



MISSOULA CONSOLIDATED PLANNING BOARD

Meeting Minutes



Missoula County
Planning, Development & Sustainability
(406) 258-4657

City of Missoula
Community Planning, Development & Innovation
(406) 552-6630

Date: December 9, 2025, 6:00 p.m.

Location: Missoula County Courthouse, Sophie Moiese Room (in person) or TEAMS (virtually)

Members in Attendance: Danny Tenenbaum (City Alternate), Danny Oberweiser (County Appt), Lynn Davis (City Appt), Derek Kanwischer (City Appt), Josh Schroeder (Conservation District), Rick Hall (County Appt), Tung Pham (Mayor), and Shane Morrissey (City Appt)

Members Absent: James Fountain (County Alternate)

I. CALL TO ORDER [Time stamp – 1:00]

Shane Morrissey, acting president, called the meeting to order at 6:01 p.m.

II. ROLL CALL [Time stamp – 1:21]

Analeshia Rodriguez called the roll. Seven regular members and one alternate were present. City alternate Danny Tenenbaum was promoted to voting member for the evening. A quorum was met.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES [Time stamp – 2:10]

There were no minutes for approval on the agenda.

IV. PUBLIC COMMENT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS [Time stamp – 2:14]

There were no public comments on non-agenda items.

V. STAFF ANNOUNCEMENTS [Time stamp – 4:08]

The Board discussed the election of officers.

Derek Kanwischer made a motion, and Danny Tenenbaum seconded to appoint Shane Morrissey as President. The motion passed unanimously by a roll call vote.

Danny Oberweiser made a motion, and Tung Pham seconded to appoint Danny Tenenbaum as Vice President. The motion passed unanimously by a roll call vote.

VI. PUBLIC HEARINGS [Time stamp – 8:01]

- 1. Continuation of the November 18th, November 20th, December 2nd, and December 4th, 2025, Public Hearings presented by Madson Matthias, Senior Planner, City of Missoula Community Planning, Development, & Innovation– Adoption of Amendments to the Our Missoula 2045 Land Use Plan and Place Types Map.**

2. Continuation of the November 18th, November 20th, December 2nd, and December 4th, 2025, Public Hearings presented by Cassie Tripard, Planning Supervisor, City of Missoula Community Planning, Development, & Innovation - City of Missoula Code Reform Project:

- 1. Title 22 – City of Missoula Unified Development Code (UDC)**
- 2. City of Missoula Zoning Map**

STAFF PRESENTATION [Time stamp – 8:06]

A team from the City of Missoula Community Planning, Development & Innovation Department (CPDI) appeared for a continuation of the public hearings previously held on November 18th, November 20th, December 2nd and December 4th, 2025.

The City's team included, but was not limited to the following:

- Ben Brewer (Ben), Long Range Planning Supervisor
- Cassie Tripard (Cassie), Planning Supervisor
- Laval Means (Laval), Community Planning Manager
- Mary McCrea (Mary), Permits and Land Use Manager
- Marc Hendrickson (Marc), Associate Planner/GIS Focus
- Eran Pehan (Eran), Director of Administration
- Aaron Wilson (Aaron), Planning Manager for Transportation Planning
- Nathan McLeod (Nathan), Associate Director of Planning, Design and Projects for the Parks and Recreation Department
- Elizabeth Johnson (Elizabeth), Preservation Officer
- Emily Gluckin (Emily), Senior Planner
- Ryan Sudbury (Ryan), City Attorney for Civil Services

PUBLIC COMMENT [Time stamp – 8:36]

The following public comment was presented to the Board:

- Christine Everett spoke on behalf of the Ben Hughes Neighborhood Association and referenced a letter submitted by the Association's President, which was included in the agenda packet under "Additional Public Comment – December 9, 2025." She stated that the letter explains why LU-R1, rather than LU-R2, is more consistent with the adopted Land Use Plan for the entire neighborhood. She discussed amenity-based zoning and stated that, of these amenities, only transit service, developed parks, and commuter trails could be applied to the Ben Hughes area.
- Mike Morgan, an architect with Hoffmann Morgan & Associates, focused his comments on proposed activity area and buffer regulations within the UDC. He recommended that activity area applicability (Section 4.9.02-D) only to apartment buildings and not to mixed-use or townhouse developments. He stated that applying activity area requirements to very small infill projects is impractical. He also recommended increasing the allowable slope for lawn-type activity areas from 2% to 5% to improve constructability and accessibility. Additionally, he recommended reducing or exempting buffer requirements for small infill projects and parking lots with 20 or fewer spaces, and further recommended excluding parking aisles located along alleys from buffer requirements.

