

## DRT CORE GROUP MEETING NOTES / PRE-APPLICATION MEETING NOTES

---

<b>Project (working) name:</b>	Aspire East Missoula Annexation and Subdivision
<b>Project type:</b>	Annexation, zoning, and subdivision
<b>Lead reviewer(s):</b>	Dave DeGrandpre, Alex Eidam
<b>DRT date(s):</b>	May 27 <sup>th</sup> and June 3 <sup>rd</sup> , 2021, and November 10 <sup>th</sup> , 2022
<b>Pre-application meeting date:</b>	November 16 <sup>th</sup> , 2022

---

**NOTE: These notes supplement the scoping and pre-application notes dated February 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2021 and June 8<sup>th</sup>, 2021, respectively.**

### General

Pre-application preliminary plat shows 173 single dwelling lots and 1 multi-dwelling lot containing a mix of 5-, 8-, and 10-plexes on 31.52 acres with a mixture of single-family lots and multi-family.

### Annexation

Submit a petition for annexation.

### Growth Policy and Zoning

Current Future Land Use Map designation - Residential Medium Density (3 to 11 dwelling units per acre)

Zoning districts that 'relate' with the Residential Medium Density – RT10 Residential (two-unit/townhouse), R8 Residential, R5.4 Residential, and RT5.4 Residential (two-unit/townhouse).

- RT5.4 Residential (two-unit/townhouse) should work for the single-family lots.

### Zoning Options

1. Subdivision exemption for boundary line relocation through the County to separate the multi-dwelling lots. Annexation, zoning upon annexation, targeted Growth Policy Amendment (for the multi-family lot only), and subdivision. For multi-family building type, applicant would need a Future Land Use Map designation of Residential Medium-High. This is a targeted growth policy amendment – see amendment, public process, and criteria section of the growth policy starting on page 144. Zoning districts that 'relate' with the Residential High Density are RT2.7, RM2.7, RMH, and R3. RM2.7 would be the recommended as it allows for multi-dwelling building types.
2. Annexation, zoning upon annexation, Subdivision and apply a neighborhood character overlay to the multi-dwelling parcel for expansion of allowed building types.

**\*This is the route recommended by the City\***

### Lots and Blocks

Demonstrate that all lots can be developed as per the zoning setbacks.

Maximum block length is 480 feet as per the subdivision regulations Section 3-030.2 Several variances needed.

Each block length variance is a separate request:

1. Western lots (TH130 to TH173) variance to block length needed. The City would support approval with the condition that pedestrian access provided through the common area to Canyon View Park/Robinson Street.
2. Central block (TH106-118 & TH144-157) variance to block length needed. The City would support approval with the condition that pedestrian access provided through the center to break up the block.
3. Eastern lots (TH14-105) variance to block length needed. The City would support approval if the pedestrian accesses were shifted to not exceed 480 feet.

## **Parks and Trails**

Provide calculations and a plan to meet requirements. The central common area and river common area seem to meet city requirements/qualify, the two smaller common areas do not. The City will accept these areas as common areas to be HOA maintained. The City will not accept these as dedicated parkland. Cash-in-lieu likely not an option for this location as there are no City parks within ½ mile from the development. The proposed trail in the river common area to be built by the developer with a public access easement.

- Common area would have to have public access.
- Provide specifications for trail in accordance with the Public Works Standards and Specifications and the City Subdivision Regulations. Also contact Missoula Parks and Recreation.
- Provide parkland dedication calculations and a plan to meet the dedication requirements.
- Submit a preliminary street tree plan with the subdivision application.

## **Water and Sanitation**

Provide utility plan in application

### Water

- Existing 8" water main in Sommers Street – approximately 150' from the property
- Existing 6" water main in Montana Avenue – approximately 400' from the property – would require an easement or ROW to loop the system
- Existing 8" water main in Waterside Drive at northern boundary
- The City does not have sufficient water rights for the Canyon River well. We would request water rights be dedicated to the public if water rights exist for the property.
- Insufficient existing system capacity to provide fireflow to Canyon River. City is working on Special Facility District to fund improvements to East Missoula water system. Phase 1 would be upsizing a water main in Sommer's St. The water model shows when this section of water main is upsized it allows for the required fireflow in Canyon River.

### Sewer

- Based on currently available information, existing sewer infrastructure has capacity to serve Aspire without downstream upgrade.
- Existing 8" gravity main, 9'-13' deep on the western and northern boundary flowing east to the East Missoula Lift Station
- East Missoula lift station has sufficient capacity to serve the development.
- Maintenance road will need to be provided where the existing sewer is located outside of the proposed roads. This could be a minimum width alley to provide additional benefit for alley-loaded units and increasing on-street parking and reducing boulevard tree conflicts. Discussion from pre-app is to re-locate the sewer removing the requirement for a utility access road. Verify dedication of sanitary easement for release. 406 to confirm initial re-location design grade analysis for feasibility.
- Is there a plan to re-route any sewer main? Specifically lots TH 71-73? Discussion from pre-app – yes, they plan to re-route.

## **Legal Access, Roads and Driveways**

### Off-Site Roads

- Sommers Street (existing 50' ROW) - See City Subdivision Regulations Section 3-020.13 regarding offsite right-of-way and potential improvements. A variance may be required for ROW leading to the subdivision – please provide information on ROW widths and whether offsite road improvements are recommended in the TIS in consultation with surface engineering.
  - From TIS – developer to improve Sommers Street with parking and sidewalks from the property to Highway 200
  - Possible typical Section (35' TBC-TBC, 47' total improvements width) – both sides from centerline
    - i. 10' asphalt drive lane
    - ii. 5.5' asphalt parking lane (plus 1.5' gutter pan for 7' total width)

- iii. 2' concrete curb/gutter
- iv. 6' concrete curbside sidewalk, transition to 7' curbside where land use adjacent to Hwy 200 is commercial
- Recommended section from surface engineering - two 10' travel lanes, one 7' parking lane, curb & gutter both sides, one 10' SUP with 3' boulevard on one side, and one 6' curbside sidewalk on the other side. This cross-section would result in a 48.5' width. The remaining 1.5' of ROW width could be allocated to behind SUP/sidewalk or to the boulevard.
- Coordination with City, County, Developer to determine the road section, informed by the TIS, but consideration to existing constraints - parking, overhead power, limited ROW.
- Highway 200/Sommers St intersection
  - Impact to Sommers/Hwy 200 intersection: additional traffic may warrant increased signalization or improvements for vehicle and non-motorized safety. We will likely recommend additional improvements such as curb, gutter, pedestrian facilities, and realignment to create a 90 degree intersection, per the Hwy 200 corridor plan.
  - The City would be likely to require the developer to waive the right to protest formation of and participation in a street improvement district.
- Robinson Street (existing 50' ROW)
  - No existing curb/gutter, boulevard, sidewalk
  - Street connection would be very beneficial in reducing pressure on southern portion of Sommers Dr and providing a better (more comfortable, less volume) non-motorized route to/from development compared to Sommers St. It appears park impacts would be minimal with street connection and essentially what is an extension of the park with the new common area, but it would be better to at least have a sidewalk on the south/west side adjacent/thru the existing park. If we can't get the street connection to happen, sidewalk should continue through park to Robinson St pavement for better pedestrian connection, especially important if/when the school is reopened.
  - Recommend shared use path through common space through Canyon View Park to Robinson St, ideal for access to school.
- Waterside Drive (existing 54' ROW)
  - No off-site improvements anticipated by Aspire Subdivision. Updated TIS and agency comment might necessitate mitigation steps for new traffic.
  - No sidewalk on west side
  - County resolution adds a condition to the removal of the no-access strip to allow the reduction of this ROW. Need to ensure the proposed extension would work with the future section. Water's Edge Subdivision has contract sewer requiring the streets to be in compliance with City standards. Reducing the ROW would likely not be supported. From pre-app the discussions for removal of the no access strip revolved around:
    - i. 400 vpd limit through Water's Edge – traffic study to inform
    - ii. 300 units or less on the property
  - Tie in proposed subdivision road to existing
  - 29' TBC-TBC existing (east to west, 42' total improvements width)
    - i. 1' sidewalk maintenance area
    - ii. 5' concrete sidewalk
    - iii. 7' landscaped boulevard
    - iv. 2' concrete curb/gutter
    - v. 25' asphalt
    - vi. 2' concrete curb/gutter
    - vii. 12' remainder (future boulevard and sidewalk)

#### On-Site Roads

- The angle between roads at uncontrolled intersection should be between 75 and 90 degrees. Consider curb extensions at on-site road intersections where on street parking is present.

