

City of Livingston Zoning Commission Meeting Minutes
Tuesday March 8, 2021

- 1) Call to Order: (5:32PM)
- 2) Roll Call: (PM)
 - i) Zoning Commission members in attendance: Jim Baerg, Deborah Monaghan, Michael Wojdylak, Wendy Weaver, Michal DeChellis
 - (1) Quorum present
- 3) Consent Items: (5:34 PM)
 - i) Approve last meeting minutes (5:34PM)
 - (1) DM motions to approve meeting minutes
 - (2) WW seconds
- 4) Public Comment (5:35 PM)
 - i) Stacy Jovick- 410 South 8th Livingston, Montana
 - (1) Encourage ZB to keep up the good work
- 5) Agenda Items: (5:36PM)
 - i) Old business
 - (1) No old business
 - ii) New business
 - (1) Recommendation O St. to the Yellowstone River (KPRK Area) Zoning Map Amendment.
 - (a) Chris Benden sent an email that ZC didn't get
 - (b) Michael Kardoes goes through the staff report on this
 - (i) Currently NC zoned, staff recommends it to be MU
 - (ii) ZC decision - Should it be MU or back to HC?
 1. Concern about MU is that the parcel would be non-conforming
 - (iii) Chris Benden - Owner prefers HC – water table highly restricts construction there, trying to alleviate concerns about what could be there
 - (iv) Jonathan Hettinger – 111 North C street Livingston, MT
 1. Is this for NC or MU?
 2. Supports MU designation
 - (v) Stacy Jovick - 410 South 8th Livingston, Montana
 1. Would like definition of MU
 2. JB reads HC and MU definitions and goes through what can and cannot be placed there.
 - (vi) Rich Croslin
 1. Shouldn't current property owner be consulted on this?
 2. JB – that end of town is a food desert, it doesn't have any commercial services for people who live out there, encourage commerce for the residents

- (vii) Tom Blurock – 1101/2 main street
 1. Allows for high density homes, allows for dense development, because of its potential density it should be used really carefully, in-between in-fill development and would allow for 5 story buildings
- (viii) Stacy Jovick - 410 South 8th Livingston, Montana
 1. Because this is land that was annexed, what did we designate this
- (ix) DB – leaning towards mixed use, understand the concern about density, but would want to develop the area for the neighborhood more
- (x) WW – agree with DB, understand what Chris is saying about HC
- (xi) Chris Benden - make last point about church that the church would have to get a special permit if it is in HC
- (xii) DM motions to zone this area Mixed Use, WW seconds, MD says aye
 1. Motion passes and it will be recommended to the City commission to be
- (2) Recommendation on Livingston School District Zoning Map Amendment
 - (a) MK goes through staff report – 747 dwelling units, could have impact to traffic and the crossing, R3 is a bit out of character for that area
 - (b) Zoning commission questions
 - (i) WW – why did school propose RIII, max units for R2, will this go through subdivision review – impact fee needs?, Has shipped sailed?
 1. MK – school has more flexibility to do what it wanted, R2 – 124 lots, 494 units
 - (ii) JB – Lynne wanted to connect with Jim on this,
 - (iii) DM – Could MK speak to the status on the 5th street crossing and implementation on alleviating this issue.
 1. MK – city is nowhere with the crossing, community vote defeated paying for a crossing, trying to max flow on 5th, can look at traffic flow, no plans for additional crossing, impact fees – may or may not go through subdivision (if all condos
 - (iv) MW – from north town subdivision plan – triangle plan – requested to be R3, commission denied it being R3
 - (v) DM – What could the school develop if we allowed it to be public?
 1. MK – could develop whatever they wanted since it would be a different entity.
 - (vi) Todd Wester – Curriculum director for the school district
 1. Intent for the school district – schools bought that in 1995, want to be helpful contributors to the housing issue, schools probably don't have the money to develop, build, or be a landlord, but R3 could allow some options for multi-family housing
 - (c) Public comment
 - (i) Rose Klumpers – 1207 Wildflower Trail Livingston, MT
 1. What would R1 be like there? How many units?
 - a. JB – large lots with single family homes
 2. Mixed use – Is MU like R3?
 - (ii) Rick Lamplugh – 1112 Prairie Drive
 1. School District didn't have expectation that we needed to make this decision
 2. TW – this is the first day that we've really understood what MU is
 - (iii) Jane Chaney– 822 North 12th street

