

CITY OF MISSION PLANNING COMMISSION

September 25, 2023

7:00 PM

Mission City Hall - 6090 Woodson

Members Present:

Stuart Braden
Wayne Snyder
Cynthia Smith
Megan Cullinane
Brian Schmid
Charlie Troppito
Robin Dukelow
Mike Lee

Staff Present:

Brian Scott - Deputy City Manager
Karie Kneller - City Planner
Kimberly Steffens - Permit Technician

Members Absent:

Amy Richards

(City of Mission Planning Commission Meeting Called to Order at 7:00 p.m.)

I. CALL TO ORDER

CHAIRMAN LEE: It's 7:00 p.m. and I'd call the meeting to order. The public is invited to participate. If you'd like to make a comment, please raise your hand but stay seated. We will call on you to come to the lectern. Please make sure to be conscientious of others trying to speak and speak slowly and clearly. If I need to confirm something that may have been difficult to hear, I will ask for a clarification.

Ms. Steffens, will you call the roll?

MS. STEFFENS: Braden.

MR. BRADEN: Aye. Here.

MS. STEFFENS: Dukelow.

MR. DUKELOW: Present.

MS. STEFFENS: Richards absent. Troppito.

MR. TROPPITO: Here.

MS. STEFFENS: Schmid.

MR. SCHMID: Here.

MS. STEFFENS: Cullinane.

MS. CULLINANE: Here.

MS. STEFFENS: Lee.

CHAIRMAN LEE: Aye.

MS. STEFFENS: Snyder.

MR. SNYDER: Here.

MS. STEFFENS: Smith.

MS. SMITH: Here.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM AUGUST 28, 2023

CHAIRMAN LEE: Okay. The first item tonight will be approval of the minutes from the August 28th meeting of 2023. If there is anyone that would like to make any changes to the minutes? If not, then I'd entertain a motion to approve.

MS. DUKELOW: Mr. Chairman, if there are no corrections to the minutes, I'll move that we accept the Minutes of August 28th, 2023, Planning Commission as presented.

MR. SNYDER: Second.

CHAIRMAN LEE: Okay. Ms. Steffens, take the vote, please.

MS. STEFFENS: Smith.

MS. SMITH: Aye.

MS. STEFFENS: Snyder.

MR. SNYDER: Abstain.

MS. STEFFENS: Schmid.

MR. SCHMID: Aye.

MS. STEFFENS: Richards. Oh, absent. Sorry. Dukelow.

MS. DUKELOW: Aye.

MS. STEFFENS: Braden.

MR. BRADEN: Aye.

MS. STEFFENS: Lee.

CHAIRMAN LEE: Aye.

MS. STEFFENS: Cullinane.

MS. CULLINANE: Aye.

MS. STEFFENS: Troppito.

MR. TROPPITO: Abstain.

MS. STEFFENS: Motion passed.

Motion 1: Robin Dukelow - Ward IV/Wayne Snyder – Ward I: Approve the August 28, 2023, Planning Commission minutes. The motion carried 6-0-2 with Wayne Snyder - Ward I and Charlie Troppito – Ward III abstaining.

III. NEW BUSINESS

1. Case #23-20 – Swig Soda Shop Final Development Plan

CHAIRMAN LEE: We have four items under New Business tonight. The first is Case #23-20 - The Swig Soda Shop Final Development Plan. Karie, do you want to provide us with your report?

MS. KNELLER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. This is Case #23-20 - The Swig Soda Shop Final Development Plan. The applicant is Superstar Holdings, LLC. This is the subject property at 5959 Barkley. The applicant proposes a drive-through soda shop with vehicle parking, landscaping, internal pedestrian walkways, and outdoor seating. Vehicular circulation is confined to the existing northernmost entrance and exit, and the southernmost curb cut on Barkley will be eliminated with this plan. Cars enter the site and circulate clockwise through the double-stack lanes of the drive-through to pick up -- to the pick-up window, in a one-story, 650 square foot building. Estimated daily vehicle count is approximately 347 cars with a peak time during 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. There's also a pedestrian walk-up window for orders and pickup with a bike rack located nearby. Eight proposed parking spaces, including one ADA accommodation and an EV station are located on the north side of the lot. Dumpster enclosure is located within the green space. Constructive CMU blocks, and there's a correction to your staff report. They will not be painted. It will be -- we established that with the Preliminary Development Plan, that will not be painted, the dumpster enclosure. It'll be the color of the building intrinsically on the blocks. Green space will increase with the proposal from .22 acres to .37 acres. That's 52 percent of the lot, including access for the community to a small, centrally located parklet with park benches and shade trees.

