

**WHITEFISH PLANNING BOARD  
MINUTES OF MEETING  
JUNE 16, 2016**

<p><b>CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL</b></p>	<p>Vice Chair Melissa Picoli Philips called the regular meeting of the Whitefish Planning Board to order at 6:03 pm. Board members present were Councilor Frank Sweeney (substituting for Richard Hildner), John Ellis, Jim Laidlaw, Rebecca Norton, Melissa Picoli Philips and Ken Stein. Chairman Ken Meckel was absent. Planning Director David Taylor and Senior Planner Wendy Compton-Ring represented the Whitefish Planning and Building Department.</p> <p>There were approximately 23 people in the audience.</p>
<p><b>APPROVAL OF MINUTES</b> 6:04 pm</p>	<p>Rebecca moved and Jim seconded to approve the April 21, 2016 minutes without changes. <b>The motion passed unanimously.</b></p>
<p><b>COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC (ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA)</b> 6:04 pm</p>	<p>None.</p>
<p><b>OLD BUSINESS:</b> 6:04 pm</p>	<p>None.</p>
<p><b>PUBLIC HEARING 1: WHITEFISH TP, LLC, CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT</b> 6:04 pm</p>	<p>A request by Whitefish TP, LLC, for a Conditional Use Permit to construct an 81-room hotel. The property is zoned WB-2 (Secondary Business District). It is located at 6361 Highway 93 South and can be legally described as Tract 1DBD in Section 1, Township 30N, Range 22W.</p>
<p><b>STAFF REPORT WCUP 16-04 (Compton-Ring)</b></p>	<p>Planner Compton-Ring reviewed her staff report and findings. This project previously came before the Planning Board as a larger project in a different location, and included a Planned Unit Development. That application was withdrawn prior to review by City Council. To date, no comments have been received on this most current proposal.</p> <p>Staff recommended adoption of the findings of fact and conditions of approval within staff report WCUP 16-04, and for <b>approval</b> to the Whitefish City Council.</p>
<p><b>BOARD QUESTIONS OF STAFF</b></p>	<p>Rebecca asked why the elevator shaft, at 42'10", is not required to be enclosed. Compton-Ring said elevator shafts are exempt from building height standards. Rebecca asked if that is different than downtown, and</p>

	<p>Compton-Ring replied downtown is different as it requires elevator shafts and all mechanical equipment stays under the 45' limit, but in the rest of town projections such as elevator shafts are exempt from building height standard of 35-feet. This has been in the Zoning Regulations since 1982. Rebecca also asked if they are using the Mky Project Geotech report and Compton-Ring replied this is one of the lots within the preliminary plat and the Geotech report was done for the entire site. Rebecca also asked what Condition No. 13 means regarding screening mechanical equipment acoustically and how it is enforced. Compton-Ring replied the requirement is included to prevent an annoyance to neighbors and will be reviewed during the building permit stage.</p>
<p><b>APPLICANT / AGENCIES</b></p>	<p>Jordan Scott, President of Glacier House Hotels, the applicant, Whitefish TP, LLC, 4340 Indian School Road, #21-550, Phoenix, said it is good to be back before the Planning Board and he felt they made a lot of mistakes the first time around. To address some of the issues raised last time, Mr. Ellis asked about the carbon footprint and Mr. Laidlaw asked why another hotel is needed. Marriott has over 11 branded hotels; this is a TownePlace hotel, which is their smallest hotel footprint product type. This is their extended-stay product, which means they try to target guests who will stay for a period of over seven days. Because people stay longer, sheets are only washed every seven days, unless a guest is staying less than seven days, which has a huge impact on their water and electricity usage. Part of the brand requirement is that they be part of the Greenhouse Global Initiative, which is an industry-wide carbon footprint tracking reduction tool. Consultants come in quarterly, evaluate all utility uses, and determine where they are not maximizing a reduction in utility consumption. They will also be participating in recycling, local sustainability programs, carpool initiatives for staff and biking options.</p> <p>As far as why another hotel, he thinks there is a need to have a Marriott product in the market, and they chose this location because they wanted to help keep Whitefish unique by not bringing national brands to downtown. They chose their initial location, behind the Mall, as they thought it was the least burdening part of the town being off the highway, but they didn't think too much about River's Edge, which was very valued and they took it into consideration when they started over. They met with Mr. Morton and chose this new location which is flat, does not have a lot of trees and is along the highway which is great for visibility. The only current extended-stay product is in Kalispell, so they will market and try to get them to come to Whitefish. Since there will be no restaurant/bar, guests will take advantage of the wonderful, independent restaurants, bars and shopping downtown Whitefish has to offer. They have tried to create an architectural look to work with rest of Whitefish,</p>