1. Proposed zoning for MCPS properties [Time stamp – 18:24]

BOARD PROPOSED MOTION

Danny Tenenbaum made the following motion to approve the request for consideration, and Danny Oberweiser seconded the motion:

I move staff to work with MCPS on text and/or zoning map amendments to ensure that MCPS has maximum flexibility in its plan for redevelopment of these underutilized properties.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Danny Tenenbaum (Tenenbaum) introduced an amendment in response to a letter submitted by Missoula County Public Schools (MCPS) requesting alignment between the draft Unified Development Code (UDC), Zoning Map and MCPS's ongoing process of finding better utilization for some of their school district parcels that are underused or vacant. Marc confirmed the underused properties that were referenced in the letter, listing off the Rimel Road property, Prescott School, and the Administration Building. Tenenbaum noted that the letter emphasized MCPS's interest in maintaining a wide variety of redevelopment options and stated that these properties present opportunities to better utilize land and add housing within the City.

VOTE

With no further discussion, the board voted by roll call, and the motion passed unanimously.

AYES: (8): Lynn Davis, Derek Kanwisher, Tung Pham, Danny Tenenbaum, Josh Schroeder, Danny Oberweiser, Rick Hall, Shane Morrissey

NAYS: (0)

2. Section 4.2.03-C. Number of Units per Building [Time stamp – 30:33]

BOARD PROPOSED MOTION

Shane Morrissey made the following motion to approve the request for consideration, and Derek Kanwischer seconded the motion:

In adaptive reuse situations, remove the units per building requirement and any associated language that would need to be clarified throughout the UDC to also follow through on that intent.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Shane directed the Board to Section 4.2.03-C of the UDC pertaining to the maximum number of dwelling units per building. The amendment was prompted by his review of the MCPS properties and concerns that adaptive reuse buildings, such as the Administration Building, located in the UR-3 zoning district, could potentially be limited to a fixed number of dwelling units despite it being an existing building. He explained that in adaptive reuse situations, buildings should be allowed to accommodate as many dwelling units as feasible within the confines of the existing building while any additional structures on the site would be applied to the allowable Floor Area Ratio (FAR). Cassie stated that the proposed amendment aligns with the policy objectives for adaptive reuse.

VOTE

With no further discussion, the board voted by roll call, and the motion passed unanimously.

AYES: (8): Lynn Davis, Derek Kanwisher, Tung Pham, Danny Tenenbaum, Josh Schroeder, Danny Oberweiser, Rick Hall, Shane Morrissey

NAYS: (0)

3. Section 4.11.02-B. Applicability [Time stamp – 34:46]

BOARD PROPOSED MOTION #1

Josh Schroeder made the following motions to approve the request for consideration, and Lynn Davis seconded the motion:

- a. I move that the Planning Board recommend City Council amend Section 4.11.02-B. Applicability by adding the following language to subsection (B)(2) consistent with the Missoula Conservation District's public comment:
 - i. For any vegetation clearing, construction of structures, or other development occurring outside the City of Missoula's 1946 boundary and within 50 feet of a riparian resource, a Natural Streambed and Land Preservation Act (310) permit application must be submitted to the Missoula Conservation District prior to commencement of any development activity. For areas inside the City of Missoula's 1946 boundary, a 310 permit application must be submitted to Missoula County Planning, Development, and Sustainability.

**BOARD PROPOSED MOTION #2 Section 4.11.02-D. Riparian Buffers
[Time stamp – 37:25]**

- b. I move that the Planning Board recommend City Council amend Section 4.11.02-D. Riparian Buffers by adding the following language to subsection (D)(1) consistent with the Missoula Conservation District's public comment:
 - i. For properties located outside the City of Missoula's 1946 boundary, the required buffer width shall be determined through submission of a 310 permit application to the Missoula Conservation District. For areas inside the City of Missoula's 1946 boundary, a 310 permit application must be submitted to Missoula County Planning, Development, and Sustainability. In no case may the buffer be less than the minimum widths listed in Table 4.11.02-1.

**BOARD PROPOSED MOTION #3 Article 4.11
[Time stamp – 38:38]**

- c. I move that the Planning Board recommend City Council incorporate language in Article 4.11 that preserves the Missoula County Environmental Design Standards for Riparian Resource Protection including existing buffer widths of 50 to 450 feet for lands that are outside City Limits but may be annexed in the future, consistent with the Missoula Conservation District's recommendation.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Josh summarized concerns that were raised by the Missoula Conservation District. He stated that the UDC could weaken riparian protections for county zoned areas that could be subject to future annexation. He also noted that the UDC is unclear regarding where the 310 law applies inside versus outside the City of Missoula's 1946 boundary and the UDC does not require

coordination between UDC riparian buffers and 310 permit jurisdiction. Cassie stated that staff supported the first two proposed amendments, clarifying that outside the 1946 boundary, 310 permits are reviewed by the Missoula Conservation District, while within the boundary they are reviewed by the Missoula County Planning Office Floodplain Administrator. She said staff had some concerns with the third proposed amendment, explaining that many properties that are being annexed, majority of them are already platted or located close to the river and may not be able to meet the County buffer standards without variances. Cassie added that staff preferred to do an additional study before adopting larging buffers. Rick expressed support for the amendments, stating concern that reduced riparian buffers could incentivize annexation into the City and increased development near the river, referencing the Aspire subdivision as an example.

