

Consolidated Land Use Board Meeting Minutes

Date: April 9, 2025

Time: 5:30 PM

Location: Community Room, City/County Complex, 414 E. Callender St, Livingston, MT

Facilitated by: Chair Jessie Wilcox

Staff: Director Jennifer Severson

1. Roll Call

Present: Baily Goodwine, Becky Moores, Caitlin Chiller, Forrest Huisman (online), Frank O'Connor, John Kalmon, Jessie Wilcox, Quentin Schwarz (non-voting)

2. Approval of Minutes

Chair Wilcox noted that the November 13, 2024 and February 24, 2025 meeting minutes were not yet ready for review. Board member Moores expressed concern regarding the delay and emphasized the need for timely documentation. Director Severson acknowledged technical delays and confirmed the minutes would be presented for approval at the next regular meeting.

3. General Public Comment

Chair Wilcox opened the floor for general public comment. No public comment was received in person or online.

4. Planning Items

There were no planning items scheduled for this meeting.

5. Zoning Items – Northtown Planned Unit Development (PUD)

Director Severson introduced a zoning map amendment request from Northtown Development Corp to rezone a 20.01-acre parcel from R2 (Medium Density Residential) to a Planned Unit Development (PUD). The proposed development includes 240 residential units, 12,850 square feet of commercial space, and more than 60% of the site dedicated to open space. The application includes an increase in maximum building height from 34 to 40 feet.

Director Severson explained that the PUD would allow for a mix of housing types, commercial services, and integrated infrastructure. She noted that while the proposal does not include deed-restricted affordable housing, it is intended to support workforce housing. The application is consistent with the 2021 Growth Policy and Housing Action Plan.

Board member Moores raised questions regarding wetland protections and requested clarification on lighting standards. Board member Chiller emphasized the importance of accessible trail systems and snow removal strategies. Board member O'Connor expressed concern about increased traffic and possible congestion without added infrastructure improvements.

Developer Matt Faure, representing Northtown Development Corp, stated that the project was redesigned following a failed 2018 rezoning attempt. He said market analysis showed a strong need for studio and one-bedroom units and described the planned commercial space as neighborhood-scaled. Foor explained that buildings would be color-coded for wayfinding and that on-site property management would oversee snow removal and maintenance.

Engineer Garrett Schultz of Headwaters Engineering provided details on the site's stormwater management plan. He stated that retention ponds had been significantly upsized and that drainage systems would rely on curb-and-gutter designs and underground piping. He confirmed that over 4,700 feet of sidewalk and 1,100 feet of natural trails were included, and that traffic projections were based on MDT standards.

Chair Wilcox asked about status of considerations about a new overpass; Commissioner Schwarz confirmed the City is still working on grant funds to conduct an updated location assessment for a new grade separated crossing. Wilcox also recommended the applicant utilize software to analyze viewshed impacts, similar to those renderings included in the Downtown Master Plan. Wilcox also requested the applicant consider including ownership model within PUD to offer opportunities for first time home buyers.

7:16 pm- Chiller motioned for a 10-minute break; Moores seconded and approved 7-0.

Public Comment

Meeting resumed at 7:26 pm. Chair Wilcox opened the floor for public comment on the Northtown PUD agenda item and thanked everyone who attended in order to participate and provide comments on the item.

Members of the public who commented:

Cynthia Westover objected to the PUC and stated that the proposed development was too dense for the area and questioned the fairness of allowing this density after similar requests in this area of the City had been denied in the past. Also expressed concerns over traffic and northside emergency access, in general, with additional traffic the development would introduce. Finally, expressed concern that the PUD would provide workforce housing for Bozeman residents instead of those already in Livingston.

Misi Ballard Reiterated concerns expressed about additional development and additional traffic impacts on emergency access to the north side of the City and their inability to

effectively evacuate in an emergency. Expressed concerns about additional on-street parking impacts (campers, second vehicles, etc) to surrounding neighborhoods. Stated that the open space included in the development was not usable for recreation because of the steep topography.

