

Missoula City Council Land Use and Planning Committee Minutes - DRAFT

January 21, 2026

9:00 am

Council Chambers (in person) or TEAMS (virtually)

Attend in person: City Council Chambers, 140 W Pine, Missoula MT

Members present: Stacie Anderson, Mirtha Becerra, Betsy Craske, Gwen Jones, Kristen Jordan, Sean McCoy, Eric Melson, Mike Nugent, Justin Ponton, Jennifer Savage, Amber Sherrill

Members absent: Bob Campbell

1. ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS

The meeting was called to order at 9:01 a.m.

1.1 Roll Call

Amanda Vermace called the roll.

1.2 Approval of the Minutes

There were no minutes to be approved.

2. PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment on items not listed on the agenda.

3. COMMITTEE BUSINESS

3.1 Amendments to the Our Missoula 2045 Land Use Plan

Public comment was held first. Residents and stakeholders expressed concerns about zoning designations, historic preservation, and development standards. Residents from the Ben Hughes neighborhood requested their area be designated LUR-1, citing misapplication of amenity-based planning and commuter trail criteria. Some opposed amendments that would remove or weaken historic overlays at Fort Missoula, emphasizing deed restrictions, preservation mandates, and the site's national significance, particularly its role in WWII Japanese American internment. Others argued against restrictive overlays and design standards, citing fairness, property rights, and compliance with state law, while suggesting overlays focus on design rather than land use. A commenter advocated for higher floor area ratios to prevent sprawl and support infill development. Another commenter urged maintaining pedestrian-oriented standards in mixed-use zones to promote walkability, health, and community cohesion.

Staff presented a final set of administrative cleanups and clarifications to the Unified Development Code (UDC), zoning map, and land use plan. These updates primarily address errors and oversights but also incorporate feedback from public comments and coordination with the airport authority. Key changes include clarifying how accessory

dwelling units (ADUs) are treated under the new code, noting that while ADUs are no longer listed as a separate building type, they are effectively replaced by allowances for one-unit houses and duplexes in residential districts. Amendments also address transparency standards for mixed-use districts by exempting parking structures from glass requirements while maintaining ventilation openings. Staff recommended simplifying neighborhood commercial regulations by removing the separate floor area ratio (FAR) and relying on a maximum size cap, continuing the increased size limit, and exempting neighborhood commercial uses from residential FAR calculations to reduce complexity. Additional updates include applying interior landscaping standards to downtown parking lots to mitigate heat impacts while exempting parking structures from perimeter landscaping requirements, clarifying subdivision rules for districts with density maximums by allowing lots based on permitted dwelling units rather than minimum parcel size, and requiring right-of-way improvements for mixed-use projects to ensure pedestrian access. Finally, land use plan amendments add language identifying a potential second airport runway as a constraint or hazard to guide future density and development decisions.

Staff also outlined several zoning map amendments intended to correct errors and align with adopted plans. The first amendment corrects a mapping error at the Missoula Insight site, ensuring zoning boundaries match prior rezoning and land use place types. Three amendments implemented the recently adopted Parks, Recreation, Open Space, and Trails (PROST) Plan by rezoning identified park areas to OP-1, including sites near Scott Street, south of Broadway along the river, and Wapikiya Park. Another amendment corrects a misclassification in the Lower Rattlesnake, where a privately owned parcel was mistakenly zoned for public open space; staff recommend UR-2 zoning to match adjacent properties. Two amendments address inconsistencies in transition zones between mixed-use districts and UR-3 by adding missing UR-4 half-blocks along South 3rd Street West to maintain continuity and follow land use plan guidance. Staff also proposed zoning for the recently annexed Roseburg Story House property, recommending I-1 (light industrial) to match its previous M-1 designation. Finally, an airport hazard overlay amendment expands the overlay boundary to include areas previously regulated under Title 21's EADA zone, reducing allowable density in high-risk areas while maintaining existing restrictions for affected properties.

