



Missoula Consolidated Planning Board Minutes

September 17, 2019, 7:00 PM
City Council Chambers
140 W. Pine Street, Missoula, MT

Voting members present: Peter Bensen (Co. Alt.), Vince Caristo (City Alt), Neva Hassanein (Mayor appointee), Helen Pent Jenkins (CC appointee), Michael Houlihan (BCC appointee), Andy Mefford (BCC appointee), Stephanie Potts (BCC appointee), Jamie Hoffman (PB appointee)

Regular member(s) absent: Dudley Improta (CC appointee), John Newman (Mayor appointee), Jason Rice (BCC appointee)

1. Call to Order

Ms. Jenkins called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

2. Roll Call

Donna McCammon called the roll.

3. Approval of Minutes

Ms. Jenkins noted that the minutes from the September 03, 2019 Missoula Consolidated Planning Board (MCPB) were missing select comments she made at that meeting. *The Missoulian* quoted select statements made by Ms. Jenkins; Ms. McCammon to review the video and amend the minutes accordingly for consistency.

A motion was made by Mr. Bensen, seconded by Ms. Hassanein, to approve the September 03, 2019 Missoula Consolidated Planning Board Minutes with the amendment listed above. With a voice vote of all 'ayes' the minutes were approved. [Amended/Approved minutes attached 09/18/2019.]

4. Public Comment

There were no public comments.

5. Staff Announcements

There were no staff announcements.

6. Communications and Special Presentations

6.1 Downtown Master Plan Update 2019 - Special Presentation. (Linda McCarthy - Downtown Missoula Partnership; Jason King - Dover, Kohl & Partners; Emy Scherrer - City Development Services)

Ms. McCarthy, from the Downtown Missoula Partnership (DMP), stated that three organizations operate out of her office: the Missoula Downtown Association, the Downtown Business Improvement District, and the Missoula Downtown Foundation. She

attended on behalf of the DMP and the Downtown Master Steering Committee to present the new Downtown Master Plan. Ms. McCarthy stated that they had been working on this project for over a year. She provided a history and introduced their partners at Dover, Kohl & Partners. The plan is available for review on-line. Funding has come from both public sector and private sector funds. Dover Kohl & Partners was selected out of an RFP process where there were ten applicants. The guiding principles of the plan were to be authentic, inclusive, innovative, versatile, and viable. She stated they had many focus areas for the plan: Land Use and Infrastructure, Downtown Housing, Parking and Transportation, Street Design Standards, Retail and Commercial Business Development, and Quality of Life.

She stated that almost 4,000 Missoulians were engaged in the process over the course of the last year. They had over 60 meetings with stakeholders, multiple conference calls, four different public presentations that had attendances between 200 and 400 persons per presentation. Ms. McCarthy stated that the plan was comprised of five major components, which will be detailed by a representative of Dover Kohl & Partners. She stated that they are in the adoption process and all three organizations within her office have adopted the plan. In October she will be coming back the Planning Board to ask for approval as an amendment to the City's Growth Policy. She stated that it is much like a neighborhood plan and would be a replacement to the original Downtown Master Plan from 2009.

Mr. Jason King, of Dover, Kohl & Partners, presented a project overview. Mr. King spoke of the multidisciplinary team for this project, which included national experts, local experts, economic and housing professionals, outreach professionals, multi-modal transportation and parking, landscape architects, planner and economists. He stated many of the ideas came from the steering committee and the technical advisory committee; the project was funded by the City of Missoula.

The project was started two and a half years ago, and Mr. King's firm started about a year ago. They have now reached the approval process. The plan was drafted and presented in May at the Wilma Theater, where there were over 200 participants. The plan was refined throughout the summer and comments were incorporated. Over 800 comments were received on the different chapters of the document. Mr. King stated that over 3,200 people participated formulating the plan. Next they took the ideas to the elected officials, appointed officials, and staff for input on feasibility and funding possibilities. On-Line activity sites have allowed the input of a greater number of individuals. The last time they met they asked over 200 persons attending if they still thought the plan was on the right track; 66% said "yes", 23% said "probably yes", 3% was "not sure", and 4% said "no". 90% of the responses were "yes" or "probably yes". Mr. King presented the "Big Five Ideas":

1. Downtown needs to be more than one "postcard" view
2. Improve Mobility, Health & Safety
3. Stay Original. Stay Authentic. Be Green. Create Opportunities.
4. Enhance Parks and Public Spaces and Better Utilize the River
5. Downtown for Everyone

Mr. King stated that the plan was revised and improved:

1. Plan usability improved
2. Economic development revisions
3. Parking and transportation revisions
4. Rethinking Wyoming Street neighborhood
5. Greener plan
6. Expanded thinking on downtown sites with more thought to cost, i.e. property tax burden. Some proposals were scaled back and they found ways to pay for others. He stated that the plan is financially responsible.

A slide demonstrated the area in an illustrative plan. Mr. King stated that the plan had not been adopted yet. There were a series of public involvement workshops scheduled for this week. He and his staff were available to answer questions. He thanked the Planning Board members for their time and consideration.

Ms. Jenkins stated she had attended a presentation at the Wilma Theater and appreciated the time and preparation of Downtown Missoula Partnership and that of Dover, Kohl, & Partners.

7. Public Hearings

7.1 Amend the growth policy and consider rezoning 57.5 acres of land north of Mullan Road, east of Flynn Lane, and west of Hellgate Meadow - Jenny Baker, City

This agenda item was initially presented at the September 03, 2019 meeting of the Missoula Consolidated Planning Board (MCPB). See meeting minutes for full details. Presentations were made by Ms. Jenny Baker, Planner, City of Missoula Development Services, and Mr. Nick Kaufman, WGM Group, attending on behalf of Resource Research Ltd and HEH LLC. Written comments and public comments were presented; public comments to the MCPB closed September 03, 2019 at 9:49 p.m. This is a continuation of that agenda item.

Ms. Jenny Baker, City of Missoula, Development Services, provided a brief summary of the motions before the board.

1. Growth Policy Amendment. She stated that this amendment was to change the Residential Medium density, which allows 3 to 11 dwelling units per acre and to make that Neighborhood Mixed Use, which permits a higher density, more building types, as well as commercial.
2. Rezoning. This would change the 57.5 acres from the Hellgate Special Zoning District to a standard Title 20 zoning district of B2-1 Community Business, which is business, commercial and residential.

