



COMMUNITY PLANNING, DEVELOPMENT & INNOVATION

Development Services Division

435 RYMAN | MISSOULA, MT 59802-4297 | 406.552.6630 | FAX 406.552.6053

February 14th, 2022

Paul Forsting
IMEG Corp
1817 South Avenue W
Missoula, MT 59801

Re: West End Homes Second Element Review

Dear Paul Forsting,

Development Services received your application packet for the above subdivision for 2nd *Element Review* on February 7th, 2022. The element review deadline is February 14th, 2022. **At this time, Development Services cannot certify your application packet as containing all the necessary elements.**

Please address the items listed below. Once these items have been addressed, please submit a third Element Review packet with a new cover page clearly titled as *3rd Element Review*, and include the date submitted. In lieu of a CD, please provide the 3rd Element Review materials on a USB drive or provide a link for downloading the application materials. Only submit documents which have changed from first Element Review.

Preliminary Plat / Master Site Plan / Regulating Plan

Provide all applicable information required under City Subdivision regulations Article 5, Section 5-010 and applicable preliminary plat supplements under Article 5, Section 5-020 while addressing all applicable subdivision design standards in Article 3 of the City Subdivision regulations. This subdivision must also comply with Title 21 (Sxwtpqyen Form Based Code). Include the following items:

- a. There are several lots that do not comply with the minimum width standards for the transect zone they are located in. Lot dimension standards can be found in Title 21, Table 3-1. Per the glossary (Division 8), lot width means “the length of the primary frontage line of a lot”. The definition for “primary frontage line” states that it is a synonym for “front lot line”. The definition for “front lot line” is “the lot line dividing a lot from the street right-of-way”. The width of the front lot line must comply with the width standards in Table 3-1.
- b. Lot 193 does not meet the 50-foot minimum lot width for the T3 transect zone.
- c. Lot 76 is just shy of the 50-foot minimum lot width for the T3 transect zone.
- d. Lot 210 does not meet the 50-foot minimum lot width for the T3 transect zone.
- e. The street hierarchy does affect which lot line must comply with the lot width. In the glossary, the definition of **Lot Width is “The length of the Primary Frontage Line of a Lot.”** In Division 6.2 it states “On each parcel that has multiple street frontages (e.g., corner lots), the **street hierarchy will determine** the highest priority **(Primary) street frontage**, where the Front Build-to-Zone or Setback shall apply.” Though it does state this is where the front build to zone and setbacks apply, it also states that it determines

where the primary street frontage is. The lot width by definition is the length of the primary frontage, so the lot width standards apply to the lot line abutting the highest priority street. While I believe a trail street is more appropriate than just common area, I do not see a hardship to support a variance. Please let me know how you would like to move forward. Below are lots affected by this code section.

- f. Lot 113 fronts the trail street per the street hierarchy provided in Division 6. This means the lot depth is non-compliant (80 ft minimum). In other words, the lot is oriented incorrectly per the street hierarchy.
- g. Lot 152 fronts the trail street per the street hierarchy provided in Division 6. This means the depth is non-compliant (80 ft minimum). In other words, the lot is oriented incorrectly per the street hierarchy.
- h. Lot 185 fronts the trail street per the street hierarchy provided in Division 6. This means the depth is non-compliant (110 ft minimum). In other words, the lot is oriented incorrectly per the street hierarchy.
- i. Lot 186 fronts the trail street per the street hierarchy provided in Division 6. This means the depth is non-compliant (110 ft minimum). In other words, the lot is oriented incorrectly per the street hierarchy.
- j. Per the subdivision application, the parkland requirement is 8.083 acres. This number has not been updated on the master site plan.

Road Construction Plans

- k. Flynn lane section should have a 10' boulevard with 1' shoulders each side of the swale per the BUILD Grant. Ensure this is shown on Sheet 3 of 3 of the Master Site Plan (cross sections) and stage plans. See Steve's email to Mike Mayen dated 2/5/22.
- l. It appears the bioswales run the entire length of the Trail Street but the road sections do not show a bioswale like the others do. Please clarify the plan for incorporating this stormwater feature.
- m. Page 60 (Sheet 10 of 31) of the stage plans shows Road D dead ending at England Boulevard. We cannot accept this to certify for Element Review but understand this is likely tied to the BUILD Grant design. Work with City Engineering to reconcile this issue so that the connection can be shown in the plans.
- n. With the travel lane adjustments to the Fietsstraat road type to accommodate Fire Code, staff have acknowledged that the road type essentially matches the Neighborhood Street type with the exception of the textured 4' portion and associated transect zones. This textured path isn't ideal in terms of maintenance. Engineering has also noted that they would prefer Road C not change road classification types. I will be bringing this to a staff DRT on February 24th to look for a more "common sense" solution through the code if possible. Please reach out for updates on this issue prior to submitting for 3rd Element.
- o. Engineering notes that the access to Road A from England Blvd. may promote higher speeds than are desirable. Work with Engineering to determine feasibility of bulb outs at the intersection.
- p. The Stage 2 plans mark the Trail Street through the open spaces as a utility easement. Considering this is a road type, it will be right-of-way and utility easements

are not necessary. Additionally, there are no boulevard trees on one side due to water utility placement. Coordination between Parks and Rec and Public Works is needed to weigh these conflicts. Are there design solutions that would allow boulevard trees along this stretch in compliance with the code?

- q. As a note, road types marked “curbless” may have a curb as this is Parks and Stormwater’s preference. We have determined this is a public health and safety issue, allowing us to have curbs despite the code stating curbless.

Other Issues (Sufficiency)

- r. Item D.3.b of the Subdivision Application states rezoning application is included. Please revise to say “N/A: zoning is applied with annexation”.
- s. Item I of the subdivision application: Adjacent property owner map does not include all owners to the west and north of the property. The parcel across Flynn Lane that is across from the northeastern most point of the property (Tract C) should be included as well. While I see an updated exhibit, the larger tracts are all still missing ownership information. Reach out if it is unclear which tracts to include.
- t. I was about to have the check cashed but then realized the lot number has changed which changes the fees due. I will revise the fees. Do you suspect there will be additional changes to the lot number? Would you like us to cash the check and issue a refund for the remainder, or I can give the check back and you can issue a new check for the revised amount.
- u. Item I of the Subdivision Application requires landscape plans for the common areas and boulevards (5-020.14.H). Per the submittal, it appears this is very preliminary and boulevard tree placement is subject to change based on utility placement and other factors. Rather than having all of the plan conditioned, I would like Parks and Rec to determine the level of review needed prior to preliminary plat approval. As seen with the lack of trees on the Trail Street through the common areas, boulevard tree placement should not just be an afterthought. Staff will discuss at DRT on February 24th.

If you have additional questions, you may reach me at (406) 552-6673 or email me at TripardC@ci.missoula.mt.us.

Sincerely,

Cassie Tripard

Cassie Tripard, Planning Supervisor
Development Services
Community Planning, Development & Innovation

cc: Mary McCrea, CPDI
Dave DeGrandpre, CPDI
Troy Monroe, PW&M
Steve Reichert, PW&M
Walt Banziger, CPDI
Eran Pehan, CPDI