



## Missoula Consolidated Planning Board Minutes

September 7, 2021, 6:00 PM

ZOOM Webinar

Voting members present: Josh Schroeder (Conservation Dist Appt), Andy Mefford (County Appt), Dave Loomis (County Appt), Neva Hassanein (Mayor Appointee), Tung Pham (Mayor Appointee), Shane Morrissey (City Appointee), Jim Bachand (County Alt), Vince Caristo, Chair (City Appt)

Regular member(s) absent: Sean McCoy, Vice Chair (County Appt), Micah Sewell (County Appt)

Alternate(s) absent: Elizabeth Costello (City Alt)

### 1. Call to Order

[YouTube Video](#) [eScribe Video](#)

Mr. Caristo called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

### 2. Roll Call

Ms. McCammon called the roll.

### 3. Approval of August 3, 2021, Missoula Consolidated Planning Board (MCPB) Minutes

Mr. Pham moved; and Mr. Morrissey seconded the approval of the August 3, 2021, Missoula Consolidated Planning Board (MCPB) minutes as submitted. With a voice vote of all ayes the minutes were approved.

Mr. Loomis stated he appreciated the detail of the minutes for those meetings he could not attend.

### 4. Public Comment

No public comment on items not on the agenda.

### 5. Staff Announcements

#### 5.1 Staff Announcement from Bailey Minnich (attached)

Ms. Minnich, Missoula County, Community and Planning Services (CAPS), stated that future agenda items had changed since she had written the memo attached to the Planning Board agenda. The September 21, 2021, Planning Board meeting will be cancelled due to lack of agenda items and availability of administrative staff to run the meeting. The next remote Planning Board meeting will be at 6:00 p.m. October 5, 2021. There are already a number of agenda items scheduled for the October 19th meeting, as well as both meetings in November.

#### 5.2 Board Training, September 14, 2021, 6:00 - 9:00 p.m.

Mr. Caristo encouraged board members to attend the training.

## **6. Communications and Special Presentations**

### **6.1 Summary of comments and next steps for the Missoula County Zoning Code Update; Andrew Hagemeyer, and Jennie Dixon - Missoula County Community and Planning Services (CAPS)**

Mr. Hagemeyer and Ms. Dixon returned to the Planning Board to provide a status update on the Missoula County Zoning Code project.

The first round of outreach has been completed. The project team used the following approaches to get the word out that a new set of regulations to the zoning code is being created:

- Mailer to tax role in the affected area of about 8,000 addresses, which represents approximately 20,000 people
- Paid advertising in social media for the events and the website in the *Missoulian* and *Missoula Currents*
- Earned media in the publications listed above and also on local television and KGVO radio
- County email blasts and newsletters
- Community partner email blasts, i.e., community councils, Missoula Organization of Realtors
- Big Sky Communications assisted with the outreach and scheduling of events, i.e. - Out to Lunch

Mr. Hagemeyer emphasized that during the last two months they have held the following outreach events:

- Four in-person events: July 28, August 4, 11 and 18
- Online workshops: July 29, August 5, 10, and 26
- Stakeholder meetings
- Public presentations
- Online comments. The website received nearly 12,000 views, persons engaged the map, and viewed the code

To date, they have heard:

- Concerns over parking for the reduced required parking spots versus the current code
- Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) were not as controversial as they anticipated, even from a few years ago. They are proposing to allow ADUs in every zoning district.
- How to get vested. The website will go into greater detail.
- Clustering and density bonus was generally supported
- Neighborhood character concerns
- Live/make designation remains very popular
- Ideas about flexibility in housing design
- A handful of zone change requests

- Neighborhood character considerations regarding scale and density
- Incentivizing mixed-use buildings, to encourage both businesses and housing
- The county currently has a minimal approach to the Condominium and Townhome Exemption Development (C-TED) process, and they are trying to find the right balance for this in the future.

Still need to work on:

- Neighborhood engagement
- Riparian buffers: what are acceptable distances?
- Wildland Urban Interface (WUI) standards and where it should apply on the landscape
- Energy efficiency bonuses or incentives need to be incorporated
- How to find a balance with C-TED

Research still needed:

- Housing estimates and comparisons
- Riparian buffer mapping
- Where are hillside/ridgeline regulations applicable?
- WUI mapping
- Parking concerns: how parking mandates contribute to the cost of housing

Mr. Hagemeyer presented a revised timeline:

- Fall 2021: Revisions based on comments (new draft)
- Early Winter 2021: Public comment and planning board hearings
- Early Winter 2021: Revisions based on comments (new draft)
- Winter 2022: Public comment and County Commissioner hearings
- Winter 2022: Revisions based on comments (final draft)
- Late Winter? Adoption?

