packet including a policy analysis that talks about the effect of marijuana legalization on property values, crime, etc., that were brought up. The Planning Board and City Council can then decide on whether this use is suitable or not in this location.</p> <p>Vice Chair Ellis asked, and Director Taylor said this building is one block away from the Liquor Store. It was previously an office space or physical therapist in this portion of the building, along with an insurance company and Whitefish Property Management.</p>
<p>PUBLIC HEARING</p>	<p>Vice Chair Ellis opened the public hearing.</p>
<p>APPLICANT / AGENCIES</p>	<p>Ian Stewart, 2130 Gilbert Avenue, Missoula, MT, a consultant for OBR Management, who runs a small family office specializing in business development and M&A work and hyper-focused in cannabis. They primarily work in the mid-West and East coast; however, give his proximity to Whitefish and in the state for 20 years, this project was relevant and something they decided to undertake. The applicant, Vincent Rimmel, is a member of OBR Management and he and his family have been in the valley for ±30 years. They are landowners and business owners, and actively engaged in the community. The objective for OBR Management is specific to opening up a retail location in Whitefish, specifically at 333 Baker Avenue. The cultivation and manufacturing processing facility for the vertical operation is in Evergreen and the objective is to expand and have two dispensaries, one in Evergreen and one</p>

	<p>in Whitefish. It is a small cultivation/manufacturing facility hyper-focused in good quality product for consumers, both recreational and medicinally. This is something his client believes in, and they want to do wholeheartedly to the best of their ability.</p> <p>There was some public feedback response to the application relative to studies which he has from the City University of New York related to findings out of Denver, Colorado. Within the letter from the Whitefish Credit Union, they stated the report indicates that since the legalization that happened in the different markets was negatively impacting crime within the areas. Within the study he has, it actually states that street segments with recreational dispensaries experience no changes in violent and disorderly conduct within crime itself. Additionally, it was found that the studies examining the relationship between dispensaries and crime at the neighborhood level have also yielded sparse evidence of increased crime.</p> <p>Regarding concerns with parking, the WB-3 zone does not require any onsite parking; however, depending on how the architect can design the parking that is available in that location, there could be three or four additional parking spaces, which is adequate for this retail location and also above and beyond the requirements called out in local zoning.</p> <p>Regarding the proximity as it pertains to the 500-foot rule, he said they comply 100% with the language adopted by the state. The local language pursuant to WCC § 11-3-34 relative to the marijuana facilities calls out, and the key word is "and", "No marijuana facility is permitted from locales within 500' of and addressed on the same street as a building used exclusively as a church or public school pursuant to state law." The application as it sits now is 110% compliant with all state and local laws. They have also retained compliance counsel out of Bozeman, who has been working on this specifically in the state for about 14 years, to help inform on of their decisions to make sure they are operating in compliance and within the best interests of the community.</p> <p>Scott asked and Mr. Stewart said the diagram submitted indicates a room labeled "stair," but that just goes to a crawl space underneath the single level.</p>
<p>PUBLIC COMMENT</p>	<p>Josh Wilson, representing the Whitefish Credit Union (WCU), resides in Kalispell. Whitefish Credit Union has two locations in Whitefish, one at 300 Baker Avenue, directly across the street. He is here to answer questions about the letter sent from WCU and rebut some of the points made by Mr. Remmel's representative</p>

regarding the City University of New York study. They operate a 24-hour ATM across from this facility and sent a letter to Director Taylor against approval of the permit. The sale of recreational marijuana imposes a direct threat to the physical safety of their employees that cannot be remediated in anyway because of the nature of this business. The two university studies cited in the letter acknowledge there is no rise in violent crime, but the report clearly states (on Page 82), "The results indicate street segments with a recreational marijuana dispensary experience a statistically significant increase in the level of property crime relative to controls." That is significant because previous studies that typically try to combat why you wouldn't want to approve dispensaries is at the city and county level and this is the first study that looked at a street level, specifically. What makes it unique in terms of property crime is looking at things like aggravated assault, burglary, public disorder, robbery, motor vehicle theft, and drug and alcohol offenses. Violet crimes as conveyed in the study relate to murder, homicide, and theft of vehicles, which are some pretty serious crimes. They are opposed to it as it is directly in conflict with their interests. This site is within 400-feet of Baker Park and River Trail Park and within 600-feet of day care centers, North Valley Music School, and multiple churches. The parks could easily be used by anybody who is frequenting that business. Director Taylor mentioned it is regulated in the same ways as liquor sales which is notable because of the 600-feet. Parking is also an issue as Baker Avenue and 4th Street are busy places with pedestrian crossings. The WB-3 District provides the City Council with the ability to deny an application that adversely affects the context of the existing neighborhood and community character, and they think these circumstances combined with the nature of the business would qualify. They urge denial of the permit.

Andrew Strong (his wife Denise is also here) submitted a letter and owns homes at 435 and 405 Central Avenue (the historic Houston house which is being restored). He provided a picture he took the other day standing on 4th Street that shows a "Drug Free Zone" sign above the stop sign, which he found both disturbing and amusing considering what is potentially going to go in across from the sign which is right next to the Post Office.

He and his wife spent a lot of time thinking about this issue and submitted a letter. The issue of marijuana has been decided by the voters and this is about character, not a referendum on whether recreational marijuana can be used in the state of Montana. He did a word search in the Growth Policy, and there

are 107 instances where the word "character" appears, and he read a couple of sections. A marijuana dispensary on the edge of downtown and in the middle of a neighborhood does not enhance, but rather distracts from the character of this family-friendly town. The 500-foot citing prohibition is a prohibition established by the state of Montana where you cannot get a license if you are within 500-feet. The statute says on the same street, and the regulation that was just passed very quickly by the state of Montana says the front entrance door.

In determining whether or not the dispensary should get a conditional use permit, the burden is on the applicant to prove they have satisfied the criteria set forth in WCC § 11-7-8. Among those criteria, WCC § 11-7-8(J)(7) says "Neighborhood/community compatibility" and § 11-7-8(J)(7)(e) (perhaps the most important) says "Community character." WCC § 11-7-8(K) reads "The granting of a conditional use permit is a matter of grace, resting in the discretion of the City Council and a refusal is not the denial of a right, conditional or otherwise." It is completely discretionary, and they have no right in this particular district (WB-3) to have a business that will detract from his neighborhood and property values.

