

# ENGAGEMENT HQ SUMMARY OF INPUT

**Survey platform:** Engage Missoula website

**Survey dates:** Saturday, July 11 to Saturday, August 1, 2020

**Survey participants:** 120

## Participant Employment

Private for-profit company	31
Private not-for-profit company	13
Government (local, state or federal)	17
Self-employed	30
Student	2
Not working	26

## Participant Industries (most closely matches the one in which he/she is employed)

Utilities	2
Transportation and warehousing	4
Manufacturing	2
Accommodation or food service	4
Forestry, fishing, hunting or agriculture	2
Professional, scientific or technical	27
Educational services	9
Finance or insurance	2
Real estate or rental and leasing	17
Arts, entertainment or recreation	2
Health care or social assistance	15
Management of companies or enterprises	1
Information technology	2
Construction	4
Not working	12
Other (please specify)	5

### Relationship to Missoula

I live in Missoula	114
I work in Missoula	84
I used to live in Missoula	5
I attend school in Missoula	6
I visit Missoula	2
Other	1

### Participant Neighborhood

Captain John Mullan	4
Fairviews Pattee Canyon	5
Franklin to the Fort	9
Grant Creek	6
Heart of Missoula	1
Lewis Clark	7
Lower Rattlesnake	5
Miller Creek	5
Moose Can Gully	9
Northside Westside	16
River Road	4
Riverfront	6
Rose Park	7
South 39 <sup>th</sup> Street	2
Southgate Triangle	1
Two Rivers	1
University District	5
Upper Rattlesnake	11

### Relationship City Limits

Inside Missoula City Limits	109
In Missoula County but outside City Limits	8
Outside Missoula County	3

### Participant's generation by year born

1981-1996	23
1965-1980	36
1946-1964	55
1945 or earlier	3

The online survey collected thoughts and community sentiment about the City of Missoula's Subdivision and TED process.

## Questions

### 1. What do you think is most important as we update subdivision and townhome regulations? (Note: we assume our recommendations will align with health, safety, welfare and State Law.)

The options provided for this question are listed below with the percentage of responses that were either somewhat important or very important:

- Help create housing that is affordable to the community, 84%
- Simplify development regulations, 48%
- Make the subdivision process faster and less expensive, 39%
- Ensure that development is consistent with Missoula's community values as determined through the growth policy and other public processes, 89%
- Increase overall predictability in the subdivision process, 68%
- Create flexibility for the City and developers, 43%
- Establish requirements unique to specific neighborhoods, 68%
- Establish requirements unique to physical features such as hillsides and waterways, 87.5%
- Closely align subdivision regulations with the City's guiding documents such as the city growth policy, housing policy, and transportation plans, 82.5%
- Closely align subdivision regulations with regulations in other City departments, 69%
- Improve the public input and neighborhood comment process, 69%

The participants would like to see an updated subdivision and townhome regulations that is aligned with community values and established guiding documents such as the growth policy, housing policy and transportation plans. Given the value of outdoor assets such as hillsides and waterways, participants prefer requirements to be responsive of unique natural features found in Missoula. Participants prefer subdivision and townhome regulations that will result in housing that is affordable to the community. These findings are all based on "very important" or "somewhat important" responses by at least 80 percent of participants.

The next tier of preferences for this question contribute additional ideas for improving the regulations. Almost 70 percent of participants prefer unique requirements for specific neighborhoods and also an improved public input and neighborhood comment process. The same number of participants want to see the subdivision regulations align with all other City regulations, which supports another response for increased overall predictability in the subdivision process.

The last tier of preferences includes three potential strategies to providing more affordable housing for residents, including simplified development regulations, making the process faster and less expensive and creating more flexibility for the City and developers.

## **2. What is your preference regarding flexibility of development rules?**

The options provided for this question are listed below with the percentage of responses for each:

- The City should mostly provide suggestions to developers, 7.5%
- The City should provide some suggestions to developers and some requirements, 32.5%
- The City should mostly provide requirements for developers, 56.7%
- I'm not sure / No opinion, 3.3%

The responses to this question indicate that the participants prefer that the City mostly provide requirements for developers. Although, there seems to be some appetite for the City to also provide some suggestions as well.

With updated regulations that provide more clarity and predictability and, perhaps, flexibility as well, the City will be better equipped to focus on requirements.

