

## **PLANNING BOARD SUMMARY – WEST END HOMES**

### **Annexation, Subdivision, Master Site Plan**

#### **PLANNING BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Planning Board makes a recommendation on the variances, proposed subdivision preliminary plat, and Sxwtpqyen master site plan.

#### **Variances**

On Tuesday, December 6, 2022, with 8 members and 1 alternate present, the Missoula Consolidated Planning Board voted 9 ayes to recommend City Council approve the variance request from Article 3, Section 3-030.1.C.3 of the City Subdivision Regulations, which requires each lot to abut and have access to a public or private street or road, to allow 18 lots to be provided access via an alley and public access easement containing a pedestrian path, based on the findings of fact and conclusions of law in the staff report.

On Tuesday, December 6, 2022, with 8 members and 1 alternate present, the Missoula Consolidated Planning Board voted 9 ayes to recommend City Council approve the variance request from Article 3, Section 3-080.8.B.3 of the City Subdivision Regulations, which requires parks to be adjacent to public streets on at least 50% of the parks perimeter, to allow for this requirement to be met with future adjacent development per a Development Agreement, based on the findings of fact and conclusions of law in the staff report.

#### **Subdivision Preliminary Plat Application & Master Site Plan**

On Tuesday, December 6, 2022, with 8 members and 1 alternate present, the Missoula Consolidated Planning Board voted 9 ayes to recommend City Council approve the West End Homes Subdivision preliminary plat application and master site plan, subject to the recommended conditions of approval, based on the findings of fact and conclusions of law in the staff report.

Planning Board voted 9 ayes to recommend the Subdivision conditions of approval provided in the staff report.

#### **Planning Board Discussion:**

Planning Board discussion included the following:

- Planning Board asked about recommended condition of approval #46 which requires a note on the plat and in the covenants stating Open Space #5 can be developed in the future in compliance with Title 21 and the Master Plan. Staff clarified that open space #4 will be large enough to cover the parkland dedication requirements, incentive area allowing for more T4-R zoning, and dedication requirements for parcel to the south referenced in the development agreement. Open Space #5 is parkland in excess of the requirements and is planned to be donated to the City. There are no plans to develop this space, but the condition captures what the City can legally require for dedication versus what is in excess of legal requirements. The condition is required as part of an ongoing

conversation with staff to fine tune the details for the donation of excess parkland.

- Planning Board asked about the recommended condition of approval requiring the subdivider to notify property owners of the EADA zone and associated risks on the plat and in the covenants. Planning Board asked if this condition means the home owners are acknowledging they are in a flight path and if the notice precludes lawsuits down the road. Staff responded that the Sxwtpqyen Master Plan and EADA zone were established in collaboration with the airport. The code requires reduced density and clustering of lots to create more open space in the EADA zone. A recommended condition of annexation approval requires the subdivider to establish an avigation easement which notifies property owners about potential risks and noise. Avigation easements are intended to preclude lawsuits. The additional requirement that the airport influence area and EADA zone be referenced on the plat and in the covenants ensures lot owners are aware.
- Planning Board stated they like the dispersion of residential building types and density, “staying true to plan”. They stated the new code promotes diversity in housing types, “incentivizing the next generation of community building”.
- Planning Board stated they are disappointed there is not commercial development proposed within the subdivision, though they stated they understand the subdivider is not required to build commercial development since residential uses are permitted. Planning Board asked if the resulting zoning precludes future commercial. Staff answered that commercial uses are permitted in T4-O zoning district and the zoning will be in place to allow commercial uses in the future. Planning Board asked the developer to consider building some non-residential uses, specifically referencing the need for child care.
- Justin Metcalf (subdivider) stated he is an “affordable housing developer by trade” but is open to considering commercial. Mr. Metcalf stated the project came about because he wanted to take his multi-family production building methodology and apply it to single family development to create homes for working Missoulians. Mr. Metcalf stated he wanted to do something at scale, and has been focused on housing affordability. As far as bringing in child care goes, Mr. Metcalf stated “I just missed it” and he is happy to consider it moving forward with the subdivision.
- Planning Board stated this subdivision, like the previous Riverfront Trails Subdivision, is “village like” development with the exception of services.
- Planning Board stated they are excited about large park. Sean McCoy advised including agriculture in the park area to serve the community and keep property values up. The subdivider responded saying that the neighborhood is envisioned as an “agri-hood” with 10 acres of the open space to be farmed. The subdivider has been working for a year and a half to figure out who will farm it, but is confident he will get there. The subdivider state the goal is to create a farm and park that serve as an active center for the whole neighborhood. Planning Board provided some recommendations for different organizations in the community that may be able to assist with accomplishing the agri-hood vision.

- Planning Board stated they think the West End Homes Subdivision is a great example for the first development in the area.
- Regarding the variance for no road abutting 18 lots, Planning Board stated the intent of the subdivision regulations and the form based code is met by the variance. Planning Board stated they support the walkway through the open spaces fronting lots and vehicular alley access as an alternative. Additionally, they stated they would like to see this alternative used more frequently because it separates vehicular and pedestrian routes, increasing safety.
- Planning Board had no comments regarding the variance to providing roads on 50% of the park perimeter. They stated the variance seems straight forward and reasonable.

*See the Planning Board Minutes for public comments and further Planning Board discussion.*