Ryan asked whether the third proposed amendment would apply only until the City completes its own comprehensive riparian analysis. Josh stated that the intent of the third proposed amendment was to preserve existing County riparian buffer standards on lands annexed in the future until the City completes a comprehensive review and adopts its own regulations. Staff clarified that the third amendment would not affect parcels already within City limits and would apply only to future annexations, and further suggested adding to the motion that the buffers would be applied to waterways that are within the urban growth area boundary to avoid waterways that are unlikely to be annexed. Marc explained that County buffer widths vary by waterway and by certain stretches of waterway, and staff noted that existing County processes, including studies and variances, will need to be discussed with the County to address pre-existing development within buffer areas. Rick noted that the County has a variance process for unique lots and expressed support for this amendment. Tung expressed his support for the amendment and acknowledged that clarifying the coordination with the Conservation District and reinforcing 310 permit requirements was the better approach, and Josh modified his motion clarifying that the third amendment would apply only until the City completes its own riparian analysis and could be further refined to apply to properties outside City limits but within the City's growth area that may be annexed in the future.

AMENDED MOTION TO BOARD PROPOSED MOTION # 3 [Time stamp – 55:56]

The motion was modified to clarify that the recommendation would remain in effect until the City completes its own riparian analysis and that it reflects lands that are outside the City limits but within the City's designated growth area, including areas that may be annexed in the future.

VOTE

With no further discussion, the board voted by roll call, and the motions passed unanimously.

AYES: (8): Lynn Davis, Derek Kanwisher, Tung Pham, Danny Tenenbaum, Josh Schroeder, Danny Oberweiser, Rick Hall, Shane Morrissey

NAYS: (0)

[Time stamp – 59:38]

The Board discussed the zoning for the Ben Hughes subdivision, including the differences between LU-R1 and LU-R2, and raised questions whether a fully connected commuter trail serves the neighborhood. Emily explained that staff's analysis relied on the adopted Parks, Recreation, Open Space, and Trails (PROST) Plan, which identifies a community-level trail

along Broadway Street serving the subdivision. Marc added that the trail is identified as Ron's River Trail and noted that many designated commuter or community trails throughout Missoula are not fully connected. Nathan clarified that the Ben Hughes Park is a City conservation lands park with natural areas, walking trails, and river access. Josh asked whether the neighborhood's single point of ingress and egress justified lower density and Emily responded that in the place type analysis that was a consideration of theirs in designating the area as Limited Urban Residential. Tenenbaum explained that the neighborhood is governed by a homeowners' association with covenants, conditions, and restrictions (CC&Rs) that may be more restrictive for this community than either zoning designation, and stated that the zoning decision may not have an effect on what can be built while those CC&Rs remain in effect. Rick expressed concern about relying on future amenities that depend on uncertain funding for future planning and Lynn echoed these concerns. Ben explained that waiting for all infrastructure to be fully built out before allowing development can create challenges, as infrastructure improvements may take time and depend on multiple factors, and growth may occur incrementally after the new code is adopted. Emily added that development often serves as a catalyst for securing right-of-way improvements and trail connections, emphasizing the need to plan zoning and infrastructure together over time.

Shane asked for clarification regarding the Airport Hazard Overlay and the potential construction of a second runway. Eran stated that staff have been communicating with the airport to better understand its needs related to expanded runway mapping. She acknowledged that several developments are already proceeding under previously approved development rights. She further explained that staff are exploring fail-safe mechanisms that could provide additional protections if those developments don't move forward. Tung asked questions regarding potential liability issues for the City related to safety concerns and existing development approvals. Ryan responded that while the second runway was previously considered more speculative, available funding has increased its likelihood, requiring additional land-use consideration. He emphasized that staff are working to establish a defensible position demonstrating that the City considered safety, planning, and development rights concerns. Marc added that staff have not received finalized GIS data from the airport and instead georeferenced airport-provided PDFs to reflect both the existing and proposed runways. Shane concluded the discussion by expressing appreciation for staff's coordination with the airport and emphasized the importance of continued collaboration to ensure a reasonable and equitable solution that protects the community.

Derek sought clarification on Section 6.2-01 of the draft UDC regarding right-of-way improvement requirements and the seven-dwelling-unit threshold. He expressed concern that developments of seven units or fewer may not be required to construct sidewalks, especially in neighborhoods where there isn't connected sidewalk infrastructure, and noted it seems inconsistent and contrary with the Land Use Plan goals. Aaron responded by explaining that the threshold is intended to balance the high cost and burden of requiring right-of-way improvements for small infill projects and that the City has historically relied on deferrals or Capital Improvement Program (CIP) projects. He added that staff are working to ensure the code still captures opportunities where a small infill project can complete connections between existing sidewalks and support network connectivity. Eran added that the seven-unit threshold is intended to strongly incentivize missing-middle housing.