The Board and Council need to determine whether it is in the best interest of the City and citizens of Whitefish and an acceptable use of this facility. Although not before us today, the Downtown Master Plan anticipates this whole area will be a parking lot for the City, and that is an important consideration as this decision is being made.

The 500-foot radius, while not determinative on whether or not to grant this, is instructive in terms of why it is there, which is to protect schools and churches from the facility that operates there. Three churches, a day care facility, and Baker Park, are all within 500-feet, and are areas important to City of Whitefish which should be considered in determining whether or not the facility should be approved.

Vice Chair Ellis asked, and Mr. Strong said he hoped his building on the corner of Central Avenue and 4th Street will hopefully be finished in the next month.

Vice Chair Ellis pointed out under our rules, the applicant is given the opportunity to make a short rebuttal. Mr. Stewart said given the language he has provided they are in full compliance with zoning and the proximities laid out by the City and state.

	<p>Lyn Bennett, 750 Northwoods Drive, said in she does not know how many dispensaries Whitefish can actually have, but she would hate to see such a family- and kid-friendly town become a place where our youth are at risk for exposure to marijuana. The rebuttal is that researchers found that Denver neighborhoods adjacent to marijuana businesses saw 84.8% more property crimes each year than those without a marijuana shop nearby.</p> <p>There being no further comments, Vice Chair Ellis closed the public hearing and turned the matter over to the Planning Board for consideration.</p>
<p>MOTION / BOARD DISCUSSION</p>	<p>Beckham made a motion, seconded by Scott, to adopt the findings of fact within staff report WCUP 22-18, with the fourteen (14) conditions of approval as proposed by City Staff, and recommend approval of the conditional use permit to the Whitefish City Council.</p> <p>Beckham addressed her motion saying months ago we dealt with zoning and this very issue and decided where a marijuana dispensary can and cannot be, which involved a heated debate and a lot of public comment. It was decided and the law is clear with the three-part test. From reading the application and testimony tonight, it is clear this applicant has worked hard to stay within the three-part test. We talked a lot about not zoning out dispensaries, essentially not giving a dispensary anywhere to be, and we do not want to go back to that.</p> <p>Councilor Norton said she will be voting against this. There was not really a lot of discussion on the City Council when this came through. One of the reasons they really wanted to have a full CUP was exactly for this situation where even though the spirit of the law is to keep churches and school protected from any kind of undue influence, in some situations even if someone has legally met all the conditions required in state law, the community has a strong opinion on what they do not want to see in their own environments. This is a really good example of when we need to use a full CUP to deny something. We have had three churches, neighbors, downtown businesses, and a financial institution strongly opposed to this. We will be getting other dispensaries in other parts of the town, but she does not think this location is appropriate given its proximity to businesses, churches, and parks. We are a community that believes in public input, and it was resounding that many of the people impacted by this decision are</p>

	saying no.
VOTE	The motion passed 3-1, with Councilor Norton voting in opposition. The matter is scheduled to go before the Council on August 15, 2022.
PUBLIC HEARING 2: CITY OF WHITEFISH REZONE REQUEST 6:37 pm	A request by the City of Whitefish to rezone three parcels annexed into City limits from County SAG-10 and AG-20 to WCR (Country Residential District) and WA (Agricultural District). The three parcels are unaddressed, located south of East Edgewood Drive and east of E 2nd Street and legally described as Tracts 3D, 3E, 5BA in S32/33 T31N R21W, P.M.,M., Flathead County, Montana.
STAFF REPORT WZC 22-06 (Compton-Ring)	<p>Senior Planner Compton-Ring explained Items Nos. 2-5 are pretty related to each other and said she would go over Item No. 2, the annexation zone change, hold the public hearing, and then go to Item Nos. 3, 4, and 5, and talk about those at the same time. They will each need their own separate motion.</p> <p>Compton-Ring then reviewed her Staff Report WZC 22-06 and findings. As of the writing of WZC 22-06, public comments had been received, but were geared towards the actual development proposal and will be noted during that public hearing.</p> <p>Staff recommended adoption of the findings of fact within staff report WZC 22-06 and for approval of the zoning map amendment to the Whitefish City Council.</p>
BOARD QUESTIONS OF STAFF	Councilor Norton asked, and Compton-Ring said the three conditions apparently agreed to with Sean Averill as outlined in the comment letter from the adjacent landowner cannot be conditioned on a zone change. They could be part of the subdivision which will be part of the next discussion, but it is an individual agreement between the two parties.
PUBLIC HEARING	Vice Chair Ellis opened the public hearing.
APPLICANT / AGENCIES	City of Whitefish.
PUBLIC COMMENT	Kim Atchinson-Broom, 1505 East Edgewood Drive, lives adjacent to the agricultural (green) area presented on the map. They would like to see it stay as agricultural and are not excited about having a subdivision go in there because the roads are already very

congested, and the water table is high.

Wade Atchinson, 1505 East Edgewood Drive, his Mother's property is the adjacent property in white by the railroad tracks. At one point, baseball fields were going to be put out there and they were moved because the infrastructure is not there for public transport. The transportation in the area needs to be improved; if a train is across the tracks, it can be there for 45-60 minutes, which can be an issue in emergency situations. An ambulance would have to come up East Edgewood which is under construction most of the time. He has lived there for 30 years, and the water table is high; it is half flooded on their property for the majority of the spring and they rely on wells. There is lots of wildlife in that area and it will be detrimental to it. His main issue, though, is the road, which he already considers dangerous because of bike riders and "nutty" drivers. It used to be 45 mph and is now 35 mph, but most people have to drive 25 mph because of the congestion.

Tom and Suzie Wambeke, 1300 East Edgewood Drive, they have lived across the street for 17 years on a two-acre homestead. They have a lot of questions and need clarification on what is being proposed and Vice Chair Ellis said maybe the developer would answer some of that during his presentation. Ms. Wambeke said high water needs to be considered as water dumps into their backyard and Cow Creek. The County road has no shoulders, and they are concerned about the PUD zoning request to will allow high density. There is no high density around there; the average lot size is 20 acres, so 5-10 acres with a single home would comply more with the neighborhood and help with the traffic situation.

