

Attachment D:
Summary of Community Engagement & Outreach

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Engagement & Outreach Overview -----2
 a. List of Community Outreach & Engagement: Jan. 1-Nov. 13, 2025 -----5
2. Summary of Public Comments & Staff Responses
 a. Unified Development Code (UDC) -----8
 b. Zoning Map -----19

1. Engagement and Outreach Overview

OVERVIEW

Community engagement and outreach for the Code Reform phase of the Our Missoula process took place following the adoption of the *Our Missoula 2045 Land Use Plan* from January-November 2025.

Prior engagement that had taken place in the previous phases of the project provided the Our Missoula team with an understanding of how land use impacts community members, what Missoulians value most in their neighborhoods, and the types of growth that Missoulians support throughout the community. This feedback created a foundation from which the proposed code was drafted.

Engagement on the draft development codes had two main focuses. The first focus was creating understanding about the connection of the Land Use Plan and Place Type Map to the draft code and zoning map. The second element was a focus on gathering technical feedback from stakeholders that frequently use the development codes.

OUTREACH

The Our Missoula team used a variety of outreach methods to inform the public about process and project updates, upcoming engagement opportunities, available documents and information, and ways to provide feedback. These include:

- Tabling opportunities at local events, including Climate Fest and City Chats in the Park.
- Newsletters sent to Community Planning, Development, & Innovation (CPDI) newsletter subscribers, neighborhood councils, and community members who signed up to receive updates about the project.
- A mass mailing sent to all physical addresses within the City of Missoula.
- Attending several meetings with community stakeholder groups.
- Press releases to local news media outlets.
- Appearing on City Talk Radio.
- Attending neighborhood meetings, including presentations to the Neighborhoods Community Forum and general meetings for individual neighborhoods.
- Requests for comment emailed to local agencies.
- Presentations to Planning Board and City Council Land Use and Planning Committee.

ENGAGEMENT

In Person

During the Code Reform phase of the Our Missoula project, the Our Missoula team held in-person engagement opportunities that ranged from targeted stakeholder meetings to large community-wide events.

Targeted stakeholder engagement included meetings and workshops with local groups that represent various interests and perspectives in the community. Three “Frequent Code User Workshops” were held with a group of developers, architects, engineers, and designers to receive technical feedback on the draft code. Similar workshops were held with the Our Missoula Community Advisory Group (OMCAG).

Two open houses were held to present the draft code information to the public and invite feedback on the materials. The first open house, held on October 9, 2025 at the Missoula County Fairgrounds, focused on the draft Zoning Framework and had 170 attendees. The second open house was held on November 5, 2025 at the Missoula Public Library and presented information about the draft Unified Development Code and the draft City of Missoula Standards and Specifications Manual. Both open houses featured opportunities for attendees to provide feedback through individual comment forms, posters, and individual discussions with staff members.

Online

The draft documents related to the updated development codes were released publicly in two phases: first the Zoning Framework and then the full Unified Development Code and accompanying Standards and Specifications Manual.

The Zoning Framework was posted online for public review on Engage Missoula on October 1, 2025. It included the draft zoning map and the draft standards for the proposed zoning districts. Both the map and the zoning regulations were shared using an interactive tool called Konveio that allows residents to comment directly on the materials. These comments were collected and are included in Attachment E: List of Public Review Comments (Oct. 1-Nov 12).

The full draft of the Unified Development Code and the City of Missoula Standards and Specifications Manual were posted online for public review on October 29, 2025. This was the final set of draft information available for public comment in the Code Reform process. Konveio was also used for these documents, and all comments were collected and included in Attachment E.

Community members were also able to share feedback through the “guestbook” tool on the Engage Missoula pages for the draft documents. These comments are also collected and recorded.