## **3. What level of oversight do you prefer for the city review process?**

The options provided for this question are listed below with the percentage of responses for each:

- Staff should review and approve projects, 22.5%
- Some projects should be reviewed and approved by staff and other projects should be reviewed and approved by City Council, 51.7%
- City Council should review and approve projects, 22.5%
- I'm not sure / No opinion, 3.3%

Most participants prefer for some flexibility where some projects are reviewed and approved by staff and other projects are more suitable for City Council to review and approve. The remainder of the responses were split among the idea of staff exclusively reviewing and approving projects or City Council.

Oversight can be reconsidered to empower staff to review and approve most projects that align with development regulations and the growth policy. In instances with a request for variance and

amendments to the growth policy or other pre-defined scenarios, then City Council can be the entity to approve the project. This initial assessment is only an example; details and criteria will need to be generally established in the recommendations report and then further detailed in subsequent planning efforts.

**4. The City conducts public processes to determine the community's vision and captures that vision in adopted policies for housing, community development, transportation, natural resources, and others. How should these policies be implemented in the city's land use and development code?**

The options provided for this question are listed below with the percentage of responses for each:

- Using incentives, 7.5%
- Using requirements, 20.8%
- A little of both, 68.3%
- I'm not sure / No opinion, 3.3%

Participants prefer a combination of incentives and requirements for policies to be implemented in the City's land use and development code. Further study will be needed to determine the most effective approach for each policy.

**5. Do you have additional comments on the subdivision or TED review policies or processes?**

This question was an open space for individual comments.

- 54 participants answered this question.
- 66 participants skipped this question.

Some common themes emerge from these individual responses. There is a suggestion for development review processes that are clear and transparent, and that are facilitated through regulations based on the growth policy. There is concern about affordability and rising housing costs, and how those may be exacerbated by development requirements and regulations. There is concern over the impacts that development has on the community, individual neighborhoods, and the livability that makes Missoula a desirable place to live. There are comments that express the desire for public comment and input to be incorporated more into development projects, including this project specifically. And there are a wide variety of specific comments and suggestions for how development can or should specifically address some of these issues. Overall, these comments represent the diversity of thought and values within the community, sometimes in contradiction to one another, and the challenge that arises in resolving these issues in a way that is satisfying and inclusive.

The individual responses are listed on in the table below:

Comment #1	Environmental considerations should be in the forefront, followed by neighborhood character considerations.
Comment #2	We recently bought a new home in Missoula. The City told us which trees could be planted in the boulevard. None of the approved trees are native to Missoula. So, due to City rules, we have native trees (Western Larch) that we are proud of in our back yard. The non-native funny colored trees in along the street have no Montana connections. The most troubling part of having non-native trees forced upon us was how difficult it was to have a conversation or get an explanation from the City. Montana has abundant cool native trees, don't force us to look like Kansas.
Comment #3	Do not sacrifice long term public safety by trusting HOAs to cover costs of major adverse events
Comment #4	Process too expensive and cumbersome for developers.
Comment #5	Smart development, unlike the subdivisions near the airport. Stop creating tract home sprawl with no businesses/amenities/transport intermixed.
Comment #6	I have a pretty negative view of subdivisions because unregulated development takes away open space and neglects housing for lower income people. Subdivisions only profit the developer. It is very tiring to hear developers complaining about excessive regulations. It is very sad to see how subdivisions have negatively changed the beauty of Missoula.
Comment #7	Your committee for this effort is mostly developers and engineers. There is only one slot for an environmental representative who isn't even named. There is no representative who is an interested resident of community member. You should have two environmental representatives and at least two community members. I have much prior experience in these types of projects and you need to have this involvement as early as possible to bring the community to consensus. Otherwise you will have public anger and blocked projects.
Comment #8	Clarify the rules and follow them. Stop putting in so many street lights and require the use of full cut-off lights . Light pollution is ruining Our Last Best Place.

Comment #9	TEDs should not receive exclusions from floodplain or storm water requirements or be developed in areas that a subdivision wouldn't fly. .
Comment #10	Please make the requirements more concise and not change requirements in the middle of the project
Comment #11	A subdivision should consider divisions of land and zoning should regulate uses. It makes no sense that a 130 unit apartment complex can be built on a property and not be limited in size, but in a TED where units could be owned, they are limited in size and location. Generally the impacts are the same and ownership should not play in to where and how many units can be built.
Comment #12	Incentives, e.g, fast-track permitting or fee discounts, for encouraging green/high performance/energy efficient projects should be a big part of this conversation.
Comment #13	Commercial TED development should be allowed again.
Comment #14	Environmental impact statements should be required for all project which disturb natural landscapes that have not been previously developed, are within or adjacent to a waterway drainage, or on hillsides.
Comment #15	Stop letting developers claim ignorance about the subjects. The usual players know what they're getting into.
Comment #16	emphasis should be on the needs of the neighborhoods, and not the convenience of developers
Comment #17	Stop overriding existing zoning. People make major decisions and huge investments based on zoning, and then these are arbitrarily ignored when a developer has a project that is more dense than is legal. It seems this ignoring of existing zoning is automatic, with no examples of a project that has been turned down due to zoning. If this is what is happening in practice why put up a false appearance of having zoning when it has no bearing on whether an infill project is approved or not. Either eliminate zoning or abide by it.