Consideration of Final Development Plans is outlined in the Mission Municipal Code at § 440.190. The Final Development Plan, which contains modifications from the approved Preliminary Development Plan, but is in substantial compliance, may be approved by the Planning Commission without a public hearing. And in this case modifications are not significant by definition in the code and are in compliance. So, the applicant and the design team considered, I'm sorry, considered Planning Commission, City Council and public input in this final design.

They also met with the Sustainability Commission on June 5th, 2023, and we're still actually, I believe we're still waiting for the recommendations coming out of that meeting from the Sustainability Commission. But I will check on that and make sure that is part of our considerations too when we're looking at permitting.

The elements that promote environmental, social, and economic improvements on the site enhance the project and further Mission's sustainability goals. While operations will primarily serve customers and vehicles, the enhanced pedestrian and bicycle amenities, along with an alternative fuel source on site and minimal parking will encourage multi-modal visitors.

Staff does recommend that the Planning Commission recommend approval of the Swig Soda Shop Final Development Plan. I'm sorry. This would be Planning Commission will vote tonight to approve Case #23-20 with the ten conditions that were included in the staff report. And that concludes the staff report.

CHAIRMAN LEE: Thank you. Does the applicant have any additional to add to it? Yeah. Just step forward and identify yourself, please.

MR. DE LA FUENTE: Robert de la Fuente, 244 West Mill, Liberty, Missouri. Karie did a great presentation there. We agree with all the recommendations. And I'm here with our architect if there's any questions that happen to arise.

CHAIRMAN LEE: Do we have any questions for the applicant?

MR. SNYDER: I have one.

CHAIRMAN LEE: Uh-huh.

MR. SNYDER: When do you plan on breaking ground? When's the groundbreaking?

MR. DE LA FUENTE: As soon as possible. We're building four of these kind of concurrently And I think we submitted a – as soon as we have a permit. We just submitted, so usually --

(Inaudible; talking of mic)

CHAIRMAN LEE: Karie.

MS. KNELLER: We usually take about a 20-day review process for permitting, construction drawings and with any questions that we may have for them in that time.

MS. DUKELOW: Mr. Chairman, I have a few questions for the applicant, perhaps some for staff. If we could, the site plan, which is Sheet 10 in the packet, that would be the original packet. Or would you pull up the -- Let's use my little landscape plan works because that'll get us farther into where we need to go. So, I'm sorry, I didn't know the sheet number in that. Floorplan. There we go. Twenty of twenty-four.

MS. KNELLER: I'm in the packet and so –

MS. DUKELOW: Oh, I'm sorry. Slide. I asked you for the site plan.

MS. KNELLER: You want the landscaping.

MS. DUKELOW: Yes, the landscape plan. Thank you.

MS. KNELLER: There we are.

MS. DUKELOW: Okay. Several questions actually on this sheet. So, on the northwest corner of the, sorry. The southwest corner of the northernmost drive there is a transformer. And it's noted that that power may be moved, able to be moved to a utility pole. And I know there are requirements for access around that. But if any screening can be added that would be great because that's never going to look good.

Also, I want to note that there are several trees slated for removal. And I believe there are three that absolutely, absolutely should be preserved, and perhaps a fourth. And I would like the applicant to work with staff to consider maintaining the tree that's at the northwest corner of the site. There are two on the south edge of the site, and there's one on the west side of the site that may be salvageable, or it may be too close to the footings.

MR. DE LA FUENTE: I know the last one you mentioned there is right on the edge of that, kind of where the building is going to be. The others I think is workable. Yeah, absolutely. We'll work with staff to see [inaudible].

MS. DUKELOW: Okay. Great. I also wanted to note that there is a tree that's actually the only one that says they're going to keep, but it's not really that great. It's an apple tree and it looks awful.

MR. DE LA FUENTE: Okay.

MS. DUKELOW: Okay. So, we'd just want to preserve the existing canopy where we can and work that in with our new site plans. Okay. Let me – sorry.

Great job on EVSE equipment, electric vehicle service equipment. I'm glad to see that. The elevation tags, they're all wrong on the floorplan. And I'd like to see a north arrow on floorplans. The, I'm sorry. I'll wait for you to get there.

MS. KNELLER: Are you talking about this north arrow here?

MS. DUKELOW: No. That's a civil plan.

MS. KNELLER: Are you talking about site plan?

MS. DUKELOW: I'm looking at the floorplan.

MS. KNELLER: Oh, floorplan of the building. Gotcha.

MS. DUKELOW: Which is – yes. The building floorplan.

MS. KNELLER: Okay.

MS. DUKELOW: Which would be 20, I believe, of 24. Yes.

MS. KNELLER: Okay.

MS. DUKELOW: Okay. I'd like to see a north arrow on that.

MS. KNELLER: Our building official will definitely want to require that for the permitting.

MS. DUKELOW: Great. Also, if we could take a quick peek at the elevations. Oh, I'm sorry, before you move off that – sorry. Before you move off that floorplan.