ATTACHMENT

1. List of Community Engagement & Outreach Activities

Community Outreach and Engagement: January 1st, 2025 - November 13th, 2025

Boards, Committees, and Council Presentations			
Date	Title	Method	Audience
11/12/2025	Planning Board: UDC and Manual Overview Informational Presentation	Presentation	Governing Body
11/12/2025	Land Use and Planning Committee: UDC and Manual Overview Informational Presentation	Presentation	Governing Body
11/4/2025	Planning Board: New Municipal Planning Commission Informational Presentation	Presentation	Governing Body
10/21/2025	Planning Board: State Law/Code Overview Informational Presentation	Presentation	Governing Body
10/8/2025	Land Use and Planning Committee: Zoning Framework Overview Informational Presentation	Presentation	Governing Body
10/7/2025	Planning Board: Zoning Framework Overview Informational Presentation	Presentation	Governing Body
9/10/2025	Land Use and Planning Committee: Resolution to Initiate Project	Presentation	Governing Body
TOTAL: 7 Occurrences			

City-Led Meetings			
Date	Title	Method	Audience
11/10/2025	OMCAG Meeting: UDC and Manual Overview	Meeting	OMCAG
10/3/2025	OMCAG Meeting: Zoning Framework	Meeting	OMCAG
5/30/2025	Frequent Code Users Workshop: Parks Regulations	Workshop	Development Community
4/4/2025	Frequent Code Users Workshop: ROW Requirements	Workshop	Development Community
3/28/2025	OMCAG Work Session: ROW Requirements	Workshop	OMCAG
2/27/2025	Frequent Code Users Workshop: Zoning	Workshop	Development Community
2/26/2025	OMCAG Work Session: Zoning	Workshop	OMCAG
TOTAL: 7 Occurrences			

General Outreach			
Date	Title	Method	Audience
9/27/2025	ClimateFest	Tabling	General Public
9/9/2025	City Chats in the Park: Fort Missoula Regional Park	Tabling	General Public
6/10/2025	City Chats in the Park: Sacajawea Park	Tabling	General Public
6/3/2025	City Chats in the Park: McLeod Park	Tabling	General Public
5/22/2025	City Chats in the Park: Kiwanis Park	Tabling	General Public
5/13/2025	City Chats in the Park: Westside Park	Tabling	General Public
TOTAL: 6 Occurrences			

Mail/Newsletters			
Date	Title	Method	Audience
10/30/2025	Newsletter: DRAFT UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT CODE NOW AVAILABLE!		General Public
10/22/2025	Newsletter: Save the Date: Our Missoula Code Reform Open House #2		General Public
10/2/2025	Newsletter: DRAFT ZONING FRAMEWORK NOW AVAILABLE		General Public
10/1/2025	Mass Mailing: Our Missoula Postcard		General Public

9/25/2025	Newsletter: Save the Date: Our Missoula Zoning Open House		General Public
9/2/2025	Newsletter: Updates to the Our Missoula Code Reform Timeline: The Final Stretch!		General Public
6/18/2025	Newsletter: Code Reform Update - Continued Progress, Slight Delay		General Public
4/16/2025	Newsletter: Updates to the Our Missoula Code Reform Timeline		General Public
1/28/2025	Newsletter: A Letter from the Mayor		General Public

TOTAL: 9 Occurrences

Meetings & Presentations

Date	Title	Method	Audience
11/12/2025	Historic Preservation Commission	Presentation	Specific Group/Organization
11/4/2025	Missoula Downtown Association Board Meeting	Presentation	Specific Group/Organization
10/16/2025	City-County JEDI Advisory Board Meeting	Presentation	Specific Group/Organization
10/8/2025	Missoula Housing Partnership Fall Meeting	Presentation	Specific Group/Organization
9/15/2025	Missoula Organization of Realtors: Zoning Workshop	Workshop	Development Community
8/19/2025	Pro Housing Missoula: Zoning Crash Course	Meeting	Community Organization
7/24/2025	Missoula Neighbors United/Eagle Watch Estates	Presentation	Community Organization
7/11/2025	CPDI Monthly Development Community Meeting	Meeting	Development Community
6/10/2025	Affordable Housing Resident Oversight Committee	Presentation	Specific Group/Organization
6/4/2025	Historic Preservation Commission	Presentation	Specific Group/Organization
4/18/2025	Zoning Workshop with Common Good Missoula	Listening Session	Community Organization
4/1/2025	Zoning Workshop with Pro Housing Missoula	Listening Session	Community Organization
3/27/2025	Missoula Architecture & Design Group Happy Hour	Event	Development Community
3/19/2025	Missoula Chamber of Commerce Board Meeting	Listening Session	Development Community
3/13/2025	MMW Architects Pin-Up Thursday Meeting	Presentation	Development Community
3/11/2025	Missoula Midtown Association Board Meeting	Listening Session	Development Community
3/11/2025	Missoula Downtown Association Board Meeting	Listening Session	Development Community
1/27/2025	MOR Public Affairs Committee	Listening Session	Development Community

