

Stevensville Planning and Zoning Board Meeting Agenda  
for WEDNESDAY, MARCH 31, 2021 6:30 PM

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

John Kellogg: called the role. Greg, Meghan, Trenis, Paul and me. All board members were present.

2. Approval of Minutes

a. January 6, 2021

b. January 13, 2021

John introduced the approval of minutes. So, for the minutes of the January 6<sup>th</sup>, I am not going to vote on this because I recused myself at that meeting, but I do have some nit-picky suggestions, on page three about 2/3 of the way down, you say Meghan Mefford and it should say Meghan Hanson. On page fourteen I think toward the bottom from Meghan Hanson should have said the cell tower not the cell phone if I am not mistaken. One final on page fifteen about halfway down John Sayer should be Jim Sayer. Is there a motion to accept and approve the minutes?

Meghan Hanson: this is the 72-page document that came in an hour ago, right.

John Kellogg: the bulk of those pages are comments. And so, there are 23 pages of minutes, I understand your residence.

Meghan Hanson: I am just getting off work I haven't read it.

John Kellogg: it is at the boards pleasure if you want to go ahead with them or postpone them. We are wide open with this.

Greg Chilcott: can we get them approved at our next meeting? Gives us a chance to review them.

Paul Ludington: this is some discussion from the community about these minutes. I have read them I noticed two of the three errors that John saw and didn't see any others and most of the rest of it is comment letters that we got sometimes in triplicate in regard to this subdivision. I would like to encourage members of the board, and I am strictly a councilmember, to make a decision to whether or not you want to approve. I don't think there is anything substantial besides some spelling errors misidentifications

Meghan Hanson: I would feel more comfortable reading something before I vote on it.

Greg Chilcott: as would I.

John Kellogg: is that the general consensus there that you would like to take some time. We will postpone the approval of the minutes until the next board meeting.

### 3. Public Hearing

#### a. Zoning change application for Ilamar properties from R-1 to R-2

John Kellogg: introduced public comment item (a). if it is acceptable with the board, and once again I am going to have to recuse myself, Trenis you will have to jump in for the second public hearing (b) hear. What I would like to do for each item in the public hearing first of all provide opportunity for the applicant or developer to explain what is being proposed and you each have a packet with that information Jenelle that has sent to or Brandon has sent to you. I would like to give the developer an opportunity to speak and say what the purpose of their request is. Following that if Mayor Dewey could as the zoning officer give a staff review as what has been included in your packets of information and then follow that up with opening the public hearing to comment from the public. Is that an acceptable approach to the board members?

Board members said yes.

John Kellogg: the first is for Ilamar properties, a property within the Town of Stevensville to rezone land from R-1 to R-2. The property is accessed from Pine Street just a little bit east from Eastside HWY and with that I will let Terry give an explanation of what is being proposed with this.

Terry Nelson: thank you for meeting with me tonight. This is a few different pieces of property a few lots within the Town of Stevensville there is another piece of ground that is not part of the plan but in Stevensville there is also a little chunk of this the entire property that is out of the town limits, sort of the north little piece of what this property is. It is currently zoned R-1 the people that have purchased it want to do some condo units on it also a picture of another project of what they are working on in Corvallis that pretty much shows what the build is going to look like as you can see from the zoning map right there it is R-1 joined to the south and the north, north west with existing R-2 zoning also the request is to change the zoning from R-1 to R-2 and then we have also included a sketch map including trying to meet all of the requirements of your building codes for R-2 setbacks and density and what not, you can see how that would kind of fit in there. I am available for any questions.

John Kellogg: thank you Terry does the board have any questions for Mr. Nelson.

Paul Ludington: I do have a couple of questions. Of course, a preliminary concern on my part is what your right of way road would be, and this storm water situation is going to be in that area. I have been by that a couple of times and I have been around that for the past couple of decades and it is extremely wet. I just want to know if part of your plan is going to be address the storm water and how that is going to look with the density on this particular lay out.

Terry Nelson: certainly, if you have been by there you have seen there is a drainage that kind of runs through it and on that northern piece there are a bunch of cat tails and what not there is certainly water going through this property one of, if this zoning is changed, one of the challenges is going to be what do we do with that storm water. That will be one of the engineering feats that we will have to look at and take care of. As far as the streets at lease what I have shown on this sort of initial thing if you look at the paved portion coming off of Pine Street, I have that as 36 foot wide and then 24 foot wide paved surfaces inside just showing a lot

of room for having good access coming into all of that and there is adequate room for the additional parking that is required plus if you will notice or if you saw a picture of the other ones they have build in garages as well as entry ways have parking in front also. Does that answer your questions?

Paul Ludington: that answers it for me, thank Terry.

John Kellogg: I have a couple for you Terry. It appears if I am not mistaken, Pine Street there is either 80 or 100 feet wide. On the rear of the property though, the unfortunately North Ave just adjacent to that property as I look at it from the Winslett addition two is a 20-foot-wide private easement and mostly unpaved I believe. So, as a private easement it is not going to offer the option of through traffic my concern is, and I understand that this is a very preliminary sketch, my concern is for a turn around at the end of the dead end driveways a turnaround adequate for large vehicle or emergency vehicles to be able to turn around and exit the property, so I would hope along the way that is considered when you put together a lay out for the property.

Terry Nelson: you a right, if North Ave was available, we would certainly connect to it not only is it a private easement I believe but also a one-foot strip, that they used to do to keep people from driving over there. As it is now these are set up similar to a hammer head turn around would be for emergency vehicle to turn around in, but we can certainly, when we get into the actual full design of it we can put in whatever is required for the safety.

John Kellogg: okay, good.

Meghan Hanson: I was going to ask a question, but I think that you addressed it John, why aren't you connecting to North Ave., but the proposal is for potentially 44 units but with one access point?

Terry Nelson: this property only has that one access point; Pine Street is the only one with access.

Meghan Hanson: have you reached out to the people on the south, I see a parking lot adjacent.

Terry Nelson: we haven't but that parking lot is about 3-4 feet off of the ground so it would have its own challenges.

Greg Chilcott: I think what we are really, conceptual design that we are looking at, at least in my mind, we are asking for a rezoning change. In regard to the development if will have to go through you before it was approved, wouldn't it?

John Kellogg: I believe that you are correct, Mayor Dewey can express the process that we will have to go through. I think that our process is to identify items that we hope the developer can take into consideration when he does a sight plan. The review of zoning contingent on making sure these items are being taken care of at this time, I think if I could paraphrase, I think the concept here is that we want to provide suggestions so it would hopefully address the issues that the planning board has identified. Is that essentially your purpose Paul and Meghan?

Meghan Hanson: I guess the goal tonight is to decide whether or not we are okay with the zone change or not and what they can do with that zone change. Obviously, a lot of preliminary

stipulations going on here. Do you have, does somebody know, a 44-unit limit what would be the limit of an R-1, does somebody know that?

John Kellogg: a quarter of that.

Mayor Dewey: John do you want me to go through the staff report? It may help answer some of the difference between the R-1 and the R-2.

John Kellogg: excellent, is that the boards pleasure right now?

Board members: yes.