4. Section 4.9.04-E. Short-Term Bicycle Storage

BOARD PROPOSED MOTION [Time stamp – 1:48:05]

Shane Morrissey made the following motion to approve the request for consideration, and Danny Tenenbaum seconded the motion:

I'll move to amend Section 4.9.04–E.2 that Short-Term Bicycle Storage with permission from the City Engineer are allowed to be placed in the right-of-way in all UMU districts, Downtown Transition districts, and Downtown districts.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Shane Morrissey inquired about Section 4.9.04-E.2 of the UDC regarding short-term bicycle storage and asked whether additional language could be added to clarify that, subject to approval by the City Engineer, short-term bicycle parking can be placed within the public right-of-way in order to save space on a site for development. Aaron explained that they could be open to considering use of the right-of-way and meet all of the street design standards can be met.

VOTE

With no further discussion, the board voted by roll call, and the motion passed unanimously.

AYES: (8): Lynn Davis, Derek Kanwisher, Tung Pham, Danny Tenenbaum, Josh Schroeder, Danny Oberweiser, Rick Hall, Shane Morrissey

NAYS: (0)

[Time stamp – 1:48:05]

Shane requested clarification on regarding a former gravel pit site along Grant Creek Road near Interstate 90, noting that the property appeared to be split-zoned or have two different zoning designations. In response, Eran stated that they have been in ongoing communication with the development team and confirmed that the site is currently designated with two zoning classifications of Urban Residential-2 (UR-2) and Limited Urban Mixed-Use (LUMU). She stated the applicant did request for single zoning designation for both parcels to perform a boundary line adjustment and are hoping to resolve the issue prior to the City Council public hearing.

5. Table 4.7.02-12 Neighborhood Commercial Building Standards *[Time stamp – 1:57:20]*

BOARD PROPOSED MOTION

Shane Morrissey made the following motion to approve the request for consideration, and Danny Oberweiser seconded the motion:

I move that staff investigates other mechanisms such as Floor Area Ratio (FAR) to better align the goals of the size of the neighborhood commercial to the lot and while still ensuring that within our residential districts the neighborhood commercial does not get too big that it affects the size of the building and takes it out of the character of the neighborhood.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board reviewed an amendment adopted at the prior meeting related to the neighborhood commercial size limit. Shane questioned whether an alternative approach could be explored that accounts for lot size rather than relying solely on a specific maximum building size, noting this could allow neighborhood commercial uses on smaller lots while accommodating larger

buildings on larger lots. Staff suggested using FAR for commercial uses to better align building size with lot size. Cassie acknowledged there is a wide lot variation across Missoula and raised the question of whether an upper cap should be included in addition to FAR, or whether size should remain proportional. Eran noted that there is interest from City Council and ongoing community input on this issue, stating that staff expect changes to happen. Ryan added that a motion directing staff to explore FAR or similar mechanisms to address larger lot sizes would be reasonable and would provide direction for staff in preparing alternatives for City Council to consider.

VOTE

With no further discussion, the board voted by roll call, and the motion passed unanimously.

AYES: (8): Lynn Davis, Derek Kanwisher, Tung Pham, Danny Tenenbaum, Josh Schroeder, Danny Oberweiser, Rick Hall, Shane Morrissey

NAYS: (0)

6. Section 1.1.01-B. Effective Date

BOARD PROPOSED MOTION [Time stamp – 2:02:43]

Danny Oberwesier made the following motion to approve the request for consideration, and Tung Pham seconded the motion:

I move that Planning Board recommends amendment to City Council section 1.1.01-B Effective Date increasing from 60 days as currently drafted to 120 days.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Oberweiser expressed concern about the effective date of the UDC and how it applies to entitled subdivisions that have not yet filed final plats. He addressed how previously approved subdivisions, specifically in the Sxwtpqyen Master Plan and general Mullan area, will apply with the new zoning standards at time of building permit.

The Board revisited concerns about transitional provisions for pre-approved subdivisions and how new zoning standards would apply where detailed, building-permit-level specific plans are not in place. Mary explained that the subdivision section includes its own transitional provisions, noting that phased subdivisions with approved preliminary plats function as pre-approved site development plans and may continue to file plats and build as approved, including those with master site plans. Oberweiser asked a clarifying question regarding recently approved subdivisions with master site plans and whether those plans would remain effective if found nonconforming under the new code, and staff confirmed they would, given their status as pre-approved site development plans. Ryan added that recent text changes to the draft code clarified transitional provisions and site-specific development plans, which may explain differences from earlier staff responses to Oberweiser's clarifying question.

VOTE

With no further discussion, the board voted by roll call, and the motion passed unanimously.