TOTAL: 18 Occurrences

Miscellaneous Media/Outreach

Date	Title	Method	Audience
10/30/2025	Press Release: Draft UDC/Manual and Open House		General Public
10/3/2025	Press Release: Draft Zoning Framework and Zoning Open House		General Public
9/26/2025	City Talk Radio: Zoning Framework		General Public

TOTAL: 3 Occurrences

Neighborhood Meetings

Date	Title	Method	Audience
10/29/2025	Lower Rattlesnake Neighborhood General Meeting	Presentation	Neighborhoods
10/23/2025	Neighborhoods Community Forum	Presentation	Neighborhoods
9/25/2025	Neighborhoods Community Forum	Presentation	Neighborhoods

9/23/2025	River Road Neighborhood General Meeting	Tabling	Neighborhoods
5/29/2025	Captain John Mullan Neighborhood General Meeting	Tabling	Neighborhoods
5/18/2025	Rose Park Neighborhood General Meeting	Tabling	Neighborhoods
5/7/2025	Northside/Westside Neighborhood General Meeting	Tabling	Neighborhoods
5/7/2025	Lewis & Clark Neighborhood Leadership Team Meeting	Meeting	Neighborhoods
4/24/2025	Neighborhoods Community Forum	Presentation	Neighborhoods
4/11/2025	Upper Rattlesnake Neighborhood General Meeting	Presentation	Neighborhoods
TOTAL: 10 Occurrences			

Online Engagement Tools			
Date	Title	Method	Audience
10/29/2025	Online Guestbook: Draft Unified Development Code	Engage Missoula	General Public
10/29/2025	Interactive Draft Unified Development Code Document	Konveio	General Public
10/1/2025	Interactive Draft Zoning Framework Document	Konveio	General Public
10/1/2025	Interactive Draft Zoning Map	Konveio	General Public
10/1/2025	Online Guestbook: Draft Zoning Framework	Engage Missoula	General Public
TOTAL: 5 Occurrences			

Our Missoula Events			
Date	Title	Method	Audience
11/5/2025	Code Reform Open House	Event	General Public
10/9/2025	Zoning Open House	Event	General Public
TOTAL: 2 Occurrences			

Requests for Agency Comment			
Date	Title	Method	Audience
10/30/2025	Request for Agency Comment: Unified Development Code	Email	Specific Group/Organization
10/2/2025	Request for Agency Comment: Zoning Framework	Email	Specific Group/Organization
TOTAL: 2 Occurrences			

Summary of Public Comments & Staff Responses: Unified Development Code (UDC)

This document consolidates public comments received on the UDC and zoning framework into major theme areas. It summarizes what participants said (left column) and provides a response (right column) indicating how the issue is addressed in the draft UDC.

Public Comment Summary (What We Heard)	Staff Response (How We Are Addressing This)
LAND USE, ZONING & DESIGN	
Building Height and View Impacts	
<p>Many residents expressed concern that new height standards could alter the scale and character of existing neighborhoods, particularly where three-story homes would be permitted next to existing one- or two-story homes. People described potential impacts such as shadowing, privacy loss, and blocked views toward Missoula’s hillsides. Others — especially those focused on housing supply — supported allowing reasonable height increases in residential areas, and more significant increases along commercial corridors and near transit, noting that additional height can make housing and mixed-use projects more viable. Overall, commenters sought height-transition requirements that respect existing neighborhood context while still enabling compact, walkable growth in appropriate areas.</p>	<p>Addressed through Chapter 4.3 – Building Form Standards. This is consistent with the direction provided in the adopted Land Use Plan and recommendations in the Montana Land Use and Planning Act.</p> <p>In response to public comment, heights were reduced in the adoption draft in UR3 to 35 feet, and in UR4 to 45 feet. These new heights provide a more gradual transition to lower density residential areas, reflecting community feedback, while maintaining adequate opportunities for more homes.</p>