Robin Edwards, 1250 East Edgewood Drive, across from the green area on the map, which she and her sisters inherited from her parents. Their family has been there a long time. That road is a County road, and their property is in the County. She is happy that it is good for the City of Whitefish, but the apartment access will be on East Edgewood, directly across from their property. The County road has no shoulder, no lights, and no sidewalk and cannot accommodate the additional traffic. There are already so many accidents on that road and will only increase.

Ms. Edwards knows we have a housing problem, but five of the 30 units will be affordable housing, which is a very low number. She spoke with Brian Averill today and he wants to use the

	<p>affordable housing for his employees.</p> <p>This proposal will hugely impact their family – her, her sisters, and their kids – and they have worked really hard to keep their property agricultural as much as they could.</p> <p>Eric Mulcahy, 2 Village Loop, Kalispell, said he is serving as one of the consultants for the owners and applicants of this project. He said the application we are looking at right now, is just the rezoning of the area in green recently annexed into the City. That is all that is on the table at this time. Once a vote is taken, the other applications will be addressed and they can go through and explain what it being proposed, what is currently allowed on those properties, and what they are proposing for density, which will answer a lot of these questions. At this present time, we are just looking at the WCR and WA as that 66-acre parcel comes into the City.</p> <p>There being no further comments, Vice Chair Ellis closed the public hearing and turned the matter over to the Planning Board for consideration.</p> <p>Vice Chair Ellis asked, and Compton-Ring said WCR zoning allows for one residence per 2.5 acres, which is our closest zoning to the County's equivalent. WA is 15-acre minimum lot size, which is our closest equivalent to the County's Ag-20 and allows one residential unit per 15 acres.</p>
<p>MOTION / BOARD DISCUSSION</p>	<p>Scott made a motion, seconded by Beckham, to adopt the findings of fact within staff report WZC 22-06 as proposed by City Staff, and recommend approval of the zoning map amendment to the Whitefish City Council.</p> <p>Scott said he has a storage unit past this property and has driven by it many, many times. Granted, the road is narrow, but there is not a lot of traffic. That empty land is so close to town and facilities he would love to see it developed even denser than one house for 15 acres. He likes the idea of their Phase 1 that may be higher density, and he urged approval.</p>
<p>VOTE</p>	<p>The motion passed unanimously. The matter is scheduled to go before the Council on August 15, 2022.</p>
<p>PUBLIC HEARING 3/4/5: 1291 EDGEWOOD, LLC</p>	<p>3) A request by 1291 Edgewood LLC for a Growth Policy Map amendment from 'Planned Industrial' to 'Urban Residential' for</p>

<p>3) GROWTH POLICY AMENDMENT REQUEST; 4) REZONE REQUEST; 5) PRELIMINARY PLAT AND PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT OVERLAY REQUEST 6:67 pm</p>	<p>3.4 acres of Tract 3. The property is located at 1291 East Edgewood Drive and is legally described as Tract 3 in S32 T31N R21W, P.M.,M., Flathead County, Montana.</p> <p>4) A request by 1291 Edgewood LLC to rezone 3.4 acres of 1291 East Edgewood Drive from WI (Industrial and Warehousing District) to WR-2 (Two-Family Residential District). The property is located at 1291 East Edgewood Drive and is legally described as Tract 3 in S32 T31N R21W, P.M.,M., Flathead County, Montana.</p> <p>5) A request by 1291 Edgewood LLC for a 15-lot Preliminary Plat and Planned Unit Development overlay. The properties are undeveloped, are zoned WI (Industrial and Warehousing District), County SAG-10 and County AG-20 but are also subject to rezone requests to WR-2 (Two-Family Residential District), WCR (Country Residential District) and WA (Agricultural District) as part of this application. The PUD overlay is to facilitate multi-family development on 3.4 acres of Drive and smaller lots in the Agricultural District to the 1291 East Edgewood east of E 2nd Street. The properties are located at 1291 East Edgewood Drive and three unaddressed parcels to the east. They can be legally described as Tracts 3, 3D, 3E and 5BA in S32/33 T31N R21W, P.M.,M., Flathead County, Montana.</p>
<p>STAFF REPORTS WGPA 22-01, WZC 22-07, and WPP 22-05/ WPUD 22-02 (Compton-Ring)</p>	<p>Senior Planner Compton-Ring said there are three subsequent applications all interrelated and could be discussed at the same time with three separate motions at the end.</p> <p>Compton-Ring reviewed her staff reports (WGPA 22-01, WZC 22-07 and WPP 22-05/WPUD 22-02) and findings. As of the writing of WGPA 22-01, WZC 22-07 and WPP 22-05/WPUD 22-02, public comments had been received citing concerns with the developments' impact on City services and infrastructure, traffic – especially with lack of pedestrian and bicycle facilities, high groundwater on the eastern portion of the property, loss of agricultural lands, change in neighborhood character, impact of residential use on the existing airport, and loss of industrial lands that should remain in order to provide job opportunities for locals. Additional comments in support of the proposed project have been received since then and distributed to Planning Board members tonight.</p> <p>Staff recommended adoption of the findings of fact within staff reports WGPA 22-01, WZC 22-07, and WPP 22-05/WPUD 22-02</p>