- Evaluate circulation plan to ensure planned pedestrian crossings won't be impacted by future driveways (primarily T-intersections).
- Evaluate circulation plan for mid-block crossings, likely routes to trail system, school, parks, and common areas.
- 50' ROW, local road
  - Typical Section (24' TBC-TBC, 50' total improvements width) – both sides from centerline
    - i. 10' asphalt drive lane
    - ii. 2' concrete curb/gutter
    - iii. 7' landscaped boulevard
    - iv. 5' concrete curbside sidewalk
    - v. 1' sidewalk maintenance area
- 62' ROW, local road
  - Typical Section (35' TBC-TBC, 61' total improvements width) – both sides from centerline
    - i. 10' asphalt drive lane
    - ii. 5.5' asphalt parking lane (plus 1.5' gutter pan for 7' total width)
      - 8' parking lane shown in proposed plans, 7' required
    - iii. 2' concrete curb/gutter
    - iv. 7' landscaped boulevard
    - v. 5' concrete sidewalk
    - vi. 1' sidewalk maintenance area
  - Variance needed to ROW width. City Staff would support this variance.
- Alley, 20' ROW
  - Provide typical section
  - Fire lane
  - 20' paved width for driveable surface (does not include L curb but can include cove gutter) – 26' required if buildings are over 30' in height
  - Construction considerations on south - is there enough room to construct the alley without impacting outside of the property into MDT ROW?

#### Driveways

- Access to the 38-foot wide townhome lots will be from the street, reducing street tree coverage. Shared driveways and consolidated services should be considered as much as possible to mitigate.
- Access to lots at T intersections (24, 74, 99, 11, for example) need to be configured so driveways are not located in intersection.
- Particularly with townhouses, there may be lots of driveways resulting in a parking lane that is not utilized, consider consolidating driveways and/or eliminating parking lane.
- P&R encourages a tree plan, at least conceptual to get ahead of the driveway and utility plans.
- With the lack of alleys, all of these lots are going to be front loaded and the trees are going to be a challenge.

#### Transit

- Need to provide pedestrian access to transit stops at Sommers/Speedway intersection. TIS may warrant traffic improvements at this location.

#### Traffic Impact Study

- TIS provided dtd June, 2022
- Pre-meeting with surface engineering was not held. The site meeting was not sufficient to discuss the complete scope of the TIS.
- There are a lot of significant errors and questions we have with this study, and we would recommend not moving this development forward until the TIS is revised.
- Wavetop comments, detailed comments are in the TIS.
- No mention of Speedway bus route.

- No analysis or discussion for pedestrian and bicycle volumes and safety considerations.
- Complete signalization warrant analysis for Speedway/Highway 200
- Study 4-way stop at Sommers/Speedway. Acceptable LOS needs to be maintained for Speedway transit route
- Speedway is also a bus route, so acceptable operations should be maintained for transit reliability. I'd like to consider an urban mini roundabout for this intersection for bus operations, and collector/collector intersection safety.

### **Grading and Drainage**

Submittal packet should include Grading & Drainage plan & report in compliance with Section 5-020.11.

As per Subdivision Regulations 3-040.2, applicant shall prepare a storm water drainage and management plan and SWPP Plan per the submittal requirements in Section 5-020.11 of the subdivision regulations. Include calculations for the 100-year 24-hour storm as required by the Storm Water Utility regulations.

All storm water shall be retained on-site at pre-development levels.

- Dry wells likely sufficient for stormwater requirements
- No reason to suspect that groundwater elevations will be impacted by the stormwater infiltration, so a groundwater assessment is not needed.
- Nearby well logs show adequate separation between the infiltration facility and groundwater but if during the digging of the test pits there is evidence of groundwater then we would want to see groundwater monitoring.

### **Fire Protection**

- More than one entrance/exit to the development is necessary depending on unit types and phasing plan.
- Hydrants plan would have to be reviewed and approved.
- Alleys for multi-family will need to meet fire requirements for swept path, fire lane widths, and named/addressed.

### **Floodplain**

Show the mapped floodway and floodplain adjacent to and on the property.

### **Revegetation & Weed Management**

Revegetation plan will be required, and should be provided and signed by the Missoula County Weed Board representative. A Weed Management plan is also required and should be included in the development covenants or other HOA docs. The weed management plan should include a vegetation map and address current weeds on the site. The plan should specify that weed management is the obligation of the developer for all undeveloped portions of the site with weed management transferring to the lot owners once lots are sold. Both the revegetation plan and weed management plan should require revegetation with beneficial species at the first appropriate opportunity after disturbance occurs.

### **Riparian Resource Plan**

Please submit a Riparian Resource Plan in compliance with City Subdivision Regulations Section 3-130.

### **Channel Migration Zone Study**

A channel migration study was conducted for this section of the Clark Fork River which shows a portion of the property in an 'Erosion Hazard Area.' Address this issue and any potential mitigation measures in the subdivision application.

### **Other General Comments**

- City strongly recommends the incorporation of alleys wherever and whenever possible. Vehicular access from the alleys reduces the amount of curb cuts along the ROW, reduces the number of vehicle/pedestrian encounters along the sidewalks, increases the number of on street parking spaces, and increases the available space for street trees within the boulevard. City asks that the developer consider incorporating alleys into the design.
- Can we have a condition of approval to participate in County RSID or City SID for improvements to Sommers (and other intersections warranted by the TIS?)
- Provide a name for all roads and alleys, even if Road A, Alley A, etc.
- Lot numbering: remove TH from lot labels
- Think about the 'social equity/environmental justice' issue of placing the multi-dwellings up against the interstate. Development should consider a noise barrier between proposed multi-family housing and interstate. They are awfully close, and it will be especially loud for upper levels "overlooking" the interstate. This is likely to come up during public review so the developer should be ready to address. Perhaps a landscape buffer/common area along the boundary would help.
- TIS: A new/updated TIS is needed. Coordinate with Public Works & Mobility staff Ryan Guelff, Kevin Slovarp, and Steve Reichert for requirements. The TIS should address vehicular and pedestrian / bike travel and improvements in addition to motor vehicle travel. Offsite improvements may be required.
- Confirm project area size. Different acreages called out in different locations. Need to get the exact size, correct the discrepancies, then keep it consistent.

### **Neighborhood Meeting Requirement**

A neighborhood meeting is required. Section 4-010.2 of the subdivision regulations includes requirements for the neighborhood meeting. Be sure to allow for enough time for posting meeting notices regarding the project within 300 feet of the property, mailing meeting notices at least 15 days in advance to residents within 300 feet, City Council Ward 1 representatives Jennifer Savage & Heidi West, the case planners at Development Services, and the Marshall Canyon Neighborhood Council.

The submittal packet shall include the mailing list, any written comments from the neighborhood organizations and individuals received, sign-in sheet for attendance at the meeting and minutes from the meeting detailing comments and suggestions regarding the project.



## COMMUNITY PLANNING, DEVELOPMENT & INNOVATION

### Development Services Division

435 RYMAN | MISSOULA, MT 59802-4297 | 406.552.6630 | FAX 406.552.6053

May 16<sup>th</sup>, 2023

Brian Throckmorton  
406 Engineering, Inc.  
1201 S 6<sup>th</sup> Street W, #102  
Missoula, MT 59801

### **Re: Aspire Annexation and Subdivision – 182 Lot Major**

Dear Brian Throckmorton,

Development Services received your application packet for the above subdivision for *1<sup>st</sup> Element Review* on May 9<sup>th</sup>, 2023. The element review deadline is May 16<sup>th</sup>, 2023. **At this time, Development Services cannot certify your application packet as containing all the necessary elements.**

Please address the items listed below. Once these items have been addressed, please submit a second Element Review packet with a new cover page clearly titled as *2<sup>nd</sup> Element Review*, and include the date submitted. In lieu of a CD, please provide the *2<sup>nd</sup> Element Review* materials on a USB drive or provide a link for downloading the application materials.

#### **General**

Provide all the information required under City Subdivision regulations Article 5, Sections 5-010 and 5-020 and provide answers to all questions consistently from one section to the next, and address all applicable subdivision design standards in Article 3 of the City Subdivision regulations. Please include the following items:

1. Throughout the subdivision application there are multiple items where the provided answer is either n/a, yes, no, or one sentence statements with no reference(s) pertaining to how the answer was established. Please go back through these items of the application and add more information, narrative, description, citation, maps, etc. to expand on the answers, to provide context and sources.

One example to illustrate the point: In the impact on agricultural water user facilities under abandonment or transfer of water rights section starting on page 9, the answer states 'No' to the posed question of abandonment or transfer of water rights from the property. How did you reach this conclusion? Were there maps or title report used to verify no water rights existed? Answers to questions on the application require clear, verifiable answers based on credible, documentable sources.

2. Throughout the subdivision application some responses are bolded, and others are not. Please choose one option and keep it consistent throughout the application.
3. The Neighborhood Character Overlay is a zoning map amendment and needs to be accompanied by the City Rezoning Application, enclosed.
4. The annexation request for these properties needs to be accompanied by an annexation petition, enclosed. In addition to a digital version, please submit an original hard copy signed by all property owners.