She stated that many questions were brought up at the last meeting which she and other staff are here to address:

- Capacity at Hellgate Elementary School. Ms. Baker provided a letter from Mr. Douglas Reisig, the Superintendent at Hellgate Elementary. Mr. Reisig stated in his letter that current enrollment from Kindergarten through 8th Grade is 1,545 students. Mr. Reisig wrote that the school had recently expanded and easily could accommodate another 250 students, which would push the student enrollment to approximately 1,800 students. An addition, 200 students beyond that could be accommodated, but it would be crowded. He also went on state that the school district has done this in the past, before a new middle school was built.
- Fire Access. Ms. Baker distributed an email from Adam Sebastian, Assistant Fire Marshal, Missoula Fire Department. Persons at the last meeting were concerned that the streets were narrow and fire equipment would be delayed due to this. Mr. Sebastian stated in his email that this development could be served and cited provisions from the *2012 International Fire Code Chapter 5 Fire Service Features and Appendix D*.
- Transportation. Ms. Baker introduced Jeremy Keene, Interim Director of Development Services, and Aaron Wilson, Manager, Transportation Planning. Mr. Keene spoke about work being done on transportation in the area. He was part of the BUILD Grant delegation that went to Washington DC last week to ask for support for a \$23M BUILD Grant. He stated that this grant would help build out the road network in that entire area; Mullan Road to Broadway; west of Reserve Street, out to the airport. He stated that they have been working on completion of the road grid network as that area develops. Mr. Keene stated 9,000 more homes will be needed over the next 20 years and that this area in the Mullan Road/Broadway area could accommodate anywhere from 1/3 to 1/2 of that growth if it is done right. He emphasized the need for the BUILD grant but stated that his department was also fully prepared to take it on themselves if they don not get the grant. It would take longer to complete but the city is already working to complete those road networks. There are projects in the capital improvement plan right now for Mary Jane Blvd to connect from Mullan up to Broadway. He stated the importance of accommodating the growth within the city or it would go elsewhere. Mr. Keene told the board members that currently 25% of the Missoula workforce commutes from outside of Missoula County. He emphasized the importance of providing affordable housing, good paying jobs, and a transportation network with connectivity and multi-modal uses. Mr. Keene stated that the development agreement would provide predictability, connectivity of roads, an understanding of land use, and transitions of existing uses.

Ms. Hassanein asked for more details regarding the master planning of this area, and the order in which it is anticipated to occur, and to which plan does this refer? Mr. Keene stated that in 2005 the county passed a grid road resolution for this area, which was part of a plan done at that time that looked at development of the entire area. It laid out the future network of roads and started to address the issues of Flynn Lane, where there was a narrow county road running past a school that needed to handle higher traffic volumes. Mr. Keene indicated that the plan to connect Mary Jane Blvd between Mullan and Broadway was started in 2005; along with that they started to provide and lay sewer lines to support that area. He detailed that if a large grant was not approved, their method for development of the road networks would be development driven; as development occurs, they would look to the developers to help provide the funding to

build those roads. He understood that there is currently a high demand for housing and the development is responding to that.

Mr. Bensen asked about details regarding the statement that 1/3 of the development in Missoula would be west of the Reserve Street area; which was being discussed tonight. He asked if this was hyperbolic for Washington or was that truly the situation. Mr. Keene specified that the numbers listed in the growth policy, as well as the transportation plan, state that this area was planned for about 3,000 homes; which is 1/3 of the growth. Mr. Bensen stated that at the last meeting the public was concerned that this growth was not anticipated, and the roads and school system could not support the growth. Mr. Keene responded the City does struggle to respond to the growth, which includes proactively applying for grants to fund the road network and to do good planning as it happens. He stated that part of the solution is to ensure that development can be served by transit services and bike-ped transportation, which create livable communities. The ability to have mixed use and neighborhood businesses and jobs will reduce the number of daily driving trips.

Ms. Potts asked about providing for other types of transportation; specifically, does the BUILD grant include non-motorized options, such as bus, trails, safer sidewalks, and bicycles? She followed with, if the BUILD grant does not get approved, are there funding sources? Mr. Keene answered that a large portion of the BUILD grant included bike trails and there are a number of new trail networks that would be created in that area, including connecting to existing trails, the Mullan Road Trail and the Flynn Lane Trail. He stated that Mountain Line largely depends on having density to make transit work. Densities of approximately 12 units per acre are needed to make transit work in a cost-effective manner. He stated that currently that area has development of 5-7 units per acre. Mr. Keene emphasized that Missoula is land-limited for development.

Mr. Hoffman remarked that Hellgate Meadows is east of the area being discussed at this meeting. It was about 40 acres and was developed in about 2002. He stated that the planning effort included 100 acres, not just the 40 acres that was developed at that time. He asked if the same transportation/road plan utilized in the preliminary design concept was designed at the time Hellgate Meadows was approved; or is it a new plan to accommodate the higher density? Ms. Baker stated that Hellgate Meadows is a special zoning district and the new proposal is in front of the board this evening as the previously proposed subdivision was never completed. Mr. Hoffman asked if this plan utilized the road plan from the original planning effort from 2002, or has it changed because of increased density? Ms. Baker stated she was not familiar enough with the 2002 plan to answer that question. Ms. Potts had researched the 2002 passing of the special zoning district. She stated that, at that time, the design strategies utilized a design call "traditional neighborhood design, also known as new urbanism"; it was a lot about narrow streets and trying to combine pedestrian and car facilities on streets to slow traffic. Ms. Potts detailed how the 20-foot wide streets with parking on the street was part of that design. She provided board members with copies of the original ordinance from 2002 and meeting minutes from platting and zoning committees.

Ms. Hassanein asked for more information about the transportation issue; at the last meeting there were a lot of residents who voiced concerns on transportation and roadways in conjunction with the number of dwelling units being added. Mr. Keene clarified that he was not attending to advocate for the project, but to advocate for good

planning and planned growth. He stated that in planning a transportation network, a grid network is planned that will support that level of anticipated growth. This included mechanisms of traffic signals, roundabouts, and a collector street network for bikes, pedestrians and cars. He stated that they still support traditional neighborhood design and promote the density and intensity of use, as well as the housing type and product that people can afford and get into at an entry level.

