

From: [Emily Gluckin \(she/her\)](#)
To: [Emily Gluckin \(she/her\)](#)
Subject: FW: Additional Information About Amenities
Date: Friday, January 9, 2026 1:10:36 PM

From: Jane Darnell <janed.darnell@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, January 2, 2026 7:43 PM
To: Emily Gluckin (she/her) <GluckinE@ci.missoula.mt.us>
Cc: Marc Hendrickson <HendricksonM@ci.missoula.mt.us>; Christine Everett <christine.reck.everett@gmail.com>; Larry Chase <lrjchase@gmail.com>; Betsy Craske <CraskeB@ci.missoula.mt.us>; Eric Melson <MelsonE@ci.missoula.mt.us>
Subject: Re: Additional Information About Amenities

Emily --

Thanks again for your time. I'm disappointed we won't be able to have a discussion about these issues. Emails just don't come across as well as an in-person conversation. I do recognize this is such a busy time with the holidays and pending Council action, but if something changes and it is at all possible to meet, please let me know. Eric and Betsy, our offer to meet with you is always open, just let us know what works for you.

My focused questions and additional information are copied below. I have not included my primary and previously stated safety and sustainability concerns, as they seem to be outside the criteria of the amenity-based planning approach. I'm cc'ing our HOA Board President and Treasurer as they've done an abundance of research on these issues. I appreciate your time and consideration of these issues -- again, I'd sure like to meet in person, if possible. Thanks.

Jane Darnell
308-430-2204 (call or text)

Questions are in bold, italics.

1. **Developed Parks:** We now understand that the City, in its amenity analysis, incorporated into that analysis not just Developed Parks as defined in PROST but also all Conservation Lands not identified as "Preserve or Open Space."

a. Is the map showing "Developed Parks" along with their buffer areas in the "Policy to Implementation Mapping" still accurate as it did not include all Conservation Lands not identified as "Preserve or Open Space?"

b. Is there any public-facing document that identifies that the city utilized Conservation Lands other than "Park Preserve and Open Space" lands in the mapping of Developed Parks?

c. Has identifying an amenity and its buffer around all Conservation lands other than Preserve or Open Space been consistently applied throughout the city in the amenity analysis?

Here are some facts regarding Ben Hughes Park that we request be considered and clarified in the amenity analysis.

- Ben Hughes Park -- according to the Plat is 6.4 acres. The western boundary is the western most walkway along S. Easy down to the Park. The Park does not encompass the user made beach near the mailboxes. The acreage of Ben Hughes Park is less than the general size of such Community Natural Area parks which is identified as 10+ acres. PROST p.ix, 3.23.
- The Ben Hughes Park is in the Clark Fork Floodplain, as currently mapped (FIRM). We understand, as such, any development would be quite limited.
- PROST makes clear that the stated purpose of these Community Natural Areas, including Ben Hughes Park, is to protect critical natural values PROST 3.23, 4.27, 6.27. For Ben Hughes Park there are specific recommendations in PROST regarding removal of outdated playground equipment and the protection of riparian resources page 6.27.

2. **Commuter Trail:** We understand from your response that the City included trails in the amenity analysis that were designated as "Commuter Trails" or "Connector Trails." And, you stated that Ron's River Trail is designated as a "primary commuter trail" in the data the City used for the analysis.

a. We have been looking at the PROST map Figure 26 at page 4.39 to understand how the City defines trails. As we have explained, there is an existing Community Trail running for about 1/2 mile behind the Cobblestones near the Ben Hughes neighborhood. This trail does not connect to any trail system and has not done so for 40 years. However, there is a proposed Community Trail along the river running from Cobblestones to Van Buren. It is identified as a proposed "Community Trail" and not as a Connector Trail (it is shown in red dots as a proposed Community Trail not as blue dots for a proposed Connector Trail.) PROST Fig. 26. Further, we understand that this proposed Community Trail represents the location of Ron's River Trail. The Commuter Trail amenity analysis (p.8 "Policy to Implementation Mapping") shows a trail buffer extending from the Ben Hughes Neighborhood to Van Buren. *As such, is it correct to assume that the trail buffer is showing both the existing Community Trail and the proposed Community Trail as shown on PROST Fig. 26?*

b. *We also ask whether the City has been consistent in the City's Commuter Trail amenity analysis by mapping buffers across the City which include all existing, planned and proposed Community Trails?* We ask this as our initial look at the Commuter Trails map in the "Policy to Implementation Mapping" document appears to show that no other amenity trail buffers for planned or proposed Community Trails were mapped.

3. **Transit Stop:** The recent maps we have seen appear to provide a transit buffer that includes the far east end of our neighborhood -- which is 1/2 mile or more away from the transit stops. Transit Routes p.6 "Policy to Implementation Mapping." I understand from previous discussion that the entire neighborhood was "up-zoned" to LU-R2 on this amenity to keep it consistent, essentially disregarding the transit stop amenity proximity criteria.

a. If it is possible to disregard the criteria in this instance to meet the goal of a less complicated zoning pattern, *is it possible to match the zoning to LU-R1, to be consistent with the 10 lots "down-zoned" in the floodplain?*

b. *What are the plans to provide safe access to the transit stop?* Please provide rationale for more housing in Ben Hughes without immediate plans to provide at minimum, a crosswalk and hazard lighting where people from Ben Hughes have to cross Hwy 200 at the "S" curve of Hwy 200 before the railroad and I-90 underpass to get to the inbound transit stop.

4. **Consistent Neighborhood Zoning:** We would like to better understand the City's ability to up or down-zone neighborhoods in order not to have different zoning applied in the same neighborhood. In our view, all of the Ben Hughes neighborhood should also be zoned as LU-R1 not only for implementation consistency purposes within our neighborhood but also based on the application of amenities.

a. *Is there some guidance written regarding the City's discretion to up/down-zone?*

b. *Has the City down-zoned other neighborhoods in this manner?* Based on the "Policy to Implementation Mapping" document this appears to have happened, at least in the Upper Rattlesnake and Upper Miller Creek.