



AGENDA
KALISPELL CITY PLANNING BOARD & ZONING COMMISSION
Tuesday, August 11, 2020

The regular meeting of the Kalispell City Planning Board and Zoning Commission will be held on Tuesday, August 11, 2020 beginning at 6:00 p.m. in the Kalispell City Council Chambers, Kalispell City Hall, 201 1st Ave E., Kalispell, MT.

August 11 - Meeting Agenda

Documents:

[August 11 agenda.pdf](#)
[07-14-20-draft minutes.pdf](#)

Work Session On B-2 Setbacks And Alleys

Documents:

[Setback and Alley work session.doc](#)

AGENDA
KALISPELL CITY PLANNING BOARD AND ZONING COMMISSION
TUESDAY, JULY 14, 2020

The regular meeting of the Kalispell City Planning Board and Zoning Commission will be held on Tuesday, August 11, 2020 beginning at 6:00 p.m. in the Kalispell City Council Chambers, Kalispell City Hall, 201 1st Avenue East, Kalispell, Montana.

The Agenda for the meeting will be:

- A.** Call to Order and Roll Call
- B.** Approval of Minutes of July 14, 2020
- C.** Hear the Public – The public may comment on any matter on the agenda or not on the agenda. (Comments are typically held to 3 minutes or less.)
- D.** Public Hearing:

The Planning Board will hold a public hearing and take public comments on the agenda items listed below:

1. File #KPP-20-02 - A request from Husky Partners, LLC, for major preliminary plat approval for a three-lot subdivision called Glenwood West Phase 2. The property contains approximately 3.60 acres and is located at 70 Glenwood Drive, extending to Financial Drive. The existing lot currently contains two apartment buildings. It can be described as Lot 1 of Glenwood West, as shown on the map or plat thereof on file and of record in the office of the Clerk and Recorder, Flathead County, Montana.

E. Old Business

F. New Business

G. Adjournment

Work Session:

- B-2 front/side corner setbacks
- Alleys

Next Regular Meeting: Wednesday, September 9, 2020

KALISPELL CITY PLANNING BOARD & ZONING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING
July 14, 2020

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL	The regular meeting of the Kalispell City Planning Board and Zoning Commission was called to order at 6:00 p.m. Board members present were Chad Graham, Kurt Vomfell, Rory Young, George Giavasis and Joshua Borgardt. Doug Kauffman and Ronalee Skees were absent. PJ Sorensen represented the Kalispell Planning Department.
APPROVAL OF MINUTES	Vomfell moved and Giavasis seconded a motion to approve the minutes of the June 9, 2020 meeting of the Kalispell City Planning Board and Zoning Commission.
VOTE BY ACCLAMATION	The motion passed unanimously on a vote of acclamation.
HEAR THE PUBLIC	None.
HOUSING SOLUTIONS LLC	<p>A request by Housing Solutions LLC to hold a public meeting and seek input on a competitive application to be submitted to the Montana Board of Housing for a new affordable senior development called Creekside Commons. The project consists of 24 one-bedroom and 12 two-bedroom units specifically designed for seniors, located at 120 Financial Drive.</p> <p>Alex Burkhalter with Housing Solutions LLC presented information on the proposed housing project. Offered to answer any questions that the board or the public may have.</p>
PUBLIC HEARING	Lisa Sheppard with the Flathead County Agency on Aging spoke in support of this project and provided planning staff with a letter of support (see attached).
BOARD DISCUSSION	Vomfell and Giavasis both said they are happy to see a project like this and feel it is much needed and in a great location.
BOARD MEMBER SEATED	Young recused himself from the next agenda item, as he is a representative for Colton Lee Communities.
KCU-20-04 – COLTON LEE COMMUNITIES	<p>PJ Sorensen representing the Kalispell Planning Department reviewed Staff Report #KCU-20-04.</p> <p>Sorensen presented the project location, surrounding land uses, existing zoning, City services and Growth Policy. Staff informed the board that no written public comments have been received. Staff further recommended that the Kalispell Planning Board adopt staff report #KCU-20-04 as findings of fact and recommend to the Kalispell City Council that the conditional use permit be approved subject to the conditions listed in the staff report.</p>

BOARD DISCUSSION	Giavasis asked about pedestrian access and crossing at the roundabout. Sorensen discussed pedestrian access along Hutton Ranch Road and potential access to the property to the west. Graham asked about Hutton Ranch design standards. Sorensen explained that this project is separate from that PUD. Vomfell noted his support for the project.
PUBLIC HEARING	Rory Young (Jackola Engineering) represented the applicant. They are happy with the conditions, but would suggest a change in condition 9 related to size of the sewer main.
MOTION (ORIGINAL)	Giavasis moved and Vomfell seconded a motion that the Kalispell City Planning Board and Zoning Commission adopt staff report #KCU-20-04 as findings of fact and recommend to the Kalispell City Council that the conditional use permit be approved subject to the conditions listed in the staff report.
BOARD DISCUSSION	Giavasis and Vomfell both noted that the project provides a good mixed use. Graham asked about the pipe size. Nygren noted that the existing main is 12 inches, but that the language in the condition could be modified to allow flexibility if Public Works agrees to a smaller size.
MOTION (AMEND COND. #9)	Vomfell moved to amend condition 9 in relevant part to read “ 12-inch water and 12-inch sewer mains shall be extended to the north property line <u>as agreed by public works.</u> . . .” Graham seconded.
BOARD DISCUSSION	None.
ROLL CALL (AMEND COND. #9)	Motion passed unanimously on a roll call vote.
ROLL CALL (ORIGINAL)	Motion passed unanimously on a roll call vote.
BOARD MEMBER SEATED	Young re-seated after the vote.
KPUD-20-01 & KPP-20-01 STILLWATER CROSSING	PJ Sorensen representing the Kalispell Planning Department reviewed Staff Report #KPUD-20-01 and KPP-20-01. Sorensen presented the project location, surrounding land uses, existing zoning, proposed zoning, City services and Growth Policy. Staff informed the board that no written public comments have been received. Staff further recommended that the Kalispell Planning Board adopt staff report #KPUD-20-01 and KPP-20-01 as findings of fact and recommend to the Kalispell City Council that the Planned Unit Development, rezoning and preliminary plat be approved subject to the conditions listed in the staff report.
BOARD DISCUSSION	Young asked about the road names and ADA ramps, and whether a CUP was needed for multifamily. Sorensen discussed the