5. Per Article 5-020.2 Ownership, certification that the applicant is also the owner of the property or, if the applicant is not the owner, certification that the owner is in concurrence with the subdivision application. County Property GIS Information indicates RCS LLC as the owner of Parcel A of COS 6338. I haven't been able to locate any deeds or other document to indicate a change in ownership. Please address this in the application, subject to the above referenced City Subdivision Regulation.
6. Please see total fee breakdown below:
 

\$11,591.31 (base fee)  
 + \$13,437.06 (182 x \$73.83/lot)  
 + \$4,387.00 (annexation >1 acre)  
 + \$5,322.00 (\$887/variance – 6 total)  
 + \$6,893.00 (zoning amendment)  
+ \$2,033.00 (phased development review)  
 \$43,663.37 (total plus APO letters)  
**+ \$9/APO letter – need to know the number of APO certified mail letters.**
- Per Article 4-030.3.B notification of the subdivision via certified mail is required to be given to the subdivider, each property owner of record whose property is immediately adjoining the land included in the preliminary plat, and each purchaser under contract for deed of property immediately adjoining the land included in the preliminary plat. The Adjacent Property Owner list provides a larger buffer than what the subdivision regulations require. This is no problem; however, it does affect the fee for the application submittal. Please indicate on the next submittal how many APO letters are needed to meet the requirements and we will calculate the fee based on that number.
- There are only six variances needed for this subdivision, not seven. So the fee provided is larger than it needs to be. Once we determine the number of APO letters, we can confirm the fee.
7. Article 3-020.12.A states, "New streets that will align with existing streets must have the same name as the existing street". The main access to this subdivision is from Sommers Street to the southwestern portion of the property. However, once this street hits this subdivision, it becomes Bent Branch Road. Please correct in order to comply with the City Subdivision Regulations.

### **Subdivision Application**

Provide all applicable information required under City Subdivision regulations Article 5, Section 5-020 while addressing all applicable subdivision design standards in Article 3 of the City Subdivision regulations. Include the following items:

1. Section D.1, insert the table below:

	Zoning	Current Land Use
Adjacent (North)	Water's Edge Special Zoning District, R Residential	Detached houses
Adjacent (South)	R Residential	Right-of-way
Adjacent (East)	Resource and Open Land	River
Adjacent (West)	R Residential	Detached houses

2. Section D.2.a, the zoning indicated is incorrect. Please update and include the full zoning district name. Additionally, when you reference the existing zoning district, here is what to call it: R Residential. Similarly, when you reference the proposed zoning district, here is what to call it: RT5.4 Residential (two-unit/townhouse).
3. Section D.2.b, state on the application where this information can be found in the packet.
4. Section D.2.c, state on the application where this information can be found in the packet.
5. Section D.2.d, include a narrative describing how the project complies with the existing zoning district, or in this case, the proposed zoning district.
6. Section D.8, include a narrative describing how the project complies with the land use designation and the goals and policies of the Growth Policy.
7. Section F.1.b, indicate which lots and which improvements will occur in each phase.
8. Section F.1.d, indicate the amount of parkland dedication required for each phase and the amount provided for each phase.
9. Section F.1.e, the phasing plan doesn't have a Phase 4 indicated on the plan itself. Please correct the inconsistency.
10. Section I, an attachment labeled "Neighborhood Comment and Response", no responses were outlined, only the comments received from the meeting. Please provide the responses.
11. Section J.1 through J.7, state on the application where this information can be found in the packet.
12. Section K.3.b.1, state on the application where this information can be found in the packet.
13. Sections K.3.e.ii, v, and vi, indicating "No" or "N/A" but not providing detail to demonstrate how you know. Please provide additional information. Based on correspondence with the Conservation District, a 310 Permit is required at a minimum.
14. Section K.3.f, Article 3-130 requires a Riparian Management Plan. Please review the intent of these regulations outlined in 3-130.1.C and address the riparian management plan criteria outlined in 3-130.3. We recommend getting input from the Missoula Conservation District and the U.S Fish and Wildlife Service or Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks to help establish these parameters. Sample Riparian Management Plan enclosed for reference.
15. Section K.3.g, Stormwater report is missing the appendices but there are additional documents included in the section; however, they don't match up with the appendices listed in the stormwater report. Please correct the inconsistencies.
16. Section K.4.c, stating "N/A" but how do you know. Please provide the map to demonstrate there is no impact.
17. Section K.6.a, Traffic Impact Study is referenced to Section L. The TIS is missing a cover with the engineer who prepared the report, a table of contents, and the appendices:
  - a) Traffic data
  - b) Traffic model
  - c) LOS calculations
18. Section K.6.f.i, update the table to demonstrate the distance of City Fire protection distance to the subdivision.

## **Road Construction Plans**

1. Doesn't show the off-site improvements to Sommers Street in plan view and doesn't say which of the two typical sections are used at which stations.

## **Preliminary Plat**

Provide all applicable information required under City Subdivision regulations Article 5, Section 5-010 and applicable preliminary plat supplements under Article 5, Section 5-020 while addressing all applicable subdivision design standards in Article 3 of the City Subdivision regulations. Include the following items:

1. Please identify the block lengths for all blocks throughout the subdivision.
2. Call out the distances between pedestrian connections for lots 32-26, lots 37-44, and lots 66-77.
3. Show contour lines at intervals of 2 feet where the average slope of the subdivision is less than ten (10) percent slope and at intervals of 5 feet where the average slope of the subdivision is ten (10) percent or greater.
4. Call out alley pavement width to ensure compliance with Article 3-020.10.B of the City Subdivision Regulations.
5. There appear to be double easements along the frontage of lots 32-36 and lots 26-30, however, it is unclear if that is true and what these easements may be for. Please clarify.
6. The eastern boundary dimension for lot 52 is 20.03 feet which doesn't seem correct based on the scale. Similarly, the western boundary dimension for lot 143 is 20.73 feet, which also doesn't seem correct based on the scale. These are more sufficiency related items, but wanted to point them out now since I noticed.

## **Variances**

Calling out seven variances total when there are only six required. Outlined below are the six variances being requested through this project. Please update the variance request document to outline, describe, and address these six variances from Article 3. Additionally, correct any discrepancies with the wrong Article reference (i.e. 3-020, not 3.020).

1. Variance request #1 for Low Density Urban Local Streets with a 62-foot-wide right-of-way needs to include all the below referenced subdivision standards that are not being met:
  - 3-020.2.B All public and private street and road improvements, including pavement, curbs, sidewalks, bike facilities, and drainage must be in accordance with the Missoula City Public Works Standards and Specifications and standards prescribed in Table .2A. Where the specifications or standards conflict with other regulations, the regulations of 3-020 apply.
  - 3-020 Table .2A Right-of-way minimum width and street width.
  - 3-020.3.C Public street and road rights-of-way must meet the standards in Table .2A.
2. Variance request #2 for Low Density Urban Local Streets with a 50-foot-wide right-of-way needs to include all the below referenced subdivision standards that are not being met:
  - 3-020.2.B All public and private street and road improvements, including pavement, curbs, sidewalks, bike facilities, and drainage must be in accordance with the Missoula City Public Works Standards and Specifications and standards prescribed in Table .2A. Where the specifications or standards conflict with other regulations, the regulations of 3-020 apply.

- 3-020 Table .2A Right-of-way minimum width and street width.
- 3-020.3.C Public street and road rights-of-way must meet the standards in Table .2A.
- 3-020.4.N a parking lane is required on both sides of local residential streets and cul-de-sacs.

3. Variance Request #3 Aspire Loop, need to correct the subdivision regulation reference as noted below:

- 3-020 Table .2A Right-of-way sidewalk

4. Variance Request #4 Bent Branch Road block length, needs to include the below referenced subdivision standard that is not being met:

- 3-030.2.A(2) Blocks may not exceed a maximum length of 480 feet. Need to correct the referenced City Subdivision Regulation.
- The City would support approval of this variance with the condition that pedestrian access is provided through the common area to Canyon View Park/Robinson Street.

5. Variance Request #5 Crosscut Way block length, needs to include the below referenced subdivision standard that is not being met:

- 3-030.2.A(2) Blocks may not exceed a maximum length of 480 feet.
- The City would support approval of this variance with the condition that pedestrian access be provided through the center to break up the block.

6. Variance Request #6 Waterside Drive block length, needs to include the below referenced subdivision standard that is not being met:

- 3-030.2.A(2) Blocks may not exceed a maximum length of 480 feet.
- The City would support approval of this variance if the pedestrian accesses were shifted to not exceed 480 feet.

If you have additional questions, you may reach me at 552-6052 or email me at [bramlettea@ci.missoula.mt.us](mailto:bramlettea@ci.missoula.mt.us).

