

LINCOLN COUNTY PLANNING BOARD
Meeting Minutes
July 20, 2010

1. 5:33PM – MEETING CALLED TO ORDER BY BOARD PRESIDENT

In Attendance: Kristin Smith (KS), Lisa Oedewaldt (LO), Joe Kelly (JK), Paul Tisher (PT), Stew Briskin (SB), Ted Clark (TC), Dave Johnson (DJ), and Heather Carvey (HC) VIA PHONE

Not In Attendance: Mark Romey (MR), Ted Andersen (TA), Charlie Newton (CN)

Public Participation: Andy Belski (AB) Flathead Geomatics, David Puttkemery (DP), Connie Puttkemery (CP), Steve Curtis (SC), Jennifer Curtis (JC)

2. APPROVAL OF MAY 18TH 2010 MINUTES

JK commented that he did ask for comments for non-agenda items; KS said the minutes would be changed to reflect the correction. Minutes were approved.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT: NON-AGENDA PLANNING BOARD ITEMS:

SC started talking about getting on the agenda to talk about lakeshore regs but was too late. He asserted some Board members seemed to “get” the issues he was discussing and others didn’t, suggesting it “went over their heads”. SC read from an e-mail that he “did not provide constructive comments”; KS said the message was from her, in regards to having something to present to the Board for their consideration. SC believes that there are so many issues pertaining to the lakeshore and wants to have a special meeting to discuss them; which have not been directly addressed. SC said he has “intercepted” emails that have stated Glen Lake should be left on as a natural lake and he still argues it is a reservoir.

SB interrupted and said that this hasn’t been on the agenda to discuss because the Board hasn’t seen any new draft. He understands his frustration, but the draft is being changed and worked on based on the comments received. KS stated that the goal is to have the lakeshore regs on the August agenda. SC asked the Board if they think there needs to be a special meeting and that he is coming to these meetings as a form of government not as the public. JK reminded SC that the Board doesn’t make decisions they make recommendation and it is the BCC that make decisions. SC would like to be more a part of the putting together this process and have a very solid voice in recommendations to the county commissioners because he has the expertise on the issues of concern. SC stresses again that he is NOT public comment. KS said that’s why she has asked several times for GLID’s input as verbal arguments are difficult to codify into the draft. SC asked why KS has been in contact with agencies to try and force the agenda of Glen Lake being a natural lake. SB said it’s the planning department’s job to research the issues and that SC needs to work with them. The Board looks at all the comments and recommendations when presented with the draft by the Department for review. KS said GLID was asked for comments just like all the agencies with an interest in the revisions. PT said that the Board has not talked about the regs since the April meeting. JK reiterated the process on how they receive things to review from the planning dept; and instructed SC to provide written comments so the dept can put recommendations together.

SC asked why someone doesn't just suggest tossing the whole document out. SC says that people call him looking for a form of government on how they should handle living and recreating on the lakes. SC said he hopes that the lakeshore regs process doesn't mirror the growth policy process in approving something no one wants. He wants to use his "governmental authority to stop the overlapping authority". KS says we rely on site specific and detailed information in written comments. PT instructed SC to put his comments on paper. JC asked when comments were needed. KS said ASAP. SC repeated his earlier assertions. KS asked for all comments to the planning department by the end of next week (Friday 7/26). SC asked what the separation between the Board and the dept. was; KS said that the planning dept are paid employees who work for the County. SB reiterated that statement and said that the Board is an advisory volunteer Board. PT restated that they were volunteers. SC said just for the record and asked them if the Board recognized him as a governing body. KS referred him back to the letter that she sent him in October. SC asked KS if she has read the MCA to know his authority. SC asked if she has read it. TC pointed out that GLID is on the agency reviewer list (noting the list from Hurricane Ranch II subdivision information) and that if SC would like a copy he could have his. SC began recounting how historically he was never contacted for comments. KS reminded SC that the Board did not review subdivisions prior to July 2009. JK ends the conversation.

4. 6:00PM – AGENDA

a. Hurricane Ranch II Subdivision Review

LO, assisted by KS, presented the slide show on the subdivision. TC asked about the utility easement between Lots 3 & 5 – part of it was missing? AB said yes it is a drafting error and it will be added to the final plat. TC had another question in regards to the well on Lot 4; AB said that Lot 4 is not a part of the review but that the well will be shared with Lot 2. TC asked if there is already legal easement. AB said that this subdivision is a reconfiguration of the original subdivision to create 3 additional lots and the water issue for Lot 4 is not of concern for this review. TC asked if garbage collection was addressed. LO stated the environmental health department did not provide comment on that issue. TC said he spoke to people from Pine Bay who stated that the cans are always full at the end of the week. TC wonders if it needs to be addressed. KS said that without the comments of Environ Health it's hard to "add boxes". JK said in the future that might need to be addressed. JK made sure the lot sizes on the report were corrected. AB talked about the choices of a road sign or an address sign. AB suggested putting an "and/or" in that condition.

DJ had a question about the drainfields and the saturation point where 4 systems in 1 confined area. AB interrupted and said that the drainfields do meet the DEQ Criteria. KS asked AB to elaborate why they are located where they are. AB went over the soils. PT asked if the easements can be moved; AB said they have to go where they are indicated. DJ asked what the situation was like on the parent subdivision. AB said it was seemingly the same but only 2 drainfields next to each other rather than 3.

TC had a question about the USFS condition and being the 1st time he has seen it. KS said that they have started doing this due to past encroachments. TC said Condition #12(b) isn't clear to which Lots the restriction is – that it should be clarified to effect only the lots adjacent to the USFS property. TC asked the developer about the condition. DP says that this is a good idea for buildings but not for fences. JK

supported the setbacks to the buildings. TC has more of a problem with the fence line more so than structures. KS said that the USFS condition is not a necessity as the setbacks are already proposed in the Covenants and that 12b doesn't add any other restrictions to the subdivision except the specific uses (paths, fences, etc.). PT said the lots aren't that large to suffice a 10' drip line. SB said the foundation 10' setback is sufficient.

1. TC made motion to Strike 12(b) from the covenants; SB 2nd
2. Condition #6 for road sign; SB made a motion for Address signs rather than road signs; PT 2nd
3. TC motion to approve subdivision subject to the changes
4. SB 2nd motion; Motion Passed

5. PLANNING DEPARTMENT REPORT

a. Status of Growth Policy Action Items

KS distributed a spreadsheet of all the Growth Policy Action Items with a column inserted to address the Status of each one.

KS began reviewing the items that have been addressed. KS appreciated the work that went into the policy, but stated she is unsure of the "direction" that the Board wanted her to do in regards to checking on the other agencies involved with some of the items.

There was a lengthy discussion on Economic Development, the Port Authority & Industrial Park, Capital Improvements; Neighborhood plans, Broadband.

The Land Use section is pretty much all in process, completed, etc... which is the responsibility of the planning dept.

SB recommended that the Board pick up at Goal 5 under Land Use at a future meeting. PT asked if they needed to make a decision. KS said NO; that it was just in response to the Board's request to see progress.

6. PLANNING BOARD COMMENTS AND QUESTION

SB asked about a comment from Ted Anderson at the last meeting; he read the section and wanted to know what exactly being talked about. KS said she thought it had to do with the lakeshore regs; that there was a pick up conversation for those who weren't at the April meeting.

JK asked SB how many more mtgs he will be here. SB said Sept should be his last meeting.

7. NEXT MEETING: August 17th 5:30pm – Commissioners Room (Libby)

8. MEETING ADJOURNED: 8pm