Mr. Houlihan asked about traffic signals and their location. Mr. Keene replied that they were planning for a traffic signal or roundabout on Mullan Road and Mary Jane, which will be a future collector street. He stated that it is a problem that Flynn Lane does not have a traffic signal at Mullan Road, and it is very difficult to make a turn, particularly when dropping off or picking up at the school. The new collector street of Mary Jane Blvd would connect to Mullan Road with a signal or roundabout to better accommodate the traffic. At the north end of Mary Jane there would be a signal or roundabout at Broadway, which would be a new north-south parallel connection to Reserve Street and take some pressure off Mullan Road and Reserve. Mr. Keene continued that this would also take the pressure off Flynn Lane and the street for the school, allowing it to be a local street. He stated that in the future that network would also include George Elmer Drive connecting to Broadway, and England Blvd connecting between Mary Jane Blvd and George Elmer Drive.

Mr. Mefford asked if the plan was in print or in concept only. He cited the Russell Street Bridge project history. He also asked about the monies being collected from the development and where they were going and how they were being put to use. Mr. Keene stated that the plan was a concept and a policy; there is a capital improvement plan, and the policy around grid road network that was created by the county. He indicated that if the BUILD grant were awarded, there is a date by which the project must be completed; usually five years to complete all the work. He repeated that if the BUILD Grant is not awarded it will continue to be worked on as funding is available; development fees and transportation impact fees are a primary method for creation of new roads. He again stated that this was development driven. Mr. Mefford mentioned the current condition of Reserve Street, capacity and needed repairs. He feels there is a big gap in Reserve Street's ability to move traffic; the plan seems vague and conceptual in his view. Mr. Keene responded that 65% of the right-of-ways have already been secured; they have letters of commitment from the remaining landowners stating that they will work with his department to complete those right-of-ways, and sewer lines are in the ground along these same corridors. He stated that it is more than a "wish list", George Elmer Blvd and Mary Jane Blvd are portions of this, but visible progress is slow. Those roadways were built as development occurred.

Mr. Caristo stated that he did research on the BUILD grant that was submitted. He confirmed that a lot of thought had gone into the road network and the non-motorized network as well. He asked about new development impact fees and if they were in place or still being worked on. Mr. Keene stated that there were no changes to the development impact fees.

Mr. Wilson added context to the discussion; he stated that planning is a process and is constantly being re-evaluated. He stated that one large roadway is less efficient than many smaller roadways.

Mr. Bensen appreciated the comments but continues to feel issues exist. One of the comments made at the public meeting on September 03, 2019 was that the neighborhood anticipated small shops and instead had the social security administration and a bank relocate to their neighborhood. He stated that although it is a great idea to have small neighborhood shops to develop an efficient community and reduce transportation needs, the reality is that there is no control over that.

Mr. Caristo asked Mr. Keene or Mr. Wilson to prioritize improvements made with BUILD grant funding. Mr. Keene stated that, within the BUILD grant, the Mary Jane Blvd corridor would be the top priority, it had already been prioritized in the CIP, with or without the BUILD grant, that project will move forward. He hopes to have engineering plans done on that next year, so they are ready to construct it whether they have the BUILD grant or not. After that, Mr. Keene stated, they would continue to the west, the connection on England, to the south half of George Elmer, and the last piece would be George Elmer going north from England up to Broadway.

Mr. Mefford stated that while north-south connectors are great, but there are still only two primary entry points; Costco or Mullan and Reserve. Mr. Keene stated that the goal was to get people up to Broadway, which has a lot more capacity than Mullan Road.

Mr. Nick Kaufman, Land Use Planner with WGM Group, attended on behalf of Resource Research Ltd and HEH LLC. He recapped his presentation at the September 03, 2019 Planning Board Meeting for those members unable to attend that meeting. He stated that their goal is to provide contemporary housing for today's market and getting the densities higher so that people can afford a home near where they work. He stated that Mr. Keene referenced that 25% of the workforce works outside of Missoula county. That means that 17,600 people drive into the community and out of this community every single day. That is why Highway 93 had to be widened by 100 feet. Mr. Kaufman stated that the traffic has to do something; today one of the things they do is turn off at Blue Mountain Road, drive Big Flat Road to Kona Bridge Road, then they get on Mullan Road. This area is used as a by-pass. He affirmed that the number one criteria to purchasing a home is affordability. If a person cannot afford a home in Missoula, they will buy it outside of Missoula. Missoula is accommodating the trips of these 17,600 on their major corridors; people need to be living in Missoula. He explained that the parcel is 57.7 acres; a northern parcel of 8.5 acres and the rest is a single parcel. HEH LLC was formed by David Edgell and Wade Hoyt and has acquired the northern most 8.5 acres. HEH LLC has also acquired the 17.7 acres south of that; and Resource Research Ltd has an offer on the remaining 31.5 acres. He stated that the current proposal for the 8.5 acres was 10 units per acre; which consists of mostly single-family; two-family and three 4-plexes; below that would be 120 single story, single-family homes; no three-story buildings; and no neighborhood commercial. The site designer would be Opticos, who provides contemporary planning for the "missing middle" which are live/work; town homes, duplexes, and tri-plexes. Mr. Kaufman provided slides of the elevational views and how the property would be accessed using city standard, city-width streets; not the width of the streets in Hellgate Meadows. He explained how density could be achieved in reducing yard setbacks and homes could be fronted on common green space; which, he stated is good for families and citizens 55+ for the security it provides. The name for these is "pocket park homes" or "cottage homes". No dwellings would be over 2-stories in the plan he presented. Another perspective east of Mary Jane Blvd demonstrated

building locations, heights and mixes. Mr. Kaufman discussed the 2015 Our Missoula Growth Policy:

- Residential-Medium is less intensive than the existing zoning
- The current land use designation is not congruent with recent policy changes
- Neighborhood Mixed Use provides an appropriate return on public investment.

