

From: [Neil Miner](#)
To: [Jordan Hess](#); [Dave DeGrandpre](#); [Mirtha Becerra](#)
Cc: [Emily Gluckin](#); [Kevin Slovarp](#); [Troy Monroe](#); [Mary McCrea](#); [Heidi West](#); [Eran Pehan](#); [Jeremy Keene](#); [Donna Gaukler](#)
Subject: RE: Couple of questions/thoughts about mcnett flats
Date: Friday, February 19, 2021 5:08:15 PM
Attachments: [Application_02Maps and Exhibits.pdf](#)

Hi All,

Thanks for the questions. I'll try to pick them off, but as always, feel free to reach out to me to clarify anything.

In response to the question *“For the trail connection, John Hancock mentioned we might be requiring a trail to nowhere. What is the status of the trail connection to east of the McNett parcel?”*

This trail connection is the relocated section of the Tipperary Way Trail, identified in the Build Grant. I've spoken with John H. for a substantial amount of time in regards to the importance of the trail connection to provide a safe route for kids (of all ages) in all the developments on George Elmer to access Hellgate Elementary and points east, without going down to Mullan Rd. During the BUILD Grant process, the Tipperary alignment was never vetted through the owners of the ag land directly west of the school (under a Conservation Easement). After the BUILD project team hit a road block on the Tipperary Trail alignment, they moved that alignment to north of Pius way. This trail is not in the first round of BUILD projects, but is still high on the priority list, so I would assume that it would be built once there is enough funding in the proposed special impact fee fund. Acquisition of other parcels would happen at that time, or as part of development of parcels, whichever happens first. We (City) have required the section through Heron's Landing to be built at time of development, and are designing the path as part of the BUILD improvements on George Elmer. Ultimately, this will be a 10' wide path, so could serve as wide sidewalk, until the complete connection is made. I have copied Jeremy, if there are any more questions, as he was involved with the rerouting of the trail and the decisions in regards to the BUILD Grant. The trail should be built to City Standards (P&R Design Manual).

I did take a look at the exhibits that the applicant included (from Wednesday's LUP agenda), and a couple things popped out. On the attached exhibit, the applicant showed a 4' boulevard for the first block on Pius way. I double checked with Emily, and the applicant also submitted the Proposed Pius Way Improvements document

(<https://www.ci.missoula.mt.us/DocumentCenter/View/55065/Existing-vs-proposed-Pius-Way-improvements>). The trail along Pius must have a 7' minimum Boulevard (more is always preferred), as shown in the Pius Way Improvements document. I would recommend 12' boulevard for the entire length, especially if we land on the linear park dedication (more on that below). It also looked like the applicant is widening the road, to provide on-street parking. Early in the discussion, there was not an appetite from the City to require a larger ROW on Pius, as the north improvements of Pius Way were already installed, however, it appears the applicant is now proposing new improvements (on-street parking, curblin). As such, the City could require more ROW to get to at least a 60' ROW.

In regards to the parkland dedication for this subdivision. Early on in the discussions on this subdivision, the City stated that we would allow Cash-in-lieu (CiL) of parkland on the west of George Elmer, and require the parkland to the east. We looked at George Elmer as a barrier to reach 44 Ranch Park, and were allowing the Remington Flats subdivision the CiL option. This subdivision is within the service area and capacity of 44 Ranch Park. During this project review, the BUILD Project's Tipperary Trail was moved to the Pius alignment (See above). As such, it was discussed that we would allow the additional width necessary to place the trail along the road to count toward the Parkland Dedication. We would support the linear park option, along the north of Pius, as the dedication of Parkland. I believe this is supported in our plans (for a trail corridor) as well as in the Sxwtpqyen Neighborhood plan. Due to the size and location, we would defer to the HOA or owner to maintain both this common area as well as the trail (similar to that of Heron's Landing).

I hope that this answer's all the questions, and please reach out if it does not.

Thanks, and have a good weekend.

Neil

Neil Miner, PLA | he/him/his |
Parks and Trails Design/Development Manager
Missoula Parks and Recreation
600 Cregg Lane | Missoula, MT 59801
406-552-6264
www.missoulaparks.org
nminer@ci.missoula.mt.us

From: Jordan Hess

Sent: Friday, February 19, 2021 12:49 PM

To: Dave DeGrandpre <DeGrandpreD@ci.missoula.mt.us>; Mirtha Becerra <MBecerra@ci.missoula.mt.us>

Cc: Emily Gluckin <GluckinE@ci.missoula.mt.us>; Kevin Slovarp <KSlovarp@ci.missoula.mt.us>; Troy Monroe <MonroeT@ci.missoula.mt.us>; Mary McCrea <McCreaM@ci.missoula.mt.us>; Heidi West <HWest@ci.missoula.mt.us>; Eran Pehan <PehanE@ci.missoula.mt.us>; Neil Miner <MinerN@ci.missoula.mt.us>

Subject: Re: Couple of questions/thoughts about mcnett flats

Thanks for the thoughts on this, Dave.