Comment #18	While we have a housing issue with supply and demand, but more importantly, we have issues with wage suppression within Missoula. Making the development process easier and cheaper for developers isn't going to solve the root problem of low and stagnant wages for those that are employed by MT businesses. Creating subdevelopments should still be a weighty task for developers and the city so that development happens thoughtfully, incorporates the views of existing community members, and is done as sustainably and ethically as possible.
Comment #19	consider roads and density of populations using them.
Comment #20	I live in the Franklin area where it sees almost anything goes: narrow three story buildings adjacent to single story homes; multi-units using the alley for their primary entrance yet little or no thought has been put into aesthetics-windows face dumpsters, poorly maintained alley roadways and very little green space around the buildings themselves. If there is landscaping, it should be a requirement that it is maintained by the owner/s of the building. Lack of connecting sidewalks is a huge problem. Requiring sidewalks for new construction or remodeling only solves part of the problem. I would like to see some of the gasoline tax used to help alleviate this.
Comment #21	We need a process with less bureaucracy, something that is easier to navigate and cuts time in the process. Right now two years is putting the initial cost into a totally different cost category. It costs time, money spent in redrawing, and is very unpredictable. As a builder developer and having been involved in an arduous and expensive rezone, neighborhood input from neighborhoods (Condo, apartments) not held to subdivision standards, and lack of transparency from engineering I would think very long and hard about doing it again. The TED rewrite in the middle of our process caused many problems. The process needs to be cleaned up.
Comment #22	Please do not allow developments to skip any staff review from all city departments. Regulations/requirements are constantly changing and staff stay up to date better than developers.
Comment #23	I believe the City should try to keep the new developments to match the existing ones already there. For example 44 Ranch Estates/Flynn Ranch homes should not have 20 acres of multi story commercial development looking right into their back yards. This totally changes the feel of a neighborhood and decreases values of said neighborhoods. It also drastically increases traffic on an already overburdened road(s). I am all for development but not changing the type/density of neighborhoods
	TED should not be used as a means of circumventing or bypassing requirements.



<p>Comment #24</p>	<p>TED should not be allowed for stand-alone homes at all; should remain for small infill projects (2-5) and then switch into subdivision/PUD etc. All 3 kinds needs to be less prescriptive on old-school items (matching the current neighborhood, car-culture features, massively wide streets, self-contained open spaces). For development over 5, needs to be less nit-picky about measurements and conformity and more demanding about minimum people that have to fit into the acreage/footprints and leave the developer to figure out which combo of McMansions, tiny homes, multi-family works. I oppose the concept of requirements and set-asides for tiers of low income. That's too fraught with winner/loser and other moral/cultural dynamics (e.g. family size, deserving/not etc.) Density standards are fairer--everyone gets the choice to live anywhere, human nature will tend to sort smaller (and therefore cheaper) units to the lower income. The point is availability of shelter, not equal space/comfort independent of income and personal choices. People instead of income will also serve the social justice/diversity goals of mixing differential incomes/housing sizes into 'quality' neighborhoods without implicating the 'leapfrog' inequity.</p>
<p>Comment #25</p>	<p>You need to make sure you have visible and accessible access to residents in which development is intended to occur the information available at public meetings. It needs to be advertised more often.</p>
<p>Comment #26</p>	<p>A major issue I see with new high density housing developments, both on the rental and home ownership sides, is allocated parking and traffic volume. Most, if not all, have inadequate parking for residents and high traffic flow on residential streets not design for either issues. Charlo street on between Holmes and Scott is a perfect example. Some days it is a vehicle single lane due to street parking on both sides of the road.</p>
<p>Comment #27</p>	<p>Missoula needs to be inclusive for everyone and in all neighborhoods. Don't just place massive apartment buildings on the outskirts of town. Place multi-family homes in the U district and the Rattlesnake. Normalizing this will reduce stigma and prejudice and will help all areas of town become affordable. And please ensure that all residents get a say in how and where subdivisions are built, with particular attention to the residents who need affordable housing and/or will be displaced by a particular project. We are only as strong as our most vulnerable community members. Decisions should be made with that in mind.</p>
<p>Comment #28</p>	<p>Housing affordability needs to be priority! also that development is sustainable and improves quality of life.</p>
<p>Comment #29</p>	<p>I am hoping the developers are thinking about the welfare of the city and not about getting rich.</p>

