

Plat, Annexation and Zoning Committee Minutes

July 15, 2009

08:20 am – 12:00 pm

Missoula City Council Chambers, 140 W. Pine Street

Members Present: Bob Jaffe (Chair), Ed Childers, Lyn Hellegaard, John Hendrickson (10:00 an), Dick Haines, Marilyn Marler, Renee Mitchell, Stacy Rye, Dave Strohmaier, Pam Walzer, Jason Wiener, and Jon Wilkins.

Members Absent:

Others Present: Phil Condon, Mitch Doherty, David Edgell, Jamie Hoffmann, David Gray, Jen Gress, Ruth Link, David Loomis, Mary McCrea, Laval Means, Roger Millar, Ryan Morton, Jim Nugent, Olivia Riatta, Kate Suterland, Lewis YellowRobe, Tom Zavitz, and Shelley Oly

I. Approval of Minutes

[July 08, 2009](#) are approved.

II. Public Comment on Items not on the Agenda

III. Staff Announcements

IV. Consent Agenda Items

- A. Approve a phasing plan amendment for The Orchard Subdivision to change the phase 2 final plat submittal date to December 11, 2011 ([memo](#)).—Regular Agenda (Mitch Doherty) (Referred to committee: 07/13/09) (**REMOVE FROM AGENDA**)

MOTION: The Committee recommends City Council approve the proposed phasing plan amendment for The Orchard Subdivision in accordance with Article 4-7(2)(A-C) of the Missoula City Subdivision Regulation.

Mitch Doherty stated this was a request to amend the phasing plan for The Orchard Subdivision.

- ◀◀ This subdivision is located between South 3rd and South 7th Street, west of Hawthorne School.
- ◀◀ The subdivision was approved September 11, 2006 and a phasing plan was approved March 2008.
- ◀◀ Phase 1 has been filed already and applicant requested to change the Phase 2 submittal date from September 11, 2009 to December 11, 2011.
- ◀◀ The OPG staff recommends approval of this request to amend the phasing plan.

Ms. Rye asked the reason for the rephasing. Mr. Doherty explained it was due to the slow down in the housing market.

Ms. Rye made a motion to accept the new phasing plan and made note that this was approximately the ninth rephrasing done this year.

The motion to accept the new phasing plan was unanimous and would go on the Consent agenda.

V. Regular Agenda

- A. An [ordinance](#) repealing Title 19 Zoning Code in its entirety and adopting Title 20 Missoula City Zoning Ordinance and an [ordinance](#) repealing Title 2.84, the Historic Preservation Committee in its entirety. ([memo](#)) ([PAZ](#)) ([Staff Report](#)) ([Potential List of Issues](#)) —Regular Agenda (Laval Means) (Returned from Council floor: 06/22/09) (HELD IN COMMITTEE)

Mr. Weiner stated when he originally made the motion regarding the adoption of Title 20 he omitted to mention the items that needed to be repealed in addition to Title 19 which was Title 2.84 the Historic Preservation Ordinance. He would like to amend his motion to include the repeal of 2.84.

Laval Means stated at the last PAZ meeting she had described the differences between the building envelope (existing method of measurement) and the table top method. She showed various schematic diagrams to demonstrate the difference. She presented a [power point](#) demonstration that described the differences in hillside measurements for Title 20 versus Title 19.

- ✓ There are key revisions between Title 19 and the proposed Title 20.
- ✓ There was a change in the threshold of when hillside standard protection would be instituted from 10% to the proposed 15%.
- ✓ The point at which the slope remains non buildable is the same in both documents.
- ✓ New criteria for site analysis.
- ✓ New grading limits.
- ✓ Additional retaining wall standards.
- ✓ New height limits and measurements.
- ✓ Revised wall element provision.

Ms. Marler asked for clarification on what happens when building on hillsides with a slope of 10-15%. Ms. Means replied the development on slopes of 10-15% would meet the current regulations for that district; the height would still be what was listed but would not be required to meet the additional hillside protection standards. Ms. Marler wondered why the threshold was changed from 10% to 15%. Ms. Means explained it was the consultant's recommendation. He noticed that nationwide the 10% threshold was a low threshold and it was common to see the threshold start at 15%. The proposed draft utilized the key issues that are most important in improving upon and restricting the way that the development occurs on the hillside.

