Meeting Number: 10

- 1. 1:03 PM Call to Order
- 2. 1:03 PM Roll Call: In attendance Commissioner K. Kahle, J. Willich, T. Blurock, W. Windham
 - a. Commissioner M. Nootz absent
- 3. 1:04 PM Agenda item #2 Approval of Minutes for July 13, 2022 and July 20, 2022
 - a. Motion to approve by TB, 2nd by WW, passed unanimously
- 4. 1:05 PM KK discusses extending the deadline for the committee
 - a. Monday, August 1 meeting is cancelled
 - b. We'll do the regular Wednesday meeting and the Friday deep dive from 9-12
 - c. 90 extension was granted by city commission meeting
- 5. 1:07 PM Goals
 - a. KK revisits the previous week's work and the slides, restating that the goal itself needs better wording
 - b. TB wants more specificity within the goals, specifically stormwater treatment within the infrastructure goal, can be a general statement with bullet points
 - c. WW is collecting the ideas being generated
 - d. TB would like to revise the land use plan, including Gateway Overlay Zones
 - e. JW asks what role the city has with ETJs considering the city is technically the county seat
 - f. TB states the ETJs are a separate legal entity
 - g. KK states that the ETJs require changes in the planning board and with how the city and county interact, adding that there are possible conflicts with the county, and they could adversely affect the working relationship between the entities
 - h. TB adds that addressing the ETJs should be a goal
 - i. WW adds that the site review process is non-existent or severely lacking, noting that it doesn't need to be added, just that it isn't included so far
 - j. WW would like to see a limit on annexation to maintain the borders of the city at or near current levels
 - k. WW noted that the land use plan is about pressure, and not about instructive use of the plan
 - I. TB compares the relative capacity of Gallatin County with Park County and their lack of advisory planning
 - m. TB muses about the city annexing the whole of Park County
 - n. WW would like to see the city boundary stay as small as possible
 - o. TB and WW agree that the county won't form a planning group for a long time, and not in the foreseeable future
 - p. TB states that since the city has a zone of influence it should exercise the control it has, concluding the ETJ should stay undeveloped/mildly developed land
 - q. JW adds the city footprint should stay as small as reasonably practicable and work on increasing assessed value and density
 - r. WW asks what we want the border to look like

- s. TB wants higher density within the city
- t. WW states that sewer and water will limit the density outside of the city, wants to increase density with infill
- u. JW adds prioritizing infill over external annexations
- v. TB adds if everyone built an ADU, housing density would increase substantially
- w. TB adds that the high-density housing behind Albertson's feels like it's in the city
- x. WW wants to see understanding of the city's border and getting all on the same page as goal bullets
- y. TB adds that urban design is done on a different scale than zoning planning
- z. KK wants to add a note about the city boundary for the deep dive meeting
- 6. 1:48 PM WW asks if we should move to Local Services or Housing
 - a. KK states that we have two meetings next week and that now is a good stopping point
 - b. TB agrees that we should focus on Housing and Local Services next week
 - c. KK adds that MN has some great insights about the growth policy and has tribal knowledge about document that we should retain
 - d. TB is looking forward to next week's meeting
- 7. 1:50 PM Member Comments
 - a. WW none
 - b. TB asks haven't we had enough, in jest
 - c. JW says he's holding his comments until next week
 - d. KK says she bets JW has plenty of comments
- 8. 1:51 PM End of member comments
- 9. 1:52 PM Public Comments None
- 10. 1:52 PM End of public comments
- 11. 1:52 PM Meeting adjourned

Public in virtual attendance: None