Sincerely,

*Alex Bramlette*

Alex Bramlette, Senior Planner  
Community Planning, Development, and Innovation

encl: City Rezoning Application  
Annexation Petition  
Riparian Management Plan Sample  
cc: Mary McCrea, CPDI  
Dave DeGrandpre, CPDI  
Troy Monroe, PW&M  
Steve Reichert, PW&M  
Eran Pehan, CPDI  
Walter Banziger, CPDI



## COMMUNITY PLANNING, DEVELOPMENT & INNOVATION

### Development Services Division

435 RYMAN | MISSOULA, MT 59802-4297 | 406.552.6630 | FAX 406.552.6053

August 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2023

Sean Amundson  
406 Engineering, Inc.  
1201 S 6<sup>th</sup> Street W, #102  
Missoula, MT 59801

### **Re: Aspire Annexation and Subdivision – 182 Lot Major**

Dear Sean Amundson,

Development Services received your application packet for the above subdivision for *2<sup>nd</sup> Element Review* on July 27<sup>th</sup>, 2023. The element review deadline is August 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2023. **At this time, Development Services cannot certify your application packet as containing all the necessary elements.**

Please address the items listed below. Once these items have been addressed, please submit a third Element Review packet with a new cover page clearly titled as *3<sup>rd</sup> Element Review*, and include the date submitted. In lieu of a CD, please provide the *3<sup>rd</sup> Element Review* materials on a USB drive or provide a link for downloading the application materials.

#### **General**

Provide all the information required under City Subdivision regulations Article 5, Sections 5-010 and 5-020 and provide answers to all questions consistently from one section to the next, and address all applicable subdivision design standards in Article 3 of the City Subdivision regulations. Please include the following items:

1. The annexation request for these properties needs to be accompanied by an annexation petition, enclosed. In addition to a digital version, please submit an original hard copy **signed by all property owners**. There is no annexation petition for RCS, LLC.
2. Update the Table of Contents to correctly reflect the documents in the application packet.
3. Please see total fee breakdown below:

\$11,591.31 (base fee)  
+ \$13,437.06 (182 x \$73.83/lot)  
+ \$4,387.00 (annexation >1 acre)  
+ \$5,322.00 (\$887/variance – 6 total)  
+ \$6,893.00 (zoning amendment)  
+ \$2,033.00 (phased development review)  
+ \$675.00 (\$9 x 75 APO letters)

**\$44,338.37 total**

- The check provided was in the amount of \$45,225.37 and is larger than the amount needed. Please provide an updated check in the above referenced amount for the 3<sup>rd</sup> element submittal.

#### **Subdivision Application**

Provide all applicable information required under City Subdivision regulations Article 5, Section 5-020 while addressing all applicable subdivision design standards in Article 3 of the City Subdivision regulations. Include the following items:

1. Section D.2.a, the zoning indicated is incorrect. Please update and include the full zoning district name. Additionally, when you reference the existing zoning district, here is what to call it: R Residential. Similarly, when you reference the proposed zoning district, here is what to call it: RT5.4 Residential (two-unit/townhouse).
2. Section D.2.d, include a narrative describing how the project complies with the existing zoning district, or in this case, the proposed zoning district.
3. Section D.8, include a narrative describing how the project complies with the land use designation and the goals and policies of the Growth Policy.
4. Section F.1.b, indicate which lots and which improvements will occur in each phase per Article 5-020.14.A.
5. Section K.4.c, stating "Maps have been provided in Section A showing wetlands and riparian resource areas located near to the subdivision" but that is not what this section is asking. Please provide the map to demonstrate there is no impact on wildlife as outlined in the application.

### **Road Construction Plans**

1. Doesn't show the off-site improvements to Sommers Street in plan view and doesn't say which of the two typical sections are used at which stations. Please provide per Article 3-020.13.

### **Variances**

1. Variance Request #4 Bent Branch Road block length, the City would support approval of this variance with the condition that pedestrian access is provided through the common area to Canyon View Park/Robinson Street. If this park will be private, a pedestrian access easement needs to be identified on the preliminary plat.
2. Variance Request #5 Crosscut Way block length, the City would support approval of this variance with the condition that pedestrian access be provided through the center to break up the block. This needs to be shown on the preliminary plat.
3. Variance Request #6 Waterside Drive block length, the City would support approval of this variance if the pedestrian accesses were shifted to not exceed 480 feet.

### **Other (preliminary sufficiency items)**

The following items are not required for element review. However, addressing these items now will speed up the process once we reach sufficiency review.

1. Throughout the subdivision application there are multiple items where the provided answer is either n/a, yes, no, or one sentence statements with no reference(s) pertaining to how the answer was established. Please go back through these items of the application and add more information, narrative, description, citation, maps, etc. to expand on the answers, to provide context and sources.

One example to illustrate the point: In the impact on agricultural water user facilities under abandonment or transfer of water rights section starting on page 9, the answer states 'No' to the posed question of abandonment or transfer of water rights from the property. How did you reach this conclusion? Were there maps or title report used to verify no water

rights existed? Answers to questions on the application require clear, verifiable answers based on credible, documentable sources.

An updated subdivision application is in the works and will be ready within the next couple weeks. If you can wait to submit and utilize the new application in order to further expand on your answers, that is great. If not, please submit an attached document with the next element submittal that further expands on the n/a, no, or yes answers.

2. Variance document will need to be more detailed when explaining how the proposed variance meets the criteria.
3. Sections K.3.e.ii, v, and vi, indicating "No" or "N/A" but not providing detail to demonstrate how you know. Please provide additional information. Based on correspondence with the Conservation District, a 310 Permit is required at a minimum. Permits not required at this point, but documentation is needed to demonstrate whether permits are/are not required.
4. The eastern boundary dimension for lot 52 is 20.03 feet which doesn't seem correct based on the scale. Similarly, the western boundary dimension for lot 143 is 20.73 feet, which also doesn't seem correct based on the scale. These are more sufficiency related items but wanted to point them out now since I noticed.
5. Article 3-020.12.A states, "New streets that will align with existing streets must have the same name as the existing street". The main access to this subdivision is from Sommers Street to the southwestern portion of the property. However, once this street hits this subdivision, it becomes Bent Branch Road. The main Road Construction plan sheet changed the street name, but all other plans still call out Bent Branch Road. Need to correct the inconsistency. We recommend calling each road a generic name (i.e. Road A, Road B, etc.) since there will be a condition of approval requiring the street naming exhibit to be reviewed and approved by Development Services prior to filing the amended plat per Article 3-020.12.

If you have additional questions, you may reach Alex Bramlette at 552-6052 / [bramlettea@ci.missoula.mt.us](mailto:bramlettea@ci.missoula.mt.us) or Lauren Stevens at 552-6054 / [stevensl@ci.missoula.mt.us](mailto:stevensl@ci.missoula.mt.us).

Sincerely,

*Alex Bramlette*

Alex Bramlette, Senior Planner  
Community Planning, Development, and Innovation

encl: Annexation Petition  
cc: Mary McCrea, CPDI  
Dave DeGrandpre, CPDI  
Troy Monroe, PW&M  
Steve Reichert, PW&M  
Eran Pehan, CPDI  
Walter Banziger, CPDI  
Lauren Stevens, CPDI



## COMMUNITY PLANNING, DEVELOPMENT & INNOVATION

### Development Services Division

435 RYMAN | MISSOULA. MT 59802-4297 | 406.552.6630 | FAX 406.552.6053

October 19, 2023

Brian Throckmorton  
406 Engineering  
1201 S. 6<sup>th</sup> Street West #102  
Missoula, MT 59801

### **Re: Aspire Major Subdivision, Annexation, & Zoning Upon Annexation 1<sup>st</sup> Sufficiency Review**

Dear Brian Throckmorton:

The first sufficiency review period began for the Aspire Subdivision on September 28, 2023. The 15-working day sufficiency review deadline is October 19, 2023. **At this time, Development Services cannot certify your application packet as sufficient for governing body review.**

Below is a summary of the deficiencies. Please address the items listed below, then submit only the updated sections of the application packet with a new cover page clearly titled as 2<sup>nd</sup> Sufficiency Review, and include the date submitted. Please submit the amended sections electronically and provide a replacement paper copy of all sections that are amended.

#### **Project Summary**

1. The fourth sentence in the second paragraph in the project summary says the current zoning designation is C-RR3 while the Missoula County Property Information System and the zoning map and regulations submitted in the application materials indicate the property is zoned Residential (R). Please correct.
2. On page 2, under Offsite Connection Streets, the fourth sentence says Waterside Drive is within a 50-foot wide right-of-way. The Water's Edge Subdivision plats show a Waterside Drive within a 54-foot wide right-of-way and utility easement. The reference to 50 feet is also located twice in the Low Density Urban Local Streets section and in the Variances Requested section. Please correct.