Mayor Dewey: I will through the staff report up for you folks just so you can follow along with me. This staff report is compiled from an effort of the administration or the planning offices perspective on the project considering a zoning change from R-1 to R-2 on the subject property and that has been laid out for you folks. Currently it has been vacant land, and the town does not have any records on how it has been used in the past. We took a very high-level approach to this kind of like Mr. Chilcott indicated where we didn't necessarily critique or evaluate concept drawings or any other information that demonstrated their intent on the property, but we kept a high level knowing that staff and department heads would have an opportunity to fully evaluate a plan once development permits were pulled for the parcels. As Terry described the surrounding zoning there, there is just a little bit there that is unzoned currently as it lies outside of the limits, but aside from that everything is zoned there. I guess skipping right into what Meghan was inquiring about was dwelling units per acre and the density so as it stands today those two parcels the density would be one dwelling unit per parcel because our code doesn't allow any more than one unit per parcel now if they were to divide those parcels out the R-1 would limit them to four dwellings per acre. That obviously increases as you see there in the R-2 but the set back do not change in an R-2 zone. Much of the other dimension requirements don't change with the exception of building height does increase to 36 feet. They are allowed to cover a lot up to 40% by structures. We determine a lot of that after the right of way and private roads are subtracted from the land area, so keep that in mind when considering the density of that property. When it comes to the growth policy we describe in here some of the statical data pulled from the 2019 American Survey where they provide some five year estimates, I don think that it is any secret in our community that we are in a housing shortage, especially work force housing and housing that is appropriate for those to age in place in the community, This certainly checks a lot of those boxes from that perspective of community development. It is the developer's intent to provide owner occupied housing it is their hope or their desire, that they have expressed to me, that many of the units in this development would be owner occupied and some would be renter occupied as well. There is a lot of conversation especially around the Burnt Fork Estates subdivision as well and even in Twin Creeks about home ownership and affordability and we view this in terms of consistency with our growth policy as achieving some of those goals for the Town of Stevensville. In the report we have kind of built it up from those perspectives of housing and affordability and even R-1 to R-2 in those densities we support the project we do feel like the governing bodies that consider this decision should consider what the impacts to our infrastructure are certainly in terms of water and sewer and those are given but the surrounding transportation infrastructure as well and while many people like us to determine what those capacities are right now today we don't know what the projected time

frame for development of this property is so we cant tell you capacity is of our system at the time this project moves forward, that has to be determined when they pull those permits. We have had a similar conversation around Burnt Fork Estates as well. With all these different development projects going on we are not coming right out and saying, "yes, our systems and our streets can handle the capacity of an up to a 44-unit development, but we are throwing some caution there. If it were to be build tomorrow, we are confident that certainly the water and sewer systems would hold to capacity. We outlined the public input process in our findings of fact, ultimately, we recommend at the end of the day approval of the zoning change. Answer any questions for the board?

John Kellogg: appreciate you addressing the density question, I forgot that you could just put one house on one lot.

Mayor Dewey: we do that all the time, actually the next issue that you address with Twin Creeks kind of brought that to light that while yes you can do four units per acre in an R-1 that is assuming that you brought those acres down into some sort of individual lot, we don't do more than one dwelling unit per lot in an R-1 zone.

John Kellogg: are there any other questions for Mayor Dewey? With that or with the assistance of Jenelle or the Mayor I guess the next step is to open this up for public comment if there is public comment either by phone or by the Zoom here.

Mayor Dewey: there is no body on the phone, there is one citizen on the Zoom meeting with us this evening and Jenelle can reference the two public comments from email, and she can reference those and the date that they were received. I believe the board has been provided a copy of those.

Jenelle Berthoud: referenced the two email comments, Steven Gronbach and Debra Buckley. I can summarize them; Steve's is very short Debra's has about 4 fact findings on hers. I will send those over to you John. Jenelle read the comment from Steve Gronbach.

Mayor Dewey: I am sorry Jenelle we should have been specific we only need the comment for Ilmar Properties, those are Twin Creeks aren't they.

Jenelle Berthoud: you are correct, I don't have any then.

John Kellogg: I guess we should wait for a few minutes to phone in, is that a phone in there?

Mayor Dewey: yep, a phone just jumped on if you are going to open public comment the number ending in 3018.

#### PUBLIC COMMENT

Marilyn Wolff: 300 Aspen Trail, gave comment/questions on this. Is the developer being represented by a PCI or anyone other than the developers handling this themselves.

John Kellogg: just Mr. Nelson is representing him here. PCI is not involved in this.

Marilyn Wolff: okay, is this are in the water use area of the town or is this similar to Creekside Meadows and Burnt Fork Estates where it is not approved by DNRC?

John Kellogg: I believe that it is in the water use area I will let Mayor Dewey answer that.

Mayor Dewey: I guess as a point of clarification, yes this property is in the use area of our old water rights but when you reference the well field and the water that we are pumping from the well field the fact remains that the entire community is outside that place of use in fact only the Twin Creeks subdivision is covered by the place of use by the well field, the entire city is outside the place of use for the well field but most of the city is in the place of use for the old water rights that we used to use on the old water system.

Marilyn Wolff: so, what you are saying is this property would be grandfathered in would not have the issue with DNRC, is that correct?

Mayor Dewey: I can't speak to what issues DNRC would have they would follow the same process as attaching to our public water supply system that anyone has to.

Marilyn Wolff: so they might be added as Creekside Meadows and Burnt Fork Estates to really get final approval from the state agencies?

Mayor Dewey: it wouldn't be a condition of the zoning change.

Marilyn Wolff: okay it wouldn't but the application perhaps.

Mayor Dewey: if they were to subdivide, yes.

Marilyn Wolff: okay, so none of this is county, it is all in the city, correct?

Mayor Dewey: that is correct.

Marilyn Wolff: I guess this just worries me, this is 44 more water and sewer users on top of what is already being proposed in the area I just want to make that comment, thank you.

John Kellogg: thank you Marilyn. Do you see any other citizens that wish to comment?

Mayor Dewey: no Mr. Chairman there are no other call ins on the list tonight.

John Kellogg: okay with that I would want to close the public hearing

Greg Chilcott: close public comment, not public hearing.

John Kellogg: yes, public comment and at this point if we are moving into the Twin Creeks re-zoning, I am going to recuse myself and disappear here until that is done.

Greg Chilcott: Mr. Chairman, Mayor don't we have two public hearing tonight?

Mayor Dewey: sounds like the public hearing has concluded for the Ilmar Properties re-zone.

Greg Chilcott: aren't we going to take action?

Mayor Dewey: no because you are not there yet, do you have an agenda in front of you?

John Kellogg: the process I believe, and it is kind of odd to me, the process of discussion on the zoning change occurs afterword when the public comment hearing is closed and the board discusses the recommendation to the town council. I should probably mention that for both of these zoning change

requests there is going to be hearing in front of the town council in the near future and so I believe those are going to be in person hearings, is that correct?

Mayor Dewey: that is correct Mr. Chairman. That addresses a couple of things firstly to Mr. Chilcott's point we structured this agenda to help the board based on how we structure other agendas in the organization if the board tonight would rather wait to do the public hearing on the Twin Creeks until after they have made a decision under their new business item that is acceptable. You folks can rearrange your agenda how ever you want to it is your meeting.