Mr. Kaufman stated that the original work on this project was with Title 19. With Title 19 three different zoning districts were allowed on the 57 acres. Today that is called split zoning; in split zoning you have to go to the least intensive district, which does not allow achievement of densities for workforce housing on this property. The 8.5 acres is going through subdivision review to determine street, sewer and water and will be completed in two phases. He anticipates that it will take 10 years to build out the 57 acres. Neighborhood meetings were held on April 10, August 21 and 28 and modifications were made following those meetings. The major concerns voiced by neighborhood members were: traffic, uncertainty and assurances. He addressed traffic concerns and future plans for those roadways and how uncertainty would be reduced by a master plan showing intended development, parks/common areas, and more intensive uses on the collector streets. Neighborhood assurances would be in the form of a Development Agreement between the city and the developers. He discussed the post September 03, 2019 Master Plan and proposed Development Agreement:

- Limits commercial uses to Neighborhood Business Uses only, in conformance with B1 District standards, and further limits the location of Neighborhood Business Uses to a location either side of Mary Jane Boulevard within five hundred (500) feet of Mullan Road; and
- The density of the residential development is limited in the Master Plan by distinct area classifications:
 - a. Area A: fourteen (14) dwelling units per acre with a maximum building height of 35 feet; and,
 - b. Area B: twenty-one (21) dwelling units per acre or density calculated as 2,000 square feet of parcel area per dwelling unit on the Subject Property, and with a maximum building height of 40 feet, which is the maximum allowed in the B2-1 Community Business zoning district.
 - The total density on the Subject Property is less than half the density allowed for lands zoned B2-1 Community Business (43 dwelling units per acre or 1,000 square feet per dwelling unit);
- The Master Plan limits the multi-dwelling buildings to a maximum of sixteen (16) units per multi-dwelling structure, and limits attached townhouses to no more than eight (8) attached dwelling units per structure on the subject property.

Mr. Kaufman stated that this is a work in progress and he and the developers would continue to work with Missoula Development Services on the Development Agreement. He thanked the Planning Board and the audience for their interest and attention.

Ms. Jenkins asked for clarification on the open space/green space for the development. Mr. Kaufman displayed a slide of the conceptual Master Plan and pointed out those areas. Ms. Jenkins stated that the Development Agreement did not specifically call out locations of the green spaces; Mr. Kaufman indicated parks and common area locations on a slide, along with connectivity. Mr. Kaufman stated subdivision review requires approximately 20% open space/park area per the subdivision and platting act of 1973; this area has approximately six acres of parkland.

Ms. Potts inquired about the Development Agreement tool and if it would be attached to the entire 57 acres. Mr. Kaufman stated that she was correct, it would be attached to the entire 57 acres and park dedication is independent of subdivision.

Ms. Hassanein voiced concern regarding prime agricultural soils and the criteria the board should be using in determining the rezoning. Ms. Baker provided the review criteria and followed up with language for the proposed motions. Review Criteria:

1. Growth Policy
2. Public Services/ Transportation
3. Compatible Urban Growth
4. Promotes Public Health and Safety
5. District Character & Suitability of Uses

Ms. Potts asked how the development agreement fits into the motions, or if they are assurances from the developers. Ms. Baker stated that the Development Agreement would be discussed in further detail at the LUP meeting on September 18. The Development Agreement is not finished at this time but would be part of a motion that City Council would vote on in the future. She stated that is a binding agreement, so even if the listed developers signed the agreement but later did not develop the properties, the agreement would remain with the land and would apply to future proposals, if this one does not come to fruition.

Ms. Jenkins stated that she feels that Neighborhood Mixed Use, on its' own merit, is not a bad designation. She did not see any issues in voting for this; the current problems in transportation by the community are because the development has not been completed. She felt that by approving this the transportation issues would be alleviated; she cited the dead ends of Mary Jane Blvd that were not supposed to be dead ends. Even without the BUILD grant she feels there is good prioritization for this area.

Ms. Hassanein asked Mr. Keene if the BUILD proposal was not funded, how much longer would it take to build out the project. Mr. Keene stated that is hard to determine; if funding doesn't come in the source of a BUILD GRANT, the local funding source is development impact fees. He said that if development happens then they have the ability to fund these projects; without development is gets pushed out in the future until enough of those fees have been collected. He clarified that these fees do not have to be tied to this specific development, but from anywhere in the community in the form of a transportation impact fee. Mary Jane Blvd is in the queue for funding in FY20 and city council approved the funding for the design. Mr. Keene stated that hopefully they would receive the funding next year for at least one of the segments to be constructed. He stated that without the BUILD grant it could still be built in the next 2-3 years.

Ms. Hassanein asked about the nearly 4,000 entitled lots and what, if anything, was being done to encourage development in those areas as opposed to development of greenfield areas. Ms. Baker responded that a number of those lots were for approved subdivisions, but they have no control on when those phases will be brought forward or if they do, it may not be under the subdivisions they were approved under.

Mr. Kaufman stated that before the recession they were designing larger lots and wider infrastructure. Following the recession development did not kick off again until May 2018. He stated that in the interim construction and labor costs increases substantially and wages did not. The developments designed pre-recession were for demand at that time.

Mr. Caristo brought up that greenfield development takes a long time and is expensive in terms of infrastructure and planning; the problem will always exist in either leading or following with infrastructure. He felt that this land development had been planned for some time and is a relatively efficient place for new housing, although this is an increase in density of approximately 3 dwelling units per acre from the original plan. He was encouraged that the development agreement would be tied to the property.

Mr. Hoffman was involved in the original Hellgate project and was familiar with it. He agreed that increased density was a necessity to keep housing affordable. He stated that when the project was first developed it cost \$100,000 for a small home on a small lot; that same property is now selling at \$230,000 - \$240,000. He noted the enormous change in the housing market from 2002 to this moment. He stated he would support the proposal and feels that traffic issues will be addressed.

Ms. Potts stated that she had a question that would also be addressed in subdivision review; however, she desired more information on the 2-A zoning conclusions; adequate provisions for water, sewer, schools, parks and other public requirements. She asked for details on right-of-way requirements for Mary Jane Blvd and asked if the city had a plan if the development did not proceed and if connectivity would still occur in that scenario. Mr. Keene indicated that Mary Jane Blvd needed to be completed regardless of what happens regarding development of this property; there is a transportation need in that area that needs to be fixed. He stated that if the community will be investing \$17M of their own monies and \$23M of federal monies, it needs to benefit the community and offer a level of housing affordability and mixed used development. Ms. Potts stated she is concerned about quality of life in high density areas, the loss of green space and greenfields although she is in complete agreement that more affordable housing is needed.