#### **Annexation Petition**

3. Please provide an original annexation petition with the original signatures of all landowners.

#### **Phasing Plan**

4. Phase 1 does not include adequate emergency service areas (Article 3-020.3.F). The fire truck turnaround area is not sufficient as shown and would require a fire official approved temporary turnaround. Either a temporary cul-de-sac or installation of the southern alley (preferred) would suffice.

#### **Subdivision Application**

5. In general, I suggest editing the text one more time for accuracy, spelling, and grammar. For example, near the bottom of page 8 the text says the Clark Fork River is located to the west of the property instead of the east. There are numerous spelling errors and minor edits needed.
6. On page 8 under agriculture production, the checked box indicates the proposed subdivision is not located on land currently or previously used for agricultural prosecution while the text above and below indicates the property has been used for agriculture. Please correct.

7. On page 10 under maintenance of agricultural water user facilities, the text states section C of the application includes existing water rights information. I did not locate this information within the application materials. Please provide.
8. On page 11 under historical features, please update this section based on the Historical Resources requirements indicated in this letter below.
9. On page 13 under water quality, section #1, October 12, 2023 correspondence from the Missoula County Conservation District indicates a 310 permit will be required for construction of the riverside trail and related fencing. Please update this section to reflect this requirement. Under section #2, the second sentence is cut off. Please update to include the complete answer.
10. On page 15 under limitations map, the text states there are no slopes in excess of 25% slope while the grading and drainage plan indicates there are slopes over 25% slope. Please provide a slope category map as described in Section 3-140.3 of the City Subdivision Regulations. If any residential development is proposed on slopes 15% or greater, please include a density reduction worksheet.
11. On page 15 and 16, please provide additional information on the types of wildlife that inhabit or are likely to inhabit not only the general area, but the property, particularly along the Clark Fork River Corridor.
12. At the top of page 24, a multiplier of between 0.2 – 0.5 school aged children per household is provided. Where did this range come from? Please state the source.
13. On page 25, please include parkland dedication calculations and ensure they are consistent with the requirements of the subdivision regulations and the totals depicted on the phasing plan or adjust as necessary.

### **Parks and Recreation**

14. As requested by the Missoula County Parks, Trails, and Open Lands office in an October 17, 2023 email, please coordinate with and document the outcome of discussions with that office on the proposed western common area access and facilities as it relates to Canyon View Park. I am interested in participating / listening into the discussion so please copy me on correspondence and / or meeting opportunities.
15. Regarding the river trail, the minimum clear zone from the edge of the trail to the property line is three feet. Lot 77 may need to be adjusted to accommodate this clearance. Please investigate and adjust if necessary.
16. Regarding connection to the river trail in the Water's Edge Subdivision, please provide evidence that trail segment has a public access easement.
17. Please ensure there is vehicle access to the north and south ends of the proposed river trail to allow for maintenance.
18. City Parks and Recreation staff indicate the common area adjacent to Canyon View Park should be HOA owned and maintained common area. The City is not willing to take on ownership and maintenance at this time as it is within the service area of existing County parklands. Please update the covenants accordingly.
19. A proposed grading plan is needed for the western common area. It appears not all of this area will count toward parkland dedication as currently designed. Areas that are steeper than 25% slope cannot be counted toward parkland dedication.
20. Parks and Recreation staff suggest Lots 139 – 141 should be eliminated to create a park / common area that works well for the neighborhood, providing more usable activity area that is flat enough for active recreation, better connect the parkland to residents of the neighborhood, and increase passive surveillance of the park from the street and follow Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design guidelines.
21. In order to mitigate the variance for block length, staff suggests a shared use path be created through the common area and through the north side of Canyon View Park to connect to the Robinson Street ROW, perhaps included in an access easement.
22. Staff also suggests providing better pedestrian connections to the multi-dwelling lots as right now, there are only pedestrian connections proposed along the streets.

## Historical Resources

23. As requested by City of Missoula Historic Preservation Officer Elizabeth Johnson in her letter of review dated October 12, 2021, please submit documentation of any buildings, structures, or site features known to be over 50 years of age that will be impacted by this proposal for determination of significance and compliance with City Subdivision Regulations Section 3-010.8. The documentation should be completed and recorded using an Architectural-Engineering Record form found [here](#). An historical research consultant can help compile this report, and it is important the individual working on the report meet the State Historic Preservation Office's professional qualifications. Should you have questions, please contact Ms. Johnson ([JohnsonE@ci.missoula.mt.us](mailto:JohnsonE@ci.missoula.mt.us)) and copy me. Specifically, please include:

- a. A detailed site history that documents the physical development of the property and landscape.
- b. Photographs of all four exterior elevations of each building on the property that would be impacted by the proposed subdivision. If interior photographs are a possibility, please include those as well.
- c. Photo documentation of the existing conditions of any landscape features (irrigation ditches, etc.) that will be impacted by the proposed subdivision.
- d. Reproductions of any available historic images or documents related to the property.
- e. An assessment of the current condition of each structure / landscape feature known to be over 50 years old.
- f. An assessment of the property's eligibility for the National Register of Historic Places.
- g. An assessment of any adverse effects the proposed subdivision may have on the historic properties / landscape features.

**Transportation, Water, Sewer, Grading and Drainage** – Note: the full comments from the City Public Works & Mobility Department are attached. The items below are required for sufficiency. We advise you address some or all of the other items with the updated submittal to move the project review and potential approvals along more quickly in compliance with City standards.

24. City Subdivision Regulations Section 3-020.12.A states, "New streets that will align with existing streets must have the same name as the existing street." The plat shows Bent Branch Road, while the main southern access to the subdivision is from Sommers Street. The road construction plan sheet changed the street name, but all other plans still call out Bent Branch Road. Please correct. Except as discussed below, please call each new street a generic name, such as Road A, Road B, etc. This will have to be reflected throughout the different sections of the submittal. A condition of approval will require proper street naming prior to final plat filing of Phase I.
25. The alleys must connect to Sommers Street and Crosscut Way at right angles as per Section 3-020.9.B and provide acceptable visibility (3-020.9.D).
26. Alleys providing fire apparatus access to the multi-dwelling lots must be a minimum of 20 feet paved width (3-020.3F and MCPWSS Table 7-5).
27. The 10-foot and 15-foot public utility easements in the multi-dwelling area references the wrong benefiting lots (5-010.4.H).
28. Provide names for the two alleys. Emergency services will have difficulty locating them if they are addressed off of other roads. The southern one would be logical to continue as Waterside Drive all the way to the intersection with Bent Branch Road / Sommers Street.
29. Provide a complete grading plan (5-020.11). Some street profiles show a large amount of fill dropping from the bench heading east (Waterside, Aspire, Junction, Crosscut). Street profiles must substantially follow natural contours while not exceeding maximum grades (3-140.6.C).
30. On sheet 17 and 18 of 20 of the road plans, clarify the trail surfacing material. The trail is shown as concrete but called out as gravel. It should be asphalt to match the existing trail in

Water's Edge – verify with City Parks & Recreation. Trail and connections must meet PROWAG accessibility requirements (grades, rest areas, stairs, handrails, etc.). Add profiles for pedestrian connections between Waterside Drive and the river trail. Check grades of pedestrian connections from Waterside Drive to the trail. Show the existing trail in Waters Edge and the proposed tie-in. Estimate grades to be verified with a profile view. (See Public Works & Mobility notes for additional information.)

31. Show utility service access for existing sewer main on the east side of the property (3-020.3.F and MCPWSS 5.3.4.A.1).
32. Please provide documentation of coordination with Missoula County Public Works regarding offsite transportation improvements.
33. Provide transit stop improvements at Sommers / Speedway (3-020.4.G).
34. All water system sheets – Show existing and proposed fire hydrants (5-020.12).
35. In reference to the subdivision application Section 6.e.v (water supply): The blow capacity comments from the pre-application notes need to be incorporated into the response. City staff will work through the issues related to the capacity issues, probably through conditions of approval, but the issues must be acknowledged in the application.
  - a. The City does not have sufficient water rights for the Canyon River well. Staff requests water rights be dedicated to the public if water rights exist for the property.
  - b. There is insufficient existing system capacity to provide fire flow to Canyon River. The City is working on a Special Facility District to fund improvements to the East Missoula water system. Phase 1 would be upsizing a water main in Sommers Street. The water model shows when this section of water main is upsized, it allows for the required fire flow in Canyon River.

### **Variance Requests**

36. Variance request #2 states the request is to reduce a segment of the Waterside Drive right-of-way to 52 feet wide, which would match the existing Waterside Drive ROW. The preliminary plat and road cross section show this segment proposed with a 50-foot ROW. As noted above, the existing Waterside Drive has a 54-foot public ROW and utility easement – City staff suggest this segment be widened to 54 feet instead of 50 to match the existing ROW and provide justification for the variance. Also please edit for content, clarity, and complete sentences. For example, the existing Waterside Drive ROW is larger, not smaller, as stated in the request. Please show how the proposed sidewalk will align with the existing sidewalk.
37. Variance request # 5 does not seem to be based on conditions that are unique to the property. It appears Heartwood Place could be extended to the south. Staff suggest a revision or further discussion on this issue. A

### **Neighborhood Character Overlay**

38. Staff have significant and substantive edits to the proposed format and text to align the proposed overlay zoning with the existing Missoula Title 20 zoning. These edits and suggestions are being provided under separate cover.