AYES: (8): Lynn Davis, Derek Kanwisher, Tung Pham, Danny Tenenbaum, Josh Schroeder, Danny Oberweiser, Rick Hall, Shane Morrissey

NAYS: (0)

7. Section 4.2.03-F. Building Placement [Time stamp – 2:10:13]

BOARD PROPOSED MOTION

Shane Morrissey made the following motion to approve the request for consideration, and Lynn Davis seconded the motion:

I move to change UR-2, UR-3, and UR-4 to 15-foot front yard setbacks and a side street setback of 10 feet, and in addition to that, including neighborhood commercial with those setbacks.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Shane addressed Table 4.2.03-F (Building Placement) in relation to setbacks. He emphasized that the UDC is intended to function as a form-based code focused on form, scale, and streetscapes rather than use, and that development in the UR-2, UR-3, and UR-4 districts should align with existing neighborhood streetscapes. They expressed concern that a 10-foot front setback combined with allowed encroachments could result in buildings being placed at the property line, negatively impacting the public realm, including boulevards and street trees. Staff explained that the current setbacks were calibrated to meet the requirements under the Montana Land Use Planning Act (MLUPA) by reducing overall setback area by at least 25%. Ben followed up by stating that reduced setbacks were calibrated in response to state guidance and public input and are intended to function in tandem with the FAR tool to expand buildable area while maintaining neighborhood compatibility and mitigating impacts on neighboring properties. Questions were raised about how neighborhood commercial at or near the lot line would transition in a residential neighborhood. Shane reiterated his amendment to increase front yard setbacks to 15 feet and side yard setbacks to 10 feet in the UR-2, UR-3, and UR-4 districts and requiring neighborhood commercial to conform to those setbacks. Tenenbaum stated his opposition to the amendment, expressing support for the setbacks as drafted in the UDC, noting that the urban residential districts are intended to facilitate more urban development patterns with smaller setbacks. Tung agreed with Tenenbaum's comments and stated he would defer to staff's concerns about supporting infill development, emphasizing the need for flexibility to accommodate additional housing and prioritizing inward growth.

VOTE

With no further discussion, the board voted by roll call, and the motion failed 6 to 2.

AYES: (2): Josh Schroeder, Shane Morrissey

NAYS: (6): Lynn Davis, Derek Kanwisher, Tung Pham, Danny Tenenbaum, Danny Oberweiser, Rick Hall

8. Division 4.9.02 Landscaping [Time stamp – 2:38:57]

BOARD PROPOSED MOTION

Danny Tenenbaum made the following motion to approve the request for consideration, and Danny Oberweiser seconded the motion:

I move to amend the landscaping section of the UDC in Table 4.9.02 to adopt the text amendments located in the letter submitted from Missoula Landscape Architects titled "UDC Landscaping Amendment Version 2".

BOARD DISCUSSION

Oberweiser clarified for the record that Version 2 was included in the electronic agenda packet for the prior meeting but was not included in the most current electronic packet, and the document displayed on the screen during the meeting was the correct version. Key elements discussed in the submitted document included raising the activity area trigger from seven to thirteen dwelling units and exempting mixed-use buildings from the activity area requirement. Cassie added that one of the biggest changes proposed in the document is to regulate landscaping by building type rather than by zoning district. She addressed some of the proposed landscaping amendments and noted that they tried to introduce flexibility in the Code by identifying different types of tree class based on canopy area. Shane clarified within the document that mixed-use buildings do still require general site landscaping requirements, with exemptions limited to apartment and mixed-use buildings in the UDU-4 district. Shane confirmed that the landscaping percentage requirements reflected in the letter are consistent with percentages previously approved by the Board, and Cassie noted that the letter does remove several tree replacement and conservation provisions that a prior board proposed motion failed to pass. Nathan highlighted that tree canopy is one of the most effective tools for mitigating urban heat and effects of climate change in the summer and cautioned that reducing landscaping requirements in these districts could further limit tree cover, increase impervious surfaces, and increase urban heat over time. Cassie pointed out that staff were in support of the amendments that proposed simplification to buffer widths but were opposed to only requiring buffers for parking lots abutting residential when there's more than 20 spaces. Clarification was requested regarding whether the buffer requirement consists of fencing alone or includes distance and landscaping. Staff acknowledged that while a fence could reduce headlight impacts, landscaped buffers also serve the purpose of filtering stormwater before it reaches our drinking water through those plantings adjacent to parking lots. Oberweiser expressed support for the landscaping amendments, citing the balanced approach proposed by the landscape architect community and the value of continuing the dialogue between staff, the City, and City Council. Lynn requested clarification on the requirement in Section F related to TED #1 that common-area landscaping be installed prior to the TED declaration. Cassie explained that the declaration establishes ownership for townhome exemption developments. She added that common-area landscaping must be completed before declaration filing because it typically occurs when the developer is finished with the project and transitioning landscaping responsibility to an HOA, whereas landscaping on individual ownership units is done at the time of building permit to avoid ruining landscaping when building.