MS. KNELLER: Yeah.

MS. DUKELOW: Yeah. What is that square at the back of the box? At the back of the box. The box at the back of the building.

MS. KNELLER: This?

MS. DUKELOW: Outside. Sorry. I'm sorry. It's so confusing because the orientation of the PowerPoint --

MS. KNELLER: That's the section marker. Yeah.

MS. DUKELOW: Yeah. That's the elevation tag that needs to be [inaudible].

MS. KNELLER: Elevation. Sorry. Elevation.

MS. DUKELOW: But the one that's at the --

MR. OLSON: Right here?

MS. DUKELOW: Yes.

MS. KNELLER: Yes. Oh.

MR. OLSON: Did I need to speak into the mic?

MS. KNELLER: Yes, please.

MR. OLSON: Yes.

MS. KNELLER: That's what I was going to say.

MR. OLSON: Yeah. I saw you looking.

MS. KNELLER: I'm sorry. I wasn't very clear with that.

MS. DUKELOW: And state your name, would you?

MS. KNELLER: And state your name too, please, first.

MR. OLSON: Scott Olson. I'm the architect with [inaudible] on this project. And that is just a cabinet that's outside that holds a tank.

MS. DUKELOW: Oh, okay. That answers another question. That would be the CO2 enclosure, Number 5?

MR. OLSON: Yes.

MS. DUKELOW: Okay. Gotcha. Okay. I also have a question regarding, well, we can go probably now to the elevations if you don't mind, Karie, which, I'm sorry –

MS. KNELLER: [inaudible]

MS. DUKELOW: That's probably the next page.

MS. KNELLER: Yep.

MS. DUKELOW: Twenty-one. So, I hate to say this, but I don't know any other way. The north elevation looks like the back of a building, and I think it needs some love. Like if that were the back of the building, you know, I mean, I don't know. It's just -- the door, the everything, it's just -- there's just nothing there. Do you see which one I mean?

MS. KNELLER: Uh-huh. This one.

MS. DUKELOW: Okay. Top right corner on the elevation sheet. And I don't, you know, you guys are the design team, but something. And that EIFS right next to that door, that door is for everybody that comes and goes and the garbage. So, I just don't know that that EIFS and that is going to look good for very long. And I'm not sure how to – how to, you know, I just don't think it's going to look good honestly. I think it's going to look dirty. Is that glass clear or is it frosted at the door?

MR. OLSON: It's clear at the door.

MS. DUKELOW: Okay. Yeah. I just -- yeah. The materials, I don't know, maybe darker or maybe bring the brick up, I don't know. But I just think it looks like the back of the building rather than the front, and it's going to be very visible, and we want to make sure that that side gets some design attention too.

Okay. So, at the base of the building, there is a stone coping noted, but what is the material at the awning level or around the top of the building? Is that EIFS or another –

MR. OLSON: That's a darker color EIFS, yes.

MS. DUKELOW: Okay. Okay. Got it. And is there rooftop access for mechanical equipment maintenance?

MR. OLSON: We don't show that right now -- but if that needed to have, like a ladder permanent.

MS. DUKELOW: Yeah. I'm just asking the question because I didn't see it on the plans or on the elevations.

MR. OLSON: No, we don't. We do not show a permanent letter right now or access just because it's –

MS. DUKELOW: Okay. So they would just bring –

MR. OLSON: A ladder.

MS. DUKELOW: They would just bring the ladder and climb up there. Okay. All right. Great.

MR. BRADEN: What kind of equipment is on the roof?

MR. OLSON: There's just a couple of HVAC small package units. And that's really it.

MR. BRADEN: Well, all I've got to say is your package rooftop units and you got to change the filters probably at least quarterly. I didn't know if that's standard on your other stores that you have to bring a ladder to get up to the equipment to service that.

MR. OLSON: So far it is. But if that is -- if that's a concern, there are opportunities where we could have a partial ladder attached and then you do a pull down. It's for safety reasons in case.

MR. BRADEN: Got it.

MR. OLSON: You don't want people up there if you can help it. Non-people changing filters.

MS. DUKELOW: Okay. And then I have another question regarding the rooftop equipment. Is that all located in the area where the high parapet is?

MR. OLSON: Actually. Oh, I'm sorry. I didn't mean to interrupt you.

MS. DUKELOW: Go ahead.

MR. OLSON: The roof itself is flat and then parapet makes that step, but the roof does not step. And there is kind of an additional wall that comes across the middle there, and it is on one, it's on the lower side parapet. That's where all the equipment is located.

MS. DUKELOW: All of the equipment is located on the side with the lower parapet?

MR. OLSON: Yeah.

MS. DUKELOW: Rather than on the side with the high parapet? I don't, sorry, I don't have a roof plan. So, I have no way of telling whether or not the equipment is appropriately screened. That's the only issue I'm [inaudible].