rather than a big-box look. As far as the competition, he feels when these groups come to Whitefish and stay at this corporate-type hotel, they see what Whitefish has to offer and will bring their families back to enjoy it. He thinks this is a value to other hotels rather than a competition, and they will work collectively with those hotels to ensure they are maximizing any overflow of rooms.

Rebecca asked Mr. Scott whether they vacated the original proposed hotel location next to the pond and bought property since that time. Mr. Scott replied they were under contract on the eight acres, which included the frontage and four acres on the pond, and they canceled escrow because it was contingent on this process, and are now under contract with Mr. Morton, Mky Properties, on the four acres of his eight-acre property he is developing. They are a separate entity and not in business together.

Eric Mulcahy, Sands Surveying, 2 Village Loop, Kalispell, has been helping Mr. Scott and his group with the application process for this TownePlace Hotel. As has been pointed out, they were at Planning Board a couple of months ago, went through the public hearing process, and received a lot of input and feedback from the Board and the public. They ultimately got a recommendation for denial so rather than go and try to battle this with the City Council, the developer went back to the drawing board to see if he could come up with a project to address the concerns and issues. One of the prior issues was the impact and height on the neighborhood to the east, River's Edge. Mr. Scott contacted Mr. Morton and moved the project south to the vacant parcel north of Les Schwab Tire. The entrance road, Akers Avenue extension, is going to access the Mky project, so will be built whether the Marriott goes in or not. This project will provide help in the cost of that construction. Where the project used to be approximately 100' from the River's Edge development, now it is approximately 500' away, so the impact to the residential neighborhood is reduced.

Height was the second issue, which is why they brought forward the Planned Unit Development previously. The applicants and architects worked extremely hard to lower the building to get three stories of units within the 35' height limit. They succeeded with the exception of the elevator shaft and mechanical equipment. He said pretty much every zoning code around the state and nation allow penetrations for mechanical and elevator shafts. The elevator shaft has to be raised because the mechanical equipment and clearance cannot fit within the roof structure and meet the 35' height requirement.

The third item the public and Planning Board addressed was the size of the structure. At 111 units, it would have been the largest hotel on the highway corridor, and at 22,600 square feet, it would have been the biggest footprint on highway corridor. They inventoried the hotels on strip and found most, five out of eight, are three stories, and a number of them are in excess of 15,000 square feet. Mr. Scott reduced the unit count to 81, which is within the average of other hotels and reduced the footprint to 17,500 square feet, also within the average, but still exceeds 15,000, which requires the Conditional Use Permit. Those are the items they changed on this application before bringing it back to the Planning Board and they hope to garner some support. Mr. Mulcahy also addressed the site plan elements of the hotel and its zoning and growth policy designation. Also, most of this site is void of trees except in the southeast corner, which has a pretty good stand of trees. The parking and structure have been moved away from the southeast corner to allow keeping the trees to soften the view and preserve the wooded feel as folks come into the City. He thinks the architects and site planners did an excellent job working on the project and they have no arguments with any of the Conditions of Approval.