Meghan Hanson: can I ask for a quick clarification there, can you point me to that agenda I don't find it.

Mayor Dewey: I think that Jenelle sent a link out to you for our website, we will have you resend that to you Meghan if you missed it. The agenda is on our website and the way that we had it listed Meghan was we have two public hearing and then you have new business two decision items for recommendation. You can rearrange that how ever you want it is your pleasure it is not going to hurt my feelings or Jenelle's. Secondary to that public hearings will be held on both items by the town council so this entire process with repeat itself with the town council, it is a little bit unique subdivisions look more accelerated than a zoning change well enough we, once you have a recommendation from the planning and zoning board we will go back through the process we will send out new mailings to everyone effected, within the effected area we will reschedule public hearings and those public hearings will be scheduled in person as part of a regular town council meeting. The reason that this meeting is virtual we did not know what kind of attendance to expect at the meeting and didn't have the space to host it for this specific night or any night within the next couple of weeks. That is why you are virtual, and we knew we would be holding those town council hearings in person.

John Kellogg: thank you Mayor Dewey. To follow up with that what is the boards pleasure for arranging the process the agenda do you want to jump into a vote on Ilmar Properties now or do you want to go onto the public hearing for the Twin Creeks proposal?

Greg Chilcott: I think that there is less confusion if we take one topic and follow it to its conclusion in a public hearing it just seems like we likely get more confusion, and the facts can get jumbled between one request and another in my opinion.

John Kellogg: is that the sense of the board?

Trenis Hindle: I believe that it would get jumbled if we move on.

Meghan Hanson: a see that point that it could get jumbled, I am getting a little concerned of the number of re-zones and changes of things that we are starting to see in the town in a short order and wanting to make sure that we keep an overall handle on that, so we make sure that we are directing things the community and everyone wants things to go and if we keep things to piece meal that just makes me a little worried, it makes me want to have, I don't want to have, but it makes me feel that we should have some sort of work group to re-address or re-bring up to speed the towns goals, the growth policy and how this all ties in.

John Kellogg: I think that is an appropriate incite because I think growth policies are typically updated every five years or so and I think the growth policy was adopted in 2016 so we are on that schedule.

Meghan Hanson: it has been a while; I was here for it.

Mayor Dewey: yeah, it was done in 2016 so you are due the end of 2021 to renew that growth policy.

John Kellogg: is that something that we want to pass along to council put on our plate to work on or should we take it up ourselves.

Meghan Hanson: I don't have a good answer I am just bringing it up as a concern that we just piece meal these things together all year all these little meetings and approvals and changes without having something bigger without having something in front of me that I can look at and say "oh yeah that makes sense in the big picture" I don't feel like I have that.

Mayor Dewey: like a master plan basically that says this is something that we anticipated.

Meghan Hanson: I have my personal opinions you know but I would like a something a little more than that.

Mayor Dewey: so, does that mean that you don't want to separate them on the agenda?

Meghan Hanson: that means that I don't know.

Mayor Dewey: going back to the issue.

Meghan Hanson: my opinion right now is that it is a great place in town for infill and growth and small housing makes absolute sense bad housing doesn't but neither does bad large housing so that would something to address in that master plan I am all for small more practical, community minded getting things vibrant etc. etc. all of that sounds awesome. I just don't want to be in over our heads with something. I think all of that is saying I am all for re-zoning it with like wight million stipulations until we figure it out.

John Kellogg: I think there are legal opinions probably both sides of the argument on whether you can condition zoning.

Meghan Hanson: I realize that I am not suggesting that you could.

John Kellogg: I think sometimes done through an agreement with the developer to put a covenant on the property but can be a complicated process I don't know if Stevensville want to jump into something that complex.

Paul Ludington: to me here is the reality and Greg can probably speak to this to the property has been black or empty for probably more than fifty years. And the reason it has been like that because it has always been wet. It has gone through in the time that I have been a resident of this town it has gone through at least the third or fourth owner and the issue of the suitability of the build ability of that piece of property is still in question. I don't care if you zone it C-1 there is still a whole lot of issue that have to be resolved before you are able to put something on there. To me the viability of the property itself does better at R-2 than it does at R-1 I think there is a better opportunity for us to do something important for the town in a higher density whether or not if they will be able to reach that density with the issues that the land has, I severely doubt. And I think at the time that we are talking about what kind of conditions we are going to put on an R-2 zone within that and what they have to go through is when we will be able to determine much better what the density will be in that particular piece of property, it is unfortunate but I think over the years put pieces of property or built houses were we can and left blank property were the water tended to pool and that is one of the last ones know and I think there is



going to be some considerable concern with those people that are down stream from this particular property and what happens, given the current regulation of storm water it is going to have to all be treated on site that cant send anymore down stream that is flowing know and that is going to take them some time. So, I think the best, the most suitable thing for the town in this particular area for a re-zone would be to go an R-2. Those two houses that are just to the south of this property to the south and the west of this piece of property there are a couple of houses there, when that happened we tried to talk the guy into putting them closer to the road and putting them into a different configuration to make a little bit more since to what is happening this is what we could get to and at that point we were also concerned about ground water if you look at the map there are a couple of houses that are off the road, that is the only R-1 that is close to that, everything else around that area is already multifamily.

Greg Chilcott: the one to the east?

Meghan Hanson: looks like just beyond that is R-2.

Paul Ludington: on North Ave there are four houses there.

John Kellogg: I sense that it is the boards wish to discuss this and take a vote on it now is that your feeling?

Meghan Hanson: I think so.

John Kellogg: so, we have heard some good concerns over the parcel are their other concerns that you can address with questions for the developers representative or the mayor.

Greg Chilcott: Mr. Chairman? I understand there is likely to be some physical realities on the ground there at least in my opinion if they are topographical that the concern is the zoning around it, impacts or conforms or flows and as far as the engineering requirements to develop this property to some density that I don't believe that has a whole lot to do with the zoning designation I think that Meghan and Paul both talked about it is on paper it is the right place for this, whether they can get the building code requirements to build skyscrapers or not I don't think that is necessary part of our zoning. I think we are looking at were R-2 belongs at least from my perspective this isn't an appropriate place for R-2 zoning parcels.

John Kellogg: thank you Mr. Chilcott. Brandon?

Mayor Dewey: in terms of process, you could compare what is ahead regardless if this is approved or not in terms of zoning you can compare a process with what ever happens to this property if it weren't subdivided. Burnt Fork Place just east of this were they situated five buildings on a specific lot and there were, how ridged we were in terms of standards that they built, and the ground water issues existed there as on this property so a lot of that process is going to happen when they submit a site plan that we have to go through a thorough review of that kind of development of that size is often a site plan review that we farm out to our engineers because we don't feel that our in house staff doesn't have the abilities or expertise to address it, just as a reference there top what we could expect if this project were built to submitted as the same way that it is being submitted today that is kind of the road we would likely go down.

John Kellogg: thank you for that, Burnt Fork Place is 16 units on 13 acres so, I think considering what potentially could be built on it and there are some challenges with this parcel as Paul laid out before. It

appears that the general direction we are headed all end with they believe that this is an appropriate area to propose for the re-zoning. And if I understand Meghan's sense is that she wishes that it fit into a bigger picture that was laid out through the growth policy. Trenis, you have the perspective that you would want to give us.