She presented the [schematic models](#) that showed the difference between the building envelope and table top approach Title 20 described the height measurement from the lowest point, either the finished or existing grade whichever was lowest, up to the maximum building height by zone and then come straight across with everything needing to fit inside the envelope. Title 19 established an envelope straight up and measured parallel to the finished grade.

The floor was opened for discussion:

1) Mr. Childers asked how often builders approached the maximum height allowed in the R-1 zone. Ms. Means replied the three examples presented showed that the maximum height was close to the building height. Mr. Childers stated the lowering of the houses on the hillside may take away from the flexibility of the builders and asked if the builders would work with the table top measurement. She stated that one of the permits used the table top measurement. Ms. Marler shared the comments she had heard from architects was that this approach produced low, flat houses with no character. Ms. Means explained each of the examples, what zone district the examples were in, the maximum building height and slope measurement technique and showed the existing and proposed measurement method.

2) Mr. Strohmaier asked how the measurement would occur if the hillside height measurement standards did not apply. Ms. Means replied the measurement would go from the lowest point of

the finished or existing grade, then project up 30-feet for a 6 in 12 roof pitch, then with the table top measurement, measure straight across. She added, in the example of the project on an 11% slope there was still the need to redesign with the new measurement even though aspects of the hillside protection standards would not apply. Mr. Strohmaier wondered what would happen if the maximum building height would be 35-feet. Ms. Means pointed that utilizing a steeper pitched roof does gain the five extra feet with more flexibility or have a smaller footprint with less roof to cover. In the example of the project on an 11% slope, the 35-feet would still come straight across as a table top technique without the rest of the hillside standards as a part of it.

3) Chair Jaffe remarked that in order to make things fit because of the grade the hillside standards increase the building height instead of reducing the building height. Chair Jaffe asked if there was a basement does the measurement start at the bottom of the basement. Mr. Zavitz replied the measurement would start at the lowest point of the exposed foundation wall.

4) Ms. Rye asked if the pitch of the roof was greater in the last example if that would allow for more flexibility. Ms. Means replied it would allow for an additional five feet. She added some other options included a steeper driveway that would lower the house into the hill, create steps between the garage and the main house to create a separation and get the main part of the structure closer to the existing grade or reduce the size of the building to have this building fit within the table top method.

The floor was opened for public comment.

David Edgell stated the ways that Ms. Means explained to mitigate the various situations was very difficult to work with, cost more money, and made these homes less marketable. He explained this table top method is tending to down-design the home to make it fit within the building envelope. He felt there were a lot of issues that still needed more attention. Mr. Edgell added in all the examples it showed the measurement of the building height started at the finished grade and if the measurement was lower it would not work. He felt the phrase "whichever grade was lower" needed to be deleted.

David Gray stated he had read the new ordinance and pointed out there was no definition that said the measurement was from the part of the building that has habitable space where it is enclosed. The measurement was from existing or finished grade whichever was lower and according to the current text that is what was done now. Currently the measurement is with the existing grade. He stressed keeping the existing grade the lowest point and measure with the contours of the land.

Phil Condon stated he lived in a hillside house. He expressed one other method for mitigating the measurement would be to reorient the house depending on the lot. He noted that the expression 'table top' was a misnomer because it left the wrong impression. This is the building height measurement of Title 20, it is clear and easy to understand and apply. The measurement was from the highest point of the roof, to the lowest point where the building plane meets existing or finished grade whichever is lower. This approach does allow for height and flexibility. Title 19 was not that simple, for example, builders can redesign the grade or in their plans add up to 8-feet more of fill to the sides of the house right beneath where measurement of envelope is. The hillside design standards were to keep houses lower on the hillsides but it has worked just the opposite and Title 19 hillside design standards has resulted in flat ugly houses. Mr. Condon is concerned about the welfare of the City, looking from views down below looking up the slopes of the hills. He stated if a new measurement was instituted in the hillside area that only kicked in at a certain slope could be done in any zone in the City, he would like to see the Planning Board's involvement on this issue.