	<p>problem with the road name changing mid block, and that a CUP would not be necessary in a PUD. Graham asked about condition 11 relating to the home designs and layouts, snow storage, parking and curb length. Sorensen noted the layout plan which was recently added, and the exhibit showing a typical street frontage. Borgardt asked about the tight driveways, and further discussion regarded the function of the streets given the size of the lots without alleys.</p>
PUBLIC HEARING	<p>Mike Brodie (WGM) represented the applicant. He commented regarding the separate PUD submittal for the B-1 area, the driveway width, the sewer extension up Stillwater, and the clubhouse spaces backing into the street. Sorensen responded to each comment.</p>
MOTION (PUD)	<p>Vomfell moved and Young seconded a motion that the Kalispell City Planning Board and Zoning Commission adopt staff report #KPUD-20-01 as findings of fact and recommend to the Kalispell City Council that the planned unit development be approved subject to the conditions listed in the staff report.</p>
BOARD DISCUSSION	<p>Giavasis stated that he likes the mixed use, but doesn't want to compromise on the alley requirement. He also thinks the driveway flares could be reduced. Graham agrees on the flares and would prefer alleys, although he understands why they are proposing none. Vomfell feels the same about alleys, but is generally supportive. Borgardt is concerned about the impact of the lot width and lack of alleys.</p>
ROLL CALL	<p>Motion passed 4-1 on a roll call vote (Giavasis voted no).</p>
MOTION (REZONING)	<p>Vomfell moved and Giavasis seconded a motion that the Kalispell City Planning Board and Zoning Commission adopt staff report #KPUD-20-01 as findings of fact and recommend to the Kalispell City Council that the rezoning from R-3/PUD to RA-1/PUD and B-1/PUD be approved.</p>
BOARD DISCUSSION	<p>None</p>
ROLL CALL	<p>Motion passed unanimously on a roll call vote.</p>
MOTION (PRELIMINARY PLAT)	<p>Vomfell moved and Young seconded a motion that the Kalispell City Planning Board and Zoning Commission adopt staff report #KPP-20-01 as findings of fact and recommend to the Kalispell City Council that the preliminary plat be approved subject to the conditions listed in the staff report.</p>
BOARD DISCUSSION	<p>None</p>
ROLL CALL	<p>Motion passed 4-1 on a roll call vote (Giavasis voted no).</p>

OLD BUSINESS	Nygren gave updates on the trail.
NEW BUSINESS	Nygren advised the board of August agenda items. Looking at work session on B-2 setbacks and alleys.
ADJOURNMENT	The meeting adjourned at approximately 7:35pm.

Chad Graham
President

Kari Barnhart
Recording Secretary

APPROVED as submitted/amended:



Development Services Department

201 1st Avenue East

Kalispell, MT 59901

Phone: (406) 758-7940

Fax: (406) 758-7739

www.kalispell.com/planning

To: Kalispell Planning Board

From: PJ Sorensen, Senior Planner

Date: August 11, 2020 Work Session – B-2 Setbacks and Alleys

BACKGROUND: After the regular Planning Board meeting on August 11, the Board will hold a work session on two topics that have generated board discussion at recent meetings. The discussion is intended to be preliminary on both topics, potentially generating ideas and provide general direction to staff.

The first item relates to setbacks in the B-2 (General Business) zone. Current front setbacks are 15 feet while parking buffers are 5 feet. Design preferences are for buildings to be closer to the street with parking in back, but the current requirements create an incentive for developers to place the parking in front and thereby saving 10 feet of developable area. Should we look at possible amendments to current setbacks to encourage designs with the building up front with the parking behind it?

The second item is alleys. While alleys are allowed under current rules, they are discouraged in many ways. There are many benefits of alleys, which allow for parking, storage, garbage collection, etc. to occur away from the main streetscape in neighborhoods and effectively shielding some of the more utilitarian aspects of a property. However, due to long-term maintenance requirements and associated costs, the City generally does not take ownership of new alleys. Developers also are often reluctant to use alleys because of the loss of developable land. Are alleys a feature which the City should become more accepting of, and perhaps even encourage? If so, what could potentially be done to alleviate the concerns about maintenance and loss of land?

NEXT STEPS: Depending upon the discussion at the work session, staff will look to take appropriate steps to further the discussion, which may include bringing in other departments to the conversation and perhaps eventually bringing one or both items up for formal consideration.