Trenis Hindle: leaning on the side of Greg and Paul feeling that it is an appropriate adjacent zoning that we have there and think that it is a good location there is obviously a lot that has to be done through the process to make this site accessible for many structures there but zoning wise just focusing on that I support the change to R-2.

John Kellogg: In terms of process here other than a straight vote, Brandon can look at the zoning impacts.

Mayor Dewey: nothing comes straight to mind I think if you concur with the findings of the staff report than you know in the past this process has been this fits, this hits the criteria on a zone change application and then make a motion to recommend or not recommend. I don't have the application; I think there is some criteria listed bear with me if there is criteria listed on the application itself that you could reference if you wanted to.

John Kellogg: it lists consideration of secure from safety from fire and other dangers, public health safety, general welfare, consideration of transportation, water, sewage, schools, parks etc. this is the type of over view that the town would need to look at for large scale zoning or setting up a zoning map, but even in a small scale we should consider reasonable provision and adequate like there, effect on motorized and non-motorized transportation systems, if even Stevensville had a non-motorized transportation system. Promotion of adequate urban growth I think that is a little stretching it for the town of Stevensville to call urban growth, but character of the district, particular suitability or the particular uses then conserving the value of buildings, there are no buildings here, so I guess that is a non-issue. So, I would entertain a motion.

Greg Chilcott: I would also like to recognize the findings of fact in that report there are five of them and I think we should accept those as our findings of fact along with your statement. And with that I would move that we approve the Ilmar Properties request to amend the zoning over the two-and-a-half-acre parcel from R-1 to R-2 actually there are two parcels.

Meghan Hanson: I will 2<sup>nd</sup>.

John Kellogg: it has been moved by Mr. Chilcott and 2<sup>nd</sup> by Ms. Hanson should we have a role call vote or a show of hands?

Mayor Dewey: I would recommend that you call for a little bit of public comment for the sake of it and then call for a role call vote for the record, so who is ever doing the recording knows how.

John Kellogg: Jenelle do we have public comment on the motion that has been made by the board?

Mayor Dewey: we don't have any on the phone at this time.

Jenelle Berthoud: none via email either.

John Kellogg: Marilyn as the public in this hearing do you have any further comments regarding the motion? Then I will call for a role call vote, Jenelle could you do that?

Jenelle Berthoud: called for the vote.

Greg Chilcott: aye.

Meghan Hanson: aye.

Trenis Hindle: aye.

Paul Ludington: aye.

John Kellogg: aye.

John Kellogg: the motion passes unanimously.

Terry Nelson: thank you all, I am going to get off and let you all go unless you need me for anything.

Mayor Dewey: no sir, we will get a letter out to you folks confirming the zoning change once it goes to council you will get the next steps.

Terry Nelson: okay, thank you very much.

John Kellogg: now I am going to pass the gavel to Trenis as a recuse myself and disappear and allow you to speak with Ron Ewart.

b. Zoning change application for Twin Creeks Subdivision from R-1 to R-2

Trenis Hindle: hello Ron, how are you doing?

Ron Ewart: good how about you.

Trenis Hindle: we are doing well, thank you. Would you like to provide us a summary of?

Ron Ewart: sure, I will try to make it quick I have some information on communications including today I sent him a letter with some information and some clarification, so I hope that all of that gets included into the record and forwarded onto the town council as we move forward. I will just hit a few highlights right now and if you have questions, I would be glad to get into further detail. Basically, the proposal is to rezone eleven lots or about three and a half acres from R-1 to R-2 to allow for duplexes or single-family houses on those eleven lots we also propose to delete a total of sixteen lots, so Phases 2 & 3 would go to 48 lots and up to 59 dwelling units on 20.37 acres the result would be the same density that we earlier approved in 2007 which was 64 lots on 20.37 acres. I think that this is a win win for the neighborhood and the environment we are increasing the common area by three acres it shuts down for the need for construction of about 1300 linear feet of utilities and road way and the areas of about 16 lots including the big two new lots on 2.0 acre to the south, there would be only one creek crossing instead of three creek crossings, we are not moving any lot lines inside of the subdivision but we have begun discussion with the owners of the 2.0 acre track to the south. The folks that live down near the 2.0 acres, they are different people from who owned it before when the proposal was to have one, but these folks would like to have there 2.0 acres as is except for, it is my idea that somebody lived down here also owned this property you can see the yard area extends into this 20.37 acres that is going to be developed, the idea is to provide these folks their 2.0 acres in some matter that takes in this yard area and the loop. We would also cover this roadway with a 20-foot access because there is not a proper access easement now, there is a specified easement that exists along the west bound and we would just

leave that as is because it does serve another lot we are just trying to help out the owner of this property and to give them legal access and of course work with them. Again, I would be glad to answer any questions that you may have, I sent in information that I would be more than happy to send more or ask any questions, thanks.

Mayor Dewey: Mr. Hindle do you want me to go through the staff report next?

Trenis Hindle: yeah, sure if you would.

Mayor Dewey: this staff report is going to really mirror that first staff report that we gave for Ilmar properties in that in terms of strictly the zone change application the re-phase request is not usually something that we heavily weighed in on in the staff report by nature we don't necessarily take an issue with the re-phase request and that is not necessarily something that is before the planning and zoning board that will be approved by the town council and their action the uniqueness of this property compared to last request that you had is that nearly all of the property surrounding this is single family use or is vacant land and this is largely because of the lack of development occurred in the area and this is a relatively new neighborhood but in terms of age and the surrounding community. As you know the Twin Creeks subdivision was approved back in 2007 and that approval was for 117 single family lots covering 42.27 acres and that phase 1 of that subdivision has been built out and is complete and the property since then has switched hands and is now owned by Mr. and Mrs. Hendrickson who are seeking development of phase 2 and 3. Recently the town council, I believe it was in 2020, the town council approved changing the final plat for phase 2 extending it to 2022 and this is not being changed in this proposal. At this time characteristically the proposal in its totality does not change the density of the property because they are deleting lots and reallocating those units to other lots. One thing to high light is that just because a portion of the property may be zoned R-2 does not mean that R-2 development will happen on those lots, it may mean that single family dwelling units are built on those lots as well we don't know that until a lot is purchased and built by a property owner but the potential does exist up to a duplex could be placed on each lot depending on the dimensions of that lot the dimensional requirements are covered in the first staff report don't really change a lot from R-1 to R-2 they are listed in the staff report here they still have the 25 foot set back from the front the rear is 20 feet and the sides are 7 ½ the dwelling units per acre does increase but again if you take into consideration the dimensional requirements you are not going to get a giant building on these R-2 lots. It just won't happen; they are allowed to go up to 36 feet and they can cover 40% vs 30% of those lots. Again, the issue that we came across here is in theory this covers the 4 units per acre, right? But you can't have more than one unit on a lot so that triggers the use or that triggers the necessity to go to R-2 and that is why we are here today. The growth policy consistency is covered almost verbatim from the other zoning change that you considered tonight where the developers have expressed their intent this too would encourage homeowner ship at a reasonable price point, something that we are really looking for in development of our community and you can see an example there that was provided by the representatives as a concept, may not be exactly what is built but it is a concept. Same consideration as previously mentioned in terms of capacity and all those things, again often times when we see a transfer from an R-1 to an R-2 we automatically flip a switch in our head and think that this means more density this will be an increase density and more homes in a neighborhood, there is an exception when you are considering Twin Creeks Phase 2 & 3 because they are removing lots from the subdivision and so that is a point that I really want to highlight as part of this proposal, we are not increasing the density of the

overall subdivision we are really just increasing density on eleven lots in a proposal. Overall, all things considered the recommendation on this zone change is approval as well. I will take any questions.