	<p>and for approval of the Growth Policy Amendment, rezone request, and preliminary plat and planned unit development overlay for the Edgewood 90 Subdivision to the Whitefish City Council.</p>
<p>BOARD QUESTIONS OF STAFF</p>	<p>Vice Chair Ellis asked, and Planning Board members agreed to consider all three of these applications at once with three separate votes, and Director Taylor agreed we can have one public hearing to cover all three applications since they are germane to the same main topic.</p> <p>Scott asked, and Compton-Ring said the developer will extend City water and sewer and work with BNSF. Scott asked, and Compton-Ring said the developer will need to work with engineering and figure out any issues arising from the high water table.</p> <p>Scott asked, and Compton-Ring said we do not know the type of industry proposed in Lots 1, 2, 3, and 4, other than just Industrial Warehousing. This was originally all industrial and there was a plat approved in maybe 2006 or 2007 for an industrial park out there, but they were never able to get services and ended up vacating it. Scott asked, and Director Taylor said an asphalt plant would be considered "industrial" and therefore an allowed use.</p> <p>Scott said regarding the trail mentioned through the open space and perhaps into the future conservation district, and staff included it should be "paved" and he would rather see it say it be "improved," and maybe a raised wooden path like that on the Trail of the Cedars in Glacier National Park. Director Taylor said it is intended to be a multi-use path and will need to meet ADA standards and be bicycle and pedestrian friendly. Scott said he hates the idea of a paved path there.</p> <p>Beckham asked if there is anything staff can answer to the issues of stormwater runoff going into neighboring areas like Cow Creek. The applicant is proposing stormwater ponds and different solutions, but how do we know they will work before this whole development goes in? Compton-Ring said they will need to work with the Engineering Department and get their plans approved and meet City Standards. No Public Works staff was available tonight, but the applicant's engineer (Brent Foley) is here.</p> <p>Councilor Norton asked, and Compton-Ring said she would let Mr. Foley answer the question of whether the lift station capacity is only for this development or will allow for more development</p>

	<p>out in that area. Councilor Norton asked, and Compton-Ring confirmed it is part of the Engineering Standards that any stormwater produced will be maintain onsite; however, she did not know whether neighbors would see an improvement on their property if this project were approved.</p> <p>Vice Chair Ellis asked, and Compton-Ring said Cow Creek goes through the High Point Subdivision to the west. Vice Chair Ellis asked, and Compton-Ring said this is not adjacent to the current City limits, it is down East Edgewood Drive to the west. The property on the left on the map (gray area) has been in the City limits since probably 2006 (15 or more years) and is zoned industrial.</p> <p>Vice Chair Ellis asked, and Compton-Ring said on the Growth Policy zone change, only the area in orange (Lot 5) is proposed to change to Urban with WR-2 zoning. Vice Chair Ellis asked, and Compton-Ring said it is a nice compromise to make part of it Industrial rather than all WR-2 as Industrial provides for future job growth opportunity. The lots are small and probably will not allow for an enormous industrial area. Director Taylor pointed out the train tracks and all BNSF facilities are zoned Industrial as well.</p> <p>Vice Chair Ellis asked, and Compton-Ring said she does not think there is currently a conservation easement, but that would be a question for the applicant.</p> <p>Vice Chair Ellis asked for the definition of "Urban" in the Growth Policy and Compton-Ring read it from her Staff Report. Vice Chair Ellis asked, and Compton-Ring said water and sewer services will need to be extended from the corner of Dodger Lane and East 2nd (the northeast corner of the Dog Park).</p>
PUBLIC HEARING	Vice Chair Ellis opened the public hearing.
APPLICANT / AGENCIES	<p>Sean Averill, lives at 3068 River Lakes Drive, and has property at 1320 East Edgewood (across the street) as well. This property was previously owned by Bill Foley and was for sale with a fairly high price tag last year. He and two neighbors were talking about it and ended up buying it together as they were worried about the development potential of the property and what could happen out there; some developers were looking at putting 40 homes on the property. Since it goes from dense city to very rural farms, they wanted to give it a rural feel where it goes from 5-acre lots to 10-acre lots. There are some smaller lots that border the project, but they are trying to "cap off" the town.</p> <p>Since this has been submitted, he met with the neighbor to the</p>

east and will change Lots 9, 10, and 11, currently depicted as three 10-acre tracts, to two 15-acre tracts, so eight "ranchettes" are being proposed in the field versus nine lots. The neighbors he talked to do not want driveways off East Edgewood, so they are shared off East 2nd Street. They are happy with the lay out; the shaded area is about one acre, so if you have a house and an acre of lawn, the rest would be field, with a buffer along the south.

They came up with the idea of having four Industrial lots against the train tracks to basically try to pay for the whole thing. Lot 5 is proposed to be 30 housing units, and you cannot see them from East Edgewood Drive as the forest buffer is thick. It will be a cool place to live as there will be a trail from Lot 5 to East 2nd Street so residents can walk to the Dog Park or ride a bike to Wisconsin. The open space is "dedicated" open space and Lot 6 is proposed to have a conservation easement or park on it.

The forest is cool and with some restoration it could be better and they want it to stay a forest forever. It touches the Airport and Dog Park, and they want to put trails through it and all around there. The underlying zoning is pretty scary, and he showed a slide of what was approved in 2007 which was 30 Industrial lots, but that did not happen. Even though there is some need, they think four is enough.

Regarding the 30-unit workforce housing, they wanted them to look nice with a barn aspect and will go through the Architectural Review Committee. These will be hidden from East Edgewood by the forest.

In summary, there are ranchettes on one side, saving the middle, which is about 70% when added to the wooded buffer, four industrial lots, and 30 apartments. This was a collaborative effort and he met with many of the neighbors who are in support based on what could go out there. It will be a nice cap to the town, will provide a nice public benefit, and is a great compromise for this property.

Councilor Norton asked if the lift station is only for their development or will there be other capacity. She read through the Traffic Study and thought it was well done but is concerned about traffic from the industrial lots since we do not for the uses. Mr. Averill said the lots are small enough to not provide room for anything major, it will just be for light industrial.