Neighborhood Character and Compatibility	
<p>A consistent theme was concern that higher-intensity zoning could erode the familiar character of long-established neighborhoods. Residents described valuing existing block patterns, trees, setbacks, and the rhythm of detached houses. Many asked the City to require step-down heights, varied building fronts, and appropriate lot coverage so that new infill 'fits' with surrounding homes. Other commenters emphasized that character must evolve to accommodate growth and that form-based standards — not strict single-family zoning — are the best tools for compatibility. The shared goal was assurance that the new code balances neighborhood identity with broader housing, equity, and climate goals.</p>	<p>Addressed through Chapter 4 – Building Form and Design Standards (transitions, setbacks, building fronts), and through the addition of form-based tools like Floor Area Ratio and limiting units per building. This is consistent with the direction provided in the adopted Land Use Plan and recommendations in the Montana Land Use and Planning Act. Furthermore, requests for single-family exclusivity are not supported by the Montana Land Use and Planning Act or by adopted policy.</p> <p>In response to public comment, step down heights were addressed by lowering maximum heights in UR3 and UR4, as noted above.</p>
Design Elements in Mixed-Use Zones	
<p>People appreciate the goal of active, walkable streets, but asked us to dial in, or right size, how we get there. They told us the build-to line can feel rigid on small or odd lots, that storefront window (transparency) targets don't fit every frontage or tenant, and that hard caps on building width can add cost without improving design. We also heard that main corridors need stronger activation than side streets, that step backs should be used only where they reduce impacts, and that small remodels and constrained sites need simpler, scaled expectations.</p>	<p>Addressed through Chapter 4 – Building Form and Design Standards (build-to zones and percentages, building width, parking location, and transparency). The standards promote a clear pedestrian focus while adding flexibility.</p> <p>In response to public comment, build-to zones and build-to widths were adjusted to provide more flexibility. Additionally, street wall heights and maximum building widths were increased in several zones. Finally, transparency requirements were reduced in all Urban Mixed Use zones. These adjustments better balance the constraints of developing mixed use buildings with the goals of a pedestrian focused streetscape.</p>

Use Table Organization and Transparency	
<p>Many participants said the draft use tables were difficult to interpret. Confusion centered on the meaning of dashes or blank cells and how to distinguish permitted versus conditional uses. Several recommended reorganizing the tables by major use category and providing a key or legend to make the code easier for non-experts to navigate. Designers and builders also noted that clearer tables improve predictability during permitting.</p>	<p>Additional clarity was added to the tables in response to these comments.</p>
Fort Missoula Zoning and Historic Reuse	
<p>Stakeholders tied to Fort Missoula emphasized the need to preserve historic resources while keeping the area economically active. They cautioned that overly restrictive zoning could make adaptive reuse infeasible and lead to deterioration of important buildings such as the Old Post Hospital. At the same time, others called for sensitivity to the site's historic setting and public amenities. Most commenters supported a mixed-use approach, small-scale commercial, or civic uses to keep the area vibrant and safe.</p>	<p>Fort Missoula is zoned as a Civic district and maintains its historic overlay. To promote economic revitalization while preserving historic character, uses in the overlay were significantly expanded, increasing redevelopment opportunities. This is consistent with the direction provided in the adopted Land Use Plan.</p>
Definition Clarity and Readability of the Code	
<p>Across engagement platforms, participants requested clearer definitions and simpler formatting, especially for technical terms like 'gross floor area,' 'building height,' and 'lot coverage.' People asked for more visuals and plain-</p>	<p>Addressed through Chapter 1 – Introduction and Chapter 2 – Definitions of the UDC; terminology is consolidated, and formatting is being improved in the adoption draft.</p>