1. Growth going north keeps coming up, from school district – one school north of school, lives on north side – huge problem with the traffic, only one way out, would like more input from the community – this can affect the entire county
2. JB question for MK – Can we postpone a decision on this since this is the first hearing? Is there a deadline by when we need to make a recommendation?
 - a. By next month because the process has started – this will go through the city commission, there will be two more meetings that this goes to the city commission
 - b. If ZC needs more info, then MK can get us more information
 - c. MK reminds us that land owners aren't consulted/negotiated with – it's just a city process
 - d. JB – school district are trying to be good citizens and we want to facilitate communications, would like to give the SD another month to talk this through with some more refined ideas about what they would like to see
3. Todd Wester – appreciate this courtesy on this opportunity to comment, have a good partnership with the City and want to continue to be partners in the planning
4. Tom Blurock –
 - a. Property has a lot of potential and should be considered carefully in the overall planning scheme, has some capabilities while being owned by the city that gives it special status, Tom was a school land planner – school district might be able to make interesting deals, put restrictions to create worker housing that simple market wouldn't allow
 - b. Opportunity is its size – this space could be a middle school – lots of options attached to it.
5. Nancy Jurvekein - 1109 Praire Drive
 - a. Moving ball fields up north?- seems like less stress on traffic, could that be considered, should school hold on to this
 - b. Todd Wester – land swap might not be what the school district is thinking, this was his idea, Washington and winans are aging
6. Rich Croslin - 1215 Ridgeview Drive
 - a. Property is unique is that it is flat – good for sports fields, this area could not handle that many more people in this area, R3 doesn't make sense for infrastructure, want people to have more time to think about options
 - b. Stacey Jovick – 410 south 8th
 - i. In SD discussion did you talk about this staying public land?
 - ii. TW – SD really hasn't talked about keeping it public, the thought is R3 and if not then R2 for more flexibility
 - c. Deborah Monaghan – have you spoken with HRDC
 - i. TW – we could like to speak with them, learned a bit about their work on the First House thing in Bozeman, have more to learn from them
 - d. Mark Narden - 1024 Prairie Drive

- i. What is the urgency for the school to zone and build? In the future, if another school needs to be built, where would that be built at?
7. Janet Rawlings - 1110 Sweetgrass
 - a. Keep integrity and beauty of Livingston, don't want to crowd in apartments
8. Johnathan Hettinger – 111 North C street
 - a. Tom Blurock has a good point that this is a great parcel, opportunity and potential as planned unit development, Mixed use might be really interesting for this area, community could really benefit from some commerce there – could open the door for more opportunities. Housing is significant prob and best way to combat is to create high-density areas, more single family homes isn't a good solution because homes there are 500K plus
9. Cynthia Westover – 1105 prairie Drive
 - a. R3 has been turned down twice up here, this parcel is 4times as big as parcels that have been turned down
10. Mary Strickroth - 1112 prairie Drive
 - a. R3 would be very negative to existing residents, don't want to diminish property values
11. Dave Westover – 1105 Prairie Drive Livingston, Montana
 - a. R3 is pulling rug out from current landowners – will hurt lots of people who have lots of money invested here, a developer won't build affordable housing
12. Nathan Bolton – 1110 West Reservoir
 - a. Worried about active transportation, walkability, seems like formality just to zone this area – would advise R2 or public space as long as the school doesn't just sell it off the bat
13. Amanda Herrera 1110 West reservoir
 - a. Second transportation concerns, north town development is already going to be tight, concerned about housing, safety, and fires. We need more housing, but we need more balance. Formality of zoning needs to happen to prevent overdevelopment – would want this developed as park and open space
14. Garret Lenderman– 1204 Sweetgrass lane
 - a. Concerned about infrastructure and a large apartment building, no continuous sidewalks, not enough roads to manage families and more cars, basic access or easy access to main street is not there, we need more affordable housing, but we can't just bet that a developer will make this affordable
15. Rick Lamplugh – 1112 prairie Drive
 - a. Hope that ZC will deny R3, MU is new to me, not comfortable with that.
16. Brooks Scott – 1104 Sweetgrass
 - a. Echo was has been said, given that school do what they want, prudent thing to do is to zone R2, gives SD time to develop a proposal for a good use, haven't considered mixed use, but if I