An elaborate discussion was held regarding the proposed airport hazard overlay, which aligns with the existing EADA zone minus an unused section near Reserve Street. The overlay limits density to four units per acre and prohibits crowd-attracting uses for safety. Two parcels (McNabb Flats and Paisley Place) remain outside for now, with future engagement recommended. Staff confirmed navigation easements will be required at annexation and reiterated neighborhood commercial size limits (3,500 sq. ft. in urban residential zones; 5,000 sq. ft. in limited urban/rural zones).

That committee revisited housing density strategies after rejecting height increases in UR-3 and UR-4. A compromise proposal would raise FAR in UR-4 from 1.2 to 1.4, allowing slightly more units without changing height limits and aligning with housing and sustainability goals. The amendment pairs with a land use plan update adjusting typical lot expectations from 6–8 units to 6–10 units.

Staff presented the policy basis for the Mixed-Use standards, emphasizing walkability through building placement, orientation, and design features. The UDC simplifies six key

tools from the former Design Excellence overlay, such as street-facing entrances and side/rear parking, to maintain walkable patterns. Removing these standards from UMU districts could conflict with land use goals and perpetuate suburban patterns. Council discussed balancing flexibility with the city's vision and noted significant public feedback.

There was an elaborate discussion regarding an amendment to limit design standards (e.g., build-to zones, street-facing entrances, transparency, parking limits) to only UMU-4, Downtown Core (DC), and Downtown Transition (DT) districts, making them voluntary in UMU-1, UMU-2, and UMU-3. The discussion centered on balancing long-term walkability and climate goals with current development realities and flexibility for businesses. Supporters of the amendment argued that existing standards are too prescriptive, create barriers for small businesses and affordable housing projects, and could delay or prevent development, especially in areas lacking infrastructure. Opponents stressed that removing these requirements risks perpetuating auto-oriented patterns and undermines the land use plan's vision for pedestrian-friendly mixed-use areas. Staff clarified that current code already exempts additions to existing buildings and that deviation processes could be explored in Phase Two for flexibility. The committee acknowledged concerns from the design community, potential unintended consequences, and the need for future refinements. Ultimately, the amendment was modified to remove language about certain auto-oriented uses (e.g., gas stations) and passed with recognition that this issue will require continued review and adjustments in future code updates.

The meeting was adjourned for a recess at 11:43 a.m.

The meeting was called back to order at 11:49 a.m.

The Committee considered an amendment allowing the planning administrator to approve alternative compliance for transparency and street-facing entrance standards to provide flexibility for uses like warehouses. Staff warned broad criteria could cause delays and recommended clearer exemptions. Language was modified to remove food and beverage retail, kept exemptions for industrial uses, and deleted a redundant healthcare provision.

Another amendment considered was to clarify flexibility for street-facing entrance requirements on parcels with multiple street frontages. The proposal would allow the required entrance to be located on the frontage that provides the most direct access from on-site parking, while other street-facing facades could meet standards through secondary entrances or enhanced pedestrian connections. The intent was to reduce ambiguity and streamline development review without overriding existing entrance requirements. Staff noted that current code already provides some flexibility but agreed the amendment could improve clarity, particularly in districts retaining build-to zone requirements. The committee discussed whether this change might encourage parking-oriented site design; staff responded that it would allow such layouts but not necessarily incentivize them. Ultimately, the motion proceeded with the understanding that staff would make minor language cleanups to ensure consistency with related sections, maintaining the amendment's intent while improving clarity.

An in-depth conversation was had regarding an amendment to consolidate the Civic District zoning categories (CD1 and CD2) into a single district citywide. Proponents argued that merging the districts would simplify the code and ensure consistent treatment of similar properties, particularly for private property owners at Fort Missoula, allowing

them the same development opportunities as other civic lands. Staff cautioned that collapsing the districts would eliminate an important planning tool for distinguishing areas suitable for residential or commercial development from those intended for civic or historic preservation, such as cemeteries, schools, and environmentally sensitive lands. They noted that CD2 permits residential uses at a density of one dwelling unit per 1,000 square feet, along with additional uses like hotels and RV parks, while CD1 does not. Concerns were raised about compatibility, historic preservation, and the potential impact on Fort Missoula's unique historic character, which includes internment camp history and longstanding community priorities for protection. Some council members suggested a more targeted approach, such as rezoning only Fort Missoula to CD2 rather than citywide consolidation. Others emphasized the need for a separate discussion on housing at the Fort and private property rights. Ultimately, the amendment was viewed as too broad, and several members indicated they would vote against it while supporting a more focused conversation in the future.

