

City Planning Board

P.O. Box 910
Miles City, Montana 59301
(406) 234-6339

MEETING MINUTES

March 19, 2013
6:00 pm

Call to Order: The City Planning Board met in the Conference Room for a public hearing and its regular monthly meeting. Board President (BP) Roxanna Brush called the hearing to order at 6:00 pm and requested a roll call. Members present were Roxanna Brush, John Hollowell, Twila Wilhelm, Carol Hardesty, Colette Butcher and Dale Thom. Excused was Dawn Leidholt. Not present was Ken Monier. Board member John Laney resigned from the board. Also present were Planner Broadie and Dianna Larson served as the recorder. Others present were Mayor Grenz and Historic Preservation Officer Connie Muggli. BP Brush noted a quorum was present.

Public Hearing: Site Plan Review for Commercial Properties - BP Brush opened the public hearing. Brush called for any proponents. Connie Muggli with the Historic Preservation Office submitted a letter (attached) for additional language changes to Section 24-96. Site Plan Review (b) Applicability. BP Brush called for any opponents. Hearing none, the public hearing was closed at 6:05 pm.

Regular Monthly Meeting

Unfinished Business: Site Plan Review for Commercial Properties - BP Brush reported that Connie Muggli submitted an excellent point regarding the language change for the site plan review.

*** Brush moved to include the verbiage that the Historic Preservation has presented, second by Wilhelm, motion passed.*

Section 24-96. Site Plan Review (b) Applicability. Site Plan review will be required for all new construction, additions greater than 25% of the existing square footage, and changes in use where the parking requirements will exceed 25% of the existing use where the permitted use in the zone calls for site plan review. A great deal of discussion was made regarding the 25% and parking issues.

*** Hollowell moved that under (b) site plan review will be required for all new construction, additions greater than 25% of existing square footage or 5,000 square feet, which ever is less, and changes in use where the parking requirements will exceed 25%, second by Hardesty, motion passed.*

(d) Submittal Requirements. Hollowell asked for an explanation on a portion of this paragraph. Planner Broadie commented the submittal requirements were for the applicant, so they knew exactly what was needed for a review process. Hollowell felt that if there were any flood plain issues, on new construction, this should be addressed by the Flood Plain Administrator and would include this in the process.