Rebecca asked Mr. Mulcahy to point out the elevator shaft on the diagram and he brought up David Mitchell, with CTA Architect and Engineers. Mr. Mitchell thinks the new site is absolutely a more appropriate site and the building fits in very gracefully. It is pulled towards the street so there is still a nice backdrop of the mountain and dense trees behind it and trees in the parking lot incorporated in two islands. The plan is oriented east to west so it doesn't look so long when driving down the highway, you catch a glimpse and then you are past it. With 35', the problem they had was to continue to give the building enough character. He described the different strategies including color, elements, depth and height to enhance the character and create a shadow effect. They put the parking in the front and had enough room to allow a nice greenbelt in front of the building with trees in the recessed areas, and canopies, wood, stone, and other products.

To answer a few of the questions, as far as the Geotech, it really is one big site with the same groundwater and soil conditions, so they were able to use the same report rather than digging new holes. He noted the location of the elevator shaft and three mechanical units which are condensed into one area and screened to limit sound. Acoustically, sound transmission is directional, so is either absorbed into the walls of the screen, or reflected up where it dissipates.

	<p>Jim asked Mr. Mitchell where they were able to save the six to seven feet to come in under the 35' height limit, and he replied they lowered the ceiling height in the rooms and used more expensive floor joists which are smaller to pick up inches from each floor.</p> <p>Melissa asked and Mr. Mitchell said signs had not specifically been addressed or calculated yet other than they will comply with Whitefish's sign regulations and dark skies ordinance. Melissa asked and Mr. Mitchell responded that recycling and trash bins will be located to the east away from the highway, hidden back in the area of the fenced pool. She asked if there will be easily-accessible recycling bins throughout property and Mr. Mitchell said yes. She also asked if bikes will be available for guests to use and Mr. Scott said they typically do not provide them, but will include them if the Board wants them.</p> <p>Rebecca asked and Mr. Scott stated an eight-person meeting room is planned for inside, but it is not for the community to rent. She also asked and Mr. Mitchell said no bike rack location is identified yet. Rebecca asked and Mr. Mitchell replied CTA has done two green roofs on commercial buildings on Whitefish Mountain and it would not be unreasonable, but you have to have a steel structure.</p>
<p><b>PUBLIC COMMENT</b> 6:47 pm</p>	<p>Mark Owagio, 270 Fox Farm Court, Whitefish, moved here as a Park employee in 1997 and works at the Stillwater Fish House. He has been in the food service business for 30 years. He likes how the downtown has preserved its feel. He feels we are an untapped sort of town with a lot of potential and an opportunity to bring in a corporate brand. By not having a restaurant and/or meeting room, folks will be encouraged to go downtown so it is a great opportunity to generate revenue, but still maintain the uniqueness of downtown. In his experience, Marriott hotels are well-managed, and this is a pleasing-looking place and should bring folks to Whitefish in the shoulder seasons. He supports the project and does not feel it will have a terrible impact. The value of this hotel is better than accommodations he has looked at in Kalispell and he sees no reason why we would not want to support businesses in our community.</p> <p>Don Spivey, 117 Park Knoll Avenue, Whitefish, distributed and read a memo dated June 16, 2016 (copy attached). He likes the new plan better, but still has concerns with traffic, sewage treatment capacity and odor control, and whether or not there is a need for more hotel rooms in Whitefish. He is also concerned with how often variances to the 15,000 square foot limit seem to be granted, since the limit was put in place with a purpose. He suggested the Planning Board recommend denial of the proposed Conditional Use Permit to the City Council.</p>