### **Recommendations**

Please see the detailed comments and requirements of the City Public Works and Mobility Department and address the comments in updated submittal documents to allow more timely review and potential approval of the development application.

When you are ready to submit your updated materials, please direct them to me. If you have any additional questions, please feel free to give me a call at 406-885-7526.

Sincerely,



Dave DeGrandpre, AICP  
Planning Supervisor  
Community Planning, Development & Innovation

cc: Mary McCrea, CPDI  
Eran Pehan, CPDI  
Walter Banziger, CPDI  
Troy Monroe, PWM  
Steve Reichert, PWM  
Nathan McLeod, Parks & Recreation  
Lucy Rummler, Parks & Recreation

## Engineering 1<sup>st</sup> Sufficiency Review – Aspire Subdivision

- **Section A – Maps, Plats, Plans, and Figures**

- **A8 Preliminary Plat**

- The below comment made in 2<sup>nd</sup> element was not addressed. The preliminary plat still shows Bent Branch Road.
      - Other (preliminary sufficiency items)
        - i. Article 3-020.12.A states, "New streets that will align with existing streets must have the same name as the existing street". The main access to this subdivision is from Sommers Street to the southwestern portion of the property. However, once this street hits this subdivision, it becomes Bent Branch Road. The main Road Construction plan sheet changed the street name, but all other plans still call out Bent Branch Road. Need to correct the inconsistency. We recommend calling each road a generic name (i.e. Road A, Road B, etc.) since there will be a condition of approval requiring the street naming exhibit to be reviewed and approved by Development Services prior to filing the amended plat per Article 3-020.12.
    - Alley must intersect with Sommers Street and Crosscut Way at right angles (Article 3-020.9B) and provide acceptable visibility (Article 3-020.9D).
    - Alleys providing fire apparatus access to the multi-family lots must be minimum 20' paved width (Article 3-020.3F and MCPWSS Table 7-5).
    - The 10' and 15' P.U.E.s in the multi-family reference the wrong benefiting lots (Article 5-010.4H).
    - Select a new proposed road name for "Junction Way". In the USPS addressing standards, the word Junction is reserved for the road type, like Drive, Avenue, Trail, etc. Junction Way is akin to Avenue St (Article 5-010.4D and MCPWSS 7.4.8F).
    - Provide names for the two alleys at the southern extent of the project. Emergency services will have difficulty locating them if they are addressed off of other roads. The southern one would be logical to continue as Waterside Drive all the way to the intersection with Bent Branch Road/Sommers Street (Article 5-010.4D and MCPWSS 7.4.8F).
    - Subdivision Application Section 2.c states that water rights will be abandoned/ transferred. The preliminary plat does not contain the required note for removal of water rights (Article 3-060.4C).

- **A12 Road Plans**

- All sheets – relocate sumps at curb ramps to the upstream flow path side (MCPWSS 6.3.4B).
    - All sheets – Sump placement seems to be random and not relatively balanced on both sides of the roads. Not related to low points. Check drainage basins in storm drainage report.
    - All Sheets – Consider traffic calming and pedestrian safety measures for internal intersections; these are local residential streets for which the City has set target speeds of 20 mph. At the least, I'd recommend curb extensions at gateway intersections (Sommers & Crosscut, Waterside & Aspire Lp) and something (curb extensions or a traffic circle) at the one four leg intersection of Heartwood & Aspire.
    - Provide a complete grading plan (Article 5-020.11). Some street profiles show a large amount of fill dropping from the bench heading east (Waterside, Aspire, Junction, Crosscut). Street profiles must substantially follow natural contours while not exceeding maximum grades (Article 3-140.6C).
    - Add plan and profile for alleys and show drainage plan (MCPWSS 7.2.2E.7).

- Sheet 3 of 20 – Add curb ramp at the end of the proposed sidewalk on the east side of Waterside Drive to the existing sidewalk in Waters Edge. (PROWAG R201.1)
- Sheet 3 Of 20 – The proposed chicane island at the north end of Waterside Dr is not a complete design for an effective chicane (missing parking lane island) - see image for example. Also, a facility like this should have associated lighting, even on a local street.



- Sheet 4 of 20 – Add curb extension, crosswalk marking, and signage to the mid-block crossing (MCPWSS 7.3.7).
- Sheet 5 of 20 – Add east-west pedestrian crossing between Lot 91/Lot 76 (MCPWSS 7.4.12J.2). Moving the pedestrian access to the trail from between Lot 77/78 to between Lot 76/77 to align with this crossing would also reduce the pedestrian access distance along this block face.
- Sheet 7 of 20 – Remove the pedestrian crossing/sidewalk at the alley entrance. Add curb extensions to the southern intersection leg and maintain the throat width (2 drive lanes) to the alley. Provide sidewalk on the east side to access the trail.
- Sheet 8/16 of 20 – Add ped crossing at the corner of Lot 142 and Lot 126, crossing to the Common Area (MCPWSS 7.4.12J.2). This will be a projected pedestrian desire line to the pedestrian network in the common area (NACTO Urban Street Design Guide). Add curb extension, crosswalk marking, and signage to these crossings (MCPWSS 7.3.7).
- Sheet 12/13 of 20 – Alley alignment must intersect the road at a right angle and must allow a single vehicle que at the stop line of the alley to meet AASHTO sight visibility requirements. The northern alley alignment is currently too skewed.
- Sheet 12/13 of 20 – Alleys providing fire apparatus access to the multi-family lots must be minimum 20' paved width (MCPWSS Table 7-5)
- Sheet 14 of 20 – Show Sommers St off-site improvements and tie-in with on-site improvements. Square up alley with Sommers St to reduce speed of vehicles turning off of Sommers. Add curb extension, crosswalk marking, and signage to the mid-block crossing (MCPWSS 7.3.7).
- Sheet 17/18 of 20 – Clarify trail surfacing material. The trail is shown as concrete but called out as gravel. It should be asphalt to match the existing trail in Waters Edge - verify with Parks. Trail and connectors must meet PROWAG accessibility requirements (grades, rest areas, stairs, handrails, etc...) Add profiles for all pedestrian connections between Waterside Drive and the river trail. Check grades of pedestrian connectors from Waterside Drive to trail. Show existing trail in Waters Edge and proposed tie-in. Estimate grades to be verified with a profile view:
  - 7.5% from beginning of trail from road down to river
  - 10% sections on trail from 5+25 to 7+25
  - ~14% between Sta 19+00 (road) – 3236' to Sta 4+44 (trail) – 3220'
  - ~10% between Sta 14+50 (road) – 3227' to Sta 8+80 (trail) – 3218'
  - ~12% between Sta 5+10 (road) – 3232' to Sta 14+55 (trail) – 3216'