Comment #30	If the subdivision / TED request is in alignment with the growth policy and zoning there should be a streamlined program.
Comment #31	I think all City departments providing services to these properties need to be involved in the design phase. For instance, does the department providing snow plowing and removal have appropriate space to turn around and store snow that cannot be easily moved out off the street? or keep school bus stops unblocked and safe? My experience with the Parks in Missoula is that they continue to be required in neighborhoods, are not usable and become a large expense for homeowners! In townhome communities. This type of reserved space does not work. I have lived in 4 different townhome communities and it is always just a "dog park" making it unacceptable for children to romp and play. I realize that this questionnaire is not to address health issues, but this is a health issue that is not being addressed in Missoula's planning processes, in my opinion. (We had one official fenced in dog park that was shut down because of disease. Other parks do not have the same scrutiny and therefore are unusable by kids.)
Comment #32	The public comment information should be more readily available. For example, it can provide flyers in the mail similar to the postcards sent for neighborhood meeting info.
Comment #33	I support requiring developers to use a complete streets model with trail access and sidewalks as MANDATORY. Developers who cannot meet these requirements and say they are too onerous should not be approved for development.
Comment #34	I'm concerned that the committee members are heavily weighted towards groups who want to reduce their responsibilities and expenses while creating high profit through construction projects. They have very little incentive to create a regulatory structure that adheres to Missoula's "feel" and doesn't simply raze the rules with the excuse of "encouraging growth". We left Austin five years ago after experiencing what happens to a city when developers are given wide leeway. Every new development was luxury, built in incongruous locations for their architecture, and oblivious to the quality of life problems created for the neighborhoods. Please don't let that happen here. There has to be a way to create housing without developers to make exorbitant profits, even though the developers will always complain that the entry-level and affordable projects "don't make financial sense." They don't make as much money as a luxury condo project, but that doesn't mean developers couldn't also make some profit on a regular apartment complex!

<p>Comment #35</p>	<p>If developers are granted too much leeway, they will take more and shrug off citizen concerns about safety. They are far more interested in how much money they can get than anything else. That is understandable, but they will cut corners that are not safe to be circumvented. In the very least, they should have to explain why they NEED exemptions. We prioritize money over safety every time. I understand the point is to make money, but that should not be at the expense of community safety. Both staff and Council are guilty of this.</p>
<p>Comment #36</p>	<p>It should be a neighborhood by neighborhood process. Allowing townhouses and backyard houses is not good if there is not adequate roads or parking or other infrastructure that will serve to maintain our quality of life.</p>
<p>Comment #37</p>	<p>While it is important to respect development rights, all developments impact existing homeowners, neighborhoods, and the community at large. They never occur in isolation. They always have impacts beyond the scope of the development. Therefore, I think the developers need to work with City staff to enumerate the ancillary impacts upfront, and give the community an opportunity to review that prior to proceeding. Perhaps a simplified development proposal with phased review during project formulation such that those impacted are not "surprised" when the proposal is brought forward to Council for approval. The City, as a legal representative of the community, needs to work in partnership with developers rather than be adversarial - BUT, the City also needs to respect the broader interests of the community. There has to be balance.</p>
<p>Comment #38</p>	<p>Once zoning is established for a neighborhood the residents have an expectation that the character created by that zoning will be maintained. The character of a neighborhood includes types of development, vehicle traffic level and flow, and density among other things. It very important that that neighborhood character be respected and maintained to conform to established zoning and not be significantly changed to accommodate. For example, the insertion of a multiple dwelling unit TED project that increases traffic, noise, etc. in an existing quiet single family home residential neighborhood is inappropriate and should not be allowed. Based on our experience and current practices the city seems to be largely unresponsive to public comments and mostly unaware of the negative effects that such developments can have on the quality of life of existing residents while prioritizing the desires of developers.</p>
<p>Comment #39</p>	<p>There seems to be some disconnects between the planning process and the regular operation once the subdivision is implemented. For example: weeds and stormwater runoff seem to be allowed during development, but not once the subdivision is done.</p> <p>Another issue is that it appears that some developers get a lot more leeway from oversight than others. With the perception that if you are big</p>