Greg Chilcott: Mr. Chairman?

Trenis Hindle: yes Greg, we have a comment letter from a Debra Buckley, and she indicated in her first finding that the developer sold two acres is that I am not sure what that means is so has it dropped from 42.27 to 40.27 or is a boundary line relocation or an adjustment maintains the size of the property in acreage?

Ron Ewart: I received Debra Buckley's letter this afternoon, so I spent a good deal of the afternoon trying to clarify the points that she brought up this 2.0-acre parcel was never part of the original 40.27-acre parcel from the beginning. Other owners before wanted to be in on the subdivision they sold that property another couple and that couple now don't really want to be part of the subdivision, but they are interested in doing a boundary relocation, so it has always been a separate lot.

Greg Chilcott: always been a separate lot because I think in the staff report Brandon indicated that it was 42.27 in its original configuration.

Ron Ewart: yes that 2.0 acres with the original 40.27 acres that is what you get now we have 40.27 acres in phases 2 and 3 without the 2.

Paul Ludington: so, does that mean that the 2.0 acres is technically in the town and is part of what was annexed?

Mayor Dewey: it doesn't appear that it was annexed. But it was oddly enough part of the subdivision preliminary plat, but it wasn't, and I am going to look here what I am seeing on the property index is that it wasn't annexed in.

Meghan Morris: I am going to jump in here and introduce myself I am Meghan Morris and am the owner of these two acres that we are talking about and I have working and talking with Ron and the developer we have had several discussion and a couple of meetings as well as with the person that we bought the property from and my understanding on this question is that it is not annexed we don't have documents to go with the house to say the land was annexed there was a letter of agreement, MOU, at some point that said that could be a possibility but it was not completed.

Greg Chilcott: thank you.

Paul Ludington: so that means that you have your own well and septic system, is that correct?

Meghan Morris: we do.

Paul Ludington: I for one appreciate your letter Ron that I got this afternoon, it explained a lot of the questions that I had and that was the only one that remained I did notice that there was a change in the acreage and just wanted to make sure that 2.0 acres was defined as being in town or out of town.

Ron Ewart: we will probably have to make a minor amendment to the town limits once we get this done, but it will be very small. Boundary location is try and help Meghan and that is what the developer wants to do try to help everyone and if there is any way that we can help somebody out and feel better about the proposal we will do whatever we can.

Mayor Dewey: I hate to muddy the water here but Ms. Morris you pay city taxes. So, you must be annexed.

Greg Chilcott: the county expects a check, Brandon.

Mayor Dewey: I am sure you do. Put it on our tab, I went into the tax system and it appears that you pay city taxes so the only way that happens is at one point on another a legal description is sent to the county saying this has been annexed into the town.

Meghan Morris: okay, we are going to have to take a look at that because that is not our understanding and is certainly not the documents that we had, and we are not connected to the city system so.

Mayor Dewey: that is something that we can explore further, because we can go back to the original annexation of the property and see if your legal description got looped in with that and if that were the case then yes you do in fact you are in fact a resident of Stevensville or of the town of. Congratulations you learned something new tonight, I am sure that is not what you expected to learn.

Meghan Morris: we have actually had this conversation with the previous owner, and she was certain, like I said it has not been part of our documents.

Mayor Dewey: we are going to look into right away, we have a guru in our office that is not obviously here tonight she is really good at going back and looking at the documentation we will pull that all up and get that over to you as it stands tonight I don't think that it has any bearing on the zoning change because you are not changing the zoning of that parcel it does just change the preliminary plat of what that subdivision looks like, something that the town council will address.

Meghan Morris: thanks for looking that up.

Meghan Hanson: can I ask a general question whenever we are ready.

Mayor Dewey: I don't know if you are ready to take public comment you have at least one caller on the phone. I will let you drive it.

Trenis Hindle: I would like to hear from Meghan, go ahead present your question and then we will take public comment.

Meghan Hanson: great, let me know if this is better after the fact. I am just wondering for the developer what is the reasoning on choosing those south easterly lots for the potential duplex's vs a different part of the property, just wondering what the reasoning was.

Ron Ewart: we tried to consolidate them a little bit they are not right next to the lots in phase 1 they are sort of all a little cluster area, I guess we could disperse them out people might be more acceptable if they were in a little cluster.

Meghan Hanson: I was just curious.

Trenis Hindle: thanks Meghan, we should probably move on to public comment.

Mayor Dewey: got one caller on the phone with the phone number ending in 7909. It doesn't look like they are able to unmute if there is any other public comment that you would like to address at this time I am going to try and call this person to see if we can get them on the phone another way.

## PUBLIC COMMENT

Meghan Morris: I don't know if I qualify as public but while he is dialing that other individual I make one more comment as that adjacent land owner the area that they have freed up and moved to keep the density the same to make into that R-2 is actually a fairly heavily used nature area and it maintains more of that we want to put on the public comment that we are in favor of that and that it is a good thing for that area, the current tenants of phase 1 are already using it they are kind of making it their own walking trail path there is a lot of bird wildlife and great spot to walk through. The boundary location that Ron mentioned that we have been working on is intended to help us so that nature area can be preserved and not be in our side yard, so people are walking by our bedroom we are in favor of it.

Mayor Dewey: alright, Debra we are on the speaker phone.

Debra Buckley: 3593 Sourdough Lane. I wrote that letter that was sent in today I just have some concerns that when I received the letter from Ron Ewart representing the developer, it was quite a lengthy letter and complicated to read actually I understand two acres had been sold off and the acreage was down to the forty so I thought that would increase the density right there. There is some language in that letter that is not very concessive it is very loosely written that there will likely be duplex's built, will the town council be controlling if they give them an R-2 that is up to 16 units per acre. That is not what the letter states what is the process?

Mayor Dewey: so, if I may answer that for you Debra. While the zoning regulation does allow up to 16 units per acre because of the size of these lots and the required setbacks in our development code from a conceptual standpoint it is very difficult to see anything larger than a two-family unit or two single family units in a same building being built on these properties. Because of the parking requirements, setback requirements all of those other things that they have to put on their property based on the law and the code alone it is not conservable that they could get anything larger than a duplex on those lots.

Debra Buckley: unless they went up.

Mayor Dewey: even if they go up, they are still going to have to meet parking requirements and that is a minimum of one and a half spaces per bedroom. They could conceivably go up but in don't know where they would put the parking as so the proposal would be denied.

Debra Buckley: the covenants that you, that we have here according to the setbacks are different from what I heard you just say. We have 10 feet from the side 30 from the back and 25 from the front.