Kate Sutherland pointed out that one of the examples shown would not work and explained why. Currently, the dug out fill that was used to create a basement can be used to fill in around the outside of the house to raise the grade for a taller house. She suggested an option that was consistent for hillside communities; which is measure from the existing grade as surveyed and carry the existing grade straight up along the slope 30-feet. When the existing grade is used then false grades and fills can not be created. This formula is easier to enforce and the houses step down the hillside with the contour of the hillside and are attractive to look at. This method is challenging but simplified.

- 5) Chair Jaffe asked about the language of enclosed space pertaining to where the building line is established. Laval Means stated the description of building height measurement is found in the Measurement chapter 110 and refers to the building line. The definition of building line is found in Chapter 100 – Terminology and refers to an imaginary line representing the vertical projection (or plumb line) of an exterior building wall that encloses interior floor space.
- 6) Dave Strohmaier wanted to know if the consultants had recommended the table top method of measurement in other communities. Ms. Means replied there were various approaches to measuring height on hillside and each of them are very appropriate for that community.
- 7) Renee Mitchell asked if the Design Review Board (DRB) was consulted for the language in the proposed draft for this section. Laval Means replied that while the DRB was on a contact list to provide comments, the DRB was not asked to provide language for the hillside standard section, specifically.
- 8) Pam Walzer asked to have more visual examples during the height discussions. She also had concerns with the older sections of town that have the river bench issues and wanted to make sure they were acceptable. She thought an option would be to have the hillside standards for areas not located in the downtown area.
- 9) Marilyn Marler wondered when the method changed from the building envelope to the table top method at Planning Board when the architects and the citizen advisory committee proposed the building envelope method. Laval Means replied there was an addendum made to the February draft of the document where the consultant proposed the simplified, revised language for building height measurement technique and during the discussion with Planning Board Mr. Bishop clarified the standardized approach was the table top method.

Chair Jaffe mentioned that this was a fairly technical discussion. There are valid reasons for concern about the language. The language does create some restriction but the intent is to address the community value to reduce heights and sizes of homes on the hillsides. This discussion may need to be revisited and the OPG staff could present different options.

Many of the committee members voiced concerns about this discussion:

- ◀ Whichever protocol was used for measurement, make sure the method is clear, concise and consistent.
- ◀ A key issue would be looking up the hillside, using the relative height and not the absolute height.
- ◀ Allow homes to be built on the existing grade into the hillside.
- ◀ How is the grade measured?
- ◀ Measuring the end of the building where the roof ends rather than to the liveable space.
- ◀ The table top method was insufficient for measurement as the one size fits all solution. The envelope method was also insufficient because of the potentially tall effect on the uphill side of a structure.
- ◀ The envelope should be narrowed as it goes up the hill to protect the downhill views.
- ◀ Another option would be something that restricts the maximum height on the uphill side.
- ◀ Need concrete examples of other communities that have adopted one method or the other.

Ed Childers made a **motion** to use the existing grade, envelope method, and measure building from the end of the building and not the liveable space. Mr. Childers withdrew his motion and asked staff to figure out what was needed for the motion.

Laval Means stated language can be drafted and distributed for review and comment. One option would be to have a building envelope just for the hillside and use the existing grade or finished grade whichever was the lower point.

BED AND BREAKFAST

Dave Strohmaier requested that Blossom's Bed and Breakfast be used as an example for this discussion to see how well it fit with the proposed language.

Laval Means showed a [power point presentation](#) showing Blossom's Bed and Breakfast (B&B). She summarized saying this home was a remodel to a single dwelling home with a B&B. The owners went through the rezoning process, the prior zoning was R-1 and the owners applied for a PUD to be able to establish the (B&B). The approval of the PUD came with some conditions:

- ❖ Owner occupied single family residence.
- ❖ No more than four rented guest rooms.
- ❖ Requirement of six off street parking spaces.
- ❖ Requirements to comply with proposed building design, site plan, lighting and signage plans.