Mr. Keene asked the board members to consider that the BUILD grant received the support of a number of conservation groups because they see that developing this area is a way of preserving other open space in other areas around Missoula, that we all value. Mr. Bensen agreed with Ms. Potts' comments. He continues to be concerned about the schools and their ability to absorb the density. Greenspace and disappearing agricultural areas remain a concern

Ms. Hassanein agreed that if this much agricultural land was being taken, then the development should be as dense as possible. She felt mixed use would provide a better neighborhood; having said that, she stated that does not cause her to support the subdivision itself as there would be no mitigation for the loss of the agricultural land.

Ms. Baker stated that this is considered prime farmland if irrigated; however, it has been zoned for residential development since 2002; it is used as a hay field, but there has been an intention for two decades that it would be residential. Major subdivision review will come before the Planning Board, minor subdivisions will not. Ms. Baker stated that every subdivision has an impact to agriculture component and would be considered as specific development proposals were presented.

Ms. Jenkins continued to be concerned about park land and open space but reminded the board that those would be addressed through subdivision review. Ms. Hassanein asked if the development would have to be built to its' fullest permitted density. Ms. Baker replied that it did not.

Moved by: Vince Caristo

Seconded by: Michael Houlihan

Recommend City Council adopt a resolution to amend the 2035 Our Missoula City Growth Policy land use designation from Residential Medium to Neighborhood Mixed Use on 57.5 acres of land north of Mullan Road, east of Flynn Lane, and west of Hellgate Meadows, as shown in Exhibit A, based on the findings of fact in the staff report.

AYES: (8): Peter Bensen, Vince Caristo, Neva Hassanein, Helen Pent Jenkins, Michael Houlihan, Andy Mefford, Stephanie Potts, and Jamie Hoffman

ABSENT: (3): Dudley Improta, John Newman, and Jason Rice

Vote results: Approved (8 to 0)

Moved by: Vince Caristo

Seconded by: Peter Bensen

Recommend City Council adopt an ordinance to rezone 57.5 acres of land north of Mullan Road, east of Flynn Lane, and west of Hellgate Meadows, as shown in Exhibit A, from Hellgate Special Zoning District to B2-1 Community Business, based on the findings of fact in the staff report.

AYES: (7): Peter Bensen, Vince Caristo, Helen Pent Jenkins, Michael Houlihan, Andy Mefford, Stephanie Potts, and Jamie Hoffman

ABSTAIN: (1): Neva Hassanein

ABSENT: (3): Dudley Improta, John Newman, and Jason Rice

Vote results: Approved (7 to 0)

7.2 Missoula Urban Area Open Space Plan - Finding of Conformance and Recommendation for Adoption as an Issue Plan (Kylie Paul-Co; Donna Gaukler-Ci)

Ms. Gaukler, City of Missoula Director of Missoula Parks and Recreation, introduced Grant Carlton, the new city open space director, and the Missoula County Parks Trails and Open Lands Staff: Kylie Paul, Juniper Davis, and Karen Hughes. She acknowledged Elizabeth Erickson and the entire Open Space Advisory Board and Open Lands Advisory

Committee, whom she stated did the majority of the work on the Missoula Urban Area Open Space Plan 2019.

The Missoula Urban Area Open Space Plan 2019 was presented. Ms. Gaukler asked that Missoula Consolidated Planning Board (MCPB) find the 2019 Open Space Plan to be in conformance with the city and county growth policies and recommend adoption as an issue plan for both growth policies.

She presented background and purpose of the open space plan:

- Updates the 1995 and 2006 Open Space Plans
- Addresses current public demands, while recognizing changing trends and conditions and balancing the many benefits of open space
- Guides Open Space/Open Lands programs in the Missoula Planning Region, including expenditures of public and private funds for open space conservation.
- When combined with other relevant plans, serves as a continued statement of our community's priorities for parks, trails, and open space.

Ms. Gaukler displayed a map of the planning area demonstrating designated public lands and the focus area for this plan.

The Plan Vision: The plan's open vision is to conserve, protect, and connect Missoula's system of open space lands to achieve a coherent and connected open space system, with access to a park, trail, open space land, natural area, or recreation area available in every neighborhood.

Goals:

- Conserve natural systems through purchase and stewardship of land, conservation easements and other available tools, for the benefit of future generations.
- Protect community open space values including important natural, cultural, and recreational resources.
- Connect urban green spaces and anchor areas through corridors and connect areas of development with open spaces through corridors.

She presented plan highlights: 1) conceptual framework/model, 2) implementation, and 3) benefits/services of open space. Ms. Gaukler stated that there is a model that demonstrates how the greater open space system works. Open space types included:

- conservation lands,
- park lands,
- historic, cultural, and scenic,
- agricultural,
- corridors.

Values and Benefits cited in the Plan Highlights:

- Ecosystem Services
- Habitat & Movement Corridors
- Ag and Soils
- Scenery/Views
- Culture & History
- Climate Resiliency
- Equity & Inclusion
- Health & wellness
- Economic

Ms. Gaukler recounted the public process. The team has worked on this for over two years and has hosted community focus groups, countywide statistically valid survey, an open-space open-house and questionnaire, public comment period on open space plan, city and county websites with project information, e-newsletter and news coverage throughout the process, involvement of advisory committee members, and support by city and county advisory committees.