The committee also considered a map amendment to change the zoning designation for the Ben Hughes neighborhood from LUR-2 to LUR-1. The proposal was based on concerns raised by residents about the methodology used to assign LUR-2, which relied heavily on the presence of a commuter trail. It was argued that the trail does not currently function as a commuter route and therefore does not meet the criteria for higher-intensity zoning. Several council members expressed support, noting that the amendment aligns zoning with existing conditions and responds to constituent feedback, while maintaining flexibility for future changes. Some members raised concerns about setting precedent for down-zoning based on neighborhood requests, but others clarified that this decision reflects a careful review of amenities and methodology rather than arbitrary changes.

The meeting was adjourned for a recess at 1:11 p.m.

The meeting was called back to order at 2:11 p.m.

Another round of public comments was heard. Members of the public expressed support for certain landscape amendments to improve housing project feasibility and advocated for eliminating commercial parking requirements, noting similar actions in other cities to promote small business development. Concerns were raised about removing build-to and entry standards, emphasizing their importance for walkable communities and suggesting prioritization of bike lanes over on-street parking. Several comments warned against incremental changes that reduce housing capacity and urged maintaining flexibility for future development, including reconsideration of civic district zoning and restoring height limits in residential zones. Additional feedback highlighted challenges with mixed-use design standards, opposed high-density zoning in areas lacking amenities, and called for stronger riparian buffers to protect environmental health.

The Committee discussed an amendment to remove or modify the Fort Missoula Historic Resource Overlay. The sponsor argued it restricts private property uses and suggested making it elective or design focused. Staff clarified the overlay continues existing standards while expanding adaptive reuse options like restaurants and lodging. Members expressed concern about weakening protections for Fort Missoula's historic character and agreed to revisit the issue in Phase Two rather than make major changes now.

They also considered an amendment to strike language limiting community residential facilities to serving eight or fewer residents within the Fort Missoula Historic Resource

Overlay. Staff explained that this change would allow larger group living facilities, such as assisted living, foster homes, or halfway houses, while still subject to other development standards. Several council members expressed that this proposal falls under a broader conversation about allowable uses at Fort Missoula rather than a standalone change. They emphasized the need for a comprehensive review of uses and design standards for the area in a future phase. As a result, members indicated they would not support the amendment at this time, preferring to address it as part of a larger discussion on Fort Missoula's future.

The next amendment discussed was to strike language prohibiting drive-through services within the Fort Missoula Historic Resource Overlay. Initially, members assumed this would broadly allow drive-throughs for all uses, but staff clarified that the restriction only applies to adaptive reuse projects for financial services (excluding pawn shops, payday lenders, and similar businesses). The prohibition was intended to prevent installation of pneumatic tubes, which could disturb archaeological resources at the Fort. This clarification shifted the perspective of some council members, as the amendment would specifically remove protections related to historic and archaeological preservation rather than broadly expanding drive-through use.

The committee considered an amendment to add "Row House/Townhouse" as a header in the "building types table" to differentiate between the two. Staff clarified that under building code, row houses and townhouses are defined the same, and the proposed change would not alter rights or development options. Several members questioned the need for the amendment, viewing it as unnecessary and potentially confusing.

The next amendment proposed pertained to allowing neighborhood-scale commercial uses mid-block rather than limiting them primarily to corner lots. The sponsor of the amendment argued this change would support walkable neighborhoods, increase housing opportunities above commercial spaces, and align with community survey results showing strong support for mid-block businesses. Staff explained the original restriction aimed at preventing entire blocks from converting to commercial uses, which could alter neighborhood character. The committee members generally supported the amendment for its flexibility and alignment with land use goals but raised concerns about unintended consequences, such as creating strip mall-like patterns. Suggestions included adding guardrails or size limits to prevent over-concentration of commercial uses. Staff noted existing size caps and zoning rules would limit large-scale commercial development. Overall, the amendment received broad support, with members emphasizing the need for potential refinements in a future cleanup phase.