Bob Ballard expressed concern about wildfire risk, infrastructure maintenance responsibility (developer vs. PUD HOA), and inadequate trail connectivity in existing developments applicant has built/ been approved for nearby. Commented on unsuitability of proposed open space for active use because of steep terrain.

David Westover stated that traffic is not his only concern with the PUD, as current neighborhood residents had purchased property based on existing zoning at that time – R2 Medium Density Residential- and felt this proposal violated community expectations for density.

Susan Curry commented that existing infrastructure like sidewalks and snow removal are already insufficiently maintained by the same developer applying for the PUD, and that this project would worsen those conditions.

Nathan Bolton supported the idea of a PUD, as developing that side with single family residences would require even more disturbance to the steep topography. Stated that local commercial development would also assist with relieving some of the traffic. However, the layout proposed by the developer lacked adequate traffic circulation and that the traffic study should be completed before approval.

Chris Curr described issues with condition of the 5th Street crossing and said future growth must include infrastructure improvements. Agreed that traffic analysis should be completed before this is approved. Does not support commercial development in the PUD and thinks single family residential homes would be more attractive.

Another member of the public (name unknown) expressed concern about traffic impacts but stated the project could help support working families by creating additional options for housing if done responsibly and she's excited about the additional people and that can create a sense of community for young families in the area.

Severson addressed questions that arose during public comment. Main road in PUD will be 60-foot wide right-of-way with parking along both sides of street. City currently restricts parking in public ROW for longer than five days; parking along PUD roads will be monitored by City for compliance with code. Staff will request developer address requests to connect existing informal 'social' trail network with new trails through PUD (within the PUD). Severson confirmed that duplexes and multi-family housing is allowed 'by right' in current

code in R2 zoning that meets density requirements; this PUD is not seeking more density than what is allowed 'by right' in the code and they do not have to seek a variance to build multi-family units in R2. Commissioner Schwarz commented that the Fire Chief has conditioned additional hydrants and that the proposed multifamily units must be sprinkled, whereas single family homes are not required to be sprinkled.

There was some additional discussion about emergency egress and evacuation routes and a recommendation was made to require the developer coordinate with emergency services at the City to ensure there are adequate evacuation plans in place as the PUD phases are developed.

Following discussion, public comment was closed. Moores expressed concerns about the existing topography on the PUD site and the amount of grading that is proposed, although she acknowledged good engineering can mitigate those impacts. Additionally, the proposed multi-family units and additional height being requested will impact the viewshed of the mountains and is inconsistent with the surrounding neighborhood. If the additional height was not allowed, this would reduce density, visual impacts and traffic impacts.

Board member Goodwine moved to recommend the City Commission approve the Northtown Planned Unit Development zoning map amendment with the conditions outlined by Director Severson, plus the following two additional conditions: the traffic study must be updated and completed prior to advancing before the City Commission; and the developer must coordinate with City Fire and Rescue and emergency responders to ensure there are adequate evacuation plans in place as the PUD phases are developed. O'Connor seconded the motion. Moores requested an additional condition be added that denies the requested 6-foot height variance so that the height does not exceed what is allowed in the R2 district 'by right'. The developer commented that they would not be able to make the economics work with reducing the height allowed in the PUD. Moores withdrew her request to add a condition. Wilcox requested a vote on the motion before the board.

Roll Call Vote:

Goodwine- Yes

Chiller- No

Kalmon- Yes

Moores- No

O'Connor- Yes

Huisman- Yes

Wilcox- Yes

Schwarz did not vote

Motion passes 5-2.

6. Board Comments

Board members reiterated the need for adequate infrastructure and thoughtful design to ensure neighborhood compatibility. Several members expressed appreciation for the

developer's efforts to include workforce housing and neighborhood-scale commercial services.

7. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at approximately 8:47 PM.