County Growth Policy Goals:

Goal 1 - Protect natural resources

Goal 4 - Address climate change mitigation and resiliency

Goal 7 - Sustain and promote resource-based industries, including recreation

Goal 8 - Proactively plan for growth and sustain resources

Goal 9 - Provide infrastructure and services

Goal 11 - Reduce risks and costs associated with hazards

City Growth Policy Goals:

- Livability - thoughtful decision-making around land use
- Safety and Wellness - healthy lifestyles, safe and accessible parks and open spaces, access for all abilities and ages, clean and healthy environment
- Community Design - responsible use of outdoor resources, preserve and protect natural resources and areas, improve urban outdoor amenities
- Environmental Quality - protect and enhance open spaces, agricultural land/water, health of river, wildlife habitat and travel corridors, trees and vegetation, viewsheds/scenic vistas, additional open space lands

In conclusion, Ms. Gaukler stated that

- Goals, objectives and implementation strategies are consistent with, and conform to, County and City Growth Policy.
- Address and furthers the city and county growth policy goals by preserving natural resources, acknowledging and responding to climate change, preserving agriculture, air and water quality, enhancing neighborhoods, and helping avoid development in hazard areas.
- Product of a robust public process. Approved and recommended by the City Parks & Recreation Board, Open Space Advisory Committee, and Open Lands Citizen's Advisory Committee.
- Qualifies as an Issue Plan under Growth Policies.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no public comments.

Public Comment Hearing Closed 9:23 p.m.

PLANNING BOARD COMMENTS

Mr. Caristo asked how the plan would be used, including testing future investments in open spaces. Ms. Gaukler stated that the open space plan is a high-elevation plan which developed a vision for the community. She stated that all the components of the open space plan were used as criteria through their voluntary partnerships. She explained that open space bonds are spent with willing landowners who want to do conservation. All the items in the presentation were criterion for best use of limited resources; from a regulatory perspective it represents a foundation of what the community desires in urban development. The Master Park Plan clearly establishes standards for greenspace.

Ms. Hassanein appreciated the amount public process that went into the development of the plan. She had hoped that it would also provide priorities on where recent bond funds would be directed. Her concern was that often the spending goes toward recreation and trails, which is fine, but river corridors and Tower Street are important in the areas of flood control, the same applies to agricultural lands. She asked if there was any way the Open Space Program could set priorities for the expenditure of bond funding, rather than responding/reacting when proposals come forward. Ms. Gaukler responded that it is an opportunistic and voluntary action when property owners choose to easements on their properties. The staff within her department are proactive about where they go. She stated that the Open Space Plan, in concert with the City Plan, Master Park Plan, the City's Conservation and Climate Action Strategy, the Long Range Transportation Plan, the Forest Plan, and the Conservation Land Management Plan all act as guidance documents in setting priorities. She stated that challenges exist in managing and balancing developed park lands, which are usually symmetrical and five or more acres in size and at regular intervals, with agricultural lands. Ms. Gaukler affirmed that some of the biggest changes in the 2019 plan, as compared to the 2006 plan, were the emphasis on the values and benefits of ecosystem services, which had not been itemized in the past.

Ms. Jenkins asked about cash-in-lieu payments that can occur instead of park land dedication. She is concerned that in-lieu fees are often chosen over park land dedication. Ms. Gaukler confirmed that cash-in-lieu and/or park land dedication, as it relates to subdivision, is one of the most difficult decision-making aspects of her department. She stated that the Master Park Plan and the goal for a connected community that has access to well-maintained infrastructure would call for at least a 5-acre park to serve every resident within a 10-12 minute walking distance. Sometimes with the subdivisions, she stated, there are also needs for storm water management, or the transportation system does not work as planned, or for whatever reason, including landowner rights, they may to break those parcels into smaller pieces. Her department tries to determine the park most likely to serve the great number of citizens. She stated that it was very difficult with .5 - 1.0 acre parcels to meet the needs of the neighborhood. Cash-in-lieu is never used for maintenance.

Mr. Bensen asked to revisit the slide that stated, "qualifies as an issue plan under growth policies". He asked if there were more ways to analyze a development and not use density as the singular issue. Ms. Gaukler indicated that this is an advisory document with the goal of providing greater clarity in advising developers and planners and it is a continuing challenge to keep the issues clear and how to apply issue plans to them.

Moved by: Stephanie Potts

Seconded by: Michael Houlihan

THAT the 2019 Missoula Urban Area Open Space Plan, as shown in Attachment A, is in conformance with the 2035 Missoula City Growth Policy and the 2016 Missoula County Growth Policy.

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the 2019 Missoula Urban Area Open Space Plan, as shown in Attachment A, be recommended to the Missoula City Council for adoption as an Issue Plan of the 2035 Missoula City Growth Policy and to the Missoula Board of County Commissioners for adoption as an Issue Plan of the 2016 Missoula County Growth Policy, based on the findings of fact and conclusions of law.

AYES: (8): Peter Bensen, Vince Caristo, Neva Hassanein, Helen Pent Jenkins, Michael Houlihan, Andy Mefford, Stephanie Potts, and Jamie Hoffman

ABSENT: (3): Dudley Improta, John Newman, and Jason Rice

Vote results: Approved (8 to 0)

7.3 Rezone 2520 Strand Avenue, RT2.7 and C1-2 (Jenny Baker - City Development Services)

Ms. Jenny Baker, Planner III, Development Services, City of Missoula stated that this re-zone request came from Mr. Nick Kaufman, WGM Group, representing Mr. John Brauer. The subject property is three parcels located west of Reserve Street, between Mount Avenue and Strand Avenue. It is part of the Two Rivers Neighborhood Council and City Council Ward 6.

Mr. Brauer had requested a boundary line relocation and rezoning of properties located at 2511 Mount Avenue; 2518, 2520 and 2526 Strand Avenue; and 1715 S Reserve Street to C1-2 Neighborhood Commercial and RT2.7 Residential (two unit/townhouse). These were the current zoning designations on these properties, however the zoning is not aligned with the parcel boundaries, thus creating a split-zoned parcel at 2511 Mount, 2518 & 2520 Strand and 1715 S Reserve Street, where both the C1-2 and RT2.7 zoning designations apply.

There were three parcels that comprised this request. The first parcel (two lots) contains addresses 1715 S Reserve Street, 2511 Mount Avenue, 2518 and 2520 Strand Avenue. The parcel contains a commercial structure facing Reserve Street, and numerous mobile homes. The second parcel at 2520 Strand Avenue contains one detached single dwelling. The third parcel at 2526 Strand Avenue contains one detached single dwelling. Pursuant to boundary line relocation, 1715 S Reserve Street will be on its own parcel, and it will be zoned C1-2. Following the boundary line relocation, one of the two remaining parcels would be zoned C1-2, and the other zoned RT2.7. If approved, this rezoning would be followed by a 31-lot major subdivision, called Orchard Homes Estates. The subdivision would create single dwelling lots on the western edge of the parcel with RT2.7 zoning, and multi-dwelling/commercial lots closer to Reserve Street. The total area to be rezoned is 6.89 acres. The boundary line relocation, occurring concurrently with this request, would create split zoning, which is prohibited under Title 20. There is a major subdivision proposal that is under consideration, which is still in element review, but the board will see it come forward at a later date.