Cannabis zoning regulations, focusing on increasing buffers and limiting dispensary visibility was also revisited. The sponsor of these amendments explained that Missoula currently has over 50 dispensaries, far exceeding the public health recommendation. They highlighted concerns about youth exposure and emergency room visits linked to cannabis products. Three proposed changes were discussed: (A) increasing buffer distances from 500 feet to 1,000 feet between dispensaries and sensitive areas like schools; (B) adding a 250-foot buffer from residential zoning to prevent dispensaries from directly facing neighborhoods; and (C) prohibiting dispensaries along state-maintained MDT routes to reduce high-visibility locations. Members of the committee debated whether market forces should regulate dispensary numbers versus zoning restrictions, compared cannabis regulation to alcohol and casino controls, and discussed legal

constraints under state law. Public health rationale emphasized cannabis's unique risks for youth and the cultural impact of widespread visibility. While most members supported A and B, some expressed reservations about C, citing concerns about overly restricting commercial corridors and limiting future business locations. Staff provided maps showing potential impacts of these changes and clarified that existing dispensaries would be grandfathered in.

The Committee discussed an amendment to prohibit dog boarding kennels, including doggy daycare facilities, within 400 feet of residential zones to reduce noise impacts. Grooming and veterinary services would remain unaffected. Members noted that even indoor facilities often create noise when doors are opened. The amendment serves as an interim measure, with plans for more detailed regulations in the future.

An amendment to reduce minimum landscaping in UR-1 through UR-4 zones from 20% to 15% was put on the floor. Staff noted this change would slightly reduce tree and shrub requirements but likely have minimal impact on housing supply. Members debated balancing development flexibility with environmental goals, stormwater management, and livability. Several expressed concern about reducing green space and tree canopy, favoring Planning Board's broader recommendations or addressing these issues later.

The last amendment discussed for the day sought to exempt developments from providing on-site activity areas if located within 0.5 miles of a park, aligning with the PROST plan's 10-minute walk goal. Members debated balancing infill incentives with park accessibility, maintenance costs, and equitable access, noting concerns about duplicative spaces and usability of unimproved activity areas. Staff explained current flexibility in activity area design and the role of cash-in-lieu payments, though final valuation methods are still being developed. The conversation broadened to scheduling, with agreement to continue remaining landscaping and map-related amendments at the next City Council meeting scheduled for Monday, January 26, 2026.

Moved by: Mike Nugent

City Council adopt a Resolution to Adopt amendments to the *Our Missoula 2045 Land Use Plan* and Place Types Map, based on the information and considerations in the staff report.

[Vote Planned - January 26, 2026]

Moved by: Sean McCoy

Adopt the package of staff recommended amendments in the Updated Staff Recommended Amendments Document, except for amendment #6.

Vote results: Approved

Moved by: Bob Campbell

Table 4.02.03-2 (units per building) - Amend table, to set maximum number of units per building, for apartment buildings, to "No Max" for UR1, UR2 and UR3. All else as-is.

Vote results: Approved

Moved by: Jennifer Savage

Code Section: Table 4.2.03-3 FAR and Density: Increase FAR in U-R4 to 1.6 to allow for more infill projects.

Vote results:Failed

Moved by: Sean McCoy

Move to modify Table 4.2.03-3 in 4.2.03-D Floor Area Ratio (FAR) and Density to allow more flexibility in developing small infill projects while maintaining growth described in the Land Use Plan. Respectfully request staff include the table from the Planning Board related to the amendment.

Vote results:Failed

Moved by: Stacie Anderson

Adopt staff's recommended amendment to FAR (Staff Recommended Amendment #6).

Vote results:Approved

Moved by: Sean McCoy

Adopt maximum densities for U-R1, U-R2, U-R3, and U-R4, based on the recommendation of Planning Commission but using the density maximums proposed by staff.