Mr. Averill invited their engineer, Brent Foley with Foley Engineering, 105 Village Loop, Suite B, Kalispell to address Councilor Norton's questions. Mr. Foley said the Traffic Impact

	<p>Study covers the whole development, both the residential and industrial lots.</p> <p>Mr. Foley said the lift station will have capacity not only for this development, but for more. They discussed this with Public Works during site review and it will be designed to accommodate this initial development and then they will work with Public Works to calculate anticipated demand for future development as well and design it in such a way to either accommodate it or more likely be added on to accommodate future capacity.</p> <p>Scott said the road around the apartments looks like it has a fairly substantial width, and Mr. Averill said staff recommended it.</p> <p>Scott asked, and Mr. Averill said the wood buffer is the existing trees that are currently there, and they will be leaving the existing trees to the north there to buffer the apartments from East Edgewood. From the apartments down to the industrial area, there will be landscaping to City standards. He thinks they can leave some of the trees in. Scott asked if they plan to remove or thin trees in the open space or conservation easement and Mr. Averill said it is an unhealthy forest, showing signs of dying, right now that needs to be thinned. They want to make it more like a park open to the public and selective thinning is needed.</p> <p>Mr. Foley said on the east side they will use detention to address stormwater. Council Norton had asked if it will decrease the amount of water on the north side and it will not, that will should the same. Their designs are not allowed to exceed existing or historic peak flows so that is what all the designs are done to, to hold back and maintain those peak flows. Peak flows will not be increased on adjacent or downgradient properties to the north. Council Norton said one of the neighbors across the street said this property drains directly onto their property and she asked if that will be mitigated with this development and Mr. Foley said no, they will not be improving their property, it will remain unchanged and not impacted with additional runoff. They will probably experience the exact same conditions they have historically.</p> <p>Vice Chair Ellis said it appears High Point on Second Street is wildly successful and asked Mr. Averill why they decided to go with so much larger lots for this development. Mr. Averill said the neighborhood, including himself, wanted the transition from big farms to City.</p>
PUBLIC COMMENT	Karen Giesy, 121 Park Knoll Lane, said she lives nowhere near the

area, but just finds it interesting that Mr. Averill did not want high density in his backyard, so he bought the property and made it look the way they want. The Park Knoll neighbors have come before Planning Board time and time again asking why we are putting high density right next to larger lots and that has been totally ignored by the City. She applauds Mr. Averill for what he is doing and requests in the future the City think about the public in established home areas and think about instead of the dollar what would be nice for them, also. Edgewood is just going to get more and more traffic and asked if there are plans to work with the County to get edges along the road so it will not be as dangerous to drive on.

Dan Thompson, 22 Snowshoe Flats in Haskill Basin, has lived out there and driven by this property for 30 years. His concern for any development going in north of the tracks is the overfull viaduct. The railroad could care less how long they block that crossing and has sat there for over an hour. Adding any population to the north of the tracks is a big issue in his opinion. At first, he was strongly opposed to this development, but after listening to the proposal tonight, he thinks this is a well thought out plan. The trees obviously need something to be done to them and there is a very large dead section along East Edgewood that is unsightly. A lot of bikers and joggers use East Edgewood Drive and adding a lot of traffic is going to be a huge issue; it is now. The road system in this town has not adapted to the number of people we are adding to this town and it needs to be addressed.

Will McDonald, 180 Fonner Road, added they are giving 15-feet of right-of-way on the north side of Lot 5 and along the tract of the 26 acres for future bike use.

Amy Olson, 1488 East Edgewood Drive, has listened to all the neighbors and feels the same way, that growth is hard. She has talked with one of the developers in terms of her concerns and see the development going in a direction she does not think she can stop. She suggested an overpass or some method to address the safety of kids walking to school would be important. She would also like to see more units allocated for workforce housing. She bikes that road all the time (to work, the farmer's market, etc.) and addressing it to make it safe would be great.

Suzie Wambeke, 1300 East Edgewood, asked why it is PUD on the east side and not more single residences? They are in the service

	<p>industry and deal with workers all the time and getting more housing actually is not keeping the workers here. Just increasing housing is not solving the problem. We need to offer affordable jobs, not just service jobs, but also industrial (like Proof) that have wages that they could grow into. Also, why is it rental and not home ownership.</p> <p>Tom Wambeke, 1300 East Edgewood, said they have a concern about 30 rental apartments versus maybe a 30-unit condo, because all of East Edgewood has been mostly owners not renters, which is a legitimate, although maybe selfish, concern. Apartments would not be their first choice even though he understands the need for affordable housing, but he appreciates the thoughtfulness that has gone into this.</p> <p>There being no further comments, Vice Chair Ellis closed the public hearing and turned the matter over to the Planning Board for consideration.</p>
<p>MOTION / BOARD DISCUSSION RE STAFF REPORT WGPA 22-01</p>	<p>Council Norton asked, and Compton-Ring said adding the condition the neighbor had negotiated would be part of the motion for WPP 22-05 since we are going to do three different motions.</p> <p>Scott made a motion, seconded by Councilor Norton, to adopt the findings of fact within staff report WGPA 22-01 as proposed by City Staff, and recommend approval of the Growth Policy Amendment to the Whitefish City Council.</p> <p>Toby thinks this is a step in the right direction and they are doing a good thing with the entire proposal.</p> <p>Beckham said there is definitely a call for this to happen now. There was no error, but it is something that is needed when you look at the map of what could happen in that Industrial (3.4 acres) area. It will be nice to have it changed to Urban Residential.</p> <p>Councilor Norton thinks it is a thoughtful plan and loves the conservancy part of it. Her only concern is what will happen in the industrial units and whether that will be an issue with traffic. She hopes it will be something compatible, and successful for people who already live out there.</p>
<p>VOTE</p>	<p>The motion passed unanimously. The matter is scheduled to go before the Council on August 15, 2022.</p>

<p>MOTION / BOARD DISCUSSION RE STAFF REPORT WZC 22-07</p>	<p>Scott made a motion, seconded by Beckham, to adopt the findings of fact within staff report WZC 22-07 as proposed by City Staff, and recommend approval of the zoning map amendment to the Whitefish City Council.</p> <p>Beckham said she is not opposed to the majority of this parcel staying industrial and is not concerned about what might happen there, especially now that it is enveloped in the safety net of a small community. It is important to preserve some industrial area, and this is a good rezone.</p> <p>Vice Chair Ellis said he will vote against this and disagrees with Beckham. He thinks all of this section (Lots 1, 2, 3, and 4) should have been rezoned to WR-2 along with Lot 5. Since we do not know what might happen with these lots and he thinks with all we are doing for this developer, he could make sure that this is residential, too.</p>
<p>VOTE</p>	<p>The motion passed 3-1 with Vice Chair Ellis voting in opposition. The matter is scheduled to go before the Council on August 15, 2022.</p>
<p>MOTION / BOARD DISCUSSION RE STAFF REPORT WPP 22-05/ WPUD 22-02</p>	<p>Scott made a motion, seconded by Councilor Norton, to adopt the findings of fact within staff report WPP 22-05/WPUD 22-02, with the twenty-three (23) conditions of approval, as proposed by City Staff, and recommend approval of the Preliminary Plat along with the requested Subdivision variance and Planned Unit Development for Edgewood 90 Subdivision to the Whitefish City Council.</p> <p>Councilor Norton made a motion, seconded by Beckham, to add a condition based on a letter received from neighbor Gary Gorian relative to items negotiated with Sean Averill. Following discussion, Condition No. 24 was proposed to read, "Eight lots will be developed on the eastern portion of the subdivision with a utility easement between Lots 9 and 10."</p> <p>The motion to add Condition No. 24 passed unanimously.</p>
<p>VOTE</p>	<p>The motion passed unanimously with the additional condition (Condition No. 24). The matter is scheduled to go before the Council on August 15, 2022.</p>