Ms. Baker displayed an aerial view of the property and provided descriptions on location, current structures, approximately 17 mobile homes in addition to a dwelling not considered in this request. A slide demonstrated the boundary lines prior to location and how the lots would be configured following boundary line relocation.

She described current growth policy designations and allowable densities and followed that with a slide of the current zoning map. The buildings along Reserve Street are part a Design Excellence Corridor Overlay typology 4. Following the boundary line relocation, split zoning would be created, which she demonstrated on a map showing Lot 2A. To eliminate the split zoning, which is not permitted under Title 20, a rezoning must be completed for this parcel.

Ms. Baker presented a slide demonstrating the requested zoning and the new parcel layouts. The commercial building would be on its' own lot and would maintain the same zoning it current has, and it keeps the Design Excellence Overlay. The center parcel would remain C1-2 and does not have a Design Excellence Overlay. She explained that the reason for that is the overlay is intended to shape development that faces transportation corridors or are in strategically important areas; as this parcel does not front Reserve Street, it would not apply here. Lot 2B would be Residential, RT2.7.

She provided the Planning Board Members with Review Criteria for approval:

1. Growth Policy
 - C1-2 zoning corresponds to the growth policy recommendation for land use. She stated that while RT2.7 is less density than the growth policy recommends; the prevailing zoning on city parcels in this area, it applies to some

of the parcels and she felt it would be a good transition between the higher density C1-2 and the lower density to the west, which is between 3 and 11 dwelling units per acre.

2. Public Services/Transportation

- Ms. Baker stated that the rezoning does facilitate adequate provision for public services. She indicated that this is in an infill area surrounded by existing infrastructure. It is already in an area that is served by water, sewer, schools and other public requirements.
- When the parcels are redeveloped, which is the subdivision proposal the board will consider, it will be served by sewer and water. It was her understanding that currently the single dwelling was operating on wells and septic systems.
- Subject property is two blocks north of C.S. Porter Middle School, where there are playing fields and playgrounds.
- Property is close to the Reserve Street travel corridor and has access to both Mount Avenue and Strand Avenue.
- Further improvements to transportation and infrastructure will be provided through that subdivision.
- The existing road network is able to handle the traffic generated by the existing uses and this rezoning would not change that level of use.
- There are intermittent sidewalks in the area.
- The area is less than 1/4 mile from Mountain Line's route 8, which runs along Eaton Street.

3. Compatible Urban Growth

- Permits a use of both commercial and residential development in an area that already has both. The boundary lines will be different, but the zoning is the same.
- The two zoning designations facilitate a transition from more intense residential/commercial development to the east, to less dense residential development to the west.

4. Promotes Public Health and Safety

- Emergency services are available to the site. Fire and law enforcement are available to address potential problems of noise, property damage, or personal injury. The site is within proximity to Missoula hospitals.
- The rezoning promotes the general welfare through the provision of more housing in close proximity to already developed areas of the city, where transportation and utility infrastructure already exists.
- This rezoning will not adversely impact the provision of adequate light and air as all future development will be required to meet internal and external building separation standards.

- This rezoning encourages an appropriate use of the land by complying with City Growth Policy goals and objectives, and adopting a zoning designation that aligns with the land use recommendation, as well as one that provides a transition between intensive commercial uses to the east, and less dense existing residential development to the west.

5. District Character & Suitability of Uses.

- The rezoning is suitable for the subject property and gives reasonable consideration to the character of the district. The permitted commercial development here is similar to that which exists along Reserve Street, and the residential component with the existing residential development to the west.

Kate Dinsmore, WGM Group, advised those attending that she was available to provide more information on the rezoning and subdivision.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Janna Moser, 2605 Mount Avenue, asked about the boundary line relocation to create lots 1A, 2A, and 2B, and due to that boundary line relocation, there would be a split zone. She asked why the boundary relocation was necessary since it was outlined around the mobile homes. The subdivision proposal that she has seen gives the impression of increasing the commercial space so apartment buildings can be accommodated. She asked for a better understanding on the necessity of the boundary line relocation. She returned later to ask about an increase in the residential portion. Lastly, she asked about the specific allowable housing units in the Growth Policy.

Ms. Dinsmore, WGM Group, showed a slide with the overlay of the proposed rezoning, the boundary line relocation and the proposed subdivision. She stated that through the boundary line relocation would allow development of Phase I on a vacant piece of land. This would allow the mobile homes on the adjacent parcel to remain during that initial phase of construction. The owner chooses to develop the empty parcel first, and the site where the mobile homes are located would be located through a future phase. She presented a slide of the proposed development: single family homes on the west side. Following Phase I, there are three multi-family apartments of 27 -, 25, and 25- units planned. Currently the plan is to commence Phase I, single family dwellings, without impacting the current residents of the mobile homes. Regarding the question on increasing the residential portion, Ms. Dinsmore stated that the intent was to provide a transition between Reserve Street, on the east side, which is built for a lot of density as a commercial corridor; and lower density residential on the other side; the intent is to provide a transition. She stated that this is congruent with the Growth Policy, and actually has less density than is called for in the Growth Policy. Single family would be provided for on the west side near the existing residential, transitioning toward higher density along Reserve Street.

Ms. Baker explained the Growth Policy and the recommendations with that.