MR. OLSON: Oh, I got you. It should still be screened with the parapet even at the lower parapet. The high parapet was mainly for a signage kind of detail.

MS. DUKELOW: Okay.

MR. OLSON: The parapet all the way around is still screening the equipment.

MS. DUKELOW: It's still [inaudible].

MR. OLSON: It's a very -- there are two very -- yes.

MS. DUKELOW: Okay. Thank you for that.

MR. OLSON: Sure.

MS. DUKELOW: So, the east elevation, this is just, I just, I don't know. Maybe I have a question. I know it's customary to pitch the roof like this towards the scuppers. But there is a downspout right on the driveway at the driveway on the east side. So my question is, where does that go? Does that go below grade, or could both of those downspouts go to the west and drain into the landscape beds?

MR. OLSON: That's the east side is actually the overflow. And most of the water right now is, well, all the roof water will drain to the site. It's not underground. The main water will come off on the west side. And then if there is additional water, so if we see water coming out of the east drain, we'll know that it's -- there's an issue with the west drain.

MS. DUKELOW: I see what you're saying.

MR. OLSON: So, there really shouldn't be too much water coming out unless there's a -- there is a problem.

MS. DUKELOW: Okay. Great. Good to know that. Let me just double check here that I addressed everything. Okay. So, we talked about the transformer. All right. That's all I have for now. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN LEE: Any other questions? Okay. At this point then, we will open it to the public. If there's anyone that would like to speak either for or against this case, now would be the time to step forward. I'm not seeing anyone and I will close the public hearing. Any other comments? I'm not seeing any and I would entertain a motion.

(a) Amend Case #23-20

MS. DUKELOW: Mr. Chairman, I move to approve the Case #23-20; The Swig Soda Shops Final Development Plan with the consideration for the applicant to work with staff on the items that we reviewed tonight, and the recommendations as listed in the staff report.

MR. TROPITO: I'll second it.

MR. BRADEN: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN LEE: Yes.

MR. BRADEN: Can we amend that now, the proposal? Or do we vote and then amend?

CHAIRMAN LEE: [Inaudible].

MR. BRADEN: Mr. Chair, I would propose we amend to add more of a permanent ladder for ease of roof access maintaining rooftop equipment.

MS. DUKELOW: Second.

MS. KNELLER: Commissioner Braden, could you speak into the microphone and repeat that again, please?

MR. BRADEN: I'd like to amend the proposal to include, add a more permanent roof access method for maintaining rooftop equipment.

MS. DUKELOW: I'll second the amendment.

CHAIRMAN LEE: [Inaudible; talking off mic]

MR. SCOTT: You'll need to vote the amendment first.

CHAIRMAN LEE: So, you want to call the roll, please.

MS. STEFFENS: Dukelow.

MS. DUKELOW: Aye.

MS. STEFFENS: Troppito.

MR. TROPPITO: Aye.

MS. STEFFENS: Schmid.

MR. SCHMID: Aye.

MS. STEFFENS: Lee.

CHAIRMAN LEE: Aye.

MS. STEFFENS: Cullinane.

MS. CULLINANE: Aye, and under the assumption that staff will work on the, like the location of the ladder too, right? Okay.

MS. STEFFENS: Braden.

MR. BRADEN: Aye.

MS. STEFFENS: Snyder.

MR. SNYDER: Aye.

MS. STEFFENS: Smith.

MS. SMITH: Aye.

MS. STEFFENS: Motion pass.

Motion 2: Stuart Braden- Ward I/Robin Dukelow - Ward IV: Amend Case #23-20 – Swig Soda Shop Final Development Plan to include

permanent roof access for maintaining rooftop equipment with developer and staff to determine appropriate ladder placement.

The motion carried 8-0-0.

(b) Approve Case #23-20

CHAIRMAN LEE: Okay. Now, we'll have the next one. You want to call the roll?

MS. STEFFENS: Dukelow.

MS. DUKELOW: Aye.

MS. STEFFENS: Troppito.

MR. TROPPITO: Aye.

MS. STEFFENS: Cullinane.

MS. CULLINANE: Aye.

MS. STEFFENS: Schmid.

MR. SCHMID: Aye.

MS. STEFFENS: Braden.

MR. BRADEN: Aye.

MS. STEFFENS: Lee.

CHAIRMAN LEE: Aye.

MS. STEFFENS: Smith.

MS. SMITH: Aye.

MS. STEFFENS: Snyder.

MR. SNYDER: Aye.

MS. STEFFENS: Motion passed.