<p>language explanations so that residents — not just professionals — can use the code. Several noted that consolidating multiple codes into a single UDC is an improvement, but usability must continue to be refined before adoption.</p>	
<p>HOUSING, AFFORDABILITY & FEASIBILITY</p>	
<p>Housing Supply, Affordability, and FAR Feasibility</p>	
<p>Housing and affordability were central to public comments. Many residents supported the idea of expanding housing options but worried that increased zoning capacity alone would not guarantee affordability. Builders and housing advocates pointed to FAR limits as a point of pressure — on small or mid-scale projects, people fear that tight FAR can reduce bedrooms or amenities, making projects harder to finance. Others supported FAR as a way to control building mass and protect neighborhood scale. Overall, commenters asked the City to strike a balance so that form standards do not unintentionally block attainable housing.</p>	<p>Addressed through calibrated FAR in Chapter 4 – Building Form Standards; right sizing the FAR calculations will continue through adoption and into implementation, to ensure feasibility for gentle infill projects while maintaining flexibility for a variety of building types, including single family homes, as we implement this new tool. This is consistent with the direction provided in the adopted Land Use Plan and recommendations in the Montana Land Use and Planning Act.</p> <p>In response to public comment, an exception to FAR was created for small lot infill development. One-unit and duplex buildings are now exempt from FAR on lots 3,000 square feet or less.</p> <p>In response to public comment, the FAR calculation table was amended, increasing the overall baseline to .5 for all Limited Urban and Urban Residential districts.</p>
<p>Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs)</p>	
<p>Comments about ADUs sought clarity. Residents value ADUs as flexible housing for relatives, caregivers, or renters. Questions focused on where ADUs are allowed, whether detached/garage units</p>	<p>We have removed all regulations that make an ADU distinct from a single-family home and instead are allowing for two or more homes on a parcel in every residential zoning district. ADUs have no</p>

<p>remain permitted, and what size and height limits apply. Some raised concerns about parking and potential over-occupation; others wanted ADUs to be easier, not harder, to build. The common message was that people like ADUs and want to see them continue to be built.</p>	<p>regulations that distinguish them from a single family home. Because of these two points, and to further simplify and streamline the code, we have removed ADUs as a building type. See Chapter 4.2 – Residential Building Types for thorough description of a single-family home. This is consistent with the direction provided in the adopted Land Use Plan and recommendations in the Montana Land Use and Planning Act.</p>
--	---

Economic Feasibility and Small-Development Barriers

<p>Developers, especially small/local builders, emphasized that the total package of requirements — parking, open space, improvements, FAR — can make small infill uneconomic. They asked for scaled or tiered requirements so smaller projects are not held to the same threshold as large sites. Others noted that consistent standards are important for fairness. Overall, commenters wanted predictability without inadvertently squeezing out local builders.</p>	<p>Addressed through scaled standards in Chapters 4 & 6; including improvement trigger reductions for parking, landscaping, multifamily activity area, and some right of way improvements. Economic testing will continue during implementation. This is consistent with the direction provided in the adopted Land Use Plan and recommendations in the Montana Land Use and Planning Act.</p> <p>In response to public comment, the trigger for Multi-Family Activity area was increased from three units to seven units, further removing barriers for small infill development.</p>
---	--

Healthcare and Community Service Uses

<p>Several commenters noted that small clinics, daycares, and community facilities are essential to complete neighborhoods and should not be unintentionally excluded from residential/mixed-use areas. They asked the City to confirm where these uses are allowed and to keep thresholds reasonable. Others supported separation in sensitive</p>	<p>Addressed in Chapter 3 – Allowed Uses. Neighborhood-scale clinics, daycares, and civic services are permitted as Neighborhood Commercial services in all Residential and Mixed-Use districts. This is consistent with the direction provided in the adopted Land Use Plan.</p>
---	---

residential areas to reduce traffic and noise.	
General Support for Zoning Reform Goals	
Alongside concerns, a notable portion of commenters expressed support for modernizing the code, simplifying processes, and aligning zoning with the adopted Our Missoula 2045 Land Use Plan. Supporters emphasized the need to keep refining the draft and to follow through on implementation.	The UDC advances adopted policy and compliance with the Montana Land Use and Planning Act and the City of Missoula is committed to an iterative process that continues to adapt and refine the code.
ENVIRONMENT, INFRASTRUCTURE & SAFETY	
Wildfire Risk and Rattlesnake Evacuation Safety	
Residents in the Rattlesnake Valley raised strong concerns about adding population in an area with only two constrained ways out. They cited congestion during events and asked how evacuation would work in a wildfire. Some suggested pausing or slowing new density until key infrastructure or roundabouts are complete. Others acknowledged that the code may not be the tool to fix evacuation concerns but still wanted land-use decisions to reflect the constraint.	Addressed through close collaboration with the Office of Emergency Management, Missoula Fire Department, and Missoula Police Department, and in alignment with the Emergency Management Plan and adopted transportation plans. Land-use intensity in the mid-and-upper Rattlesnake is limited (primarily U-R1/U-R2) to recognize these constraints. This is consistent with the direction provided in the adopted Land Use Plan and recommendations in the Montana Land Use and Planning Act.
Infrastructure Capacity and Phasing	
Across engagement, people asked whether existing water, sewer, stormwater, and street systems can absorb the growth enabled by the UDC. Some wanted proof of capacity or phased improvements before approving	Addressed in Chapter 6 – Infrastructure Improvements and coordinated with Titles 12 and 13. The UDC can require proportional improvements, but capital timing is handled through broader infrastructure planning and investments in