Vote results:Failed

Moved by: Mirtha Becerra

Move that the City Council amend Section 4.2.03-D.4 (Floor Area Ratio FAR and Density, Exceptions) of the Unified Development Code to increase the lot-size threshold for the FAR exemption for one-unit houses and duplexes, as follows:

1. In Section 4.2.03-D.4, revise the exception for one-unit houses and duplexes to read: "One-unit house and duplex building types are exempt from floor area ratio (FAR) requirements on parcels/lots with an area of 4,000 square feet or less."
2. Replace any previous numeric reference to 3,250 square feet for this exception with 4,000 square feet for consistency.

Vote results:Approved

Moved by: Sean McCoy

Move that the City Council amend Section 4.2.03-D (Floor Area Ratio FAR and Density) of the Unified Development Code to encourage residential units over Neighborhood Commercial in Limited Urban and Urban Residential districts, as follows:

Section 4.2.03-D.4 – Exceptions to FAR (add new subsection)

h. In the LU-R1, LU-R2, U-R1, U-R2, U-R3, and U-R4 zoning districts, gross floor area devoted to residential dwelling units located above a ground-floor Neighborhood Commercial use on the same building footprint is exempt from maximum allowed gross floor area when calculating Floor Area Ratio (FAR).

1. To qualify for this exemption, the ground-floor Neighborhood Commercial use must meet the Neighborhood Commercial building type standards in Article 4.7, and the exempt residential floor area must be located on stories above that Neighborhood Commercial space.
2. This exemption does not alter other applicable height, setback, or building width standards.”

Vote results:Approved

Moved by: Betsy Craske

Amend table 4.2.03-7 Building Form and Components to increase the maximum height in the U-R3 district from 35 feet to 45 feet and in the U-R4 district from 45 feet to 50 feet.

Vote results:Failed

Moved by: Sean McCoy

Move that the City Council not adopt the staff -recommended amendment creating Section 4.2.03-E.3 “Driveway Access Restriction on Narrow Lots” (prohibiting street -accessed driveways on lots with street frontage less than 40 feet), and that this subsection be deleted from the adoption draft in its entirety.

Vote results:Approved

Moved by: Mike Nugent

Waive transparency requirements for healthcare facilities, hospitals, and medical offices.

Vote results:Approved

Moved by: Sean McCoy

Adopt staff January 21, 2026 recommendations.

AYES: (10): Mirtha Becerra, Betsy Craske, Gwen Jones, Kristen Jordan, Sean McCoy, Eric Melson, Mike Nugent, Justin Ponton, Jennifer Savage, and Amber Sherrill

ABSENT: (2): Stacie Anderson, and Bob Campbell

Vote results:Approved (10 to 0)

Moved by: Betsy Craske

Motion to increase FAR in UR4 from 1.2 to 1.4 and to update the LUP Place Type from 6-8 units on a typical lot, to 6-10 units on a typical lot.

AYES: (10): Mirtha Becerra, Betsy Craske, Gwen Jones, Kristen Jordan, Sean McCoy, Eric Melson, Mike Nugent, Justin Ponton, Jennifer Savage, and Amber Sherrill

ABSENT: (2): Stacie Anderson, and Bob Campbell

Vote results: Approved (10 to 0)

Moved by: Sean McCoy

Move that the City Council amend Article 4.3 and Article 4.9 of the Unified Development Code to limit the previous design-excellence form standards—specifically build-to-zone and build-to-width, ground-floor transparency minimums, required street-adjacent entrances, and the strict limits on parking located between the building and the street—to the U-MU4 Urban Mixed-Use Community 2, D-T

Downtown Transition, and D-C Downtown Core zoning districts, as follows:

