

Grant Creek Village/Expo Parkway

Public Comment 9/11/20 to 9/14/20 at 11:30 am

<p>I am writing to express my opposition to the re zoning of and support for the current zoning of this parcel of land.</p> <p>I am in full agreement with the numerous, well-written comments of my neighbors as to the numerous issues the rezoning proposal would create. The current zoning already creates issues in and of itself. Allowing even more units will be detrimental to Grant Creek. We will not be able to handle the numerous challenges such rezoning will create, only one of which is adding to an already congested area. A traffic study done in the midst of a pandemic is hardly a reflection of the traffic we encounter on a typical day.</p> <p>I am asking for our City Council to vote No on the proposed rezoning and to allow the developer to build a number of homes that is more compatible with our community. Thank You.</p>	Sep 11 20 09:29:07 am	Liz	Hausbeck
<p>The city planners are concerned that an opportunity for high density housing will be lost forever if the rezoning does not go through. The residents of Grant Creek north of I-90, myself included, are concerned that the high density housing project proposed will irreparably damage our neighborhood because of traffic, damage to Grant Creek, increased burden on the school system and inadequate fire/police and other safety concerns. Has there been any consideration to allow the third of the parcel, closest to I-90, to be rezoned to the high density 4 story apartments the developer is requesting which would accommodate the "344 multi-dwelling homes" allowed for by the current zoning? If filling these 344 units doesn't impact the traffic (with the new upgrades), the schools or safety of the area, then it would be reasonable to reconsider rezoning for the middle third of the property to higher density housing. I strongly feel that single family homes should be encouraged for the third of the property closest to the neighborhood that currently has single family homes because of the need for this type of housing in Missoula. Developing this property in phases would also allow for infrastructure and transportation (bus service) to catch up.</p>	Sep 11 20 10:45:08 am	Carol	Cady

<p>#5 years ago I bought this property with the knowledge that the old gravel pit would be built as single family homes and some condo's. The back of my property overlooks the pit. I am at 2617 Old Quarry Road and was the fifth home to be completed in the Propect sub division. I have seen all the changes over the years and have welcomed them to our area.</p> <p>This new construction is more than we can handle for the existing infrastructure. The current situation with the west coast wild fires and all of the evacuations is clearly evident that our small part of Missoula is in grave danger. Our two lane road is not adequate to evacuate everyone when you add 1185 more housing units at our entry to Grant Creek and people are in a panic. The reserve street construction still has cars backed up on both expo way and stone bridge road at peak times of the day so can you imagine 2000 more cars and trucks.</p> <p>I am concerned about my property values if this land is rezoned. The noise levels have increased drastically with the road construction that goes on all night so I can't wait for the housing construction. The anticipation of 2000 more residents should be very relaxing i am sure.</p> <p>I am in support of the current zoning and have no objection to continuing to that zoning. I have lived here for 35 years knowing that the gravel pit could some day be developed to the existing zoning. I encourage the council to deny the new zoning and build to the existing zoning.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Thank you Robert W.</p> <p>Johnson</p>	<p>Sep 11 20 01:42:27 pm</p>	<p>Robert</p>	<p>Johnson</p>
<p>I am in opposition of the proposed change in zoning at 2920 Expo Parkway.</p> <p>I have lived her 17 years, the wait at the light on Reserve and I-90 is about 2 minutes per change over. Seventeen years ago, going through one iteration of the light was good. Rarely was it two times. Now it is two and three times all the time, so just waiting for the light is 6 minutes. Today, a week after Labor Day there were five cars waiting to get out of Expo Parkway after four had already come in and this is also after the morning rush hour. This has just become the normal day now and not counting any new residences yet. So it will be come four or five changes of the light to get through, making this 10 minutes of idling the cars and adding to the air pollution.</p>	<p>Sep 11 20 04:17:34 pm</p>	<p>Holly</p>	<p>Swartz</p>