Motion 3: **Robin Dukelow - Ward IV/Charlie Troppito - Ward III:** Approve Case #23-20 – The Swig Soda Shop, Final Development Plan, as amended. **The motion carried 8-0-0.**

2. Case #23-19 – Swig – 5959 Barkley Final Plat

CHAIRMAN LEE: Item Number 2 will be the public hearing in Case #23-19 – The Swig at the 5959 Barkley, Final Plat. Karie, you want to make your revised report?

MS. KNELLER: This will be Case #23-19 – The Swig – 5959 Barkley, Final Plat. The subject property is located at 5959 Barkley Street. The property is not currently platted, and staff required the plat to be recorded with the county after final approval of the plan. Rights-of-way were previously established for the current sidewalk infrastructure around the site. And the plat establishes easements for public utilities that are already currently existing on the site as well, including stormwater, water main, and sanitary sewer.

Mission Municipal Code at § 440.260 states that a preliminary plat shall be approved by the Planning Commission if it determines that, and first of all, staff determines whether there needs to be a dedication of right-of-way in addition to what is already currently there. Staff did not determine that any additional right-of-way needed to occur with this plat. And then final plat should be approved by the Planning Commission if it determines that the final plat substantially conforms to the approved preliminary plat and rule exceptions granted thereto. The plat conforms to all applicable requirements of the code. And if submission requirements have been satisfied and, oh, and approval of the final plat shall require the affirmative vote of all Planning Commission members in a majority.

Analysis, staff analysis is that the final plat conforms to the approved preliminary plat and conforms to requirements of the Municipal Code. Utility easements of established utilities currently on the site are provided. Following approval, this will go to the City Council if you vote to approve this today. And staff does recommend that the Planning Commission recommend approval of Case #23-19, the final plat of Swig, 5959 Barkley, to the City Council.

CHAIRMAN LEE: Thank you. Does the applicant have anything to add to this portion?

MR. DE LA FUENTE: Only if there are any questions you might have.

CHAIRMAN LEE: Okay. Do we have any questions for the applicant? Okay. I'm not seeing any at this point. I will then open the hearing to the public. If anyone would like to speak for or against, now would be the time to do so. I'm not seeing anyone. Once again, I'll close the hearing. Any comments from the Commission. If not, then entertain a motion.

MS. CULLINANE: Mr. Chair, I'd move to approve Case #23-19 – Swig, 5959 Barkley, final plat.

MR. SNYDER: Second.

CHAIRMAN LEE: Call the roll, please.

MS. STEFFENS: Dukelow.

MS. DUKELOW: Aye.

MS. STEFFENS: Troppito.

MR. TROPPITO: Aye.

MS. STEFFENS: Cullinane.

MS. CULLINANE: Aye.

MS. STEFFENS: Snyder.

MR. SNYDER: Aye.

MS. STEFFENS: Smith.

MS. SMITH: Aye.

MS. STEFFENS: Schmid.

MR. SCHMID: Aye.

MS. STEFFENS: Braden.

MR. BRADEN: Aye.

MS. STEFFENS: And Lee.

CHAIRMAN LEE: Aye.

MS. STEFFENS: Motion passed.

CHAIRMAN LEE: Thank you.

MR. DE LA FUENTE: Great. Thank you.

Motion 4: **Megan Cullinane - Ward III/Wayne Snyder - Ward I:** Approve Case #23-19 – Swig, 5959 Barkley, Final Plat. **The motion carried 8-0-0.**

3. Case #23-12 – Morrison Ridge Final Plat

CHAIRMAN LEE: Okay. Case Number 3 will be 23-12. This Morrison Ridge Park Final Plat. Karie, would you like to provide us with your report, please? ask for your report of this.

MS. KNELLER: This is Case #23-12, the Morrison Ridge Final Plat. The subject property is located at approximately Riggs Street, half a block north of 53rd Street and west of properties on the west side of Riggs Street. This is preparation for lots that will carry four single-family homes, and this is a – the applicant is Klassen Construction.

This re-plat will consolidate Lots 357 through 362 and Lots 351 through 356 and split the consolidated lots north to south to create four lots. Lots 1 and 2 are north of the public right-of-way that already exists. And Lots 3 and 4 are south of the public right-of-way. This was meant originally for a street called Florence Street that will now become a drive a private drive. The original 40-foot right-of-way will remain public, but it will be maintained by the property owner. Public utility rights, rights-of-way are also proposed.

Mission Municipal Code at §440.260 states that Preliminary Plats shall be approved by the Planning Commission if it determines the following conditions:

- The final plat substantially conforms to the approved preliminary plat.
- The plat conforms to all applicable requirements of the Code.
- If submission requirements have been satisfied.
- And approval of the final plat shall require the affirmative vote of the Planning Commission in majority.

Also, whether the City staff has determined whether additional dedication of right-of-way is needed. Staff did not require any additional right-of-way beyond what was established with the original plat.