- A. Projects in the T-MU, U-MU1, U-MU2, U-MU3, and LU-MU districts may voluntarily comply with these design-excellence standards, but such compliance is not mandatory outside U-MU4, D-T, and D-C.
- B. Amend Section 4.3.03-D.1–2 and Table 4.3.03-3 so that build-to-zone and build-to-width standards apply only in U-MU4, D-T, and D-C, and entries for U-MU1, U-MU2, U-MU3, and LU-MU are shown as “na” for build-to and build-to-width.
- C. Amend Section 4.3.03-E.3 and Table 4.3.03-5/6 so that ground-floor transparency minimums and street-adjacent entrance requirements are mandatory only in U-MU4, D-T, and D-C, and not in, U-MU1, U-MU2, U-MU3, or LU-MU.
- D. Amend Table 4.9.03-2 and Table 4.9.03-3 so that the tight limits on surface parking between the building and the street remain in place for U-MU4, D-T, and D-C, but are relaxed or removed for T-MU, U-MU1, U-MU2, U-MU3, and LU-MU to allow auto-oriented formats such as grocery stores and fueling stations in those districts subject to general landscaping and buffering standards.
- E. ~~Amend Table 4.8.02-1 Allowed Uses to allow uses such as Gasoline & Fuel Sales, Car Wash/Cleaning Service, Motor Vehicle Repair General, and Warehousing General.~~

AYES: (8): Mirtha Becerra, Betsy Craske, Kristen Jordan, Sean McCoy, Mike Nugent, Justin Ponton, Jennifer Savage, and Amber Sherrill

NAYS: (3): Stacie Anderson, Gwen Jones, and Eric Melson

ABSENT: (1): Bob Campbell

Vote results: Approved (8 to 3)

Moved by: Mike Nugent

Move that the City Council amend Section 4.3.03-E (Building Form and Components) and related transparency and entrance standards in the Unified Development Code to allow reasonable flexibility for certain uses and building layouts, as follows:

- A. Add a new subsection to Section 4.3.03-E.3: Section 4.3.03-E.3.e –Use-Based Transparency and Entrance Flexibility:
 - a. In all zoning districts where ground-floor transparency and street-adjacent entrances are required, the Planning Administrator may approve alternative compliance for the following uses when located on a parcel with more than one street frontage:
 - i. ~~Health Care Facilities, Hospitals, and medical clinics as defined in Article 4.8;~~
 - ii. Warehousing, Manufacturing, and similar industrial or logistics uses where primary operational areas require limited glazing for security, climate control, or interior layout; and
 - iii. ~~Food and Beverage Retail Sales, Grocery type retail, and other Retail Sales uses where store layout, merchandising, and loss prevention practices require windows and primary customer entrances to face on-site parking areas rather than all street frontages.~~
 - b. Alternative compliance under this section may include:
 - i. Reducing the required percentage of ground-floor transparency on one or more street frontages;
 - ii. Allowing spandrel glass, tinted glass, or screened windows to count toward the transparency requirement; and
 - iii. Allowing the primary public entrance to face a parking area rather than the street on frontages that are not the primary customer access.

AYES: (11): Stacie Anderson, Mirtha Becerra, Betsy Craske, Gwen Jones, Kristen Jordan, Sean McCoy, Eric Melson, Mike Nugent, Justin Ponton, Jennifer Savage, and Amber Sherrill

ABSENT: (1): Bob Campbell

Vote results: Approved (11 to 0)

Moved by: Mike Nugent

Add to the street-adjacent entrance standard in Table 4.3.03-5 / Section 4.3.03-E:

For buildings on parcels with more than one street frontage, the required street-adjacent entrance may be located on the frontage that provides the most direct access from on-site customer, patient, or client parking, and other street-facing facades may meet the standard through secondary entrances or enhanced pedestrian connections instead of a primary entrance

AYES: (11): Stacie Anderson, Mirtha Becerra, Betsy Craske, Gwen Jones, Kristen Jordan, Sean McCoy, Eric Melson, Mike Nugent, Justin Ponton, Jennifer Savage, and Amber Sherrill

ABSENT: (1): Bob Campbell

Vote results:Approved (11 to 0)

Moved by: Kristen Jordan

Replace CD-1 with CD-2 citywide

AYES: (2): Kristen Jordan, and Amber Sherrill

NAYS: (9): Stacie Anderson, Mirtha Becerra, Betsy Craske, Gwen Jones, Sean McCoy, Eric Melson, Mike Nugent, Justin Ponton, and Jennifer Savage

