

Missoula City Council Land Use and Planning Committee Minutes

February 24, 2021

8:30 am

ZOOM Webinar

Members present: Stacie Anderson, Mirtha Becerra, John P. Contos, Heather Harp, Jordan Hess, Julie Merritt, Jesse Ramos, Amber Sherrill, Sandra Vasecka, Bryan von Lossberg, Heidi West

Members absent: Gwen Jones

1. ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS

1.1 Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 8:32 a.m.

1.2 Approval of the Minutes from February 10, 2021

The minutes were approved as submitted.

2. PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

3. COMMITTEE BUSINESS

3.1 Mcnett Flats Major Subdivision - Dave DeGrandpre and Emily Gluckin- City of Missoula, Community Planning, Development & Innovation

Submit public comments or questions: <https://www.engagemissoula.com/mcnett-flats>
<https://www.ci.missoula.mt.us/2707/Mcnett-Flats>

Jordan Hess introduced the item on McNett Flats Major Subdivision as a continuation from the prior pre-public hearing and public hearing held over the last week.

Dave DeGrandpre and Emily Gluckin with Community Planning, Development and Innovation took over the conversation by giving an overview of some of the concerns and controversy surrounding the proposed subdivision. Mr. DeGrandpre requested the committee think about what they want out of the development and what their interests are in pursuing. He also touched on the zoning options and explained that while there are not many differences, one difference to point out was building height requirements. Ms. Gluckin took over by presenting a rough map of the setback and easements on the subject property, specifically Lot 1, Lot 6 and Lot 7. Lot 6 is located on the south western portion of the property and the easement was discussed in detail. Kody Swartz and Spencer Woith with Woith Engineering also gave input about the properties easement. Ms. Gluckin pointed out the setbacks on Lot 1 and Lot 7 have uncertainty due to the adjacent subdivision not being constructed. Mr. Hess requested a condition be added to the project that outlines the concerns.

The committee inquired about the building height based on the setbacks. Mr. Swartz shared a visual showing the setbacks based on the closest dwelling unit. This showed the dwelling unit 47 feet from the setback. All the other properties displayed had 89 feet between the dwelling unit and the setback line.

Another committee member asked if this project would be subject to the impact fees that were recently discussed. Mr. DeGrandpre confirmed that this project would be subject to the special impact fees. Members also expressed concern over the parkland location being proposed. Their concern is it would not be safe as it would be close to a busy roadway.

Additional options were discussed regarding the approval of the subdivision and the effects of approving part of the project versus the overall proposal. Jim Nugent, City attorney, stated council could be flexible to mold the timing of annexation of various articles and suggested council have a broader discussion. It was clarified that language would need to be amended to reflect the desire of the council's decision. It was also clarified that the city would need to annex the property in its entirety in order to have future authority on the subdivision of the property. Members asked about the property going through the county for the subdivision request and the impacts of not annexing the property into the city. Mr. DeGrandpre gave some insight on differences in the process and potential outcomes. Mr. Nugent also noted that not annexing the property would not allow council to make any decisions to future development of the property.

Members sought clarification regarding a phased approach for the subdivision and the effect it would have on the parkland dedication requirements. Mr. DeGrandpre stated the parkland dedication would be greatly reduced should council decide to only annex one lot on the subdivision. Additionally, members expressed affordable housing be a priority over other aspects of the project.

Jordan Hess confirmed that Monday, March 1, 2021, would be the final consideration for council. He also informed the committee on the statutory deadline under Montana Law. Mr. Hess requested that any amendments be on the record today and be drafted in advance to allow time for review prior to final consideration on Monday.

John Contos joined the meeting at 9:25 a.m.

Neil Miner, Parks and Trails Design/Development Manager with Parks and Recreation, was able to provide some background on the decision to go with part of the parkland dedication as cash-in-lieu and the other portion as a pocket park along the Tipperary Way Trail. Members expressed desire to get a visual on the layout of the parkland. Mr. Miner was able to draft something quickly and showed the committee a rough visual on where nearby parks are located within the subject property's area. He also showed a table with information on Existing Neighborhood Park Level of Service and reiterated that once the land is developed parkland is no longer an option in that area. Many members agreed they did not want to approve the project and regret it in the future due to insufficient parkland. Another concern that was addressed was the maintenance portion of existing parks in regards to cash-in-lieu funds. Mr. Miner gave some examples on how those funds from cash-in-lieu can be spent based on the city's best practices and policies.

Aaron Wilson, Transportation Manager, provided some information about the impacts of Abby Lane upon development and gave some ideas on design to help with the high volume of traffic. One option would be to keep lower speed limits and another option

would be to ensure there are protected bike lanes. One member asked how transportation was considered in terms of the traffic impact study. Kody Swartz with Woith Engineering confirmed that the impact study was based on maximum density and determined roughly 3,500 trips per day in the development area.

Lastly, members discussed approval and denial options. They also gave feedback for conditions of approval that should be added for final consideration. Mr. Hess reiterated getting all the information gathered and on paper prior to the final consideration set for Monday, March 1, 2021.

4. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 10:31 a.m.