

ZONING ADVISORY PANEL PUBLIC COMMENT

Received Between May 7, 2021 (noon) and May 21, 2021 (noon)

From: [County Planning Mail](#)
To: ["Thomas, Andrew"](#)
Subject: RE: Public Comment ZAP meeting 5.12.2021
Date: Friday, May 21, 2021 4:23:00 PM

Andrew Thomas,
Thank you for additional comments and questions. Our office will share them with the Zoning Advisory Panel members.
Best,
Greg

Greg McNally, Planner III

Lewis and Clark County
Community Development and Planning Department
316 N. Park, Rm 230
Helena, MT 59623
(406) 447-8343 (Direct)
(406) 447-8374 (Front Office)
gmcnally@lccountymt.gov

From: Thomas, Andrew <arthomas@carroll.edu>
Sent: Thursday, May 20, 2021 10:43 PM
To: County_Planning_Mail <County_Planning_Mail@lccountymt.gov>
Subject: Public Comment ZAP meeting 5.12.2021

Please see attached comment for the 5.12.2021 ZAP meeting.

--

Andrew R. Thomas

Department of Business/MAcc Program
332B Simperman Hall
Office: 406-447-5454
Cell: 509-592-0720
ARThomas@Carroll.edu

General comment: This meeting is already being held at a highly inconvenient time. Most citizens including real-estate professionals, builders, and the population in general are already hard pressed to attend. Additionally, forcing people to attend in person would make it difficult take detailed notes and offer systematic and constructive suggestions. If the meeting format is to be changed, I would strongly suggest that the meeting be held after regular business hours. Additionally, more opportunity for public comment should be made.

Comment: It appears that there is a general understanding of the priority areas with regards to road issues outside of the development itself. The critical issue is modeling first those current issues and to realistically anticipate future development patterns while considering realistic tradeoffs in terms of cost regulatory burden and individual preference.

Questions: Regardless of models of vehicle traffic what has been the observed impact of development on roads? How extensively has it been modeled? How clearly can road issues be prioritized?

Question: Given the discussion of road impacts can an impact fee model, or planning requirements be developed for development in a certain area. In particular areas that are experiencing growth or are higher density area such as the North Hills?

Comment: If an impact fee structure, or planning requirements are applied to those areas how much can they consider both direct and indirect costs? Also, how could such costs be distributed between developers and the inhabitants of that area?

Question: What would a fee model for “ideal” roads, verses incremental efforts to achieve “adequate” roads?

Comment: It appears reasonable that most people include developers would support moderate increases in taxes to support incremental, realistic improvements in infrastructure if it means that development will allowed to continue in a certain area.

Comment: Regardless of the county’s size the majority of development is occurring in a rather limited area in the valley.

Comment: Given the current pattern of development, constraints in terms of funding as well as other considerations it appears that a reasonable course of action would strategically prioritize areas of the highest density and potential growth while attempting to incrementally improve other areas.

Comment: Regardless of legal mandates, most developers would be willing to contribute to developing roads if it meant that their developments would be approved.

Comment: Per Mr. Emmert’s comment about higher value buildings. Although there is likely some utility to building for density in an urban core, you have to balance the cost of the building in terms of construction (which is usually 3-5 times more than 1-2 story) and impact of people who work and live in 5-6 story building in terms of traffic and parking against the property tax revenue. Also realistically, what proportion of that type of building would be part of total built environment? Although I clearly understand his desire to increase the property tax base, such a desire must be carefully balanced against

the cost to infrastructure as well as what type of development is realistic for the community in terms of preferences and likely development patterns.