	<p>There being no further comment, Vice Chair Picoli Philips closed the public hearing and turned the matter over to the Planning Board for consideration.</p>
<p><b>MOTION / BOARD DISCUSSION</b></p>	<p>John moved and Rebecca seconded to adopt the findings of fact within staff report WCUP 16-04, with the sixteen (16) Conditions of Approval as proposed by City Staff.</p> <p>Rebecca likes the design and how the structure is placed on the property. She appreciates the height being reduced to protect the viewshed and the lessened impact on the neighbors. She would like to see a bike rack, and Mr. Scott agreed. She is concerned about adding this many rooms, but is comfortable passing the project forward.</p> <p>Melissa asked Mr. Scott stated the windows open 4". She also asked if he is aware of the shortage of service staff in Whitefish and he said he was. She suggested bikes again and he will add a bike rack and rental bikes. She suggested they think about going even further than required to reduce light pollution.</p> <p>John said when the Planning Board previously denied the project, they were not saying a hotel could not be built on that property, they were simply saying the mass of the hotel, and its connection to the residential neighborhood were problems to be resolved. He thinks they could have built a great hotel on the other property, just by doing it a little differently. Secondly, he wanted to say to the applicant and the public, he doesn't, and he doesn't think any other member of the Board, take sides in the hotel business. He is not going to vote to deny the proposed hotel simply because we have other hotels in town. Those are business decisions Mr. Scott and other folks have made and it's not the Planning Board's function to get into picking favorites with hotels when making decisions. Although Mr. Averill stood up last time and recommended the Planning Board deny this proposed hotel based on his new hotel, that had no bearing on his decision and he doubted it was factor in any other Board member's decision. Third, in the landscaping he hopes they will use native trees. He feels a lot of people come to the northwest to see Spruce, Fir and Larch trees and it distresses him to see how many non-native trees get planted. Doing a good job with landscaping and not trying to save money there will go a long way towards making this hotel really cool place to stay.</p> <p>Jim called for the question.</p>

<p><b>VOTE</b></p>	<p><b>The motion passed unanimously.</b> The matter is scheduled to go before the Council on July 5, 2016.</p>
<p><b>PUBLIC HEARING 2: ANDREÉ LAROSE AND HENRY ELSEN ZONING MAP AMENDMENT</b> 7:10 pm</p>	<p>A request by Andréé Larose and Henry Elsen for a Zoning Map Amendment from County R-2.5 to Estate Residential District (WER). The property is located at 325 Haugen Heights Road and can be legally described as Tract 3F in Section 27, Township 31N, Range 22W.</p>
<p><b>STAFF REPORT WZC 16-02 (Compton-Ring)</b></p>	<p>Planner Compton-Ring reviewed her staff report and findings. To date, one email was received with concerns of density and traffic.</p> <p>Staff recommended adoption of the findings of fact within staff report WZC 16-02, and for <b>approval</b> to the Whitefish City Council.</p>
<p><b>BOARD QUESTIONS OF STAFF</b></p>	<p>Regarding the email received, John asked Compton-Ring to provide more information about the concerns of residents and City Council members in 2013 that lead to a directed limited amount of houses to be built in the Tamarack Ridge Subdivision. Compton-Ring replied the Council approved the subdivision as it was proposed by the applicant. The lots were between one-half acre and an acre, so the Council did not limit any development of that property.</p> <p>Jim asked if the Tamarack subdivision is the Collins' property and Compton-Ring replied yes. Jim said it was his understanding the sewer line has just been connected down the lane next to Maple Ridge was paid for and put in by developer. He asked if this property would be serviced by that line and Compton-Ring replied yes, there is a public main in the road. The lines and roads have not been dedicated to the City yet because it has not gone to final plat. She said the Public Works Director is here and could answer any more specific questions if necessary.</p>
<p><b>APPLICANT / AGENCIES</b></p>	<p>Andréé Larose, one of the property owners, 901 Stuart Street, Helena, said she is here, along with Bruce Boody, Bruce Boody Landscape Architect, and Andy Bestwick, TD&amp;H Engineering, to answer any questions. She thanked Compton-Ring and other Planning Department staff, and Public Works Director Craig Workman for helping put this together.</p>
<p><b>PUBLIC COMMENT</b></p>	<p>There being no comment, Vice Chair Picoli Philips closed the public hearing and turned the matter over to the Planning Board for consideration.</p>

