



Gallatin County

MEMO

To: Planning and Zoning Commission

From: Sean O’Callaghan, AICP, Director
Dept. of Planning & Community Development

Re: Identification of Lots within the Bridger Canyon Zoning District Subject to Section 14.2

Date: February 5, 2019

In an effort to quantify the impact of the proposed deletion of Section 14.2 of the Bridger Canyon Zoning Regulation (Zoning Regulation), Planning Staff conducted a GIS analysis to identify parcels that may be subject to Section 14.2. This memo outlines the methodology used by Staff, the known limitations of that analysis, and Staff’s results.

1. **Methodology.** In completing the GIS analysis, staff used the following methodology:
 - a. Staff utilized the County’s GIS parcel data and zoning layers to identify all parcels within the Bridger Canyon Zoning District.
 - b. Staff used the “DATE_SURV” field in the County parcel data to identify all parcels within the Bridger Canyon Zoning District that were created on or before July 12, 1971. All records for which the “DATE_SURV” field was blank were also included in the analysis.
 - c. Staff used GIS to calculate parcel size in acres, and then pursuant to sections 6.5 and 7.5, identified all parcels 36 acres or less.
 - d. Staff used the Clerk and Recorder interactive mapper to review the remaining parcels and identify parcels that had the same ownership as an adjoining parcel.
 - e. Staff produced a map showing the results of staff’s analysis - see Exhibit A.
2. **Known Limitations.** Staff is aware of the following limitations in the analysis that was completed.
 - a. Calculation of parcel area using GIS is not as accurate as a survey of parcels.
 - b. Due to time and resource constraints, as well as ambiguity in the language of Section 14.2, Staff did not go back through the Clerk and Recorder records and identify ownership of parcels as of the effective date of the Zoning Regulation, July 12, 1971.
 - c. For the same reasons identified in *a* above, Staff did not research the alignment of roads as they existed as of the effective date of the Zoning Regulation.
 - d. The “continuous frontage” standard of Section 14.2 was minimally considered by staff due to the broadness of the language. For example, staff did not exclude undeveloped parcels that may be accessed by the same driveway as the adjoining parcel under the same ownership. This produces a conservative result.

- e. Staff's analysis focused on lot area and did not attempt to identify parcels that are not in conformance with lot width requirements, which is also a component of Section 14.2 of the Zoning Regulation.
 - f. To review ownership of the parcels, Staff relied on the Clerk & Recorder mapper, which provides access to images of the plat books and webtax. This information is not as up-to-date as researching ownership in the current plat books, but was much more efficient with respect to Staff time.
3. **Staff's Results.**
- a. Staff identified 67 parcels that were in existence on or before July 12, 1971, that were 36 acres or less, and that had the same ownership as an adjoining parcel.
 - b. Of those 67 parcels, 16 are owned by the U.S. Forest Service.
 - c. 20 of those 67 parcels appear to have already been developed.
 - d. 7 of those 67 parcels appear to be slivers of land intended to provide access to adjoining parcels, and are of a configuration that could likely not be developed.
 - e. Additional scrutiny of the "continuous frontage" standard would likely exclude some of the 67 parcels. It is unknown how analyzing the lot width standard would impact the results.
 - f. The impact of striking Section 14.2 of the Zoning Regulation appears to be a potential for 24 additional lots being developed across the Bridger Canyon Zoning District, which is approximately 51,573 acres in size.