<p>increased housing options; developers urged flexibility so needed housing is not stalled. The core ask was alignment between infrastructure decisions and zoning decisions.</p>	<p>the City’s CIP. This is consistent with the direction provided in the adopted Land Use Plan and recommendations in the Montana Land Use and Planning Act.</p> <p>Upon further assessment, zoning intensity in several specific residential areas was decreased due to narrow one-way streets, parking demand, and associated concerns with emergency access. The new zoning designations better align potential development with existing infrastructure.</p>
--	--

Environmental Protection and Riparian Buffers

<p>Environmental advocates and residents asked the City to match or approach Missoula County’s riparian standards, especially along the Clark Fork and Rattlesnake Creek. They emphasized buffers, vegetation retention, and habitat connectivity. Several noted that without clear numeric standards, implementation can vary.</p>	<p>Addressed in Chapter 5, which contains Riparian setbacks mirroring those adopted by the Missoula County Conversation District. Additional setback and buffer detail can be found in the Development Manual. This is consistent with the direction provided in the adopted Land Use Plan and recommendations in the Montana Land Use and Planning Act. More comprehensive planning for sensitive lands, including riparian areas, is scheduled to occur as a second phase project.</p>
---	--

Slope and Hillside Development

<p>Residents near Mount Sentinel and other slopes expressed concern about erosion, drainage, and visual impacts of development on steep terrain. Some asked for stricter limits or overlays; others said hillside building is acceptable if it meets strong geotechnical and drainage requirements.</p>	<p>Addressed in development regulations with slope, geotechnical, and vegetation-protection requirements; further detail can be found in the Development Manual. This is consistent with the direction provided in the adopted Land Use Plan and recommendations in the Montana Land Use and Planning Act.</p>
---	--

Parks, Open Space, and Public Lands Zoning	
<p>Many residents were surprised to see neighborhood parks shown with residential zoning and feared it meant parks could be developed. Others understood that parks are protected by ownership and that zoning is not the tool to guarantee park use. The shared message was a desire for clearer explanation in public materials.</p>	<p>Addressed through zoning map refinement. Parks are protected through public ownership, not zoning. However, our decision to match city-owned Neighborhood Park zoning with adjacent neighborhoods created significant confusion and lead to the belief we may be changing the use of these parks. This is not the case. To remove that confusion, we are remapping city-owned Neighborhood Parks to an Open Space designation.</p>
Climate and Sustainability Standards	
<p>An emerging theme was the desire to see more explicit climate/sustainability requirements — EV-ready parking, permeable paving, canopy targets, incentives for energy efficiency. Others cautioned that these must be calibrated to avoid adding cost to housing. Most agreed zoning should reinforce the City’s climate goals.</p>	<p>Partially addressed via compact-growth provisions and tree-canopy/mobility standards. This is consistent with the direction provided in the adopted Land Use Plan and recommendations in the Montana Land Use and Planning Act. Further work to develop incentives and performance-based climate metrics is scheduled to occur in a second phase of this project.</p>
PROCESS, COMMUNICATION & IMPLEMENTATION	
Trust, Transparency, and Communication	
<p>Some residents found the process confusing — especially postcard mailings, draft access, and how to tell whether a map ‘applied’ to them. Others said the City made a real effort with multiple open houses, individual mailings, and online</p>	<p>Addressed administratively through Konveio, Engage Missoula, open houses, and engagement events in alignment with the adopted Public Participation Plan. All comments will be analyzed and coded, as required by the Public Participation Plan</p>