Following approval of the final plat by the Planning Commission, the final plat will be submitted to the City Council for vote. The applicant did provide all necessary documentation as required by the preliminary plat, the conditions of the preliminary plat. And so staff does recommend that the Planning Commission approve the final plat for Morrison Ridge Park.

CHAIRMAN LEE: Thank you. Does the applicant have anything to add to this?

MR. KLASSEN: Hello. I'm Kevin Klassen. I live at 5540 Maple Street, and I'm here to answer any questions.

CHAIRMAN LEE: Do we have any questions for the applicant?

MR. TROPITO: I have a question.

CHAIRMAN LEE: Go ahead.

MR. TROPITO: The plat as it's signed [inaudible].

MS. KNELLER: It is. It's in the packet. It's signed and stamped.

MR. BRADEN: [Inaudible] So, you say we have the current version where it's signed? [Inaudible].

MS. KNELLER: I'm sorry. A more current than what? I'm not aware of what Stuart is looking at.

MR. BRADEN: Well, I downloaded the first version. I know there was an update that you sent out. I don't know if that has anything to do with it, but the --

MS. KNELLER: I'll pull up the packet right now. But I checked it just today and it looked like it was signed and stamped by the surveyor.

MR. BRADEN: But it's not in there.

MS. KNELLER: This is the packet.

MR. BRADEN: So, he said it was stamped.

MS. KNELLER: Oh, it's stamped and not --

MR. BRADEN: Yeah.

MS. KNELLER: -- not signed for this one. We'll ensure that it is signed by the surveyor on the hard copy that we'll receive before it goes to record. I mean, the county wouldn't take it otherwise.

MR. BRADEN: Okay. And when we're supposed to approve something, I feel more comfortable when it's already been signed. But what's represented to us has been certified by a surveyor, professional engineer.

MR. SCOTT: So, there is --

MR. BRADEN: So, there is a stamp and --

MR. SCOTT: But there's a stamp, but --

MS. DUKELOW: But is that Swig or is that Barkley? Is that the Barkley project?

(Commissioners talking amongst themselves)

MS. KNELLER: Yeah. It looks like on this digital copy that the signature is not on it, but the hard copy would have the signature on it.

MR. BRADEN: Okay. Thank you.

MS. KNELLER: I apologize for not including that in the digital one in here.

MR. BRADEN: Thank you.

MR. SNYDER: No. I have a question. One of the recommendations stated that the property will retain an easement agreement with the -- with the adjacent property owner. I would imagine that's like fait accompli, that's, you know, there's not going to be any problem with the -- getting that agreement with the owner at 5285 Foxridge.

MS. KNELLER: That's in -- sorry.

MR. KLASSEN: We actually have done that. I don't -- I think that was --

MR. SNYDER: Oh.

MR. KLASSEN: -- perhaps an oversight. It wasn't a condition of the preliminary, but that has been -- has been done.

MS. KNELLER: That should be included in your packet here. It's been signed and executed.

MR. SNYDER: Okay.

CHAIRMAN LEE: Any other questions? I guess not.

MR. KLASSEN: Great. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LEE: At this time I will open it up to the public. Would anyone like to speak for or against? And not seeing anyone, I will close it again. Any comments from the Planning Commission?

MS. DUKELOW: Commissioner Chair, if there's no further questions or comments, I will move to approve Case #23-12; Morrison Ridge Park – Final Plat.

MR. SCHMID: Second.

CHAIRMAN LEE: Please take the vote.

MS. STEFFENS: Braden.

MR. BRADEN: Aye.

MS. STEFFENS: Dukelow.

MS. DUKELOW: Aye.

MS. STEFFENS: Schmid.

MR. SCHMID: Aye.

MS. STEFFENS: Troppito.

MR. TROPBITO: Nay.

MS. STEFFENS: Lee.

CHAIRMAN LEE: Aye.

MS. STEFFENS: Snyder.

MR. SNYDER: Aye.

MS. STEFFENS: Smith.

MS. SMITH: Aye.

MS. STEFFENS: Cullinane.

MS. CULLINANE: Aye.

MS. STEFFENS: Motion passed.

CHAIRMAN LEE: Okay. Thank you.

MR. KLASSEN: Thank you.

Motion 5: Robin Dukelow - Ward IV/Brian Schmid – Ward III: Approve Case #23-12 – Morrison Ridge Park, Final Plat. The motion

carried 7-1-0 with Charlie Troppito – Ward III voting no.

* * * * *
* * * * *

4. Public Hearing: Case #23-10 – Comprehensive Plan

CHAIRMAN LEE: The next item will be the Public Hearing in Case #23-10 on our Comprehensive Plan. At this time I'd like to open the hearing. Mr. Scott, would you like to provide us with your report?