Ms. Means stated that under Title 20 the BB would not be treated as a prohibited use but as a conditional use in that zoning district. The maximum numbers of guest rooms would be restricted to four with four parking spaces, three bicycle spaces and the size of the sign would be reduced to 6 -10 square feet with no ground sign option. She added that there are some additional use specific standards that are a part Chapter 40, subsection 030 for bed and breakfasts. Within those sections there is some consistency with the conditions that were a part of the existing PUD for the Blossoms. She added there were a couple of check points:

- ✓ As a Conditional Use it would have to go through the review process.
- ✓ There are notification procedures and criteria.
- ✓ There are specific design standards that are part of Chapter 30.

The floor was opened for discussion:

- 1) Ms, Marler clarified that the B-1 zone is the neighborhood commercial zone which allows residences...She asked if the guest rooms would always be limited to four. Ms. Means replied R-1 zoning district was limited to four guest rooms. Other zones were limited to eight guest rooms.
- 2) Dave Strohmaier was fine with the bed and breakfast language.
- 3) Renee Mitchell asked what the rational was for allowing bed and breakfasts throughout the City. Laval Means replied this was not proposed as a permitted use but a conditional use. It was a use that fits in with the residential character. Chair Jaffe added that a bed and breakfast brought another option for guests to stay instead of a hotel. Bed and breakfasts serve people in the community and people that come into our community. Bed and breakfasts are an amenity to the neighborhood. Ms. Walzer added this was an option to restore beautiful older homes and not have the homes split up into apartments.
- 4) Lyn Hellegaard felt it was important to have the parking requirements but she had concerns that there were too many parking spaces which meant too much paved surface. Ms. Means stated that Title 20 required one parking space per two guest room and two parking spaces for the primary dwelling unit.

Pam Walzer made a **motion** to require two parking spaces for the single family use and one parking space per each rented room.

Lyn Hellegaard made an **amendment** to raise the maximum number of parking spaces in other R or B-1 districts to 10 spaces.

There was much discussion concerning the number of parking spaces allowed:

- ❖ Additional parking surfaces and adding additional parking spaces increased traffic and changes the character of the neighborhood.
- ❖ Could on-street parking count toward off-street parking requirements?
- ❖ Concerns with the access to the guest parking spaces.
- ❖ What are the dimensions of a parking space. Ms. Means answered the dimensions were 9.5-feet x 18-feet.

- ✧ It was felt that the amount of parking spaces provided inadequate area for yard and part of the attraction with bed and breakfasts was the landscaping. People can park on the streets. Streets are public right of way.
- ✧ Concern with amending the general requirement that applies to other zones and concern with the impact of raising the maximum parking spaces.

Laval Means responded if there was interest in off setting a specific standard that is in the parking regulations then it would be helpful to have an additional link under the bed and breakfast Use Specific Standards that stated a certain number of on-street parking spaces can count toward the off street requirement.

Renee Mitchell called for the question, it passed.

The amendment to raise the parking cap in the other R and B-1 from six to 10 parking spaces failed with 6 votes of 'aye' and 6 votes opposed. (Mr. Haines, Mr. Strohmaier, Mr. Wiener, Mr. Jaffe, Ms. Rye, and Ms. Marler).

The motion to require two parking spaces for the primary dwelling unit and one parking space per guest room carried with 7 votes of 'aye' and 5 votes opposed. (Mr, Strohmaier, Mr. Wiener, Ms. Rye, Ms. Walzer and Mr. Jaffe).

Laval Means went through the process for applying for a bed and breakfast:

- ✓ Applicant applies for a conditional use, staff reviews it and the application goes before the City Council.
- ✓ The use must meet use-specific standards from Chapter 20.40 and the review criteria for any conditional use from chapter 20.85.
- ✓ There is notification, posting and a public hearing to determine the outcome of the proposal.

Mr. Wilkins asked if there could be a right of protest during this process by the neighbors. Ms. Means replied this was not a rezone so there would be no right of protest but the neighbors could comment and those comments would be considered by the council.