Mr. Schroeder asked what issues were under consideration in the riparian buffer distances. Mr. Hagemeyer stated that when they were drafted, they included a discussion about the channel migration zone, but they had not actually seen the channel migration zone study yet. They now have that study and need to re-evaluate the draft code. They know what resources they are trying to protect but need to see if they are actually accomplishing that. Mr. Schroeder asked if they were working with the Conservation District on that and with the 310 Permitting laws. Mr. Hagemeyer stated that 310 Permitting and the code needs to interface, as 310 Permitting is required throughout the entire country, and they are working on the right language. They will be working more with the Conservation District to make that occur.

Mr. Caristo asked about "vesting" or "grandfathering". Mr. Hagemeyer stated that landowners have "plans" for their property and changes can affect their plans. They want to avoid creating hardships during the changes to the code for those property owners. He stated that it is important to be very explicit about which permits, or information would establish vesting to a landowner under the current code. Many of these would become a nonconforming use under the proposed code. Chapter 10

discusses nonconformities. Mr. Caristo thanked Mr. Hagemeier and Ms. Dixon for their work on the comprehensive changes and the inclusive process.

## **7. Public Hearings**

### **7.1 Resolution of conformance and adoption of the Long Range Transportation Plan as an issue plan of the city and county growth policies. Aaron Wilson, Missoula Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), Jon Sand and Dave Gray, City of Missoula**

Mr. Sand, Missoula Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), Transportation Planner, stated that "Missoula Connect" is the update to the 2050 Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). He explained that the Planning Board members had two agenda items for their consideration:

- Consider the 2021 Missoula Long Range Transportation Plan as an Issue Plan for conformance with the 2035 Missoula City Growth Policy
- Consider the 2021 Missoula Long Range Transportation Plan for conformance with the 2016 Missoula County Growth Policy.

Mr. Sand provided overviews of the MPO, the MPO planning area, the LRTP, the LRTP performance-based planning process, the MPO purpose statement and city-county relationship, all available in the [presentation](#) materials. The plan is fiscally constrained and cannot allocate funding to committed and recommended projects beyond the estimated funding available for the next 30 years (2050). In response to COVID-19, all Missoula Connect engagement activities shifted to online and virtual formats in mid-March 2020 to ensure the safety of residents and staff.

A slide on plan funding detailed prioritized discretionary funding: 54% for complete streets, 20% for active transportation, 16% for roadway extensions, 9% for bridges, and 1% for intersection improvements. 71 projects, totaling \$208.3 million through 2050. Mr. Sand explained plan funding allocation near-term (2021-2025), mid-term (2026-2035), and long term (2036-2050) projects.

Growth Policy Objectives Supported by the LRTP:

- City Goal SW1: Encourage healthy lifestyles by having a complete active transportation and transit network for all abilities and recreational opportunities that are safe, clean, beautiful, and navigable.
- City Goal SW8: Missoula encourages the close connection between development patterns, community infrastructure and the environment as well as the importance of a healthy environment to our sense of social, economic, and physical well-being.
- County Growth Policy Goal 13: Promote equal access to employment, safe housing, transportation, community services and amenities for all segments of the population.
- County Growth Policy Goal 4: Reduce Missoula County's contribution to climate change while promoting resiliency and adapting to its impact on the natural environment and communities.
- [Conformance report is attached to the agenda](#)

- Formulate land use policy that supports compact development, transit, and multi-modal accessibility
- Support land use policy based upon transit and multi-modal transportation alternatives, and Focus Inward concepts
- Continue to build and maintain the core transportation facilities that contribute to Missoula's overall quality of life and economic advantages, including streets/roads, Interstate highway, and non-motorized trail and pathway system

Project spotlights were presented:

- Reserve Street Area Projects (Mullan Road to I-90)
- Brooks Street Complete Streets and Transit Improvements
- Creation of a Mobility Hub