<p>At the previous meeting one member said it is hard to equate traffic with people; but each car represents one or two people so it does equate. When you are doubling the number of residences in Grant Creek you will have a people problem because it will take so long to get out of Grant Creek just to get to work. Several years ago the RMEF had the Clydesdales here, it took me 45 minutes to get out of Grant Creek from Prospect with nothing backed up to Prospect with the traffic coming out of Stone Bridge and Expo Parkway. When I made my way back home the road was backed up well beyond the Prospect entrance. This could become a daily occurrence during the morning rush hour if this rezoning passes. So what happens when there is an emergency, going up our coming out with only two lanes and it is backed up. The biggest danger is a fire and the whole creek needs to evacuate, there probably is not enough time,. Just look at what California, Oregon and Washington are seeing. We could be next.</p> <p>Holly Swartz</p>			
<p>I appreciate this opportunity to join those who have filed many conscientious , cogent and civic-minded comments in opposition to the proposed rezoning which in so many respects defies the 2035 growth policy.</p> <p>The proposed development stands afoul not only the interests of those who live hereabouts but also it would prove to be a disservice for those who would attempt to make a home in a retrogressive development and, perhaps, as several comments indicate it is a development that favors density over the imperatives for safety for those up and down the area, In addition, the development does not appear to be forward looking as it pertains to climate, congestion, and, as one commentator remarked -- it car-centric.</p> <p>According to another commentator: "The Quarry can and should be developed for housing, and Grant Creek residents are willing to absorb more residential housing to help with the need for housing in Missoula, but this rezoning is not the best way to get there. To rezone as requested, the City would be abdicating its responsibilities under the Growth Plan, the Zoning Ordinances and its newly adopted housing plan. Voting no will give the City the ability to assure a sustainable and livable development that does not add an undue burden and create safety problems for both residents of the development and the other numerous users of Grant Creek Road, some of which are not in the City and many of</p>	<p>Sep 12 20 03:39:40 pm</p>	<p>Patrick</p>	<p>marx</p>

<p>whom are visitors to our community."</p> <p>And another: "If the rezone goes through, Grant Creek will be irreparably damaged by the greed of a few to the detriment of many. Please follow your own Missoula Growth Plan, Climate Change Missoula and the 1980 neighborhood plan. In addition, please consider the expertise of the 3 retired firefighters who researched and let you know their very real concerns should the rezone go through. Also, the input from RMEF, the revised traffic numbers RT Cox submitted, the research and facts Karen Sippy presented. There is a huge body of research, facts and well thought out thinking that you will hopefully consider and vote no on the rezone. Safety before density!"</p> <p>I urge you to consider these and the other comments that detail the adverse consequences of the proposed rezoning.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Patrick Marx</p>			
<p>R T Cox 2601 Old Quarry Road Missoula MT</p> <p>September 13, 2020</p> <p>Missoula City Council</p> <p>Re: last minute communications on behalf of KJA Development</p> <p>Dear Council Members:</p> <p>Thank you for your attention to this matter; one wonders if some of you may be getting "attention fatigue" after several cycles of comments. However, I must briefly respond to the letters submitted on September 11 by Mr. McCormick and Mr. Morgan.</p> <p>"Correcting an error" is one of several rezoning criteria, but just because one can argue that this criterion has been met does not address other weighty issues. The "stripe zoning" is not causing any problems other than this developer does not like it. The south lot is not affected by any "error"; it can</p>	<p>Sep 13 20 09:48:16 am</p>	<p>Randall</p>	<p>Cox</p>

be developed as is. Another solution to “correct the error” is to divide the north lot into two lots and still use the north lot for single family homes and a buffer zone. This town needs single family homes.

Mr. Abelin, traffic engineer, improves his story with each telling, but the facts do not change. Two open lanes did improve flows, but traffic still backs up past Starbucks with each cycle, as I observed on Thursday morning (9/19) when both lanes were open. There is no room to fix north-bound traffic problems and the intersection will still have a “D” rating with the new development, even after improvements, by his report. No one can believe that 5,000 trips per day will not cause enormous traffic conflicts; 5,000 trips divided by 12 hours is about 416 trips per hour. With 27 130-second signal cycles per hour, that is an additional 15 cars per cycle added to existing traffic, more at peak times. The new lane holds 15 cars from the signal to the turn lane past Starbucks before it blocks the cross street. Further, Mr. Abelin should observe the traffic instead of offering opinions from Helena; there is actually a great deal of early morning traffic from tourists and motel guests.