There was discussion on enforcement on boarding houses instead of bed and breakfasts. Ms. Means stated there was a definition of a bed and breakfast under the lodging use specific classification in Chapter 105. She read that lodging was the "provision of lodging services on a temporary basis with incidental food, drink and other sales and services intended for the convenience of guests". Specifically the bed and breakfast is "a detached house in which the owner offers over night accommodations and meal service to guests for compensation."

5) Lyn Hellegaard asked how to enforce that a bed and breakfast does not become a boarding house. This question was raised because of the increased impact of additional cars and parking for that neighborhood. Mr. Loomis replied the difference was to determine whether the rooms were legally rented as a rental or a self supporting separate facility within the same structure that does not allow two self supporting living units. He replied that determination was difficult. There was no restriction in any district to rent out rooms if the house had one kitchen and separate bedrooms. The difference would be if there were two kitchens.

6) Mr. Haines asked if bed and breakfast needed a business license. Mr. Nugent replied that the City would require a business license. Mr. Haines wondered if the rental was operating like a bed and breakfast (without a license) if a daily fine could be issued. Mr. Nugent stated that if the City had a license requirement for the bed and breakfast then this was already covered.

Jon Wilkins made a **motion** to restrict the bed and breakfast to have only one kitchen.

There was discussion on Mr. Wilkins motion to restrict the bed and breakfast to one kitchen.

- Trying to solve a problem that does not exist.
- This motion was a preventative motion.

- Ms. Rye called for the question, it failed.
- This motion was unnecessary because a family might have a smaller kitchen separate from the commercial kitchen required to meet health codes.
- Language could be added to state rented rooms can not offer kitchen amenities.
- Ms. Marler felt there were regulations that prevented this issue and called for the question, it passed.

The **motion** to restrict bed and breakfasts to one kitchen failed with 5 votes of 'aye' and 7 votes opposed. (Mr. Haines, Mr. Jaffe, Ms. Rye, Ms. Walzer, Mr. Wiener, Mr. Strohmaier and Ms. Marler)

Jason Wiener **made** a motion to add a regulation to 20.40.030 Bed and Breakfast use standards stating that off street parking requirements may be reduced by one space for every 36-feet of frontage (half of the on-street area adjacent to the bed and breakfast). The governing body **may** reduce the off street parking requirements during a conditional use hearing.

There was discussion on Mr. Wiener's motion:

- ◀ On street parking can not be a privilege for a single establishment and not for everyone else that lives on that street.
- ◀ Mr. Childers called for the question because the issue of on-street and off street parking had already been dealt with, it carried.

The **motion** to add a regulation to 20.40.030 Bed and Breakfast use standards stating that required off street parking may be reduced by one space for every 36-feet of adjacent street frontage failed with 6 votes of 'aye' and 6 votes opposed (Mr. Hendrickson, Mr. Wilkins, Ms. Hellegaard, Mr. Haines, Ms. Mitchell and Mr. Childers)

John Hendrickson wanted to know if the bed and breakfast could be created even if the neighborhood objected to it. Ms. Means replied that it would be a decision for the City Council and the neighbors that objected could comment to City Council. Chair Jaffe asked if language could be inserted that created a protest for this conditional use. Mr. Nugent replied the City Council could propose a protest provision for the conditional use, it would not be governed by state law, but it could be done.

John Hendrickson offered an **amendment** in the bed and breakfast conditional use process that a super majority vote can be triggered by a protest of 25 % of the property owners within 150-feet of the project.

There was discussion on Mr. Hendrickson's amendment.

- ① The neighbors wanted the Blossom's bed and breakfast in their area and there were no complaints.
- ① Seems like this body is tying the hands of future council members to carry out a conditional use.
- ① Right of protest is an important step.
- ① There is a difference between right of protest and protesting via comments.
- ① Having a right of protest means it would be harder for the project to fail.
- ① Would there be extra notification requirements.
- ① What is the increase level of commitment for the City and for OPG.
- ① The project already required a notice and a posting so the additional cost was on the applicant. Ms. Means added the counting of protest and reporting on the protest piece is the new aspect. For all public hearing whether it is can be protested or not, the newspaper notice would still have to be done, and certified mail to the surrounding property owners are still the same.
- ① John Hendrickson called for the question, it carried.