Tenenbaum stated he ultimately supported the amendments proposed in the letter because they added nuance, including raising the activity area trigger to 13 dwelling units, exempting Downtown Transition and Downtown Core districts to reinforce urban development goals, and a provision exempting development near parkland or conservation lands from the activity area requirement, acknowledging proximity to existing green space. Rick expressed support for the activity area revisions but raised concern about reductions in landscaping requirements. Cassie commented that general site landscaping requirements in terms of residential districts would primarily apply in UR-3 and UR-4 districts, and clarified how some of the amendments in the letter differed from prior votes, including consistency with previously adopted board proposed motions regarding activity area standards and tree conservation. Discussion clarified that TEDs consist of individual ownership units comparable to subdivided lots and that landscaping requirements may be triggered at seven or more units. Lynn further asked whether TEDs with

fewer than seven units are required to replace removed trees, and Nathan confirmed that tree replacement is still required, but the requirement is significantly reduced. Derek stated that he remained conflicted with the motion expressing support for the goals of providing affordable and denser housing while also voicing concern about reducing opportunities for landscaping and activity areas that contribute to the community character of Missoula. Josh expressed that he intended to support the motion describing the comments as thoughtful and nuanced, and noted that although he was unsure as a layperson whether the proposed changes were appropriate, he believed they would spur further discussion at City Council. Shane intended to support the motion as well, noting support for the reduction in activity area requirements and appeared to address issues including activity area, slope, and other landscaping-related requirements. He further reflected that, although a prior amendment aimed at preserving more green space had been voted down, they viewed this amendment as one that would help facilitate development.

VOTE

With no further discussion, the board voted by roll call, and the motion passed 6 to 2.

AYES: (6): Lynn Davis, Tung Pham, Danny Tenenbaum, Danny Oberweiser, Josh Schroeder, Shane Morrissey

NAYS: (2): Derek Kanwisher, Rick Hall

9. Division 4.6.08 Historic Resource Overlays [Time stamp – 3:13:34]

BOARD PROPOSED MOTION

Danny Tenenbaum made the following motion to approve the request for consideration and Tung Pham seconded the motion:

I move to amend Section 4.6.08 to say that historic resource overlays can regulate the design of structures that are not listed on the national or the Missoula Historic Registry but the regulation of use remains with the underlying zoning district.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Tenenbaum explained that the intent of the amendment is to maintain the uniform character and aesthetic of historic districts by continuing to regulate building design, while still allowing additional flexibility for structures not listed on the Missoula Historic Registry by leaving use regulations to the underlying zoning district. He noted that the amendment would not affect properties listed on either the national or local historic registries. Josh expressed support for the motion, noting that it avoids creating parallel zoning systems by leaving land use regulation to the underlying zoning district while allowing the overlay to regulate design. Tenenbaum confirmed that the amendment exempts non-listed structures within the historic overlay boundaries and applies to future historic resource overlays to ensure that we have that balance between historical preservation and redevelopment opportunity for specific structures that are not listed on the registry.

Elizabeth emphasized that the proposed amendment primarily affects the Fort Missoula Historic Resource Overlay, which exists to protect the entire historic district rather than individual structures, noting that no buildings at Fort Missoula are individually listed on the National Register. She explained that incompatible changes could threaten the district's national register listing and funding opportunities. She also noted that certain uses are restricted to preserve the district's character and community gathering space, citing concerns that alcohol

related uses could increase safety risks. Cassie added that the uses that could occur at Fort Missoula depends on where City Council lands on the proposal to remove the CD-1 zoning district. A tavern would still not be allowed under either civic zoning district, even if the amendment passes. If CD-1 were removed and CD-2 applied instead, additional uses could be allowed. Staff suggested reviewing Article 4.8 for a full list of uses. It was clarified that while the amendment is written to apply broadly, Fort Missoula is the only historic overlay currently affected. Elizabeth added that two of the other three buildings are only contributing structures to historic districts rather than individually listed buildings, which places them in the same status as the Fort Missoula structures.

The discussion focused on what outcomes the amendment would lead to, both for Fort Missoula and for future historic resource overlays. Tenenbaum explained that the amendment primarily clarifies how regulation applies to structures that are listed on the National or Missoula Historic Registries and are treated differently than non-listed structures located within historic resource overlays. The amendment doesn't eliminate the City's ability to regulate structures not listed on a historic registry. Instead, it limits regulation to building design to ensure compatibility with the district, while uses continue to be governed by the underlying zoning. Questions were raised about how uses not explicitly listed as permitted or prohibited in the Fort Missoula Historic Resource Overlay would be treated. Staff clarified that, with conditional uses eliminated, all uses default to either permitted or prohibited, and that permitted uses generally follow the base zoning unless expressly prohibited by the overlay. Elizabeth clarified the overlay also allows certain additional uses, such as adaptive reuse, that may not be permitted in the base zoning.

