

## Title 20 Revisions

Tiffany Brander

Thu 7/16, 11:27 AM

Jen Gress;

+1 more

Hi Jen,

In follow up to our recent phone conversation, I wanted to provide you with a written response regarding the proposed revisions to Title 20; specifically, Section 2.45.060B.10; remove parking requirements for an accessory dwelling unit.

I would be in favor of this revision as it supports transportation and mobility best practices while encouraging the use of alternative transportation and more efficient use of the existing right-of-way. This revision supports existing City policies including the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) and A Place to Call Home: Meeting Missoula's Housing Needs. The removal of parking requirements for ADU's supports the mode split goals outlined in the LRTP and allows for an increase of density in places where there are existing transportation services and infrastructure. I do not see a significant difference or need for the current requirement of one additional off-street space for an ADU and feel the updated requirement of maintaining or replacing the existing parking to meet the requirements for the primary house would be sufficient.

Please let me know if you would like to discuss further. Thank you!

**Tiffany Brander**

Parking Services Director

Missoula Parking Commission

[tbrander@ci.missoula.mt.us](mailto:tbrander@ci.missoula.mt.us)

406-552-6243

*Regular Schedule M-F 7:00-3:00*



P. O.

Box 8196 – Missoula, MT 59807 – <http://www.lwvmissoula.org>

July 17, 2020

The League of Women Voter of Missoula believes housing is a human right. Housing promotes self-sufficiency for individuals and families, promotes stability in neighborhoods, and is an effective tool in reducing and preventing poverty.

We recognize that as Missoula lags behind the state and the nation in median income, housing costs are rising drastically, there is a shortage of homes, and an extreme need for affordable homes. Home ownership is increasingly elusive for lower income households, and rental affordability remains one of the most crucial issues facing our community. The health, social and economic shocks of the COVID -19 pandemic intensify the urgency of the present housing crisis.

We endorsed the City of Missoula's affordable housing policy recommendations adopted in 2019, and included in the report, **A Place to Call Home**. The Missoula League of Women Voters supports current and future efforts to increase the availability of safe, decent, and affordable homes for moderate and low-income households. Some actions include updates to Missoula's current zoning code in order to align with Missoula's housing policy, specifically a new definition of Affordable Housing and streamlined processes to increase the availability of Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs).

The Missoula League of Women Voters accepts the premise that there will be continued growth in Missoula, adding more pressure to the housing market. Generally, the League believes that all growth (commercial, industrial, and residential) should be efficiently managed. Growth decisions made for Missoula should be based upon **Human needs**, which include shelter, privacy, health, safety, dignity, green space, public meeting spaces, and the preservation of aesthetic, cultural, and historic values; **Land use planning and development** that incorporates systematic planning studies and impact analysis; and an **Equitable home supply** that provides opportunity for residents of all income levels. Additionally, we seek to ensure that growth decisions are based upon environmental protection, available and affordable clean energy, access to public services and the maintenance of a healthy economy.

The Missoula League of Women Voters supports residential growth that provides a sufficient supply of affordable homes, including rentals and owner-occupied homes. Additionally, we support residential in-fill housing development that is compatible with neighborhood character and that has neighborhood

support.

We endorse the zoning code amendments included in the annual zoning code updates as proposed by the Development Services Department, including regulations related to Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs,) in order to help address the urgent housing needs in the City of Missoula.

Nancy Leifer and Nancy Maxson, co-Presidents, League of Women Voters Missoula

## comments on Title 20 Update Amendments

KAT

Fri 7/17, 3:20 PM

Jen Gress

Dear Ms. Gress,

Today, July 17, 2020 at 3:15p I attempted to submit comments on the Title 20 Update Amendments 2019/2020 – using the “Engage Missoula” web site. I had previously registered to use the site.

I pasted my comments into the text box, and hit “submit” – nothing happened.

So here are my comments. Thanks for taking these into consideration.

Kathy Tonnessen

[tonnessen@bresnan.net](mailto:tonnessen@bresnan.net)

### **Title 20 Update Amendments 2019/2020**

- ADU Amendments: I disagree with the amendment to remove the requirement for the owner to provide one parking space to go with the ADU. The parking congestion in our neighborhoods is severe, with most homeowners parking a variety of large (often commercial) vehicles on the street because of a lack of on-property parking spots. This ADU provision will make that situation even worse. The ADU parking requirement should remain for one spot per unit, and also provide that large boats, RVs, trailers and commercial vans/trucks should not be- allowed on the neighborhood streets.
- Notice requirements: instead of changing the notice requirements to the shorter 15-day notice period, all city notice requirements should be “consistent” at 20 days minimum. I might suggest that 30-day notice might be appropriate to allow interested parties to comment.
- Tourist homes: I disagree with the proposed amendment to remove the requirement for notice of proposed Tourist Homes to surrounding parcels, homeowners, etc.. No one wants to be surprised when their neighborhood is subjected to the establishment of an Air B&Bs or other tourist home. The amendment proposed indicates that notice will be provided to residents, owners, etc. “confirming that a tourist home has been permitted”. Does that mean that the nearby homeowners have no input to this permitting decision?

Hi Jen,

Thanks for allowing the Parks Department the opportunity to provide comment for the Title 20 Amendments. Many of our proposed amendments have been years in the making, so we appreciate the ability to incorporate these into Title 20.

**20.65.020 C**

One of the explanations for the change to the Garden Area requirement of 20.65.020C was to ensure that the residents had access to a useable garden space. More often than not, we were seeing a small garden parcel directly north of a 3 story building. We worked with Garden City Harvest, and consulted with the MSU Extension office to determine amount and duration of sunlight for most vegetable plants. It would also be helpful to identify this as a “Vegetable” or “Plant” garden. But we can clarify that via an administrative rule (along with the specific light requirements).

**20.65.010C.1.b(3)**

We have previously discussed an amendment to the size/ratio of the activity area, however, I did not see it in these changes. While it would be an ideal ratio of the activity area to *“Have a length that is no more than two times its width, with a width of no less than 40 feet (e.g., a 40-foot wide area could be no longer than 80 feet).”* This is restricting someone that may want to provide an activity area that meets the minimum width of 40’, but is longer than 80’. If a 40’x40’ is determined to be a usable activity area, then a 40’x120’ should also be usable. A possible amendment could be: “Must have a minimum size of 40’x40’.”

**20.65.100B.2**

The Alternative compliance section of 20.65 has caused some challenges for the local landscape architects, as discussed in local ASLA (American Society of Landscape Architects) Chapter meetings. While it is beneficial to the profession to identify the need to hire a landscape architect, this section often causes folks ‘shopping around’ for a landscape architect if they choose not to meet the landscaping chapter. This small change would require that when deviating from the landscaping code, the Landscape Architect would need to state that they are still meeting the intent of the chapter, and how.

Please let me know if you have any questions or comments on the above.

Thanks,  
Neil

**Neil Miner, PLA**  
Parks and Trails Design/Development Manager  
Missoula Parks and Recreation  
600 Cregg Lane | Missoula, MT 59801  
406-552-6264  
[www.missoulaparks.org](http://www.missoulaparks.org)  
[nminer@ci.missoula.mt.us](mailto:nminer@ci.missoula.mt.us)