Jan Chacrell / Shakell (*unknown spelling. Did not spell name/did not sign-in*) stated that this is city zoning and was spot annexed into the city in March. She stated that the

comparison zonings were not in line and that zone 12, which was the county zoning, for everything except the Reserve Street Corridor, called for one house per acre and suddenly 23 houses per acre were proposed for this area. She felt this is very high density and not in keeping with the neighborhood. She stated that the trailer park had been grandfathered in as one of the acceptable uses as far back as 1959; the other uses are one- and two-family dwellings; commercial and industrial enterprises are prohibited. She stated that the county zoning to the city zoning is like comparing apples and oranges. She stated that she has concerns and was not consulted and would like to have a joint meeting. Of the two meetings advertised, she stated that one was a small 2 by 2 sign put at the foot of a pole on the corner of Mount and Reserve, which no one saw. She stated that the sign announcing this meeting was "in the middle of Reserve Street, on the right-hand side, where you couldn't possibly stop to see it." She was told that there was not a lot of community interest expressed, and she feels this was because the community did not know. She spent the last week walking the neighborhood canvassing and everyone concurred that they had no idea this was happening. She would like to see more community input and more valid comparisons. She disagrees totally with the findings for Number 1 and Number 5 and also with parts of the others. She asked about getting a copy of the Growth Policy. Lastly, she cited impacts on the aquifer and a needed water study for the adding of these dwelling units. She felt she may have dug her well deeper due to the stress on the aquifer caused by the increased density on this 3-acre area.

Ms. Baker stated that the annexation in March was for one acre, not the entirety of the parcels being discussed at this meeting. She described that there was a notification poster placed on Mount, another on Strand, and another on Reserve. Additionally, she sent letter to all residents within the boundaries of this request and also to residents and owners within 150 feet. This is the first public meeting and the requirement to have a neighborhood meeting comes with the subdivision and this is prior to that. There will be more opportunities to have neighborhoods come and hear the proposal. This meeting is for the rezone request and the subdivision request will come at a later date. Ms. Baker advised that the Growth Policy is posted on the city's website and she can also email a link to those requesting it. Ms. Baker clarified that lot 2B RT2.7 rezoning would allow the 20 proposed units, all single dwelling; and multi-dwellings on lot 2A and specifics would be forthcoming at the subdivision review.

Marsha Johnson asked why more density was needed in this area. Ms. Baker answered that this is an area that was designated for higher density by the Growth Policy; these lots are Community Mixed Use, which allows up to 40 dwelling units per acre. What is prompting this specific proposal is the property owner's desire to change the use of the land and the subdivision would come before the board. The density is driven by the owner's plans for his property, and the Growth Policy permits that with greater density.

Larry Nagy, Business Manager of Target Range Sewer and Water, stated that his office has a business location on the corner of Mount Avenue and Reserve Street. He stated that the high-density apartment complex will generate more traffic in the already congested area of Mount and Strand. He has witnessed about an accident every day. He hasn't seen any provisions for roadway improvements to provide for the new homes, the apartments in addition to the existing traffic from Big Sky High School, Valley Christian

School, DNRC, and Community Hospital. He is against the proposal without having more information on roadway improvements.

Public Comment Hearing Closed 10:17 p.m.

PLANNING BOARD COMMENTS

Ms. Jenkins asked Ms. Baker to provide details of the stormwater provisions. Ms. Baker cited an email from Mr. Bob Hayes, Storm Water Superintendent, Storm Water Utility Division, Public Works Department, City of Missoula. He stated that the rezoning, in itself, would not indicate a change of the listed uses. However, when the project does come before subdivision review it will be studied in greater detail. She stated that road dedication is also part of subdivision review.

Mr. Caristo was concerned about how changes in densities impact the current residents. Ms. Baker clarified that the proposed densities have not changed. Mr. Caristo is also sympathetic to persons in a re-zoning situation who do not actually own the property.

Mr. Bensen agreed with Mr. Caristo and shared his concerns. Ms. Baker stated that most of these concerns would be addressed during subdivision review; further, the Planning Board also has the option of recommending to the City Council that they need to look at changing the approval criteria.

Ms. Hassanein asked about transportation, one of the criteria for approval, and inquired about the traffic on Mount Avenue. She asked about the dead-end street in one of the graphics. Ms. Baker stated that the street Ms. Hassanein was referring to would connect from Mount to Strand as there is an option to obtain that property; and although it is not owned at this time, the subdivision proposal has that street connection.

Ms. Jenkins reviewed the motions before the board and stated that there would be future opportunity to address concerns during subdivision review. Ms. Potts shared her concerns about traffic and the loss of mobile homes in the community due to infill and the creation of affordable housing.

Moved by: Neva Hassanein

Seconded by: Michael Houlihan

APPROVE the adoption of an ordinance to rezone from RT2.7 Residential and C1-2 Neighborhood Commercial / Design Excellence Corridor Overlay to the following, in accordance with new lot boundaries:

Lot 1A: C1-2 Neighborhood Commercial / Design Excellence Corridor Overlay and

Lot 2A: C1-2 Neighborhood Commercial

Lot 2B; RT2.7 Residential, based on the findings of fact in the staff report.

AYES: (6): Neva Hassanein, Helen Pent Jenkins, Michael Houlihan, Andy Mefford, Stephanie Potts, and Jamie Hoffman

NAYS: (2): Peter Bensen, and Vince Caristo

ABSENT: (3): Dudley Improta, John Newman, and Jason Rice

Vote results: Approved (6 to 2)

8. Committee Reports

8.1 New Subcommittee / Low Income Housing

Ms. Jenkins stated that trying to keep persons in their mobile homes may be the wrong conversation. She felt the conversation needed to be: What are the economic incentives for the developer to have a buy-back program so that the mobile home ends up acting as a deposit on a permanent home? She believes that the board should be looking to improve access to economic mobility and permanent housing; which will not happen by keeping this group in mobile homes. Mr. Bensen concurred that this was a good point to make and the conversation would continue when the subcommittee meets next. The subcommittee will meet independent of the MCPB scheduled meetings and will bring those conversations before the Planning Board when applicable. Subcommittee group is comprised of Ms. Jenkins, Mr. Mefford and Mr. Bensen. Ms. Potts expressed interest in joining the group, if a seat is still available. Ms. Jenkins will work with staff to establish a meeting date and time.

8.2 Transportation Policy Coordinating Committee

Mr. Houlihan attended a Transportation Policy Coordinating Committee Meeting earlier in the day and will present his report at a future meeting.

9. Other Business

No other business presented at this meeting.

10. New Business and Referrals

There was no new business.

11. Comments from MCPB Members

12. Adjournment

Ms. Jenkins adjourned the meeting at 10:40 p.m.