Mr. McCormick, obviously a skillful advocate, ignores the Grant Creek plan and overlooks Mr. DeGrandpre’s comment that the mapping of “high density” on the lots did not take into account local geographic features but was a “macro” approach, not at all a requirement to meet the 2015 Growth Policy. Mr. McCormick argues that the “high density mapping” creates some sort of expectation or right that the developer can erect 45 foot high buildings. There is no such right; Mr. Ault bought (or optioned) this land subject to the existing zoning. Apartment vacancy rates are not at historic lows; his statement is incorrect. This property is adjacent to no transit system, contrary to his statement. The sketch plan shows little to no “greenspace.” Further, if anyone can claim reliance on a plan, Grant Creek residents have relied on the official Grant Creek plan for decades.

Neither letter addresses the principal issue: modern city planning is trying to get us away from single-vehicle trips for every work and personal errand. This rezoning would allow 950 plus units in an area with no parks, no schools, no bikeway network, no retail, few or no jobs, requiring single-vehicle trips for every resident, every time.

We have planning staff in several City departments; planning means preparing for needs before they arise, not reacting to

<p>problems after they arise. Mr. Ault is building on this property right now; maybe we should prepare for access to parks, schools and shopping, now, for what he is building, now, instead of adding hundreds of new units with none of these amenities, or really, necessities.</p>			
<p>Zachary Scott 5756 Prospect DR Missoula, MT 59808</p> <p>September 14, 2020</p> <p>RE: 2920 Expo Parkway Rezone Application</p> <p>Dear Council Members,</p> <p>I write today to encourage you to reject the rezone application concerning 2920 Expo Parkway.</p> <p>Montana law (MCA 76-2-304) and Missoula ordinance (Title 20.01.050) provide the purpose and framework for consideration of zoning regulations by the Council. In both cases, the laws require that zoning regulations, including rezone applications, MUST be designed to promote public health and safety, including "to secure safety from fire..." Whatever the merits of the proposed Grant Creek Village development at this site, the Council has the profound and paramount obligation to protect the safety and welfare of current and future residents.</p> <p>I will not recapitulate the concerns raised by others, including professional urban and forest firefighters, at the challenges to the public safety posed by nearly tripling the dwelling census of Grant Creek. The presence of one route of ingress/egress only compounds the risk posed by fire or other natural disaster. Neither city planners or city, county, or state agencies (e.g., DNRC) have provided ANY compelling reason or evidence to refute these concerns. Indeed, various communications from such agencies that simply indicate "no concerns" about fire dangers, without further elaboration or attention to detail, betray a fundamental lack of concern and duty to existing Missoula city and county residents. The massive and deadly fires currently sweeping through Washington, Oregon, and California should give any council member pause to reflect on his or her obligation to Missoula's residents.</p> <p>The existing zoning at 2920 Expo Parkway will provide</p>	<p>Sep 14 20 09:47:40 am</p>	<p>Zachary</p>	<p>Scott</p>

<p>hundreds of dwellings to Missoulians at a time of great housing need, without endangering an entire valley of city and county residents.</p>			
<p>I own a condo in the Cottonwoods at Grant Creek and I fully support the comments of the many people who have already raised objections to the change in the current zoning regulations.</p> <p>Missoula cannot address its housing problems without also addressing its underlying transportation and safety problems. There is neither bus service to the Grant Creek area nor an alternate route for evacuation in the event of a forest fire. Granting this application would exacerbate the existing problems of traffic flow through the I-90 interchange and put the lives of an even larger population of residents at risk.</p> <p>Just because land is available in the quarry area is not enough to make it suitable for a significant increase in residency. To make this land suitable, the Council has to establish an alternate route for road traffic and evacuation in case of emergency. This would not only alleviate the impact of the increase in population but also benefit the existing population in the area as well. The Council also needs to provide for an extension of bus service into the Grant Creek area, which would offset some of the increased automobile traffic. These measures, of course, are not a consideration for the developer, who will have taken his profit and moved on without having to deal with the consequences of his actions. But these are the kind of considerations the members of the Council must address if they are truly concerned for the future of our city.</p> <p>This application must be rejected and no change in the existing regulations approved until a better plan is in place to address the very real constraints that currently make any significant increase in the population and use of the Grant Creek area an unacceptable public hazard.</p> <p>Brad Bigelow</p>	<p>Sep 14 20 10:12:27 am</p>	<p>Brad</p>	<p>Bigelow</p>