	<p>enough (think Linda Vista), you are somehow get a pass on many requirements.</p> <p>Its not always that easy to figure out what the requirements are for any given subdivision. Could use improvements to web organization and presence.</p> <p>The City has many important goals, such as reduction in green house gas emissions, but corresponding suggestions or requirements to address these in the subdivision process.</p>
Comment #40	<p>I would've preferred more options for questions 2, 3 and 4, to allow for more nuance. For example, I clicked policies should be implemented using requirements, instead of "a little of both" because I think it should be predominantly requirements that get good development. But, there is certainly still room for incentives to get even better development.</p>
Comment #41	<p>Some of the City-approved projects in my neighborhood have not considered parking. One project on Lolo Street has one parking spot per large house (not including space inside the one-car garages which would be blocked by the one parking space). WHO APPROVED THIS PROJECT??!!! The four houses crowded together with no yards on a stub street with NO parking (and on Lolo St. with NO parking) are constantly for sale because occupants quickly realize the undesirability of these houses. They do not fit the neighborhood and they do not add value to the neighborhood (but several years ago, they made some developer a great deal of money). Neighborhood character and parking should be considered in all new developments. I'm okay with thoughtful infill, but this development was conceived with no thought other than profit.</p>
Comment #42	<p>I think TED developments thus far have sometimes sacrificed public benefit. For example, TED developments should be required to build sidewalks. I understand these projects are often billed as "affordable," but I have yet to see a TED development that sells for less than \$300K per unit. If the project is not for affordable housing, then they should be subject to all of the standard subdivision requirements.</p>
Comment #43	<p>The subdivision and development process is completely broken and too complicated. This needs to be remedied IMMEDIATELY before our city is destroyed. I'm sick and tired of seeing builders and developers get jerked around by the bureaucratic bullshit. It has to be easier and more affordable, end of story.</p>
Comment #44	<p>If you overdevelop or develop poorly, you lose the attraction that brings good professionals and attractive businesses to our community. In other words, don't kill the goose. Please!</p>

Comment #45	Affordable housing can be accomplished and done well through TED, as we've seen recently in the Scott St Village development. We need to be careful about requiring developments to have affordable housing and consider that without that requirement there will still be more opportunities for affordable housing to open up when we add more inventory to the market. Inventory is key. Reducing red tape and overbearing regulations will help developers add inventory.
Comment #46	Inclusionary zoning policies need to be crafted and put in place.
Comment #47	The number of lots should not be limited to a specific number. Each TED and subdivision should be approved by their own merit. The TED that David Edgel at the old Clawson Mfg site is the best example of affordable housing and fast process bringing homes to the market.
Comment #48	<p>I marked neutral on the questions that seemed too vague in the survey. I would answer differently depending on numerous unknown factors. Additional questions that would need to be answered before I could submit an opinion.</p> <p>I believe one of the most important steps in addressing future development is to talk with the folks who live in the neighborhoods. People that have already invested in their home and community, have developed bonds and friendships, people who care about what happens around them and the well being of Missoula. I don't think it's a good idea to fragment an area with outsider interests and objectives. In my opinion, working with an existing neighborhood and agreeing on future improvements, seems to be the unifying way to go.</p> <p>As far as helping the development approval process:              If there is a way to simplify the paperwork process. I think that could be a helpful step for developers, investors or builders. Once projects are submitted and approved all departments should be on the same page with the plan, so it can go forward smoothly.</p>
Comment #49	I hope that missoulans can still afford to live in missoula in the near future because its looking bleak.
Comment #50	We are a housing shortage crisis made worse by COVID migration to Missoula. Housing shortages are at all price points such that affordable housing units coming on the market are being purchased by high income families making the affordable housing crisis more acute. Missoula needs an adequate number of staff to review projects, they need regulations, TED and Subdivision and Zoning that protect the public health safety and welfare but have a streamlined review process.

Comment #51	I am not sure this is pertinent to this survey but I feel there should be a requirement/incentive for solar power, low maintenance landscaping in developments
Comment #52	We need to have more consistency to speed up the process for subdivisions and TEDs. I know the city development services is understaffed and more money should go to increase staffing and retain the staff that is there.
Comment #53	Create more consistency within the planning dept so that we all get the same information
Comment #54	I cannot agree that Missoula needs to make it easy for developers to pursue their goals. They are provided adequate incentive in the profits they reap from their projects. Otherwise, they would not be here.