MR. SCOTT: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chair. We have with us tonight Chris Shires from Confluence. Well, I met Chris a few times before, probably most recently back in the spring. We had a couple of joint sessions with the City Council to discuss, you know, the Comprehensive Land Use Plan Update. It's been a journey. We started this process, I won't steal too much of Chris' thunder, but we started this process in 2019, creating an RFP. Then we got input from the Planning Commission. And then advertised to a number of firms. We advised with the American Planning Association, and we received quite a few proposals. So, we went with a selection process and narrowed it down to about five firms we brought into town to interview. And then we ultimately selected Confluence. And a lot of that is because Confluence was familiar with our community. We had done some other projects with them. And they had also done recently at that time the Comprehensive Land Use Plans for Roeland Park and Merriam. They're very familiar with our neighbors and many of the issues that all of the communities in Northeast Johnson County are collectively facing.

We initiated the project. Our first kick-off meeting was in March of 2020. You all will remember that was a joint session with the City Council and the chairs were going to spread out and we all sort of doing this thing and kind of, you got to be careful about this thing called COVID. And within a few weeks, the wheels just kind of fell off and everybody was sitting at home and trying to figure out what to do with their lives for the next few months.

So we kind of stepped back from that process. You know, I know Chris and his team was also trying to figure out how to do public engagement through virtual meetings and so forth. It was kind of a learning process for all of us. But we reengaged in August of that year, and we set off creating steering committee. And a couple of our members of our steering committee with us tonight. Josh Thede, who is also a member of the Sustainability Commission, and Jacque Gameson who is also a member of the Parks, Recreation + Tree Board. And as well as two of our Planning Commission members, Robin and Stuart, were on the steering committee. And we had some representatives from the business community, other residents, and Chris has that list in his presentation.

So, we went through a kick-off meeting, kind of gathering of information and reviewing where we were at currently and then beginning to formulate a vision plan and recommendations. And that took us the better part of a year, maybe a year and a half to go through that process. And then we kind of wrapped it up with a public input session in November of 2021. Karie had been with us for about a week or two when we had that meeting. And then we kind of looked through a final draft plan in the winter of 2022, and got input from our department directors and some other folks. And that was about the time the wheels kind of fell again, just in terms of development applications

that started coming through the door. So, that really was -- unfortunately, we had to cast everything aside to work on those development applications. But that has kind of subsided a little bit, and so we're back here tonight with a final draft plan. This has been on our website for a few weeks now. And I've shared it with the steering committee as well. And I don't know if, obviously it's the public hearing tonight, so we will take input from the public after Chris' presentation, and any questions that you all may have. Our goal, I'm not saying it's set in stone, but our goal is to present this to the City Council with your recommendation sometime in your future, probably October is kind of what we're shooting for. But we'll kind of see how tonight goes and decide after that, so.

So I'm going to just hand it over to Chris. He's going to go through his PowerPoint presentation and kind of give you an update of where we're at, and then we'll open it up for questions and answers.

MR. SHIRES: All right. Brian, thank you. Again, I'm Christopher Shires, principal with Confluence. Our office locally is 417 Delaware Avenue, Kansas City, Missouri. And so with tonight's presentation, I'd say we're a casual group. So, as I'm going through, if you have a question and want me to go back over something, I will. Otherwise, I will run through the presentation, of course. Definitely welcome the public's input as well as your comments. And Brian did a good overview on this.

This document has had a lot of eyes on it, a lot of input. And we've gone back and forth on a lot of items. So, we spent a lot of time and attention, especially your staff, and with all the other work they have to do as assigned.

So, with that on the next slide, just a little bit of the presentation outline, I do want to recap that project schedule. I think that is important, and our public input. Just to make sure it's really clear, we did go out to seek the public and stakeholder input and received it. We want to walk through the plan format just to make sure that chapter outline is kind of clear. And then I do want to spend some time because you did receive a special copy, the actual chapter goals. But I'm not going to go through all those individual action steps and policy considerations. You have it in full. We can sure talk about it, but I want to make sure I just kind of hit the highlights.

And then the hopeful next step is, depending on how -- what action you desire to take tonight, how comfortable we are, that then we can proceed to Council in October.

So, on the next slide, you don't have to read that, but that's what the schedule looks like. COVID did slow this one down as it had other plans. And then yeah, it takes a lot of staff time and attention. And so this did take a little bit more time than we typically like to see, but we also don't want to rush through a document that is this important.

So, on the next slide, I do want to kind of recap some of those key dates. And so we did have that initial joint workshop, the kick-off workshop with the Commission and Council on March of 2020. And then they had an official steering committee meeting on August of 2020, and then that steering committee met with us eight more times. So, nine total meetings. We had our public workshop in October of 2020. That's also when our interactive website went live. And I'll talk a little bit about what we heard there. We met with the City's leadership team, received their input early on in November of '21. We had another joint workshop in November 10th of '21. Then we had our draft public open house where we had good representation from the community to show up, review our plan. They could look at it online. That was also November of 2021. And then it

really came about to finalizing, making sure we really had the language in the plan that everybody's comfortable with, and that's why we had those two joint workshops with the Commission and Council there in April and May of this year.