Mr. Sand presented a timeline of the adoption and growth policy conformity

- The Transportation Technical Advisory Committee recommended TPCC Plan adoption on June 3, 2021
- The Transportation Policy Coordinating Committee adopted the Plan on June 15, 2021
- The final fiscal constraint and air quality conformity requirements were approved by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Federal Transit Administration (FTA), Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the Montana Department of Transportation (MDT) on July 26, 2021
- Request Planning Board recommendation of conformity to 2035 Missoula City Growth Policy, as an Issue Plan
- Request Planning Board recommendation of conformity to 2016 Missoula County Growth Policy
- Request City and County approval of LRTP

### **PLANNING BOARD QUESTIONS**

Mr. Caristo asked for examples of other issues plans that are incorporated into the Growth Policy. Mr. Sand stated that three previous Long Range Transportation Plans (LRTPs) were adopted, much like the Climate Action Plan, and the Waste Water Facilities Plan. Mr. Caristo asked if, by being included as an issue plan in the Growth Policy, is it fair to say that when the Planning Board is asked to review a proposal for how well it accords with the Growth Policy, is it fair to consider ways in which a proposal would help further the goals of this plan? Mr. Sand stated that the next agenda item is a good example, as specific items could be pointed to as examples, such as emerging mobility and constantly changing technology trends. Mr. Wilson, MPO, added that issue plans are under the umbrella of the Growth Policy subsets and plans. A Climate Action Plan is a very specific topic related to the Growth Policy, similar to the LRTP which focuses on transportation. They are all issues related to the Growth Policy; when the issue plans are adopted State Law allows them to fall under the regulatory umbrella of the Growth Policy.

Mr. Mefford stated that although the plan appears to be in conformance with the City's and the County's Growth Policies, does it consider future annexations? He is not an advocate of the modal switch from 70% single occupancy vehicle trips in the

recommended period of time. Mr. Mefford asked if the plan addresses new development and petitions into the MPO, and those expanding networks. Although taxes are collected, areas still remain underserved. He cited growth in the Miller Creek area, yet difficulties persist in making a modal shift as riders need to drive or bike to the Wal-Mart at the bottom of the hill to catch a bus to go downtown, and if they don't work downtown, they need to transfer to yet another bus. Grant Creek is another example of an under-served area which makes the modal shift difficult. Mr. Wilson felt these were fundamental questions, that they tried to address in the plan. He emphasized that the MPO is a federally designated boundary, so they do not annex or tax, but manage federal funds. By adopting the transportation plan at the city and the county level it provides the role of an urban transportation plan, but in terms of tax dollars the boundaries are set by FHWA by census urbanized areas.

Mr. Caristo invited Mr. Mefford and other board members to attend an on-line Mountain Line Board meeting to discuss transit issues in greater depth, or to call him during work hours. The staff and board at Mountain Line deal with these concerns on a daily basis and welcome working with local development and to use their funding efficiently to not only get high ridership but to cover areas that need services.

**PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD OPENED [7:05 p.m.]**

No public comment.

**PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD CLOSED [7:07 p.m.]**

**Moved by:** Shane Morrissey

**Seconded by:** Jim Bachand

That the Missoula Consolidated Planning Board finds that the 2021 Missoula Long Range Transportation Plan, as an Issue Plan, is in conformance with the 2035 Missoula City Growth Policy and is in conformance with the 2016 Missoula County Growth Policy.

AYES: (8): Josh Schroeder, Andy Mefford, Dave Loomis, Neva Hassanein, Tung Pham, Shane Morrissey, Jim Bachand, and Vince Caristo

ABSENT: (2): Sean McCoy, and Micah Sewell

**Vote results: Approved (8 to 0)**

**7.2 Rezone 500 South Higgins Avenue from Missoulia PUD and M1R-2 Limited Industrial Residential to C1-4 Neighborhood Commercial / DE-D Design Excellence Overlay, Hipstrip and OP1 Open Space. Cassie Tripard, City of Missoula**

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vAMQgcXsl-k> [Time mark 1:10:16]

Ms. Tripard, City of Missoula, Land Use Supervisor, Community Planning, Development & Innovation, stated that they had received a request from Jamie Erbacher of WGM Group Inc. on behalf of Lee Enterprises, Inc. to rezone 500 South Higgins Avenue, legally described in Exhibit A, from *Missoulia* PUD and M1R-2 Limited Industrial Residential to C1-4 Neighborhood Commercial / DE-D Design Excellence Overlay Downtown Hip Strip and OP1 Open Space. This rezoning will result in a standard zoning district under Title 20

which cannot be conditioned. Standard zoning districts must apply the same requirements to all parcels within the same zoning district equally.