- Sheet 20 of 20 – Make parking lanes 7' wide (including gutter) on sections A/B. (Table .2A for low density local residential street and MCPWSS Table 7-5). Wider drive lanes on section C are acceptable due to geometry but drive lane width cannot include gutter. (MCPWSS Table 7-5)
  - Show utility service access for existing sewer main on east side of the property (Article 3-020.3F and MCPWSS 5.3.4A.1).
- A14 Watermain Plans
  - All sheets – Show existing and proposed fire hydrants (Article 5-020.12)
  - All sheets – Show trees/sumps/sewer services/other utilities to evaluate clearances (MCPWSS 4.2.2A).
  - All sheets – Minimize high points in the water main profile to avoid unnecessary air-relief. Add air-relief valves as necessary (MCPWSS 4.3.6).
  - All sheets – Call out main horizontal deflection (MCPWSS 3.2.2A.4). Ensure it doesn't exceed 60% of manufacturer's recommendation (MCPWSS Appendix 2-A, Section 02660, Part 3.2D.2.f)
  - Sheet 3 of 20 – Match the profile stationing to the plan stationing (reverse the profile).
  - Sheet 15/16 of 20 – How is alley going to be drained? We want to avoid conflict with water main routing and any necessary drainage facility. Water main should be centered unless there are clearance issues to other facilities.
  - Sheet 4 of 20 – Show existing sewer main (MCPWSS 4.2.2A).
  - Sheet 13 of 20 – Tee into Sommers St main at 90 degrees. Typical comment for other relevant sheets.
  - Sheet 20 of 20 – Horizontal fitting near 15+30 not realistic. Need to adjust so 22.5/45/90 degree bend can be used.
- Water Main Report
  - Include a more in-depth explanation of the phasing of the water system in relation to the subdivision phases.
  - Calculate water demands (MCPWSS 4.2.3B).
  - Discuss fire flow requirements (MCPWSS 4.2.3B.4).
- A15 Sewermain Plans
  - All sheets - INV IN and INV OUT appear backwards, double check all invert elevations.
  - All sheets – Show trees/sumps/water services/other utilities to evaluate clearances (MCPWSS 5.2.2A).
  - All relevant sheets – Show service lines from existing main (MCPWSS 5.2.2A.5).
  - Sheet 4 of 16 – Move manhole lids minimum 2' from gutters and out of wheel paths (MCPWSS 5.3.4.A.1.c)
  - Sheet 5 of 16 – Missing pipe size callout on profile (MCPWSS 5.2.2A.6.a).
  - Sheet 5 of 16 – Show existing sewer mains (MCPWSS 5.2.2A.5). Confirm that connection to wet well is feasible given the other sewer main connections.
  - Sheet 6/8/9/11/12/13/15 of 16 – Place terminal manholes that will not be extended further at minimum depth, adjust grade of sewer main accordingly to maximum of 10% grade in order to avoid using drop structures.
  - Sheet 7 of 16 – It is unclear what is proposed at the North intersection of Heartwood Place and Aspire Loop where existing and proposed sewer mains intersect (Sta. 4+89 on Sheet 8, Sta. 0+00 on Sheet 7). Show existing sewer mains and call out abandonment (MCPWSS 5.2.2A.5). Will the existing manhole be re-used or replaced?
  - Sheet 10 of 16 – Street names are mis-labeled. Correct and check other sheets.
  - Sheet 3/14/16 of 16 – Label depth in these minimum cover locations. Ensure minimum depth of 4' from top of pipe to finish grade is maintained. (MCPWSS 5.3.1.C.1) Use flat tops for manholes less than 5' from pipe invert to rim elevation. (MCPWSS 5.3.1.C.3)
  - Is there room to build on Lots 1-5 with the existing sewer main? How is access to the existing sewer main being maintained?

- Sheet 15 of 16 – 6-inch sewer services required for multifamily lots (MCPWSS 5.3.3B.1.b)
  - Confirm existing sewer can serve lots West of Bent Branch Road by a gravity sewer service. (i.e. no ejector pumps). Lots 100 to 110 especially.
- Sewer Report
  - Pipe sizing discussion is inadequate. Does not discuss carrying capacity of proposed pipe. Does not compute peaking factor and peak flow. Also need to discuss pipe sizing for section where existing sewer main is to be replaced. (MCPWSS 5.2.3B).
  - Need to discuss existing lift station and ability to handle new flows (MCPWSS 5.2.3C).
- A16 Phasing Plan
  - Roads
    - Phase 1 does not include adequate emergency service access (Article 3-020.3F). Fire truck turnaround is not sufficient as shown and would require a fire official approved temporary turnaround. Either a temporary cul-de-sac or installation of the southern alley (preferred).
  - Non-motorized
    - Phase 1-4 would not have access to the existing park. Temporary access for Phases 1-4 will likely be a condition of approval until Phase 5 is completed.
  - Water
    - Could not evaluate hydrants phasing for fire protection.
  - Sewer
    - Phase 1 sewer would require extension to lift station (and all stubs for adjacent phases)
    - Phase 6 services for Lots 142-148 would be long services from the existing sewer in common area (phase 5).
    - Which phase would require abandonment of the existing sewer through lots 182 and 87? Phase 4 will require abandonment of existing sewer beneath Lot 87 or platting with the existing sewer/easement in place.
- A17 Sommers Street Offsite Improvements
  - City staff acknowledge off-site improvements are under Missoula County jurisdiction.
  - **Provide transit stop improvements at Sommers/Speedway (Article 3-020.4G).**
  - Provide ramps for Sommers St pedestrian crossings at every intersection. At the very least, the crossings at the Speedway intersection should be striped.
  - Provide curb extensions on the continuous side of T-intersections (Dakota Ave, Colorado Ave) for those pedestrian crossings and additional traffic calming benefits.
  - Recommend centerline striping on Sommers (not required per MUTCD max volume threshold, but projected volume is approaching/at what we would consider reclassifying as a City collector) and sharrows to emphasize the route's potential bicycle greenway traffic.
  - City Complete Streets policy and PW Manual suggest lighting is appropriate on Sommers, especially considering the lack of a proposed dedicated bike facility.
  - Section B – drive lane cannot include gutter pan.
  - Is there opportunity for a JUT on the east side and bury of overhead utilities?
  - With a potential water main project beginning at the corner of Sommers/Dakota, road improvements may be held south of this intersection to avoid removing newly installed infrastructure. Timing of both projects, and a future Highway 200 project, would need to be considered as well.
- **Section C – Subdivision Application**
  - Section 2.e – Where is the referenced attachment? **"Attached in Section C of this application are existing water rights."**
  - Section 6.e.v (Water Supply) – The below capacity comments from the pre-application notes need to be incorporated into the response. We will work through the issues related to the

capacity issues, probably through conditions of approval, but the issues need to be acknowledged in the application.

- The City does not have sufficient water rights for the Canyon River well. We would request water rights be dedicated to the public if water rights exist for the property.
- Insufficient existing system capacity to provide fireflow to Canyon River. City is working on Special Facility District to fund improvements to East Missoula water system. Phase 1 would be upsizing a water main in Sommer's St. The water model shows when this section of water main is upsized it allows for the required fireflow in Canyon River.

- **Section L – Traffic Impact Study**

- City staff acknowledge off-site improvements are under Missoula County jurisdiction. These comments will be provided to Missoula County Public Works.
- It is recommended that the developers work with Missoula County and MDT to help implement the planned widening of Highway 200 through East Missoula and monitor the traffic conditions at the intersection of Highway 200 and Sommers Street during the development process to determine if a traffic signal is warranted at this intersection through 2030.
- [The East Missoula Highway 200 Corridor Plan](#) – shows the proposed section of Hwy 200 at Sommers in Figure 5-10 on Page 97. It lists Bus stop and striped crossing improvements are planned for the Hwy 200/Sommers intersection. Note: No traffic signal or roundabout is currently proposed in this plan. However, the TIS states the projected LOS for this intersection is D and E for the peak hours.
- Look to realign Sommers Street to a 90-degree angle with its intersection of Hwy 200.
- Minimum driving lanes on Sommers need to be 10' on asphalt, no driving lane width shall be shown on adjacent gutter pan.

- **Section N – Grading and Drainage Report**

- Proposed Condition needs to consider run-on from upgradient areas, including Sommers Street, Waterside Drive in Waters Edge, and neighborhoods to the West.
- Blanket use of Type A soil is not appropriate. NRCS soils report indicates Type B soils are present. Additionally, Geotech report indicates clay lenses were encountered.
- Post-development curve numbers should be based on actual proposed impervious area. Where impervious extents are not known (i.e. lot layouts) base CN on maximum impervious area allowed by zoning.
- Update pre and post development condition figures to show all requirements for MCPWSS 6.2.3.A5 and 6.2.3.A6, including land cover assumptions, curve numbers, and soil types. Elements can be shown across multiple figures as needed for clarity.
- Pre and post development condition analysis areas should have matching extents or provide justification for variations.
- Basins GG, HH, and NN are missing from Table 3-5.
- Proposed and existing contours are indistinguishable in proposed condition figure.
- Discuss multifamily stormwater control in greater detail. Runoff originating in parking lots and from multifamily roofs should be infiltrated by private sumps outside of the ROW.
- Single family lots should be graded to provide a drainage path to the ROW without directing runoff to across neighboring lots. Drainage across neighboring lots is allowable if drainage easements are provided.
- Provide more information about the swale in Basin NN. The report states that the swale will act as a detention facility but also states the swale will have centerline slopes up to 12%. Swale detention capacity should account for centerline slope.
- Swale in Basin NN should have 1-ft of freeboard and meet setback requirements of MCPWSS 6.3.11.
- Discuss swale drawdown time.

- **Recommended Conditions of Approval if not addressed in sufficiency.**

- Proof of abandonment of sewer main and easement from East Missoula Sewer District
- Transferring of water rights to City
- SID/RSID waiver statement for roadway improvements to Sommers Street including the intersection of Sommers Street and Highway 200.
- Utility access road for existing sewer main
- Temporary non-motorized connection from trail to existing park for use until Phase 5 is completed.
- Accessible route to nearest transit stops on Speedway.
- Latecomers agreement or other method for Dakota water main.