<p><b>MOTION / BOARD DISCUSSION</b></p>	<p>Rebecca moved and Frank seconded to adopt the findings of fact within staff report WZC 16-02.</p> <p>Rebecca said she appreciated the applicants being willing to get on City sewer and water, especially given our water issues around town.</p> <p>Jim called for the question.</p>
<p><b>VOTE</b></p>	<p><b>The motion passed unanimously.</b> The matter is scheduled to go before the Council on July 5, 2016.</p>
<p><b>PUBLIC HEARING 3: GMJ, LLC, CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT</b> 7:20 pm</p>	<p>A request by GMJ, LLC, for a Conditional Use Permit to develop a 12 condominium cabin neighborhood. The properties are zoned WRR-1 (Low Density Resort Residential District). They are located at 1325 and 1331 Nelson Lane and can be legally described as Tracts 1AD, 1MA-NPT and 1ABAA in Section 35, Township 31N, Range 22W.</p>
<p><b>STAFF REPORT WCUP 16-05 (Compton-Ring)</b></p>	<p>Planner Compton-Ring distributed a revised site plan received tonight with changes, including locations for three required additional guest parking spaces and a rearrangement of the four cabins in the southwest portion of the project. She reviewed her staff report and findings. To date, one letter was received from a neighbor with concerns regarding the overall long-term management of the project to ensure it is a good neighbor.</p> <p>Staff recommended adoption of the findings of fact and conditions of approval within staff report WCUP 16-05, and for <b>approval</b> to the Whitefish City Council.</p>
<p><b>BOARD QUESTIONS OF STAFF</b></p>	<p>Rebecca wondered about ownership of the property they are developing into a road and whether the City owns the land if it is determined no one owns it. Compton-Ring replied no, but probably attorneys and surveyors will need to get involved to determine who owns it.</p> <p>Melissa asked if it is a loophole to not have to have a landscape plan or architectural review by making them single units versus combining them. Compton-Ring replied landscape review is not required unless it is a triplex or up and architectural review is not required unless it is a duplex or up. These 12 units will be individually owned and will not be required to go through architectural review.</p>

	<p>Rebecca asked what a "cart parking barn" is and Compton-Ring replied it is for golf carts. Rebecca asked where the location for garbage collection will be and Compton-Ring pointed it out on the drawing. She said the location will need to be reviewed by the Public Works Department and North Valley Refuse, so the drawing may not indicate the final location.</p>
<p><b>APPLICANT / AGENCIES</b></p>	<p>Garth Boksich, managing partner of GMJ, LLC, PO Box 4274, Whitefish, said his two partners are James Allen and Mike Bargery. They have been through site review three times dating back to 2013. Initially they looked at doing a conventional condominium development, but he was watching a "tiny home" show and his focus shifted to something like the North Forty Resort, which is made up of individual cabins. But this will be its own condominium unit a person can live in or use as a vacation home or rental, and this is one of the two pockets in town with a WRR-1 zoning. It is not a loophole to get out of anything, it is to create something that does not exist in Whitefish. They will be unique, rustic looking, modern architecture, similar to the Mindful Designs condos where their office is located.</p> <p>They acquired the 10' of what was supposed to be the location of Nelson Lane, but it got built next to it. There is 26.5' of land that nobody owns. There are several (6-7) homeowners this issue impacts because they are driving on a road on property nobody owns, and they will need to obtain legal access.</p> <p>Jim asked about the stakes currently located beside the border patrol office, and Mr. Boksich replied it is the 10' they purchased originally set aside to be Nelson Lane, and a 10' easement to the west which was abandoned in 2010, prior to them buying Nelson Lane. The road was built in the wrong spot.</p> <p>Mr. Boksich addressed the public comment letter and they intend to use the same model as Fox Hollow. Fox Hollow is made up of individually-deeded condominiums with an HOA, and this proposal would also have an HOA and manager. They will probably take it one step further because they have space in the existing home to turn into an onsite office/maintenance room/laundry room area. They will have oversight of guests with a fulltime position to run the HOA.</p> <p>Jim asked about access through to the Grouse Mountain Park and Mr. Boksich replied there is a dirt path from Nelson Lane that is used by golf carts, walkers, and bikers. A lot of Fox Hollow residents go through the Loewen property to get to Grouse Mountain and the golf course, so they are proposing a pedestrian path and will grant them an easement so</p>