ABSENT: (1): Bob Campbell

Vote results:Failed (2 to 9)

Moved by: Eric Melson

Change zoning layer for the entirety of the Ben Hughes HOA neighborhood from LUR2 to LU-R1

AYES: (11): Stacie Anderson, Mirtha Becerra, Betsy Craske, Gwen Jones, Kristen Jordan, Sean McCoy, Eric Melson, Mike Nugent, Justin Ponton, Jennifer Savage, and Amber Sherrill

ABSENT: (1): Bob Campbell

Vote results:Approved (11 to 0)

Moved by: Kristen Jordan

Remove the Fort Missoula Historic Overlay or limit the overlay to owners that elect to participate or for properties with individually listed historic buildings.

AYES: (1): Kristen Jordan

NAYS: (9): Stacie Anderson, Mirtha Becerra, Betsy Craske, Sean McCoy, Eric Melson, Mike Nugent, Justin Ponton, Jennifer Savage, and Amber Sherrill

ABSTAIN: (1): Gwen Jones

ABSENT: (1): Bob Campbell

Vote results:Failed (1 to 9)

Moved by: Mike Nugent

Section 4.6.08-H, 4b(2) - Strike “serving eight or fewer residents” (Cambell)

NAYS: (11): Stacie Anderson, Mirtha Becerra, Betsy Craske, Gwen Jones, Kristen Jordan, Sean McCoy, Eric Melson, Mike Nugent, Justin Ponton, Jennifer Savage, and Amber Sherrill

ABSENT: (1): Bob Campbell

Vote results:Failed (0 to 11)

Moved by: Mike Nugent

Section 4.6.08-H 5a(3) - Strike “and drive-thru services”

NAYS: (11): Stacie Anderson, Mirtha Becerra, Betsy Craske, Gwen Jones, Kristen Jordan, Sean McCoy, Eric Melson, Mike Nugent, Justin Ponton, Jennifer Savage, and Amber Sherrill

ABSENT: (1): Bob Campbell

Vote results:Failed (0 to 11)

Section 4.7.02-E - Add to header “Rowhouse / Townhouse”

NAYS: (11): Stacie Anderson, Mirtha Becerra, Betsy Craske, Gwen Jones, Kristen Jordan, Sean McCoy, Eric Melson, Mike Nugent, Justin Ponton, Jennifer Savage, and Amber Sherrill

ABSENT: (1): Bob Campbell

Vote results:Failed (0 to 11)

Moved by: Betsy Craske

Motion to amend Table 4.7.02-6 to allow neighborhood commercial buildings mid-block and require neighborhood commercial structures mid-block to comply with the setbacks for the districts.

AYES: (10): Mirtha Becerra, Betsy Craske, Gwen Jones, Kristen Jordan, Sean McCoy, Eric Melson, Mike Nugent, Justin Ponton, Jennifer Savage, and Amber Sherrill

ABSENT: (2): Stacie Anderson, and Bob Campbell

Vote results:Approved (10 to 0)

Moved by: Gwen Jones

Increase buffer to 1000 feet (already reflected in adoption draft)

AYES: (10): Mirtha Becerra, Betsy Craske, Gwen Jones, Kristen Jordan, Sean McCoy, Eric Melson, Mike Nugent, Justin Ponton, Jennifer Savage, and Amber Sherrill

ABSENT: (2): Stacie Anderson, and Bob Campbell

Vote results:Approved (10 to 0)

Moved by: Gwen Jones

Cannabis dispensaries shall not be located within 250 feet of a residential zoning district. Distances shall be measured from parcel line to parcel line.

AYES: (10): Mirtha Becerra, Betsy Craske, Gwen Jones, Kristen Jordan, Sean McCoy, Eric Melson, Mike Nugent, Justin Ponton, Jennifer Savage, and Amber Sherrill

ABSENT: (2): Stacie Anderson, and Bob Campbell

Vote results:Approved (10 to 0)

Moved by: Gwen Jones

Cannabis dispensaries shall not be located on parcels abutting Montana Departments of Transportation right of way or routes on the Montana Highway System including any roads maintained by MDT.