## COMMUNITY PLANNING, DEVELOPMENT & INNOVATION

### Development Services Division

435 RYMAN | MISSOULA. MT 59802-4297 | 406.552.6630 | FAX 406.552.6053

March 15, 2024

Brian Throckmorton  
406 Engineering  
1201 S. 6<sup>th</sup> Street West #102  
Missoula, MT 59801

### **Re: Aspire Major Subdivision, Annexation, & Zoning Upon Annexation 2<sup>nd</sup> Sufficiency Review**

Dear Brian Throckmorton:

The second sufficiency review period began for the Aspire Subdivision on February 26, 2024. The 15-working day sufficiency review deadline is March 15, 2024. **At this time, Development Services cannot certify your application packet as sufficient for governing body review.**

Below is a summary of the deficiencies. Please address the items listed below, then submit only the updated sections of the application packet with a new cover page clearly titled as 3<sup>rd</sup> Sufficiency Review, and include the date submitted. Please submit the amended sections electronically and provide a replacement paper copy of all sections that are amended.

#### **Preliminary Plat**

1. Please rename Junction Way as the City cannot accept street types as road names.
2. Please rename Aspire Alley as it too closely resembles Aspire Loop and the word alley cannot be included in a road name. We would prefer (new name) Lane.
3. The easements on Lots 61-62 and 62/63: The easements are for services to the lots, not public, so please make the easements for the benefit of the appropriate lots.

#### **Phasing**

4. Please update the phasing plan as shown on the attachment.

#### **Off Site Road Improvements**

5. The Sommers Street bus stop needs to be on Speedway and sidewalks need to be shown to bus stop. Provide documentation that Mountain Line approves offsite improvements. (3-020.4.G)
6. Please provide documentation of coordination with Missoula County Public Works regarding offsite transportation improvements including a timeline of all County improvements along with which phase each improvement will be installed.
7. Watermain improvements in Sommers needs to be constructed prior to road improvements – when is this proposed to occur?

#### **Fire**

8. Hydrants need to be relocated to approved fire locations - see fire attachment. We know that the back lot will not have 250' of cover but City Fire would prefer hydrants located at intersections and not mid-block. (5-020.12)

#### **Roads**

9. Show Waterside Drive as a single profile, as road will be constructed first and other roads tie into this main road. (3-140.6.C)
10. Provide road section for 25-foot ROW Waterside Lane (alley). (3-020.C)

11. Sheet D1 - There are three Waterside Drive page 21 of 22 both former rear lanes are named as such, ensure proper road name changes are on all pages of sufficiency submission.
12. Mid-block crossing needs to have ladder paint on crossing (not sufficiency)

### **Water**

13. The water plans need a lot of work (showing water mains joining at acute angles, high points in their profiles, etc.) but again this can be addressed in the Stage process. (not sufficiency)
14. Sewer and Water Report – Flow rate calculations need to get updated with City of Missoula standard flow rates in the Public Works manual (not just use DEQ numbers). (not sufficiency)
15. Provide Sommers to Dakota 12" watermain extension prior to Phase 3. For sufficiency provide plan view design. (MCPWSS 4.2.3)

### **Sewer Main Plans**

16. Clarify the proposed sewer main size. The sewer report indicates 8" sewer but Sewer Main Plan & Profile Sheet 7 of 16 calls out a 10" main. Additionally, sewer main size downstream of MH-(73) is not stated in plan/profile sheets. (Required for sufficiency)
17. Confirm that connection to wet well is feasible given the other sewer main connections. (Required for sufficiency) (MCPWSS 5.2.7)
18. Confirm Lots 1-5 are buildable with the existing sewer main easement. (Required for sufficiency) (MCPWSS 5.2.7)
19. Gravity sewer services will be required for all lots. Ejector pumps will not be permitted. Gravity mains will be required for lots 1-18, 100-110. Confirm that lots 142-153 can discharge to existing sewer by gravity services or provide new gravity sewer main. (Required for sufficiency) (MCPWSS 5.3.1)

### **Grading and Drainage Plan**

20. Pre- and post-development condition analysis areas should have matching extents or provide justification for variations. (Required for sufficiency) (MCPWSS 6.2.1)
21. Post-development conditions need to consider run-on from upgradient areas. (Required for sufficiency) (MCPWSS 6.2.1)
22. Discuss multifamily stormwater control in greater detail. Runoff originating in parking lots and from multifamily roofs should be infiltrated by private sumps outside of the ROW. (Required for Sufficiency) (MCPWSS 6.2.4)
23. Measured infiltration rates vary widely between test pits (28,826-in/hr to 126-in/hr). Applying the lowest measured infiltration rate for design of the entire site will result in an excessive number of drywells. Subsequent detailed design should seek to optimize the number of dry wells. (Not required for sufficiency)
24. Catch basins need to be on uphill side of curb ramps.

### **Parkland**

25. Assuming several issues can be worked out, the City has agreed to take ownership of the new park, and maintenance of Canyon View Park, if the new park is designed in a cohesive way that functions as one larger park. Please change the labels on the plat from common area to parkland.
26. The swale shown within the riverside parkland is a private stormwater feature. Please locate the swale on the lots to prevent stormwater from impacting the parkland and provide an appropriate easement on the plat.
27. City Parks and Recreation requires vehicular maintenance access through the riverside park. There is an existing 1-foot no-access strip between the sewer maintenance easement on

Waters Edge Subdivision that will not be lifted. The existing pedestrian access between Lot 78 and 79 should be widened to 20 feet to accommodate maintenance vehicles, and there must be enough space for vehicles to turn around at the north end of the trail.

### **Riparian Resource Plan**

28. Page 3 states the open space and riparian areas will be maintained by the Aspire Subdivision Homeowners Association and dedicated as common area. The City of Missoula Parks and Recreation Department has agreed to accept and maintain the riverfront area if this subdivision is approved and platted, as stated elsewhere in the application materials. Please modify the Riparian Resource Plan text to be consistent with the current proposal for riverfront ownership and maintenance.

### **Additional Recommendations**

Please see the detailed comments of the City Parks and Recreation Department.

When you are ready to submit your updated materials, please direct them to me. If you have any additional questions, please feel free to give me a call at 406-885-7526.

Sincerely,



Dave DeGrandpre, AICP  
Planning Supervisor  
Community Planning, Development & Innovation

cc: Mary McCrea, CPDI  
Eran Pehan, CPDI  
Walter Banziger, CPDI  
Troy Monroe, PWM  
Steve Reichert, PWM  
Nathan McLeod, Parks & Recreation  
Lucy Rummler, Parks & Recreation



MISSOULA

COMMUNITY PLANNING, DEVELOPMENT & INNOVATION

Development Services Division

435 RYMAN | MISSOULA, MT 59802-4297 | 406.552.6630 | FAX 406.552.6053

May 9, 2024

Brian Throckmorton  
406 Engineering, Inc.  
1201 South 6<sup>th</sup> Street West, #102  
Missoula, MT 59801

**Re: Aspire Major Subdivision, Annexation and Rezone 3rd Sufficiency Review**

Dear Mr. Throckmorton:

City of Missoula Development Services received your application packet for the above subdivision for 3rd Sufficiency review on April 19, 2024. The sufficiency review deadline is May 10, 2024. **Development Services hereby declares your application packet sufficient for governing body review.** Please submit a revised copy of the following documents by **Friday, May 17 at 5:00 PM:**

1. A replacement cover page that adds “Governing Body Review” and the date: May 10, 2024.
2. A replacement table of contents with updated date for the latest revision of each section.
3. Updates / corrections on the items listed below and allowing one week to make the corrections for governing body review.
  - a. Project Summary page 5 under variances requested, #4 says a block length variance is requested for Lots 1-18 and 100-110. Due to recent changes in the plat, the text should reference Lots 103-113 instead of 100-110. Variance request #5 references the block length of Lots 19-31 at 580 feet. The plat shows this half of the block measuring 562 feet. This paragraph is also a bit confusing so please clarify. #6 also includes incorrect lot numbers and appears to include an incorrect distance, based on the distances shown on the plat.
  - b. Project Summary bottom of page 5: the text references 1.5 acres of parkland while the plat now shows 1.73 acres. The application form also still references 1.5 acres in a couple of locations so please update.
  - c. Grading and drainage report, bottom of page 1, says the land is zoned C-RR3 and is proposed to be annexed with a planned unit development to support RT5.4 and RM1-35. The land is zoned R Residential and proposed to be zoned RT5.4 with a neighborhood character overlay. Please correct.

Please email the above documents as PDFs. I will replace the pages in the packet with the new documents and upload them to the City of Missoula Private Development Projects webpage.

If you have any additional questions, please feel free to contact me at 406.552.6633 or [degrandpred@ci.missoula.mt.us](mailto:degrandpred@ci.missoula.mt.us).

Sincerely,



Dave DeGrandpre, AICP, Planning Supervisor  
Development Services  
Community Planning, Development, & Innovation

cc: Kristin Spadafore, CPDI  
Mary McCrea, CPDI  
Eran Pehan, CPDI  
Walter Banziger, CPDI  
Troy Monroe, PW&M  
Traci Freshour, PW&M  
Nathan McLeod, Parks & Rec  
Lucy Rummel, Parks & Rec