<p>tools. Overall, people wanted to see clearly how their feedback was being used, not just collected.</p>	<p>and the Montana Land Use and Planning Act.</p>
<p>Public Engagement Process</p>	
<p>Participants appreciated the number of engagement opportunities but asked for longer review windows, more neighborhood-level meetings, and clearer 'before/after' summaries that show what changed between drafts. They also asked to slow the timeline for such a major regulatory update.</p>	<p>The UDC and zoning map are the product of a multi-year, community-driven process launched in 2022 and moved through phased engagement using open houses, online tools on Engage Missoula, and targeted stakeholder meetings in alignment with our adopted Public Participation Plan. Engagement is ongoing through adoption; post-adoption education and guidance are planned.</p>
<p>Consistency with the Land Use Plan</p>	
<p>Many commenters used the Our Missoula 2045 Land Use Plan as their reference point and asked the City to show, parcel by parcel where possible, how zoning implements the plan. In a few areas, people perceived mismatches (e.g., LU-R2 applied to areas they understood as mixed). They asked that any deviations be transparent and deliberate.</p>	<p>All zoning districts were derived from and cross-walked to Our Missoula 2045 place types. Minor mapping adjustments to the Land Use Plan's place types are being made to ensure alignment and will be documented for Council review. This is consistent with the direction provided in the adopted Land Use Plan and recommendations in the Montana Land Use and Planning Act.</p>
<p>Definition Clarity and Readability of the Code</p>	
<p>Residents linked readability to trust — if the code is too technical, people doubt they're getting the whole picture. They asked for more plain-language sections and 'How to Use This Code' style guidance.</p>	<p>Clarified in Chapters 1–2; formatting and navigation improvements are being incorporated in the adoption draft. Implementation will include the creation of educational guides and flow charts to assist code users.</p>

	<p>The UDC is technical guide through which development occurs. The Land Use Plan is the community guide that sets our goals and values.</p>
<p>Balance of Density and Infrastructure Investment</p>	
<p>Many accepted the need for more housing but worried that, without parallel investment, basic services will be stretched. Developers cautioned that tying every project to off-site improvements could stall housing. Commenters asked for better sequencing, not an end to growth.</p>	<p>Addressed through Chapter 6 and coordination between departments on infrastructure development. This is consistent with the direction provided in the adopted Land Use Plan and recommendations in the Montana Land Use and Planning Act.</p>
<p>MISCELLANEOUS TOPICS</p>	
<p>Aspire Subdivision, East Missoula Zoning, and Annexation</p>	
<p>A large, coordinated set of comments opposed the U-R3 designation shown for the Aspire Subdivision in East Missoula. Commenters said the area is not served by urban infrastructure, is surrounded by low-density county neighborhoods, and should not be treated as an urban neighborhood. Some also believed the zoning was intended to retroactively validate earlier approvals. They asked the City to respect county jurisdiction and contexts.</p> <p>County residents who received City materials were confused or frustrated, thinking zoning was being applied without annexation. They asked for materials that clearly distinguish City from County and that acknowledge East Missoula's Live/Make district.</p>	<p>This zoning designation is consistent with the direction provided in the adopted Land Use Plan and recommendations in the Montana Land Use and Planning Act.</p> <p>Outreach materials have been updated to clarify jurisdiction. East Missoula remains under County zoning, outside UDC scope. However, it is part of the larger planning area for the adopted Land Use Plan, so we aim to keep them informed of our work.</p>

M1R Districts and Mixed-Use Transition Areas	
<p>Owners of former M1R zoned parcels objected to being downzoned to U-R3, especially along the Bitterroot Trail and rail corridor. They noted active or planned mixed-use projects that would be constrained. They requested U-MU or I-MU, consistent with similar sites elsewhere in the city.</p>	<p>Addressed through zoning-map refinement: M1R areas were reviewed for conversion to Urban Mixed Use or Transitional Mixed Use; residential sites retained Urban Residential for compatibility.</p>
Industrial Zoning Near Residential Areas	
<p>Residents near legacy industrial corridors raised concerns about dust, noise, and truck traffic, particularly near housing and schools. They asked for clearer buffers and performance standards to prevent conflicts as both employment and housing grow in these areas.</p>	<p>Addressed through Chapter 4, Site Standards, and in the instance of subdivision, Chapter 5, Development Standards, retaining noise, dust, and screening requirements between industrial and residential uses.</p>

Summary of Public Comments: Zoning Map

This document provides a snapshot of zoning map comments by neighborhood, highlighting place-based concerns, interests, and priorities. Each summary reflects the general tone, themes, and number of comments received. The goal of this summary is to help you contextualize public sentiment geographically. Please see the UDC Public Comment Summary to understand how these comments impacted the adoption draft of the UDC.