Laval stated that historic districts are defined by comprehensive descriptions of character and value that apply to the district as an entire place, where it could be hard to distinguish wanting to apply it to individually listed structures from the broader context of the historic district. Shane expressed concern about the amendment's broader implications, noting that the City's other historic overlays generally apply to single buildings or small groups of buildings. Rick stated that he did not feel qualified to make decisions that could determine whether a historic area retains its designation and expressed concern that the amendment could endanger historic areas.

VOTE

With no further discussion, the board voted by roll call, and the motion resulted in a tie vote.

AYES: (4): Tung Pham, Danny Tenenbaum, Danny Oberweiser, Josh Schroeder

NAYS: (4): Lynn Davis, Derek Kanwisher, Rick Hall, Shane Morrissey

10. Zoning Map Adjustments [Time stamp –3:36:39]

BOARD PROPOSED MOTION

Shane Morrissey made the following motion to approve the request for consideration, and Lynn Davis seconded the motion:

I move to request staff within the zoning districts as they're established right now, try to smooth them out and ensure consistent street types and development patterns along them and there's a reasonable line as to where they stop and start.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Shane acknowledged City staff for the methodology on how the Land Use Plan informed the Zoning Map, including how access to amenities and the presence of barriers were used to define base zoning districts. He suggested refining zoning boundaries to align more consistently along alleys or street edges rather than mid-block or street centerlines, in order to create more aligned streetscapes and uniform development patterns on both sides of a street. Examples were given near Stevens Avenue, the University District where minor changes could better reflect neighborhood character. Board members raised questions about split-zoned lots. Marc clarified that these inconsistencies stem from ongoing parcel fabric updates, noting that split-zone parcels are not an intended outcome and are addressed in the UDC if they occur. He added that some irregular boundaries result from mapping mixed-use districts to design excellence corridors. Additional discussion addressed U-R4 concentrations on the west side, with staff noting proximity to high-frequency transit, developed parks, schools, and a quarter-mile walkability distance.

VOTE

With no further discussion, the board voted by roll call, and the motion passed unanimously.

AYES: (8): Lynn Davis, Derek Kanwisher, Tung Pham, Danny Tenenbaum, Josh Schroeder, Danny Oberweiser, Rick Hall, Shane Morrissey

NAYS: (0)

11. Zoning Map Amendment – (U-R3 to U-R4) [Time stamp – 3:46:36]

BOARD PROPOSED MOTION

Danny Tenenbaum made the following motion to approve the request for consideration, and Tung Pham seconded the motion:

I move to amend the zoning map to change the zoning district along Johnson St. between 3rd St. and north from U-R3 to U-R4. Catlin St between 3rd St. West and 14th from U-R3 to U-R4. Arthur from Evans Ave. down to South Ave from U-R3 to U-R4 and South Ave East from Higgins to Arthur from U-R3 to U-R4.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Tenenbaum explained that the amendment remains consistent with the adopted Land Use Map while aligning zoning with existing high-frequency transit infrastructure. He emphasized that these corridors are among the City's most transit-served residential areas, and stated that it could help expand housing options and support transit-oriented living. Discussion included the Franklin to the Fort area, where Marc explained that neighborhood typologies from the Land Use and Equity Report were used in mapping due to high amenity access, while also acknowledging the area's vulnerability to displacement and ongoing gentrification. Tenenbaum stated he would defer to City staff regarding parcel-specific details. Josh expressed support for the amendment but noted concern that the area is already experiencing significant upzoning and targeted higher-density development, and questioned whether additional upzoning in that location was appropriate. Tenenbaum asked staff to clarify how the proposed U-R3 zoning compares to existing zoning on Catlin Street and Johnson Street in terms of density and height. Staff explained that Catlin Street is currently zoned commercial under Title 20, allowing building heights of up to 125 feet. Johnson Street is currently zoned RM1-45, with height limits more comparable to U-R4 but residential density closer to U-R3.

VOTE

With no further discussion, the board voted by roll call, and the motion passed 7 to 1.

AYES: (7): Lynn Davis, Tung Pham, Josh Schroeder, Danny Oberweiser, Danny Tenenbaum, Rick Hall, Shane Morrissey

NAYS: (1): Derek Kanwisher

[Time stamp – 4:00:13]