Mayor Dewey: so, the town doesn't enforce covenants but your homeowners association does and so you can basically accept yours as the bare minimum unless the developer protested those covenants yours are going to over ride them just know that we are not going to enforce them, we only look for our own but when they go to your architectural committee you are going to have to tell them, "you are going to have to be back this set it sounds like, and Ron can correct me if I am wrong , there are going to adhere to the covenants that apply to the property and if your covenants are more restrictive than city code than it is even more so unrealistic to think that anything huge is going to be built on these lots.

Debra Buckley: the other question that I have that I brought up in my letter that I am concerned about the two creeks, split up the creeks. In the plat Mr. Ewart was not aware of where the creeks were at, the location of the creeks out here I know that he is on ZOOM right now he was referring to an arial map of

where the creeks were at I am not really sure from his plat drawing that there is any water drawn in there so how are they addressing the water the two acres that the owner purchased are they from the creek over, south? Where does the creek lie on the plat of the proposal?

Mayor Dewey: Ron can speak to that for you.

Ron Ewart: basically, conceptual drawings as proposed and as approved to give people a clear idea as to what it is that we would like to do with the lots and what we would like to do as far as rezoning. I did send in a photo showing it so we know that the creeks are there we mapped them and they are on our data base, we set back the property lines from the creeks, pads for the houses at a certain elevation so if you want more information we can certainly provide you that, we still have to find out if we get this rezoning approved but we do have maps showing the creeks and the creeks are all within boundary areas.

Debra Buckley: I am so sorry I hope that you can understand me better, I couldn't understand a thing through the phone I guess that it is just a projection. I was having a hard time on the Zoom meeting trying to hear. I have a feeling that if you are looking at the proposed as proposed versus as approved, as approved the creeks originally had to have been beyond where the original 64 lots were going to be which in the proposal is removed those 16 lots are removed and the 11 are single are going to R-2 which is just a proposal, but I imagine the lots are beyond it. I guess another thing with this common area I am not sure about the homeowners it is assumed that this will become part of our neighborhood our homeowner's association, so we are basically having to take on any common area with out any investment from the developer is that how it works? The developer doesn't have to invest anything in the common area.

Mayor Dewey: Debra to just back up I want to relay what Ron stated regarding the water ways on the property. As I understand what he said those water ways are protected by the common areas and fall within the common areas that you see. The maps don't show that, but it sounds like he has maps that do show those water ways. Just know that the creeks are running through the green areas and are buffered by the common area, so they won't be developing up to a water way with out some sort of a setback in place.

Debra Buckley: that is good because the first as approved it wasn't drawn that way. I know further down they have rights to that water for irrigation.

Mayor Dewey: they are being buffered and protected by those common areas.

Debra Buckley: we are concerned about these common areas, are they just going to be left natural, big dirt pile and construction rubble. That will have to be addressed where is that dirt going to go.

Ron Ewart: the piles of dirt are in the area to be developed I don't know of anything in the common area, that dirt will be removed to build houses and streets. Also, I would like folks and especially Debra, I sent the letter today and I hope that answered questions especially in regards to homeowners association and the covenants and the other things that she had brought up.

Mayor Dewey: just paraphrasing for you Debra, the piles of dirt are not sitting in the areas of the common area they are actually sitting in areas that will be developed for homes, so those piles of dirt are going to go away. He referred to the letter of what the expectations of the common area and the homeowner's association.



Debra Buckley: we have difficulty keeping this one common area, this other common area has become a dumping area. I just wonder if this new area has to become of the existing homeowners if we chose, if the association chooses to not take that on I don't know the answers I do thank you for your time. Commented on keeping in touch with the town council and the outcome.

John Kellogg: I would like to repeat some of what Ron was emphasizing if you look at that proposal what it does is vesting increase the protection of the creeks it enlarges the area around the creeks that will be protected with common area, focuses development more efficiently into that area at the south east corner I think that Ron has explained that well just want to make sure of that.

Mayor Dewey: Mr. Hindle I think that concludes the public comment, I don't think that there is any other comment. Jenelle can review the other comments.

Jenelle Berthoud: read public comment from Steven Gronbach. Email will be included in the minutes.

Trenis Hindle: thank you Jenelle. Would we like to move on to comments from the board? anyone?

Meghan Hanson: sound good to me, I appreciated Debra's comments. Especially the way I understand it if we approve R-2, which could open up the door for much larger development, but technically not happen here nor would it make sense or does it seem like it is the intent of the developer. Doing duplexes on those lots makes a ton of sense to me, keeping that more open space make sense, it seems like the new proposal would reduce road traffic and road maintenance for the city like what was just noted in the email that was read. Potentially some of that is incorrect, so I would definitely be in favor of it with the question being is there any way to provide the existing residents with some sort of assurance that C-2 zoning wouldn't result in something much larger.

Mayor Dewey: as a clarification Meghan you are referring R-2, correct?

Meghan Hanson: did I say C-2? R-2 thank you.

Mayor Dewey: I think when this goes before council especially under some final plat because they are going to have to go through a process with council anyway aside from the zoning, I think it could be addressed that way further showing some cards, the homeowners association has some time right now to install some covenants on that property. We want "x" on this property, I know that Creekside residents had put some covenants on the place restricting where one story and two-story homes, I don't see why the Twin Creeks homeowner's association couldn't get on the ball and put that into place before the phases were developed. I think that it could be addressed from the town council's perspective as well, again I think that those lots are very hard to fit anything besides a duplex on. I just don't see it happening.

Paul Ludington: part of the intent when the zoning ordinance was created was that so that we couldn't try to cram 16 units into an acre only if there was sufficient room to do that. In all honesty, there are square footage requirements, size of the dwelling unit, we can't have anything smaller than 800 square feet which in today's world is pretty darn small. I think it kind of self restricts itself and the only other thing that I would be concerned about and I am also concerned about in other subdivisions is lot integration if they take and join two or three of the lots together and try to form one bigger lot, they might not have to worry about a 7 ½ or 10-foot setbacks and that would allow them for more space. I think as a representative from the town council would be looking to make sure that doesn't happen.

That being said we have to remember that the Stevensville School District is at 48% free and reduced lunches which means that 48% of those people are financially able to get free and reduced lunches because of their low income so we are a low income are a duplex or a four plex if that dirty word is allowed it makes it more affordable for those people to live here and we don't want to make it unaffordable for people to live here that is happening all over the place and as we are seeing now with the way housing is going now, I saw a listing for a house on College Street \$274. A square foot, you can buy a house in Louisiana for \$75.00 a square foot so this is what the market will bear but it makes it really difficult for people on limited incomes to live here and in order for the town to survive we have to have some diversity and I think that this is an opportunity for us to protect number one in my opinion is to protect the land scape to me for what they are looking to do it is pretty obvious that they are trying to protect some of that creek down that and try to protect some of that area down there, which would be hard to build in anyway, based on the way the water is around here you don't know, I think , I can remember eight inches of water run down 3<sup>rd</sup> street I can imagine what it was like in that subdivision with water coming from Middle Burnt Fork so you know you might want to stay away from that area for that very reason that someday those people might be under water, I think this is a win-win doesn't reduce or increase the number of dwelling units of the density I think that it allows us to try do not unduly harness the developer on what they are trying to accomplish but allows them to preserve some open space I think that it is an asset for that subdivision if not for the town.