The floor was opened for public comment:

Ryan Morton was concerned that conditional use has gone from Design Review Board to Planning Board to City Council and now as a rezone in this particular instance. He stated that conditional use should mean something and if the idea of a bed and breakfast is uncomfortable it should be taken out of the conditional use and made a zoning overlay.

The motion to add the right of protest provision carried with 7 votes of 'aye' and 4 votes opposed. (Mr. Strohmaier, Ms. Rye, Mr. Wiener, and Mr. Jaffe)

Dave Strohmaier stated it would be worth discussing the impacts of other conditional uses such as religious assembly and schools at another time. Mr. Nugent noted that under the conditional uses, page 20.05-3 stated that schools and government agencies are listed as conditional yet they have a right to be anywhere and it does not matter if they are listed as permitted uses they are government entities and not subject to zoning. The same concern would be directed to major utilities as well. Chair Jaffe suggested working out questions regarding the other uses listed as conditional with staff and see if they may be addressed as staff recommended revisions.

ADMINISTRATIVE ADJUSTMENTS

Laval Means presented a [power point](#) on Administrative Adjustments and explained this was a new procedure being proposed to address minor deviances currently requiring an approved variance from the City Board of Adjustment (CiBOA) where fees must be assessed and it could be at least a two month process to find a resolution for that request. The tool provided by the consultant is limited to very minor forms of deviations including a few situations as the pedestrian overlay that has not been applied yet, reductions for bike parking, reduction in parking for transit served locations, for expansions of non conforming uses in an existing building, and for minor parcel area adjustments of 5% or less. There is a requirement for notification to surrounding property owners a 20-day waiting period before a decision can be made. At any point the staff person can send this on to the CiBOA and it is appealable.

Chair Jaffe asked if the appeal process could be detailed. Laval Means stated it was the same appeal process as for administrative decisions. Any person who has been aggrieved by a decision could request an appeal then work with staff to fill out a form. Be scheduled for the CiBOA and then go before the CiBOA. Chair Jaffe asked if the term aggrieved could be applied to persons out of the City of Missoula's jurisdiction. Mr. Nugent replied that the term aggrieved was limited to someone within the City of Missoula's jurisdiction, any aggrieved taxpayer with the City of Missoula.

Renee Mitchell made a **motion** to postpone review of the Administrative Adjustment section until after the committee has taken into consideration the points that are specifically referenced in the administrative adjustment section. The Committee agreed to postpone discussion of this section until all other issues related to administrative adjustments have been reviewed.

HOME OCCUPATION

Laval Means presented a [power point](#) and explained this was a use that was already addressed and allowed in the existing ordinance. It is currently called Residential Accessory Use and there are no limitations on the number of employees or customers that can be at or use the site. Home Occupation is described in Title 20 in Chapter 45, Accessory Uses and Structures, and there are additional standards to address non-resident persons and the number of customers on the site.

The floor was opened for discussion:

1) Chair Jaffe wanted to make sure medical uses such as counseling offices did not fall under the reference of prohibited uses. . He wanted to know if the language could address more than one person at a time for clients and for the restriction of the employees.

2) Pam Walzer appreciated the need to control the number of parking spaces that home businesses utilize. Ms. Walzer felt that home business were a safety feature, or a protection for the neighborhood because someone was at home all the time during the day.

Ms. Walzer offered an **amendment** to #8 under E-Standards on page 20.45-4 that dealt with hazardous substances. She wanted to delete the last portion of the paragraph defining consumer quantities. .

There was discussion on Ms. Walzer's amendment:

- It was clarified that hazardous substances are prohibited except that consumer quantities are allowed.
- What if someone had a home based landscaped business, that person may have more than a consumer amount.
- Ms. Walzer suggested to strike standard #8 completely.
- What are consumer quantities?
- The motion was dropped.