The subject property is located at 500 South Higgins Avenue at the northeast corner of South Higgins Avenue and South 4th Street East in the University District Neighborhood Council and City Council Ward 3. The property abuts the Clark Fork River to the north and is intersected by the Milwaukee Trail. The property currently contains the *Missoulian* Building and related parking; the Milwaukee Trail is located near the river, and an irrigation ditch bisects the property and naturally delineates the current open space containing the trail from the *Missoulian* development. Ms. Tripard explained that the area surrounding the property contains mixed use residential, tavern, restaurant, and retail uses to the west. Abutting the river to the west is a parcel containing the Boone and Crocket Club; to the south there is a restaurant, multi-dwelling building and detached houses; and there is a park to the east.

The applicable regional plan is *Our Missoula: City Growth Policy 2035* which recommends land use designations of “Urban Center” and “Parks and Open Lands”. The property is also within the Downtown Master Plan area. The Downtown Master Plan is an amendment to the City Growth Policy. The Urban Center land use designation supports mixed use, commercial, and high-density residential development that promote walkability, urban streetscapes, plazas, outdoor seating, public art, and open space. The City Growth Policy suggests the following zoning districts for lands within the Urban Center land use designation: C1-4 Neighborhood Commercial, C2-4 Community Commercial, and CBD Central Business District. All three zoning districts permit commercial uses and residential density up to forty-three (43) dwelling units per acre. The Parks and Open Lands designation supports larger park areas to be used as open space for active recreation. The City Growth Policy suggests the OP1 Open Space zoning district for the Parks and Open land use designation. Additionally, the park is located within the Hip Strip area of the Downtown Master Plan, which city council adopted as an amendment to the City Growth Policy.

The applicant has requested zoning the subject property C1-4 Neighborhood Commercial, with a Design Excellence Downtown Hip Strip overlay, and OP1 Open Space which complies with the recommendations of the Growth Policy.

Ms. Tripard explained that the City Growth Policy strongly emphasizes a focus inward approach to development to encourage denser and infill development in the urban core where infrastructure already exists and promotes mixed-use, increased density, and enhanced connectivity while limiting sprawl and promoting efficient use of existing infrastructure. This location meets all the criteria. The parcel is located along the commercial portion of South Higgins Avenue, across the bridge from the urban core. There is existing infrastructure serving the property, including roads, sidewalks, bike lanes on Higgins Avenue, and water and sewer services. The parcel is currently served by city fire and city police. Bus stops serving route six are within two blocks of the property. The Downtown Master Plan includes a vision statement vision-type statements including ‘better utilize the river’, ‘help the Hip Strip stay unique and be the next great downtown neighborhood’, ‘improve urban design off of Higgins Avenue’, and ‘grow inward and upward’. The Downtown Master Plan includes illustrations showing significant change on the subject property including a new mixed-use building. Because the current Planned Unit Development (PUD) zoning is only applicable to the

development of the *Missoulia* land use, rezoning is necessary to facilitate future development that can help to achieve the vision for the site in accordance with the Downtown Master Plan and Growth Policy.

Ms. Tripard presented a map taken from *Our Missoula Development Guide*, formerly known as the Urban Fringe Development Area. She stated that the purpose of the Development Guide is to identify locations more definitively within the study area that have capacity for increased density, suitable net capacity was indicated by varying circle sizes on the map. The subject property falls in tier four as being very suitable to serve in that capacity. Currently the *Missoulia* PUD zoning is only applicable to development of the *Missoulia* land use, rezoning is necessary to facilitate future development that can help to achieve the vision for the site in accordance with the Downtown Master Plan. The current zoning does not permit residential development and the proposed rezoning would allow high density residential development.

The parcel is currently split zoned *Missoulia* Planned Unit Development (PUD), and a small portion of the subject property is zoned M1R-2 Limited Industrial-Residential. The *Missoulia* PUD does not permit residential development. Because the property is split zoned, development must follow the regulations of the *Missoulia* PUD because it is the more restrictive zoning district. The *Missoulia* PUD was written to allow specific development of the site for the *Missoulia* building which contains office and newspaper printing and limited industrial uses. The majority of the parcels to the west are zoned C1-4 Neighborhood Commercial with a Design Excellence Downtown Hip Strip Overlay. Abutting the river to the west, the parcel continues to the Boone and Crocket Club which is zoned Clark Fork PUD. The park to the east is zoned M1R-2 Limited Industrial Residential. Parcels to the south, on Higgins Avenue, are zoned C1-4 Neighborhood Commercial. Other parcels south of the subject property are zoned RT2.7 residential with the University District Neighborhood Character overlay.