Greg Chilcott: I have been on a subdivision or two in my career the one thing that I have never heard is we have to much open space in our development, that is truly unheard of for me I do understand that open space sometimes requires some maintenance and some cost from the homeowners and the association and frankly too often nobody does the maintenance and then you have a weed patch, but again I have never heard anyone say there is just to much green space in my subdivision. As far as the density goes, I don't know that the argument that we took on it, how many lots have been removed off that south stretch Ron?

Ron Ewart: the original approval allowed 64 homes and the propels is for 48 lots, so it has gone down by a total of 16 lots we are deleting 16 lots including those 9 on the 2.0 acres to the south.

Greg Chilcott: so, you reduced it 16 lots, but you doubled up on the R-2 right or conceivably if you went higher, you could get more than a duplex on those lots if you went 36 feet in R-2.

Ron Ewart: we haven't even thought of going up we have only talked about single story houses so that senior folks want to live there, one car, small house to clean I don't know why we would want to go up and make it three stories high I don't foresee that, I guess it could be their right to do so we are planning to put in the covenants only duplexes are allowed to be constructed on lots 42 through 53 which are those 11 lots.

Greg Chilcott: of course, it is completing up to the landowner and what they right into their phases.

Ron Ewart: I share that concern once you zone something who knows what is going to get built out there so we can also put it on the plat it would help to memorialize it even further when the building folks go to look at the plat they see right there they can only build a single family or up to a duplex on a certain lot, we could put it on the plat and in the covenants.

Greg Chilcott: our clerk and recorder gets a little grumpy when you put things on the face of a plat I will just give you a heads up, I am not trying to course you but before you go in front of town council and neighbors come in and have some concerns in writing, you are right the R-21 allows "x" you are proposing something less than that people's minds change, plans change so it might reduce some of your opposition in a meeting. I think the zoning makes sense I like the green space and common space I think the zoning request makes sense when you opened up that extra space.

Trenis Hindle: does anyone else have an opinion thought that they would like to share? I will go ahead then, I am in favor of the rezoning I like the removal of the lots, the open space, the protection of the water, the idea of more affordable housing in our community obviously something that we need and have discussed I think that it makes sense in the location the self-governing of the HOA to be able to keep everything in check and our growth policy I do think it would be a shame to have something taller built out there but it doesn't sound like that is the intent. As of now I am in favor.

Greg Chilcott: I just say that we should adopt the findings of fact in the staff report.

Trenis Hindle: would you like to read them?

Greg Chilcott: I sure can. The current zoning is R-1 low density residential; the surrounding properties are zoned R-1 the surrounding uses are zoned R-1 single family residential and vacant land agricultural and the proposed R-2 zoning residential is consistent with the Town of Stevensville's growth policy. I would even add one that the proposal increases the common area for the enjoyment of members of the HOA.

Meghan Hanson: the proposal also works for the adjacent landowners.

Trenis Hindle: would you like to take this to a vote and add that last findings of fact to it before that?

Greg Chilcott: Mr. Chairman I would like to add, it is part of the record, there is a reduction in the number of lots I think that is, when we talk about additional green space but the introduction of number of lots in a development is something that we have discussed quiet a bit.

Meghan Hanson: Brandon is that legitimate to add those in?

Mayor Dewey: because those are the planning and zoning boards findings of fact. So, just like you did with BFE review you are creating essentially through adopting the findings of fact in the staff report and adopting the findings and facts of your own, those are becoming the planning and zoning boards findings of fact that you will pass along to the town council and they may come up with their own set.

Meghan Hanson: speaking of findings of fact, who is taking these meting notes, will it be me or Jenelle?

Mayor Dewey: Jenelle is hiding, and I can hear her giggling through the wall, the meeting is being recorded Meghan, so we are covered in that regard. I don't think Jenelle has been taking minutes of this meeting I think she has been working on your other set of minutes for you.

Greg Chilcott: Mr. Chairman I would move that we recommend approval to the town council of amending and re-zoning phase three of Twin Creeks Subdivision from R-1 to R-2. Based on the findings of fact and the staff report.

Meghan Hanson: I will 2<sup>nd</sup>.

Trenis Hindle: would you like to call for an individual vote?

Mayor Dewey: I would call for public comment for the sake of it. And then a roll call vote, in that vein there is no public comment and Jenelle has none.

Trenis Hindle: I will start with Greg, what do you say?

Greg Chilcott: aye.

Meghan Hanson: aye.

Paul Ludington: aye.

Trenis Hindle: aye.

Greg Chilcott: I recommend that we capture John Kellogg has recused himself from this vote.

Ron Ewart: a quick clarification, sorry to interrupt, so I believe the motion was for phase three there are eleven lots in phase three, lots 33-43 in phase three because we have five other lots 43-48 that are not having the zoning change with the information that I have submitted a legal description with leaps and bounds for the property to be easily rezoned so that they can add it into the GIS system.

Greg Chilcott: what I am hearing is that you want just the motion to not be just phase three you want lot 33-43?

Ron Ewart: yes.

Greg Chilcott: Mr. Chairman I would make a motion to reflect that.

Meghan Hanson: sounds good.

Trenis Hindle: that makes it clean.

Mayor Dewey: for the sake of the record, you may want to revote on that.

Greg Chilcott: if you want to be picky, we would need to do a motion to reconsider and then vote on that and then make a motion.

Greg Chilcott: I make a motion.

Trenis Hindle: I 2<sup>nd</sup> the thought.

Meghan Hanson: aye.

Paul Ludington: aye.

Greg Chilcott: aye.

Trenis Hindle: aye.

Greg Chilcott: I propose the amended motion lots 33-43 everything else the same.

Meghan Hanson: I 2<sup>nd</sup>.

Mayor Dewey: there is no public comment on the phone.

Greg Chilcott: aye.

Meghan Hanson: aye.

Paul Ludington: aye.

Trenis Hindle: aye.

Meghan Morris: I have questions when there is a time for that.

Mayor Dewey: is your question directed at the administration?

Meghan Morris: contact information and get this sorted out, a lot of confusion on whether our two acres is included or not included in the subdivision. The previous owners' comments to me while we have been on this meeting were, we were only supposed to be annexed at the final phase of the approval as part of the subdivision.

Mayor Dewey: if you would stay on the ZOOM call after the board meeting, we can meet.

#### 4. Unfinished Business

#### 5. New Business

a. Zoning change application for Ilamar Properties from R-1 to R-2

b. Zoning change application for Twin Creeks subdivision from R-1 to R-2

#### 6. Board Comments

Meghan Hanson: it seems like a good question to put out to the town council on whether this should be things are really busy right now, I am in the building world and I am getting crushed with work but with what we see is happening all over Stevensville we are going to have a run on all sorts of building stuff we have prices going up expediently we going to have a lot of development I don't really want to do it and revisit our master plan but it could be open for others.

John Kellogg: I think Mayor Dewey you had mentioned that the trigger to that happening would be the end of 2021.

