

Planning Board Summary

Rezone 2900, 2920, and 2990 Expo Parkway / Grant Creek Village from R5.4 Residential, RM1-35 Residential (multi-dwelling), B2-2 Community Business, and C1-4 Neighborhood Commercial to RM 1-45 Residential (multi-dwelling)

Planning Board Recommendation:

On Tuesday, April 19, 2022, with 8 members present, the Missoula Consolidated Planning Board **failed to approve the motion** to adopt an ordinance to rezone 2900, 2920 and 2990 Expo Parkway / Grant Creek Village from R5.4 Residential, RM1-35 Residential (multi-dwelling), B2-2 Community Business, and C1-4 Neighborhood Commercial to RM1-45 Residential (multi-dwelling). **The vote was 3 ayes and 5 nays on the motion to approve the rezoning.**

This Board's recommendation is contrary to Development Services staff recommendation for **approval** of the rezoning request.

Planning Board's Recommended Conditions of Approval:

None, conditioning of a standard Title 20 zoning district is not permitted by state law. MCA 76-2-302(2) requires that a class of zoning standards, such as the RM1-45 Residential (multi-dwelling) zoning district standards, be uniform in all locations where the standards apply.

Planning Board Discussion:

Planning Board members had a lengthy and thoughtful discussion about the proposed rezoning. Board member statements varied and included the following:

- Compliance with the Growth Policy is not clear. The rezoning would comply with the Future Land Use Map and several goals and policies, but could result in many single-occupancy vehicle trips, not help meet climate goals, etc.
- This is not the core of the community. Growth should occur in the core, then expand outward.
- Lack of compatibility with surrounding development. The current zoning designations - R5.4 and RM1-35 - are compatible, despite the High Density Residential Growth Policy map designation.
- Fire safety concerns are valid, particularly with one way in and out of the Grant Creek drainage. However, this site is on the edge of the Wildland Urban Interface where fire danger is lower. Is the developer being penalized by the existing WUI development farther up the drainage?
- Traffic impacts are uncertain – it would be helpful to see a final, city-approved Traffic Impact Study to know what mitigation measures (if any) are necessary and if safety concerns can be alleviated.
- The developer has made significant efforts to address concerns, such as area for co-working, considering renters with physical limitations, bike repair area, trails, and protection of the hillside.
- The Development Agreement - Board members appreciated the effort but wondered: Is it enforceable? Can we rely on it?
- Equity - Each neighborhood must absorb growth if we are going to address housing needs. Some neighborhoods are better equipped to oppose development than others. This rezoning would help to meet City equity goals.

- There is a 'chicken or egg' question. Must services and public facilities be available before development, or can they be improved as demand occurs? What will the impacts be if services and facilities are NOT improved over time to serve new residents?
- Missoula has a housing problem: We need all types. The City should prioritize housing development AND address access, service, and facility issues. We need to address the housing supply problem; infrastructure and services will follow.
- The City needs to increase housing supply. RM1-35 and R5.4 are not high density enough, while the growth policy calls for high density development in this location.
- Uncertainty whether this rezoning meets the criteria – concerns about health and safety, transportation impacts, wildfire, climate...
- This site is appropriate for housing. The hillside should be protected and housing should be built on the floor.
- Would subdivision be more appropriate? We need housing but also need to grow in an intentional manner, less auto centric, and more diverse.
- We should consider the cumulative impacts of all developments on an area.

Please see the Planning Board Minutes for further Planning Board discussion.