BREAK <i>8:20 pm</i>	Vice Chair Ellis called for a break at 8:20 pm and reconvened the meeting at 8:30 pm.
PUBLIC HEARING 6: CITY OF WHITEFISH ANNEXATION ZONE CHANGE REQUEST <i>8:30 pm</i>	A request by the City of Whitefish to rezone a 31.17-acre undeveloped parcel owned by Uppercut 57, LLC recently annexed into City limits from County SAG-5 zoning to the closest equivalent City zoning of WCR, Country Residential. The property can be legally described as Tract 7A in SE4SW4 S01 T30N R22W, P.M.,M., Flathead County, Montana.
STAFF REPORT WZC 22-05 (Taylor)	<p>Director Taylor reviewed his staff report and findings. As of the writing of WZC 22-05, one public comment email had been received objecting to the zone change; no additional comments have been received since then.</p> <p>The criteria for approval of a zoning map amendment have been met and staff recommended adoption of the findings of fact within staff report WZC 22-05 and for approval of the zoning map amendment request to the Whitefish City Council.</p>
BOARD QUESTIONS OF STAFF	Councilor Norton talked to Direct Taylor this afternoon about the density if built out at this level. There are 31 acres that would be zoned at 2.5 acres, so that would mean 12 houses would be the maximum if it was subdivided. There may be less than that, maybe 10 houses, due to roads, etc., and is congruent with surrounding neighborhoods.
PUBLIC HEARING	Vice Chair Ellis opened the public hearing.
APPLICANT / AGENCIES	City of Whitefish.
PUBLIC COMMENT	<p>Michelle Weinberg, with Weinberg & Hromadka, 116 Lupfer Avenue, spoke representing South Whitefish Neighborhood Association. Her client respectfully asked for denial of the request. The maximum density Councilor Norton just talked about would be <u>without</u> a PUD, which of course could come later on in the process as the plan materializes as to what is going to occur on this and the adjacent properties. She submitted a letter dated July 14, 2022, in the pack for the next item for the next agenda but also addressed this agenda item.</p> <p>The applicant (City of Whitefish) did not explain how this request meets the zoning criteria under MCA § 76-2-304 in the application itself. That includes whether this request would 1) be consistent</p>

with the Growth Policy, 2) whether it would secure safety from fire and other dangers, 3) whether it would promote the public health, safety, and the general welfare of the community, and 4) whether it would facilitate the adequate provisions of transportation, water, sewage, schools, parks, and other public requirements.

While Staff did try to attempt to cure this legal deficiency in the Staff Report, there are at least two problems with the Staff's analysis. First, the conclusory findings of fact in the Staff Report are insufficient to meet the zoning criteria under §76-2-304, MCA. By way of example, Findings 2, 3, 4, 5, and 7-11. Findings 1 and 6 are both factually inaccurate in addition to being conclusory. Finding of fact 6 says the proposed zone will not have an effect on motorized and nonmotorized transportation systems, but how can any of us know that without knowing how many residential units will be proposed under the current zoning or with a PUD that is subject to the larger development plan for this parcel and the adjacent parcels? The Planning Board does not have sufficient information to adopt this finding of fact and they respectfully request it deny this request. Finding of fact 1 states that the zone request is not consistent with the Growth Policy Land Use Map and her client would agree with that.

Additionally, Ms. Weinberg addressed goals, vision statements, and policies of the 2007 Growth Policy she feels this zone change request does not fulfill. In view of Growth Policy goals, vision statements, and policies they believe this request does not fulfill in furtherance of the Growth Policy, and because this request runs contrary to the community's vision overall for Whitefish and the Water Quality Policies, and Land Use Goals in the Policy, they ask for denial of this request.

Vice Chair Ellis asked Ms. Weinberg if she had a recommendation on what this should be zoned since it is now within the City, not County, and she said ideally the City would have a zone that is exactly equivalent. She would have hoped the City would have done before annexing this parcel in. Since it did not, she would think the WA-10 would be more appropriate than the 2.5.

Brian Luke, 144 Old Morris Trail, said the 60 acres adjacent to this property to the west has been in his family for 60 years. There are subsequent wetlands back there, not just seasonal drainage, and it needs to be considered very complicated property to build on and needs to be looked at really closely. This property is a wildlife corridor and there are close to 60 head of whitetail who migrate through his property from this property coming from Whitefish

	<p>River. We need to be very careful how we look at this and go onto it in the future and make sure it is not developed in certain areas because of the high water, wetlands, and effect on wildlife.</p> <p>Vice Chair Ellis asked, and Mr. Luke said it is not a perennial stream, but that property is wet year round. It comes through Lambs' property, through his property, drains off down through there, and goes to the City of Whitefish property. There is no stream name but there is definitely a stream there every year.</p> <p>There being no further comments, Vice Chair Ellis closed the public hearing and turned the matter over to the Planning Board for consideration.</p>
<p>MOTION / BOARD DISCUSSION</p>	<p>Councilor Norton asked for an explanation regarding what Ms. Weinberg was talking about (downzoning to WA-10), and Director Taylor said we do not have a WA-10 zone on the books, we have a WA 15-acre zone, and it is currently five acres. Generally, the City has a policy of not downzoning someone in the sense of when they annex into the City. We try to look at the closest equivalent zoning, which is our 2.5 acre. Our options are 15 or 2.5 acres and since it is adjacent to 2.5-acre zoning to the west and east, WCR is the most equivalent to what is on either side of them. It is higher density general to the north and south, so that zoning is the most compatible.</p> <p>Councilor Norton asked, and Director Taylor said the water conservancy issues would come through when they go to develop. Right now, since it is one lot, with the current zoning you could only build one house on the lot. We have Water Quality setbacks off intermittent streams, etc., so the intermittent stream would be protected under our Water Quality Ordinance now that it is in the City. If they come forward to develop, they will obviously have to address that, whether with a subdivision or planned unit development, and Staff will be looking very closely at how they protect that.</p> <p>Beckham made a motion, seconded by Scott, to adopt the findings of fact within staff report WZC 22-05 as proposed by City Staff, and recommend approval of the zoning map amendment to the Whitefish City Council.</p>
<p>VOTE</p>	<p>The motion passed unanimously. The matter is scheduled to go before the Council on August 15, 2022.</p>