wanted a coffee shop then I would have bought a house downtown not up north

17. Alyssa Durkee – 829 north 12th street
 - a. Same concerns about safety concerns, no stop signs, lots of accidents, so much traffic back-up, property manager of Brookstone – worried about affordable housing
18. Christopher Atkinson – 1120 Ridgeview trail
 - a. Agree with what people have said about not overburdening the area, really concerned about the R3 designation, R2 would be better

(d) Board discussion

- (i) WW – agree that we can be creative about the housing crisis, don't want just to develop just to develop or justify a zone change or land use designation
 1. Traffic issue is such a significant public health and safety issue – don't understand enough about how to fix this issue resolved. Don't want to increase density until the traffic/congestion is fixed. Could this be an action item? What are options to address this issue – can't support increase density.
 - (ii) DM – curious about additional info – any other traffic studies that have mentioned alleviating – if services are up there does that help alleviate the congestion.
 - (iii) MD – want to give the SD more time, want more info from the city about the traffic
 1. MD motions to give the school district more time – table discussion
 2. MK – lots of implications with different zoning designations – we can use the northside traffic study, city doesn't have the money to make another crossing – work on timing of lights, no significant that can solve this problem in the near future.
 3. JB – has city exhausted all federal funding
 - a. MK – yes, this just doesn't affect enough people. If someone had 20 million, we could build a trench
 - b. DM – how far off are we from growth and federal support
 - i. MK – probably a lot – this affects less than 4K people
 - ii. Last grant application was 1-2 years ago, not pursuing any more funding
 4. DM seconds the motion
 - a. ZC passes this motion
- (3) Recommendation on 72 N. 8th Street and 72 N. 9th Street Zoning Map Amendment
- (a) Public Comment - none
 - (i) JB – would allow up to 25 ADUs and primary dwelling units
 - (b) MW motions to zone these parcels R2, WW seconds this
 - (i) ZC passes this motion
- (4) Recommendation on Area Between the Railroad Tracks and Gallatin/Bennett Street Zoning Map Amendment
- (a) MK goes through staff report, this is mainly BNSF land, MU designation
 - (b) JB – Questions on MU
 - (c) JB motions that this area be designated MU, amends to adopt the two parcels to the East be designated industrial, MW seconds this

- (i) ZC approves this
- (5) Recommendation on Myers Lane Zoning Map Amendment
 - (a) MK staff report – this is county property, recommended to zone this public, intent to keep this trail protected under public zoning, these were annexed in, but still owned by the county
 - (b) DM motions to accept staff recommendation to zone this area public, WW seconds
 - (i) ZC passes this
- (6) Recommendation on Sign Regulations Zoning Text Amendment
 - (a) MK goes through staff report
 - (b) Discussion on whether to review next month
- (7) Discussion on Design Review Overlay Zone
- 6) Future agenda items (7:58PM)
 - i) JB – could we meet another night next month to interact with the school board?
 - ii) ZC would like MK to help them understand their options and timing,
 - iii) Recommendation on Sign Regulations Zoning Text Amendment
 - iv) Discussion on Design Review Overlay Zone
- 7) Adjournment (8:10PM)

The next regular meeting will occur on April 12, 2022, at 5:30pm,