	<p>they will have the legal right to use the path and go through their property. They offered Fox Hollow residents a connection between the two roads for emergency vehicle traffic and snowplowing.</p> <p>Rebecca asked about snow storage and Mr. Boksich replied snow storage is set aside on the eastern side of their property, which was one of the reasons they wanted to connect the two roads so they do not stop right next to each other.</p> <p>John asked if they are going to build the condominiums or let the people who are buying them choose what to build and Mr. Boksich replied they are going to build them. Mike Bargery of Bargery Builders is one of his partners and they want to build them as soon as possible.</p> <p>Melissa asked whether recycling will be part of their HOA requirements. Mr. Boksich said they can look into it but he does not recall any HOA documents or CCRs requiring recycling. Melissa asked for clarification, and Mr. Boksich responded it is zoned for nightly/weekly rental, and each unit will be individually deeded and owned.</p> <p>Melissa asked Compton-Ring if the recycling requirement could be added, and Compton-Ring suggested it could be added to Condition No. 11, "The refuse <i>and recycling</i> location ...." Mr. Boksich said they addressed the concerns with garbage expressed in the comment letter by moving it slightly and making sure it is enclosed for animal resistance.</p> <p>Rebecca asked if the three guest parking spots could be labeled as such and Mr. Boksich replied they could.</p>
<p><b>PUBLIC COMMENT</b></p>	<p>Glenn Nye, 201 Fox Hollow, Whitefish, had a couple of clarification points. He has heard the term "rental weekly and nightly" and he asked what the zoning allows. Compton-Ring replied it allows both. Mr. Nye was concerned about lack of parking, traffic, emergency access, the emergency gate and how it will be handled in the winter. He also asked about the cart parking barn - who has access, what will be in there, and who is entitled to use it? He noted there is no good access to Grouse Mountain Park other than going down a steep embankment.</p> <p>Pete Glee, who manages Fox Hollow Condominium Association spoke of noise potential from nightly rentals. He requested screening and buffering between this project and Fox Hollow and the emergency access into Fox Hollow be constructed and maintained by this development. He encouraged onsite lighting for safety to deter crime and vandalism. He encouraged parking be included for RVs, boats and RV trailers. Snow</p>

	<p>removal and snow storage are also concerns experienced in Fox Hollow. As far as the overall management of the project, the Fox Hollow management plan has helped with oversight of the nightly rental properties; they don't have a way of finding out who is renting, but they do have access back to the owners which helps with management.</p> <p>Marilyn Joseph, 215 Fox Hollow, Whitefish, asked about the strip of land with the trees between Fox Hollow and the border patrol. She wanted to know how many 1,100 square foot cabins they intend to build, where will they go, and how close they will be to her condo. She asked what kind of fence they intend to build.</p> <p>There being no further comment, Vice Chair Picoli Philips closed the public hearing and turned the matter over to the Planning Board for consideration.</p>
<p><b>MOTION / BOARD DISCUSSION</b></p>	<p>Melissa asked Mr. Boksich if he and his partners have taken the time to go through the project with Fox Hollow residents and allow them to ask questions outside of this setting. He replied they have not met with them, but he has emailed and met with Mr. Glee along the way to keep them informed of their plans.</p> <p>In response to Ms. Joseph's question about the trees, Mr. Boksich said they plan to keep as many trees as possible between their property and Fox Hollow. Also, they are a condominium association, not a hotel.</p> <p>Ken asked if they have a plan of how many buildings of what sizes and Mr. Boksich replied they do and the number on the application actually exceeds their plan as 600 square feet would be about the largest. The dimensions indicated are not a finished product. They will leave it up to Matt at Montana Creative to design the units, but the footprints they had in mind are based off a project in Jackson, WY called the Fireside Resort, and he showed a sample of the units there. Mr. Boksich said they do not have a unit with 1,100 square feet and was not sure where that number came from. Compton-Ring replied she measured it off the submitted plans and maybe the scale wasn't correct. Mr. Boksich said they are going to be small, one-bedroom cabins with a loft, and they may be able to get some two-bedroom units on the site. They estimate the units will probably be 12' or 13' wide by maybe 35' long.</p> <p>Matt Lawrence, Montana Creative, 158 Railway Street, Whitefish, said for this application, they needed to keep the design general, and make sure they could fit the units in the space, and get through this process with conceptual plans before they spend a lot of time and money on specifics.</p>