<p>PUBLIC HEARING 7: CITY OF WHITEFISH REZONE REQUEST <i>8:49 pm</i></p>	<p>A request by UpperCut 57 LLC/Eagle Enterprises for a zoning map amendment to two lots, one 19.375-acre lot currently zoned WCR owned by UpperCut, LLC that would be changed to WER and WR-2, and one 11.26-acre parcel currently split zoned WER and WB-2 owned by Eagle Enterprises, LLC that would be changed to WR-2 and WB-2. The lots can be legally described as Tract 3BBD in SW4SE4 & SE4SW4, S01 T30N, R22W, P.M.,M., Flathead County, Montana, no address, and Tract 3B in SW4SE4, S01 T30N R22W, P.M.,M., Flathead County, Montana, addressed as 6208 US Highway 93 S.</p>
<p>STAFF REPORT WZC 22-04 (Taylor)</p>	<p>Director Taylor reviewed his staff report and findings. As of the writing of WZC 22-04, a comment had been received from the Montana Department of Transportation (MDT) that the zone change should not impact MDT facilities, and multiple comments were received from twelve nearby property owners, generally in Park Knoll and Great Northern Heights, opposing the rezone as requested as being too dense. There were also three letters from adjacent residential owners supporting the proposed zoning density.</p> <p>The proposed rezone request meets the legal criteria for approval, and staff recommended adoption of the findings of fact within staff report WZC 22-04 and for approval of the zoning map amendment to the Whitefish City Council.</p> <p>Director Taylor said in the Zoning Code there is a section where during the process of a rezone, in the best interests of the City, the applicant can offer some conditions for the neighbors or City Council to be more comfortable with the rezone. Director Taylor provided a copy of "Conditional Zoning Statement of Conditions" sent in by the applicant following discussions with the neighbors stating they would be willing to add the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Any future subdivision or Planned Unit Development that occurs on the parcel, whether in the WER Zone on the western portion of the WR-2 Zone on the eastern portion, or both, shall be subject to the following additional restrictions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any minimum yard setback for any new lot located adjacent to any property located on or adjacent to Park Knoll lane west of the future Baker Avenue intersection will have an additional 5' setback added on to the required yard setback that directly abuts those properties.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only single-family residential development will be located adjacent to any property located on or adjacent to Park Knoll lane west of the future Baker Avenue intersection. <p>Director Taylor said that would go on the zoning and would apply to any ownership or subdivision that ever happened there in the future.</p> <p><i>Note: There is no recording of the remainder of the July 21, 2022, Planning Board meeting.</i></p>
BOARD QUESTIONS OF STAFF	<p>Councilor Norton asked if there is a diagram depicting where Baker Avenue would extend, and Director Taylor said there is an approximate location shown in the Transportation Plan with a curved line, but it is subject to change and will need to be worked out with Public Works.</p> <p>Council Norton asked about the density of WR-2 and Director Taylor said they can have 13 units per acre unless they come in with a PUD and then can only increase the density if they provide 10% deed restricted for permanent affordable housing. Approximately 30% of the property will be needed for roads, etc. Councilor Norton said she would like to see the potential build-out in terms of density, so the various zone densities involved were extensively discussed.</p>
PUBLIC HEARING	Vice Chair Ellis opened the public hearing.
APPLICANT / AGENCIES	Eric Mulcahy, 2 Village Loop, Kalispell, said he represents the applicants on this proposal. For clarification, the application was submitted when Uppercut 57 owned the property, but it has since been purchased by Honor Bound. About four years ago there was a large land use proposal which was denied by split vote of the Council as they wanted to see a Highway 93 South Corridor Plan first. After meeting for three years, the Highway 93 South Corridor Plan was finally adopted in the fall of 2021, and the proposed zone change is in compliance with the Corridor Plan. They have no idea what their final density or design will look like. Carter Unger of Honor Bound has met with the HOAs of Park Knoll and Great Northern Heights and agreed to the commitments in writing that Director Taylor read tonight.
PUBLIC COMMENT	Lisa Post, 101 Vista Drive, President of the Great Northern Heights

HOA, submitted a comment letter before she met with Mr. Unger or Mr. Kaltschmidt. She received notice of this hearing, but eight homes on JP Road that abut the property did not receive it. She has since talked to Mr. Unger and Mr. Kaltschmidt and what Mr. Mulcahy has not mentioned that Mr. Unger is representing the grey and yellow depicted areas, and Mr. Kaltschmidt the green. Great Northern Heights is zoned WR-1, which is 33% less density than WR-2. Mr. Unger has put in writing his proposal for buffering of Park Knoll, but Mr. Kaltschmidt has not agreed to do that. They indicated their requests for single-family homes along JP Road with high density on the internal part of the property were not unreasonable. They have no plans to develop at this time and said when the time came, they could compromise, and she is optimistic that they are men of their word and will honor what they have told them. She supports this personally but does not know how other Great Northern Heights homeowners feel.

Giselle McKnight, 149 Vista Drive, in Great Northern Heights said growth is hard. After Ms. Post spoke with Mr. Unger and Mr. Kaltschmidt yesterday, she felt more reassured that they would be consulted and open to the types of compromises she saw being made with the 1291 East Edgewood project relative to buffer zones and less density butting up to their development. One of her biggest concerns is traffic and they do not want Granite Drive used as a cut-across to get to Highway 93. If Baker Avenue is brought down far enough that will eliminate that. Director Taylor said we do not know exactly where Baker Avenue will go, but the indication is that it will be on the east, closer to the commercial property.

