

Greenough Heights Subdivision and Rezoning
Engage Missoula Public Comments
March 29th, 2022 through April 1st, 2022

Comment	Date	Name
I have spent the last several hours trying to read through all of the documents posted concerning the Greenough Heights subdivision. I wonder if anyone from the county has spent much time in Greenough Park and really assessed the gulch area that is to be on the side of this development. The water from this gulch runs right into the creek. I can only assume any run-off from either building or from landscape inputs could run down this slope into the gulch and into the creek. Is the developer on the hook to mitigate any negative impacts? Would the residents agree not to use toxic chemicals on their lawns? Has anyone really looked at this and how to avoid potential fisheries and water degradation downstream? The developer has requested a variance that open space be changed to take in most of cherry gulch but allows building right up to the edge instead of the open space designation that is there now. The gulch is not buildable land anyway so the developer gives up nothing and is allowed to add houses right up to the edge overlooking the park with this variance request. Wouldn't it be better to have an open space buffer between the front houses and the slope leading to the park. I could imagine residents might enjoy being able to walk up to the edge for the view. I don't know much about sidewalks or lot size variances even though it looks like a couple are too small but I do know that this development of 20 houses will have a huge impact on Greenough Drive- especially with the traffic back-up that already occurs with multiple trains. It will also have an impact on the wildlife that uses Greenough Park and I can envision more deer being struck and more bear issues. Does planning and zoning take into account the special characteristics of a particular piece of land? or because Missoula needs housing everything is being approved. I completely understand the housing needs and the developer seems to be in compliance with all the internal growth plans of the city. However, Greenough Park is a pretty special place. There is not another place like it anywhere within in the city or the county. Parks and Rec. has spent a lot of our tax dollars to keep this park "natural" and to protect the creek and the riparian areas. This 20 lot development right at the edge of the park seems to be at odds with the special nature of the park and I can only hope the city realizes that once a piece of property is developed it can never be undeveloped. So erring on the side of caution is warranted.	3/29/22	Susie Spindler
This project isn't in my backyard, but it's pretty close. I have no problem with either variance request. I am glad to have new neighbors. That being said, I agree with Councilmembers Becerra and Carlino: given our housing crisis, it'd be great if the project was be more dense. The parcel's zoning permits more density,	3/31/22	Danny Tenenbaum

<p>but other outdated Title 20 provisions make such density difficult to actually build. Council should eliminate antiquated sections of title 20 like setbacks, parking minimums, mandatory landscaping/lawns, and minimum lot sizes. These sections of Title 20 force builders to set aside space for parking spaces and lawns instead of additional homes for people to live in. The Rattlesnake doesn't have a whole lot of 5 acre parcels left for larger projects like this one, so it is important to remove obstacles for small-scale multifamily on the standard-sized city lots where most of us live. Two-, three-, and four-unit buildings should be permitted by right on any parcel served by city water and sewer.</p>		
---	--	--