Mr. Haines wanted to clarify that point #7 meant a non-resident employee person. Chair Jaffe agreed it was an employee of the business whether paid or not. Ms. Means stated it was intended to refer to a person working there whether, an associate, partner, employee, or volunteer.

Chair Jaffe asked if there was a restriction on the number of customers. Ms. Means replied that point #13 (J) under prohibitions stated any business in which more than two customers are present at any one time.

Renee Mitchell asked if the home occupation chapter allowed for a home business that included trucks with trailers to be parked on the residential street during the time when they were not in use. Ms. Means replied the standard No. #11 addressed trucks and commercial vehicles and they were not permitted. Mr. Nugent added trucks were defined in the truck route under Motor Vehicle Regulations. Ms. Means replied she would work on clarification of trucks and trailers because this was getting into the storage aspect.

There will be no special meeting next Tuesday July 21st but there would be the regular PAZ meeting on Wednesday, July 22, 2009. Home occupation will be discussed again on July 22nd.

Removed from the Agenda

VI. Held in Committee or Ongoing in Committee

1. Annexation. (see separate list at City Clerk's Office for pending annexations) (Ongoing in Committee)
2. Update the Rattlesnake Valley Comprehensive Plan Amendment ([memo](#)).—Regular Agenda (Dave Strohmaier) (Referred to committee: 04/02/07)
3. Discuss council's interest in pursuing a negotiated settlement over disputed trail conditions for Clark Fork Terrace No. 2 Subdivision ([memo](#)).—Regular Agenda (Mayor Engen/Jim Nugent) (Referred to committee: 02/25/08)
4. Request to rezone the property legally described as Lot 3 of Scott Street Lots Subdivision, located in Section 16, T13N, R19W, P.M.M. form D (Industrial) to I-1 (Light Industrial), based on the finding of fact and conclusions of law. (PAZ [05/21/08](#)) (Returned from Council floor: 6/2/08)
5. Correct the conflict in the height calculation regulations, between written language (a building envelope shall be established by showing the maximum vertical height allowed by zoning from finished grade) and the drawing on [page 151](#) of the [Zoning Ordinance](#).-- Regular Agenda (Ed Childers) (Referred to committee: 3/27/06)
6. Ongoing discussion of City planning issues with members of the Planning Board.-- Regular Agenda (Bob Jaffe) (Referred to committee: 3/20/06)

7. Discussion on assuring the currency of growth policy amendments ([memo](#))—Regular Agenda (Dave Strohmaier) (Referred to committee: 09/08/08)
8. Consider an interim emergency ordinance for proposed amendments to the City Zoning Ordinance, Chapter 19.90 Signs ([memo](#)).—Regular Agenda (Tom Zavitz) (Referred to committee: 12/15/08)
9. Consolidated Public Review Draft of the Missoula City Zoning Ordinance submitted by Duncan Associates to the Missoula Consolidate Planning Board for its review and recommendation ([memo](#)).—Regular Agenda (Roger Millar) (Referred to committee: 02/09/09)
10. Discussion of OPG's [task list](#) and workload ([Urban Initiatives work plan](#)).—Regular Agenda (Mike Barton) (Referred to committee: 06/12/06)
11. Develop policies and procedures regarding ag land mitigation ([memo](#)).—Regular Agenda (Lyn Hellegaard) (Referred to committee: 06/01/09)
12. [Petition 9432](#)—Knife River; 4800 Wilkie; A portion of Tract 1-A, COS 4971, located in and being a portion of the Northwest Quarter of Section 6, Township 13 North, Range 19 West, P.M.M; Petition for Annexation (Referred to committee: 07/13/09)
13. Confirm the re-appointments of Lee Clemmensen, Joe Easton and Jeff Rolston-Clemmer City Board of Adjustment for a term commencing immediately and ending June 30, 2012 ([memo](#)).—Regular Agenda (Mayor Engen) (Referred to committee: 07/13/09)

VIII. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 12:00 pm

Respectfully Submitted,

Shelley Oly

Administrative Secretary
Office of Planning and Grants

The recording of these minutes is available in the City Clerk's Office (for up to three months after approval of minutes). These minutes are summary and not verbatim.