Shane asked staff to reflect on a prior amendment increasing height limits in U-R3 districts and raised concerns about potential impacts on street parking and street trees when buildings exceed 30 feet and require fire ladder truck access. Cassie referenced prior staff amendments that reduced allowable heights on narrow blocks in the Lower Rattlesnake and Northside due to fire access requirements. Aaron explained that once buildings exceed approximately 30 feet, fire access requirements begin to significantly affect right-of-way width and building placement. Nathan added that fire access and tree placement conflicts are typically addressed on a case-by-case basis and sometimes results in smaller trees being planted in the right-of-way or the removal of existing mature trees. Lynn questioned whether staff had verified that street widths in Westside U-R4 areas are appropriate to support taller building heights, similar to the Northside. Cassie explained that while the City does not maintain a full map layer of actual paved street widths, staff relied on right-of-way widths and staff knowledge from locations where similar issues have appeared. Aaron added that where right-of-way width exists but the type of fire apparatus isn't sufficient, development would typically trigger right-of-way improvements as part of the project, with fire access needs addressed through case-by-case negotiation involving street design, parking, trees, and access points. Shane stated his concern that allowing taller buildings on smaller lots could potentially create fire access issues, and wanted ensure that the fire department reviewed proposed heights and street condition changes to address any problems in advance. Eran clarified that decisions regarding building heights, zoning districts, and final mapping were developed collaboratively with the fire department. Staff confirmed that the fire department will continue to review all Planning Board-recommended amendments and provide guidance to City Council on any access or safety concerns.

12. Land Use Plan *[Time stamp – 4:16:05]*

STAFF RECOMMENDED MOTION

Rick Hall made the following motion to approve the request, and Danny Oberweiser seconded the motion:

That the Planning Commission resolves to recommend that the City Council adopt amendments to the Our Missoula 2045 Land Use Plan and Place Types Map (Attachment 1), based on the information and considerations in the staff report and the recommended amendments of the Planning Commission.

VOTE

With no further discussion, the board voted by roll call, and the motion passed unanimously.

AYES: (8): Lynn Davis, Derek Kanwisher, Tung Pham, Danny Tenenbaum, Josh Schroeder, Danny Oberweiser, Rick Hall, Shane Morrissey

NAYS: (0)

13. UDC [Time stamp – 4:20:54]

STAFF RECOMMENDED MOTION

Danny Tenenbaum made the following motion to approve the request, and Tung Pham seconded the motion:

That the Planning Commission recommends the 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 in 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 and the recommended amendments of the Planning Commission.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Planning Board members expressed appreciation for staff's dedication and the effort behind the UDC, Zoning Map, and Land Use Plan update. While noting that additional work remains as the process moves forward to City Council, members emphasized that the Code Reform update represents an important step toward aligning Missoula's zoning with its adopted growth policies and future needs, reducing the need for ongoing rezoning requests and better supporting long-term growth. Members highlighted that the process promotes infill development, makes better use of existing infrastructure, and removes barriers to housing. They also stressed the importance of the Planning Board's amendments, noting that many were informed by input from the development community, landscape architects, and the public, and should be taken seriously as the project moves ahead. Members further emphasized that as the City encourages infill and development near existing infrastructure, we don't sacrifice Missoula's unique natural amenities, including waterways, streams, and rivers, and expressed interest in the upcoming updates to the City's riparian regulations. The discussion concluded with the hope that the Code will remain a living document that continues to evolve over time.

VOTE

With no further discussion, the board voted by roll call, and the motion passed unanimously.

AYES: (8) Lynn Davis, Derek Kanwisher, Tung Pham, Danny Tenenbaum, Josh Schroeder, Danny Oberweiser, Rick Hall, Shane Morrissey

NAYS: (0)

14. Zoning Map [Time stamp – 4:34:00]

STAFF RECOMMENDED MOTION

Rick Hall made the following motion to approve the request, and Danny Oberweiser seconded the motion:

That the Planning Commission recommends the 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 and the recommended amendments of the Planning Commission.

VOTE

With no further discussion, the board voted by roll call, and the motion passed 7 to 1.

AYES: (7) Lynn Davis, Derek Kanwisher, Tung Pham, Danny Tenenbaum, Josh Schroeder, Danny Oberweiser, Rick Hall

NAYS: (1) Shane Morrissey

VII. COMMUNICATIONS & SPECIAL PRESENTATIONS [Time stamp – 4:35:33]

There were no communications or special presentations.

VIII. COMMITTEE REPORTS [Time stamp – 4:35:38]

No committee reports were reported.

IX. OLD BUSINESS [Time stamp – 4:35:42]

No old business was reported.

X. NEW BUSINESS [Time stamp – 4:35:51]

No new business was reported

XI. COMMENTS FROM BOARD MEMBERS [Time stamp – 4:35:57]

Shane thanked fellow Planning Board members for the significant time and effort devoted to the process of the UDC, Zoning Map, and Land Use Plan. He also thanked City staff and the public for their dedication and participation.

XII. ADJOURNMENT [Time stamp – 4:38:51]

The meeting was adjourned at 10:38 p.m.

Missoula Consolidated Planning Board December 9, 2025 – Transcription

This transcription was produced by transcription software. There may be discrepancies between this transcription and meeting dialogue. You can view the recording of the meeting at this link:

<https://missoulacomt.portal.civicclerk.com/event/10227/media>