They like the style and design they have in mind, but it may not fit in a certain lot footprint. They have tried to be sensitive to the neighbor's concerns.

Rebecca asked if there will be a washer and dryer in each unit, since a central laundry room area was mentioned and Mr. Lawrence said yes.

A sidebar conversation occurred between the applicant and neighbor. Frank made a point of order and apologized, but said this is not the place for this conversation.

John moved and Ken seconded to adopt the findings of fact within staff report WCUP 16-05, with the fifteen (15) Conditions of Approval as proposed by City Staff.

Frank said if acceptable to the motion makers and second he wanted to include in the motion to add a requirement the project go before the Architectural Review Committee (ARC) prior to building permits being issued. Ken and John said that was fine with them.

Rebecca is concerned with how congested it seems for fire suppression but the Fire Marshal approved the project. The neighbors are concerned about screening and noise, so wondered if the Board could mandate an on-site manager be available to address noise. Taylor noted there is nothing in our Code to stipulate an on-site manager, but the City Council approves all CCRs. Compton-Ring added if a condo unit is going to allow overnight rentals, they will have to get a short-term rental permit, so the application will be on file and include a local contact in case someone has a complaint. She said landscape screening is within the Board's realm and could be added.

John asked how can we add a Condition to require this project to go before the ARC since the units are single-family dwellings and zoning does not require it. Compton-Ring replied through the public comment received they could make a finding there is an impact, and if they feel additional review through the ARC is necessary it could be a Condition of the CUP. John asked for a reminder of why a CUP is required for this project and Compton-Ring replied because there is more than one principal use on the property; 12 units on this one project instead of just one house per lot. They either have to do a CUP to have multiple buildings on one lot or they could have done a subdivision and each unit would have been on its own lot.

	<p>Rebecca asked whether on-site lighting will be covered in the architectural review process and Compton-Ring replied outdoor lighting is part of architectural review but we also have the dark skies ordinance. Melissa pointed out it is Condition No. 10. Rebecca would like to consider a requirement of adding trees for screening along the Southern portion of the Western boundary. Melissa asked if it is covered by Condition No. 12 and Compton-Ring replied a landscaping plan does not necessarily cover screening. Ken asked and Compton-Ring replied the ARC looks at conceptual landscaping plans but not screening. Rebecca moved and Frank seconded that Condition No. 12 be revised to read, "A landscaping plan, <i>which shall include planting trees along the southern portion of the western boundary</i>, shall be submitted to the Planning Department for review and approval." include planting trees along the southern portion of the western boundary. <b>The motion passed unanimously.</b></p> <p>Melissa moved and Rebecca seconded that Condition No. 11 be revised to read, "The refuse <i>and recycling</i> location shall be reviewed and approved by the Public Works Department and North Valley Refuse." <b>The motion passed unanimously.</b></p> <p>Rebecca moved and Melissa seconded that Condition No. 9 be revised to read, "The applicant shall provide <i>and sign</i> three guest parking spaces in a central location." <b>The motion passed with a 5-1 vote; John opposed.</b></p> <p>Frank called for the question.</p>
<p><b>VOTE</b></p>	<p><b>The motion passed unanimously with the additional Condition of Approval No. 16 regarding Architectural Review Committee approval, and three amendments to Condition Nos. 9, 11 and 12.</b> The matter is scheduled to go before the Council on July 5, 2016.</p>
<p><b>PUBLIC HEARING 4: CITY OF WHITEFISH REZONE REQUEST 8:22 pm</b></p>	<p>A request by GMJ, LLC, to rezone a parcel recently annexed into City limits from County RR-1 (Low Density Resort Residential District) to WRR-1 (Low Density Resort Residential District). The subject property is unaddressed, but is known as Nelson Lane. It can be legally described as Tract 1MA-NPT in Section 35, Township 31N, Range 22W.</p>
<p><b>STAFF REPORT WZC 16-04 (Compton-Ring)</b></p>	<p>Planner Compton-Ring reviewed her staff report and findings.</p> <p>Staff recommended adoption of the findings of fact within staff report WZC 16-04, and for <b>approval</b> to the Whitefish City Council.</p>