I am specifically interested in the questions around buffering/transitioning. Does Parks believe we should require parkland dedication on the east side of George Elmer? Can we specifically require/condition where this parkland is dedicated? The idea of a parkland buffer would create an amenity for the area and a buffer between intensities of uses. Does Parks support this type of linear park along the north edge of the trail as a condition?

For the trail connection, John Hancock mentioned we might be requiring a trail to nowhere. What is the status of the trail connection to east of the McNett parcel?

In addition, can you ask the transportation division to weigh in on the buffered bike lanes that the Planning Board voted to require? Does the Transportation division recommend including these?

Thanks,

Jordan

From: Dave DeGrandpre

Sent: Thursday, February 18, 2021 7:00:20 PM

To: Mirtha Becerra

Cc: Emily Gluckin; Kevin Slovarp; Troy Monroe; Jordan Hess; Mary McCrea; Heidi West; Eran Pehan; Neil Miner

Subject: RE: Couple of questions/thoughts about mcnett flats

Hi Mirtha,

I don't know all of the history of the George Elmer and Cattle Drive roundabout but in conversations with city engineering staff, the 44 Ranch and Flynn Ranch developers were supposed to pay a proportionate share for it, but if other developments would also necessitate its development, they would pay a proportionate share as well. I am copying Kevin Slovarp and Troy Monroe so they can correct me or add as necessary.

Kody Swartz of Woith Engineering said one lot for sure is expected to be developed with multi-family dwellings soon if the applications are approved. Today he indicated it would be Lot 2, on the north side of the property adjacent and to the east of George Elmer.

Regarding a development agreement, I have asked Mary McCrea and others and from what I have heard, such an agreement only works if the developer is willing to commit to certain land uses or other restrictive parameters, which this applicant has not appeared to be open to, because the city is not keen on enforcing land use requirements unless we must.

From a planning perspective it would be nice to see the city's plans for mixed use development come to fruition on this parcel, but I don't think we can require it. From my perspective, we can provide the appropriate zoning and the market will (and should) have a role in what types of structures and uses are built so when there is an adequate concentration of residences, some neighborhood commercial will naturally develop, but it is tough to require commercial when there is not yet a market, so I don't think we should try. This is probably a conversation best had over appetizers and drinks!

At the same time, I think some neighbors to the south only want single-family residential, which is not in accord with the city's plans and will not significantly move the needle on providing more workforce housing, so making everyone happy is not an option.

The idea of requiring parkland along the trail north of Pius Way across from the Flynn Ranch homes is to provide a buffer or olive branch to the homeowners to the south. Today Emily followed up with Parks and Rec to make sure we can accurately relay their perspective and preferences.

I wanted to bring a few more people into this conversation to make sure I am providing accurate information and to keep folks in the loop - I hope you don't mind.

I will not be available Friday but you can call me this weekend or I will respond to emails Monday.

Cheers,

Dave DeGrandpre, AICP | Planning Supervisor
Community Planning, Development & Innovation
Development Services Division
406-529-0709 | degrandpred@ci.missoula.mt.us

Promoting equitable growth and a resilient, sustainable community.

-----Original Message-----

From: Mirtha Becerra <MBecerra@ci.missoula.mt.us>
Sent: Thursday, February 18, 2021 5:52 PM
To: Dave DeGrandpre <DeGrandpreD@ci.missoula.mt.us>
Subject: Couple of questions/thoughts about mcnett flats

Hi Dave,

During the presentations on Wednesday, a couple of things got my attention:

Why is this development required to pay for the installation of the roundabout at George Elmer and Cattle Drive?. Development of that roundabout was a condition of approval for the 44Ranch and Flynn Ranch subdivisions with the City paying for the installation.

Also, did the developer say they know for sure that one lot will be apartments or that Lot one will have apartments on it?.

Have you explored the development agreement idea any further? Or any other way to get more predictability for the property?

Thanks Dave.

Mirtha

Sent from my iPhone