Ms. Tripard stated that the requested zoning is C1-4 Neighborhood Commercial / DE-D Design Excellence Overlay Downtown Hip Strip south of the irrigation ditch and OP1 Open Space north of the irrigation ditch. Staff supports the requested zoning districts as they comply with the Growth Policy and aligns with existing neighboring parcels.

The rezoning application is accompanied by a request for a boundary line relocation in order to create parcel lines that align with the boundaries of the proposed zoning districts. The proposed boundary was displayed on a map. Land north of the ditch would be zoned OP1 Open Space and the land south of the ditch to C1-4 Neighborhood Commercial / DE-D Design Excellence Overlay Downtown Hip Strip.

Zoning comparisons were made between the existing and proposed zoning districts. The current PUD does not allow residential development; C1-4 permits one dwelling unit per 1,000 square feet of parcel area, which computes to 43 dwelling units per acre. The OP1, to be applied to the open space north of the irrigation ditch, does not allow residential development. Setbacks were detailed in the [staff report](#). The C1-4 zoning district has no setbacks if the parcel does not abut a residential zoning district. The residentially zoned parcels to the south are across a right-of-way and are not considered abutting so there would be no setbacks for the subject property. The maximum height in C1-4 is 125 feet. C1-4 will allow for residential, commercial, and some industrial uses. OP1 will only allow for parks, recreation, utilities, garden, and agriculture.



The Design Excellence Overlay applies additional site and building design standards to development. The Downtown Hip Strip sub-district includes design requirements tailored to this specific area of town to ensure high quality development that compliments the character of the Hip Strip. Design excellence overlay was explained, along with a few of the main design requirements:

- Upper Story Step-Back
- Windows, Frequent Entries, Street Facing Entry, Masonry
- Build-to-Zone, Build-to-Width, and Parking Setback

Ms. Tripard stated that while no development plan was provided with the application, future redevelopment of the site would need to comply with the Design Excellence Standards. She stated that C1-4 allows for a 125-foot maximum height, and by comparison the Wilma Building is 103-feet tall, the Millennium Building is approximately 128-feet tall, and the Mercantile is 58-feet tall. The Wilma and the Millennium Buildings were constructed prior to Design Excellence so the upper stories were not required to be setback.

Ms. Tripard presented the review criteria:

Staffs' recommendation, based on the review criteria provided in the Title 20 zoning ordinance, is that this request complies with the land use designation and focus inward objectives of the City Growth Policy. The requested rezoning supports the vision shown in the Downtown Master Plan, which is an amendment to the Growth Policy. The subject property is served by city fire, police, sewer, water, and existing multi-modal transportation infrastructure. The parcel is in proximity to adequate services and amenities. Future development must comply with all applicable local, state, and federal regulations which ensure protection of public health, safety, and welfare. The upper story setback required by Design Excellence will ensure adequate provision of light and air. The rezoning considers compatible urban growth because the rezoning complies with the Growth Policy recommendations, the Downtown Master Plan, and provides efficient use of existing infrastructure. The rezoning considers the character of the district because Design Excellence will apply the same design standards as other development in the Hip Strip sub-district. The requested C104 zoning district matches the zoning of adjacent parcels along this portion of South Higgins Avenue and will allow the same uses as these parcels. The requested OP1 Open Space zoning district, north of the irrigation ditch, will preserve the existing use of the area as open space. The *Missoulian* PUD only permits office and limited manufacturing uses; the requested C1-4 zoning would allow the land to be used for additional commercial, and mixed use residential development; which encourages the most appropriate use of land located in the urban center. Design Excellence will ensure high quality design and conservation of building value. The OP1 zoning district complies with the Parks and Open Lands land use designation and ensures that area is the most appropriate use per the Growth Policy, which is open space. The *Missoulian* business will no longer be printing newspapers at the subject property. The proposed rezoning meets the changing

condition of the site by removing the restrictive *Missoulian* PUD. The proposed zoning also permits high density residential, which could help to meet the challenge of changing housing conditions in Missoula. The requested rezoning is in the best interest of the City as a whole because the C1-4 zoning promotes mixed use, commercial, and high density development which provides additional economic and housing opportunities in the city. The proposed OP1 Open Space appropriately zones existing open space and trail use by the public.

**PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD OPENS [7:28 p.m.]**

No public comment.

**PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD CLOSSES [7:31 p.m.]**

**PLANNING BOARD QUESTIONS/COMMENTS**

Mr. Loomis had read the on-line comments and noted the concerns:

- protected bike lanes and walking access to the river
- building height
- future property development to accommodate commercial enterprises on the street level with residential development above, and a parking structure below ground level

Mr. Loomis stated that although the zoning designation does not require these, he felt they were important. He supports the rezoning to higher density mixed use and asked if the terms of the final amended plat would occur after the rezoning approval by City Council. Ms. Tripard stated that the boundary line relocation has been applied for and once City Council approves, the ordinance is written so that when they file that amended plat making that boundary official, the rezoning would go into effect. Mr. Loomis asked about the conservation easement OP1; the report states that it might not be open for public use; however, OP1 allows a maximum building height of 35-feet. He asked if this was the proper open space designation. Ms. Tripard stated that this is the only zoning district recommended for that land use designation. There is an existing easement for the trail, which preserves access to the public. The maximum allowable building height of 35-feet, although there are no permitted structures, no residential or commercial uses; however, utilities are allowed; so, a utility related structure could be added in the future. Mr. Loomis asked about bike facilities on East Fourth; there are none at present; how can the city accommodate appropriate sidewalk and bike lane widths?

Ms. Hassanein asked if the developer's representative had a sense of what is envisioned for this property and what percentage would be devoted to residential uses and what percentage to commercial endeavors.

Ms. Erbacher, WGM Group, stated that they envision mixed use developments, and no density has been set yet for the residential portion of it. The zoning regulations have a requirement where if average daily trips increase by 200 or more, then a traffic study is required. With the traffic study the City can require on-site and off-site improvements to motorized and non-motorized transportation. A larger mixed use development project may have changes to the motorized and non-motorized transportation system within the area.

Mr. Caristo asked if the zoning code requires mixed use, with shops on the ground floor. Ms. Tripard stated that the zoning code does not require mixed use; it is incentivized but not required. They can choose from any of the permitted uses in the zoning district. None of the zones require mixed use.

Ms. Hassanein asked Ms. Erbacher if she had a sense of a percentage or number of planned units for residential development, as this could become a tall building. Ms. Erbacher stated that there was no set percentage; but she anticipated that the ground floor would be dedicated to commercial uses, with residential above that. The site will likely be developed with a parking structure.

Mr. Caristo liked the proposal for the *Missoulia* building and would support the motion.

Ms. Hassanein went on record to request that future designs around the irrigation ditch include the installation of guards to better protect children and dogs from becoming entrapped. 15-years ago a dog of hers died in the irrigation ditch in this area, and she knows of other animals that perished there as well.

Ms. Hassanein and Mr. Morrissey both supported ground floor commercial activities with residential development above.

**Moved by:** Shane Morrissey

**Seconded by:** Jim Bachand

**APPROVE** the adoption of an ordinance to rezone property located at 500 South Higgins Avenue, legally described in Exhibit A, from Missoulia PUD and M1R-2 Limited Industrial Residential to C1-4 Neighborhood Commercial / DE-D Design Excellence Overlay Downtown Hip Strip and OP1 Open Space, subject to the applicant filing the amended plat and meeting the terms of approval for subdivision exemption application 2021-MSS-SEA-00020 within one hundred and eighty (180) days of approval of the rezoning, subject to review and approval by Development Services and Public Works and Mobility, otherwise the rezoning of the property shall become null and void, and the property shall revert to its original status. The effective date of the ordinance is the date the amended plat is filed for subdivision exemption application 2021-MSS-SEA-00020.

AYES: (7): Josh Schroeder, Andy Mefford, Neva Hassanein, Tung Pham, Shane Morrissey, Jim Bachand, and Vince Caristo

ABSTAIN: (1): Dave Loomis

ABSENT: (2): Sean McCoy, and Micah Sewell

**Vote results: Approved (7 to 0)**

## **8. Committee Reports**

Mr. Morrissey had no report from the Transportation Policy Coordinating Committee (TPCC).

## **9. Old Business**

No old business.

## **10. New Business and Referrals**

No new business or referrals.

**11. Comments from MCPB Members**

No comments from Planning Board Members.

**12. Adjournment**

Mr. Caristo adjourned the meeting at 7:46 p.m.