<b>BOARD QUESTIONS OF STAFF</b>	None.
<b>APPLICANT / AGENCIES</b>	None.
<b>PUBLIC COMMENT</b>	There being no comment, Vice Chair Picoli Philips closed the public hearing and turned the matter over to the Planning Board for consideration.
<b>MOTION / BOARD DISCUSSION</b>	John moved and Rebecca seconded to adopt the findings of fact within staff report WZC 16-04.
<b>VOTE</b>	<b>The motion passed unanimously.</b> The matter is scheduled to go before the Council on July 5, 2016.
<b>NEW BUSINESS</b> 8:25 pm	None.
<b>GOOD AND WELFARE</b> 8:25 pm	<p>1. Matters from Board. Rebecca said she has been attending the Planned Unit Development Re-Write Committee meetings and said if a Planning Board representative was needed on it, she would like to serve in that capacity. Taylor replied the Council has already established the Committee but, Rebecca was welcome to attend and offer comments; however, it would not be in an official capacity as a Planning Board representative. Melissa said she is sad about this being her second to last meeting since she is moving to Somers and she has really enjoyed serving on the Board. Ken asked whether recycling could be addressed in the application process for new developments if there is a need or feeling for it from the Board. Taylor said it is an important issue with the Council and most of these projects have included a condition, but he doesn't know if it needs to be codified in the Code. If the Board feels strongly, it is something they can look at as far as subdivisions. Part of the issue is North Valley Refuse is now doing billing instead of the City, we have a central recycling location and the process is still changing. Until we get to a place where we have easy, maybe curbside, recycling it is a little tricky. We can condition subdivisions, but the whole process is evolving. Ken asked if Taylor was saying it would be for any new projects and Taylor replied potentially. Taylor said a combined conference of Montana Planners and Western Planners is scheduled for August 10-12 in Great Falls. The City would cover the cost of tuition for any interested Board members, but not for lodging.</p>

	<p>2. Matters from Staff. Compton-Ring suggested moving the September meeting to the 22nd since a "meet and greet" for the City Manager candidates is scheduled for the evening of September 15th, the normal Planning Board meeting date. Members thought that would be fine.</p> <p>3. Poll of Board members available for the next meeting on July 21, 2016. All indicated they thought they would be available.</p>
<p><b>ADJOURNMENT</b> 8:30 pm</p>	<p>Jim moved and John seconded to adjourn the meeting at approximately 8:30 pm. <b>The motion passed unanimously.</b> The next regular meeting of the Whitefish Planning Board is scheduled to be held on July 21, 2016, at 6:00 pm, at 1005 Baker Avenue.</p>

*/s/ Ken Meckel* \_\_\_\_\_  
Ken Meckel, Chair of the Board

*/s/ Keni Hopkins* \_\_\_\_\_  
Keni Hopkins, Recording Secretary

APPROVED AS SUBMITTED / CORRECTED: 7-21-16 \_\_\_\_\_