Mayor Dewey: State law mandates that we do them every five years and so we are hitting that benchmark and rubbing up against it. In that vein there was a conversation initiated in the planning and zoning board about doing a follow up and figuring out where we sit with our current growth policy and how we are doing on the goals we lay out in that policy that was a long, I think like two years ago when we discussed that, and I think we probably made some promises with following up with the board and failing to do so, so it is probably worth while as the board as a body commit to a monthly meeting to hold those of us accountable that need to present you with material. That would be helpful if you are willing to do that, I think it is going to have to take at least a monthly meeting to walk through some of those steps, so you are fully briefed and prepared to dive into growth policy revision for the end of 2021 or the very beginning of 2022.

John Kellogg: I think that I speak for the board here, more meetings is fantastic.

Mayor Dewey: I am in favor of any planning and zoning meeting that a subdivision is discussed that is just my preference.

Meghan Hanson: if it was possible to schedule a meeting once a month or every six weeks where we could say it is over ZOOM and we limit the time that would be helpful.

Mayor Dewey: on that note you have traditionally met at least in the last 6 months you are typically meeting towards the end of the month on a Wednesday either second or the fourth Wednesday of the month depending on how the calendar lays out generally when you guys have been meeting from that perspective and we can host as many ZOOM meetings as necessary for the board, those are easier for us to accommodate the reason for that is our council room here by the time you get the board in here with social distancing it just does not work our library agreement with the community room there is limited to the number of times we can facilitate meetings in that room and the town council has a tendency to fill those slots up that is why we pushed the ZOOM meetings for our auxiliary boards.

Paul Ludington: Mr. Mayor if I could muddy the waters a little bit further what it be possible for us to use excess building permit money to hire, for the lack of a better word, a consultant to help advise us of a re-write of the growth policy, so that the planning and zoning board wasn't taken this word smithing and rewriting all upon themselves.

Mayor Dewey: off the cuff I will tell you I will ask for a legal answer on that in terms of the local government services on the funding on that I think as it relates to building code standards and building code safety yes those funds could be used for that purpose so say the town, last time the town did a growth policy they received a 30,000 dollar grant from the department of commerce and then I think we had to match that with some money as well and all together I think that it was a 50,000 thousand dollar document so a portion of the funding could in theory could maybe come from delinquent enforcement funding but that is something that we are addressing right now as an administration is trying to find the appropriate funding level to fund the overall growth process I don't know if Meghan is really looking to get into the minutia of that but more to say here are some things that we should be prepared to speak to when the brains come into the room to write it for us.

Meghan Hanson: that is exactly right I don't want to get into mind numbing minutia and legal documents I really have no interest.

Mayor Dewey: I would love to have a planner on staff by the time we are ready to get into the growth policy I am really setting a goal, and it might be lofty, but that we maybe have a community director or planner on staff in the organization who could write that policy for us and has that skill set to get us there.

Meghan Hanson: that would be amazing we have a big whole there.

Mayor Dewey: we will see if that comes to fruition.

Greg Chilcott: Mr. Chairman most everybody knows I am cheap, and I think state law Mr. Mayor, only requires it be reviewed every five years I don't think that it has to be re-written. There is a lot of time, effort and expense put into it five years ago it would be my hope that we could salvage most of that and just do some updates and hopefully not be nearly as expensive as, again I am not an attorney but that is what the law requires every five years.

Mayor Dewey: you are right Greg and I think I am speaking more from the executives point of view and the desire of the growth policy I have some very deep frustrations with the growth policy as it is written and a lot of those stem from predictions where it blatantly states one thing on one page, lets use capacity for example, they will say in one page that we have capacity to serve every buildable lot in the annexed area then flip like six pages in and it contradicts itself and says no you don't, so who do you believe. We have run into those issues throughout the course of utilizing the policy there have been some inconsistencies and some frustrations that I would not expect from a 50,000-thousand-dollar document. That being said I don't think that there is any reason that you can't fix those nuances without having to upheave the entire thing. Good point.

John Kellogg: nuances, can we ask the council if they are on board with us fixing nuances in the growth policy? I am trying to get a process here where we can pass this suggestion to council and have them thinking about it at this point so that at some point in the year, they may want to take actions and direct the planning board to look at fixing nuances or doing an efficient update of the growth policy. As Commissioner Chilcott suggested.

Mayor Dewey: on way you could approach this as a board is to take this opportunity right now to say, here is our feedback in terms of what we expect and want to cover, maybe that is subdivision regulations, code reform or growth policy and put that into a work plan for the board, it doesn't have to be fancy, these are the priorities that the board is interested in working on asking the council to approve that work plan and then going forth on it. And maybe you are prepared tonight to say these are the priorities in a work plan once that is drafted take it to the council or maybe you want to say tonight here are some things, we would like to see in a work plan please bring up draft work plan back to us at our next meeting in April and we will approve it and send it to council for their consideration.

Meghan Hanson: you guys say that you already had things that you wanted to bring up?

Mayor Dewey: I think that yeah, first and fore most I think I would like the board to work through where we are in terms of status on the goals that are already listed so we can take that goal out, right? And then time needs to be spent on my part to go through the policy with a comb and say these things need to be tweaked or changed or overhauled but maybe it doesn't escalate to a level where an entire rebuilding of the growth policy needs to happen. I think the 2016 version was overhauled from 2009. That was an old policy.

John Kellogg: much of the effort was taken up in meetings with neighborhood folks that were interested in identifying goals and objectives and that was a very rewarding process to show the people interested that were involved in developing the growth policy at that point they wanted to look forward to things they wanted to see in Stevensville and that effort I think is a long lasting process that doesn't necessarily need to be revisited but the background information that you refer to Mr. Mayor certainly should be updated. Would the board want to come back to the next meeting and maybe between Mayor Dewey and myself we could put together a work program for the board to take a look at and say yes this is what we would like to pass along to council.

Meghan Hanson: I think that would be great and the rest of us and if anybody has any points, we could email them to you for consideration before that.

Greg Chilcott: I brought up before, but I think subdivision regs would be a good thing to through onto the list that is a big job and would probably require a consultant at least for part of it.

John Kellogg: yes, that is by far the most expensive process I am sure that would be undertaken. I am sorry Mayor Dewey that I suggested more work. I think then if that is the case I can work with Mayor Dewey to come back to our next meeting with a recommended work plan if that is the boards desire.

Mayor Dewey: do you guys want to meet on April 28<sup>th</sup> at 6:30?

Trenis Hindle: that is a negative for me, the 29<sup>th</sup> or the 30<sup>th</sup> would be fine for me.

Mayor Dewey: the 29<sup>th</sup> would work.

John Kellogg: April 29<sup>th</sup>? Should we do one of your internet doodles?

Mayor Dewey: I will doodle it and throw dates out that week and if you would respond that would be great, you do have to meet in April just so you know the city code says so.

Trenis Hindle: do we want to pick a deration of a time limit. Hour and a half?

#### 7. Public Comment

John Kellogg: the agenda calls for public comment as the last item before adjournment. Is there any public comment that Jenelle or Brandon notice? With that I will..

Greg Chilcott: move.

Paul Ludington: 2<sup>nd</sup>.

Meghan Hanson: 3<sup>rd</sup>.

John Kellogg: all in favor?

Everyone stated: aye.

#### 8. Adjournment