

Public Comment
River View Subdivision and Rezoning
Engage Missoula

Comment	Date	Commenter
<p>Comment on River View Subdivision</p> <p>This development is requesting 4 variances and a rezoning to build 19 houses on a very narrow strip of land. It seems to us that if they cannot adhere to City standards then the lot is not adequate to accommodate that number of houses. I know it is about financial gain with developers and land owners wanting to make maximum profit - but if they were to build one row of houses and create more of a full street to include bike lane making access to the park and S. Johnson it would be a much better project.</p> <p>Throughout the application for variances they state that “nor is it injurious to other persons or property”. We disagree with this statement. If approved, our front room bay window view will be of 3 backyards sitting 20’ off the property line. This development as proposed will devalue our property. Why would the orientation of my house not count when making decisions to develop this lot, our home has been here for a long time! When we moved in the current zoning told us that if developed the property in front of our house would be a few single family homes with an access road. We were hoping that we could work with whoever developed this lot to share the access road and eliminate the restriction Development Services put on our property for resale. We were never invited to any neighborhood meeting and the only way I found out about the development in the first place was from a coworker in the Parks and Rec office.</p> <p>So, when I put in a small house for my mother on our property about 10 years ago, Development Services was adamant regarding holding me to a 25’ set back for the back of the house. But it is ok to use the 20’ setback if you are putting in 19 houses? This does not seem right that we would be held to this higher standard but a developer does not need to do the same.</p> <p>Variance Request 2 Design of Roads and Streets</p> <p>The lot is so narrow they have to use a hammer head design to allow people to turn around, this seems like a poor design for an intention road. Consider the side streets and winter driving this is going to be a less than ideal flow of traffic.</p> <p>6.) I take exception to the number of times they describe the properties adjacent to this lot. They describe as “rental properties, and existing subdivision, and a public park on all sides”. This is a false statement. The “subdivision” of Carter Court are all privately owned homes, on the west side there are 2 privately owned homes that make up most of the length with the park at the end of the western stretch. Throughout this document they discount the 2 west side property owners. The only rental</p>	2/8/22	Shirley Kinsey

<p>houses I'm aware of is the small cluster of homes off Lafray Ln, and one small house at the mouth of the trail coming into the park off S. Johnson!</p> <p>Variance Request 4 Road Width</p> <p>Any subdivision putting in 19 houses should meet minimum road design. They site River Rd as a standard because it is a narrow road as well. Not acceptable, River Road is not a safe urban collector and it should be widened and side walks and bike lane added for safe travel – it is scary to walk or fried your bike down it as is.</p> <p>The request is to build a very narrow road in this subdivision is unreasonable.</p> <p>City standard for Residential Street Proposed Difference ROW 45' ROW 29.5' -15.5' from standard Street Width 33' Width 25.5' -7.5' from standard</p> <p>Parking on only one side of the road, providing for 17 spots so those on the end would not have any off street parking. To accommodate this number of houses I feel like it would be poor planning to allow this developer to provide any width of street other than the standards set per zoning.</p>		
--	--	--