For reference, the MDT On System Routes are shown in this map:

<https://mdt.maps.arcgis.com/apps/mapviewer/index.html?webmap=1eab4f286f61456b87fa28dc42e49e8f>.

AYES: (3): Mirtha Becerra, Gwen Jones, and Amber Sherrill

NAYS: (7): Betsy Craske, Kristen Jordan, Sean McCoy, Eric Melson, Mike Nugent, Justin Ponton, and Jennifer Savage

ABSENT: (2): Stacie Anderson, and Bob Campbell

Vote results:Failed (3 to 7)

Moved by: Gwen Jones

Motion to disallow Dog Boarding Kennels as a new use within 400 feet of a residential district.

AYES: (9): Mirtha Becerra, Betsy Craske, Gwen Jones, Kristen Jordan, Sean McCoy, Eric Melson, Mike Nugent, Jennifer Savage, and Amber Sherrill

NAYS: (1): Justin Ponton

ABSENT: (2): Stacie Anderson, and Bob Campbell

Vote results:Approved (9 to 1)

Moved by: Mike Nugent

Table 4.9.02-1 (residential landscaping) - Set minimum landscaping to 15% for UR1, UR2, UR3, UR4. All else as-is.

NAYS: (10): Mirtha Becerra, Betsy Craske, Gwen Jones, Kristen Jordan, Sean McCoy, Eric Melson, Mike Nugent, Justin Ponton, Jennifer Savage, and Amber Sherrill

ABSENT: (2): Stacie Anderson, and Bob Campbell

Vote results:Failed (0 to 10)

Moved by: Mike Nugent

Move to amend Article 4.9, Section 4.9.02-D (Activity Area), to add a new subsection 4.9.02-D.2.c as follows:

Section 4.9.02-D.2.c – Exemptions for Infill Development Near Existing Parks A. Activity area is not required for development that meets all of the following:

- i. The development is located in one of the following zoning districts: U-R2, U-R3, U-R4, U-MU1, U-MU2, U-MU3, U-MU4, D-T, D-C, or LU-MU.
- ii. At the time a complete zoning compliance permit application is submitted, the parcel is located within one-half mile walking or rolling distance of an existing public park or trailhead identified in the adopted Parks, Recreation, Open Space, and Trails PROST) 2040 Master Plan or its successors.
- iii. The one-half mile distance in subsection (b) is measured along an existing or planned public roadway, sidewalk, trail, or other pedestrian route that does not require crossing a barrier identified in the PROST Plan definition of “10-Minute Walk,” including interstate highways, railroads, major rivers, or other similar obstacles.

3.2 Our Missoula Project – Adoption of the Unified Development Code & Zoning Map

This item was discussed simultaneously with item 3.1: Amendments to the Our Missoula 2045 Land Use Plan. Some of the votes and attachments to item 3.1 relate to the adoption of the Unified Development Code and Zoning Map and will be properly reflected before the public hearing closes.

Moved by: Mike Nugent

City Council adopt an ordinance establishing Title 22 – City of Missoula Unified Development Code (UDC) (Attachment A), repealing in its entirety Title 16 – Manufactured Housing and Mobile Home Parks; Title 17 – Subdivisions; Title 20 - Missoula City Zoning Ordinance; Title 21 – Form Based Code (Sx wtpqyen); and any Planned Unit Development (PUD) or Special District (SD) found on Attachment C – Planned Unit Development (PUD) and Special Districts (SD) Repealed/Retained – as well as any PUD or SD not listed as Converted to Historic Resource Overlay; with all of the foregoing based on the findings of facts and conclusions outlined in the staff report.

[Vote Planned - January 26, 2026]

Moved by: Mike Nugent

City Council adopt an ordinance establishing a new City of Missoula Zoning Map (Attachment B), and repeal the existing Zoning map, to come into compliance with the Montana Land Use and Planning Act, MCA 76-25, based on the findings of facts and conclusions outlined in the staff report.

[Vote Planned - January 26, 2026]

4. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:06 p.m.