David Hunt, 113 Park Knoll Lane, said it is a huge ask of any neighborhood to increase density four times (Park Knoll) and three times (Great Northern Heights). The neighborhood created scenarios in their written remarks of what this could be, and what could happen in WR-2 could be at least double. Park Knoll Estates is .8 units per acre built out and this could be 11 times denser. They talked with Mr. Unger at length, and they got a sense that while he does not live in Park Knoll looking at this development, he put himself in their shoes for a while, and after those sessions the neighbors got a good sense that he can help them get a better vision. They have been in support of responsible growth and will continue to work with Mr. Unger. So, for possibly only the second time he is speaking in favor of this rezone and in support of 12 of the 16 residents of Park Knoll as listed on the written materials in

	<p>the packet.</p> <p>Michelle Weinberg, 116 Lupfer Avenue, representing the South Whitefish Neighborhood Association, said she was glad Mr. Mulcahy brought up the South Whitefish Neighborhood Association lawsuit resulting from the denial four years ago as this will probably become the 2.0 version of the lawsuit. She again requested denial.</p> <p>Karen Giesy, 121 Park Knoll Lane, thanked Mr. Unger for meeting with them and being willing to put into writing the buffer conditions he is willing to agree to. As Mr. Hunt said, this is probably only the second time she would agree to this zoning - but only based on Mr. Unger's written agreement. She feels the sense of community is going away and urged the Planning Board members to take time out and travel on Highway 93 at various times of the day. We just cannot continue with this kind of traffic without a Transportation Plan, and changes need to be made.</p> <p>Lisa Post, 101 Vista Drive asked, and Director Taylor said even though this is a dual application and both Mr. Unger of Honor Bound and Eagle Enterprises are on it, Eagle Enterprises would not be subject to the voluntary conditions agreed to by Mr. Unger. Ms. Post said it would be great if the additional conditions could apply to both and go with application.</p> <p>Carter Unger, Honor Bound, LLC, thanked everyone for the welcome, especially Lisa (Post) and David (Hunt), and all the other great residents. He reaffirmed that he is very excited to create something we will all be proud of.</p> <p>There being no further comments, Vice Chair Ellis closed the public hearing and turned the matter over to the Planning Board for consideration.</p>
<p>MOTION / BOARD DISCUSSION</p>	<p>Beckham made a motion, seconded by Scott, to adopt the findings of fact within staff report WZC 22-04 as proposed by City Staff, and recommend approval of the zoning map amendment to the Whitefish City Council.</p> <p>Vice Chair Ellis said he was prepared to vote against this until he heard from Ms. Post and Mr. Hunt tonight, but it disturbs him that Eagle Enterprises has not agreed to the voluntary conditions agreed to by Mr. Unger. If the additional conditions applied to all</p>

	<p>the land, he would change his mind but since Eagle Enterprises has not, they are not going to be bound by that. Earlier, everyone here was in agreement on 1291 Edgewood, and when he compares it with this one, that gives him pause.</p> <p>Councilor Norton said she will also be voting against the proposal. She reminded us that Planning Board is an advisory board to City Council and we have a few weeks to try to work out an agreement with Mr. Kaltschmidt. Councilor Norton feels it is too dense for this time, although she knows the current zoning is not realistic. She is happy the neighboring neighborhoods feel they have been heard, and thinks it is an improvement, but that we need more surety, and need to be more careful with the density.</p> <p>Beckham said this zone change is the closest to what could have happened to what the old County zoning was. Especially now that there are concessions being made, the neighbors can feel more comfortable. She thinks this zoning change is for the best no matter who owns the property, and this is a good space for potentially higher density housing. With Baker Avenue coming through, this is a good spot to change zoning.</p> <p>Scott said he agrees with Beckham. He feels the fact that Mr. Kaltschmidt is not here just shows that he has faith in the City Council. What we need is housing, and if part of this can be WR-2 and create more multi-family housing, he is in favor of it.</p>
<p>VOTE</p>	<p>The motion failed on a tie vote of 2-2 with Scott and Beckham voting in favor, and Vice Chair Ellis and Norton voting in opposition. The matter is scheduled to go before the Council on August 15, 2022.</p>
<p>GOOD AND WELFARE <i>9:50 pm</i></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Matters from Board. Councilor Norton said she attached a meeting last Tuesday put on by the Montana League of Cities and Towns and Columbia Falls City Manager Susan Nicosia said they got through their Growth Policy in six months by taking one chapter at each meeting. 2. Matters from Staff. Director Taylor introduced Nelson Loring, the City's new Planner I-Current, who is replacing Jessica Nymark. Nelson is from North Carolina via Ohio, and will be working with lakeshore, floodplain, etc. Welcome Nelson! We are in the process of hiring a Long Range Planner.

	<p>Compton-Ring said we will have the Transportation Plan on the agenda next month. The Montana Department of Transportation has agreed to do an access management plan on Highway 93, and Senior Project Engineer Karin Hilding convinced them to go all the way through town.</p> <p>Compton-Ring said the Housing Needs Assessment is in the process of being updated (originally done in 2016). Consultants are working on it and will have a draft in August, with finalization in the fall. Vice Chair Ellis asked, and Compton-Ring said Housing Coordinator/Long-Ranger Planner II Marissa Getts is working on it with the Housing Authority and Planning Board will see it in October.</p> <p>3. Poll of Board members available for the next meeting on August 18, 2022. All board members present indicated they thought they would be available.</p>
<p>ADJOURNMENT <i>9:58 pm</i></p>	<p>The meeting was adjourned on a motion by Councilor Norton, seconded by Scott, at approximately 9:58 pm. The next regular meeting of the Whitefish Planning Board is scheduled to be held on August 18, 2022, at 6:00 pm, at 418 E. 2nd Street.</p>

Steve Qunell, Chair of the Board

Keni Hopkins, Recording Secretary

APPROVED AS SUBMITTED / CORRECTED: _____