Bonner and West Riverside

A few comments were received for the Bonner and West Riverside areas. Most feedback came from residents clarifying that this neighborhood remains outside City limits and should not appear as part of the draft zoning map. A small number expressed interest in maintaining the rural, small-lot residential pattern and ensuring that City zoning changes nearby do not indirectly pressure future annexation.

East Missoula

East Missoula generated a significant number of comments, many expressing frustration about inclusion of the site of the recently approved Aspire subdivision on the City zoning map despite being generally outside city limits. Residents highlighted the community's County-adopted Live/Make zoning and asked that the City respect it in any future annexation. Other comments focused on traffic safety, infrastructure, and jurisdictional boundaries.

Brooks Street Corridor

The Brooks Corridor received one of the highest volumes of comments, reflecting the public's interest in redevelopment potential along this major transportation corridor. Residents generally supported the transition toward mixed-use, transit-oriented zoning and asked that redevelopment include improved walkability, safe crossings, and active ground-floor uses. Some supported increased height and density near the Midtown area, while others raised concerns about parking and impacts to nearby housing.

Central Missoula

Feedback focused on balancing redevelopment with preservation of existing housing stock. Commenters recognized the area's proximity to employment and services as ideal for gentle density but expressed concern about displacement and tree canopy loss. Several commenters supported the proposed Urban Residential designations but urged attention to transitions along Russell, 3rd, and 14th Streets.

Farviews–Pattee Canyon

Comments reflected strong attachment to open space and hillside character. Residents opposed upzoning near steep slopes or forested areas due to erosion and visual impact concerns. Some supported modest flexibility for duplexes and other gentle infill, provided that design and slope protections remain strong.

Franklin-to-the-Fort

Comments focused on equity, infrastructure, and redevelopment pressure. Residents supported reinvestment and infill but expressed concern about displacement and traffic on narrow streets. They encouraged careful zoning transitions near single-story homes and asked for continued investment in sidewalks, parks, and drainage.

Grant Creek

Residents raised concerns about wildfire evacuation, limited road access, and preserving the area's rural, forested character. Several stressed protections of wildlife corridors and natural resources. A few supported gentle infill if evacuation and access are adequately addressed.

Heart of Missoula

Commenters generally supported downtown mixed-use and residential development but emphasized maintaining livability and historic context. They requested high-quality design, preservation of key landmarks, and policies supporting active ground-floor uses. Others supported parking reductions to make downtown housing feasible.

Lower Rattlesnake

This area generated substantial feedback focused on wildfire evacuation, traffic congestion, and maintaining tree canopy and neighborhood character. Residents opposed significant upzoning and requested incremental change supported by infrastructure upgrades. Some supported gentle infill-like duplexes or triplexes.

Miller Creek

Comments emphasized traffic, infrastructure, and the need for new parks and schools to accompany growth. Some supported small commercial nodes to reduce car trips into central Missoula. The overall tone supported managed growth tied to infrastructure investment.

Northside / Westside

Feedback reflected enthusiasm for mixed-use redevelopment but concerns about affordability and displacement. Residents want reinvestment that retains neighborhood diversity and scale. Some praised inclusion of maker spaces and light-industrial uses consistent with neighborhood identity.

Riverfront

Residents supported walkable mixed-use corridors but called for stronger riparian protection and limits on building height near the Clark Fork River. Some worried about view obstruction and runoff, while others supported added density on corridors if floodplain safeguards remain strong.

Rose Park

Residents emphasized preserving historic character and tree-lined streets. Concerns centered on height, parking, and maintaining scale within established blocks. Some supported duplexes and triplexes on corners but opposed large multifamily buildings within interior lots.

Southgate Triangle

Comments showed cautious support for infill and mixed-use redevelopment, paired with concerns about traffic, parking, and drainage infrastructure. Residents requested design standards and pedestrian safety improvements near Stephens and South Avenues.

University District

Residents emphasized protecting the historic character and open space of the University District while managing off-campus housing impacts. They supported small-scale, gentle infill that complements existing homes but opposed large multifamily structures. Some requested retention of the University Overlay to preserve setbacks and form.

Upper Rattlesnake

Residents raised concerns about wildfire risk, slope stability, and maintaining the area's natural and semi-rural character. Many opposed added densities and emphasized conservation of vegetation and wildlife corridors. Some support existed for additional gentle infill.