On the next slide, just to recap of all those steering committee members. So, those that are here as well as if you run into them on the street, you know, buy them a coffee, buy them a beer, tell them a big thanks because that was a lot of work. We made them do a lot -- a lot of effort in this. Some of it online, some of it in person.

So, in the next slide, this is just a recap. So, we did a four-step project, and so here we're at the very end, Phase 4, the final plan adoption.

So with that, let's talk a little bit about that public input recap. The steering committee, our advisory committee, is always one of the most important things we include in the process. Again, those nine meetings, those four joint workshops. We did individual stakeholder and small group interviews. Had that interactive website. The public workshop, and then the -- to get that initial, and then the public open house to have them review the draft. And there was also an ETC Direction Finder survey that the City conducted that was instrumental in a lot of some of our recommendations. And that is a statistically valid survey of the community. And so it's something that Mission, the City regularly does, and it's a really good benchmarking tool to see how you've changed.

For those stakeholder interviews that took place in October of 2020, we had representatives from Rushton Elementary, some longtime residents, former City officials, local developers, transportation advocates, and a bunch of different business, community business leaders. And so a deep cross-section of the community.

And then our website had great traffic, 3,400 visits. And then what's most important is how unique. And so we're not tracking individuals. We're just tracking their IP address, so it is still anonymous, but 770 unique people. And that's a pretty good turn-out. We had a lot of different types of comments. And you can see, you know, like the various ways people provided their feedback. That budget response, it's always hard to get somebody to actually go through and move those tiles around and spend dollars. So only 73. That's okay.

Then on the next slide, what's a lot of fun is the map comments. And so that's kind of the power of us using some of these online engagement tools, is that mapping comment where they can zoom into any part of the community, drop a different type of map icon and make a specific comment. Hey, this is a great area for a trail. We need a park here. I don't like this intersection, whatever it might be. And then other commenters can see those or visitors to the website and say they like, they agree, or dislike, they disagree, or add their own comments. And so had a lot of comments that way about very specific things. That made it into the plan as well.

All right. Well, let's get into the plan document itself. The one thing I did want to note, and I almost hesitate to read. Maybe I should just hit a few of the highlights because it is a little bit lengthy, but we spent some time, and I think this was important on a mission statement. You know, what's our vision, I should say vision statement for the Comprehensive Plan. And that can be a little bit different than the City's overall mission or vision statement. But something really geared back to plan. And so some of those key things: inviting – sustainable – inclusive – generally embraces people of all ages and backgrounds – respects and nurtures all environments – put people first – connect points east for easy access towards the Metro. So, really understanding our role in the

Metro. Eclectic Downtown – respects our history and authentic character – invest in sustainable practices. So, really all those values that we heard from the community, the elected officials, our Commission members, our steering committee members are written into this vision statement. And I can I think maybe just summarize with that last paragraph, “We embrace and look forward to the many challenges we will experience in the 21st century. We plan ahead for new technologies and opportunities that will connect our residents and enhance our quality of life. Mission is a great place to grow up and grow old.” And so really thinking of a Community for All Ages. So, something to be respected. All right.

So, for those plan chapters, 1 through 11. So Section 1, that's just the introduction that kind of makes sense what it is. It's why we planned, how we use the Comprehensive Plan, its importance, its connection to zoning. Then the strategic opportunities, future land use, natural resources and environment, parks and rec, transportation, mobility, economic revitalization, housing and neighborhoods, infrastructure, and maintenance. And then the very important implementation chapter, just to kind of sum it all together and then some rather lengthy appendix. And that's just -- we do need to document the data that was collected. So, we have our existing conditions report and then that public input summary. Not something you'll probably read every day, but I would definitely of those, that introduction, the strategic opportunities, future land use, and then that implementation section are really those highlights, especially for the Planning Commission. This is a document for you to use as a reference point when you're making recommendations on rezonings, preliminary development plans, and new development projects.

And so let's start with that Strategic Opportunities Map. I do have a hard copy just in case. I'm ready. I've got red pens and colors just in case anybody wants to -- have any questions or mark something up or have us look at, so. But with that, that Strategic Opportunities Map on the next slide really helped us set the basis of where do we think are areas for new growth, redevelopment, infill development, or important locations and things for us to keep in mind. And so there is the red dashed circle around the little purple shapes. Those are areas identified for potential new or mixed-use development. The dashed blue circles are really those major gateway corridors, those entry areas. And so the City already thinks like this, and this helped reinforce that these are gateways into the community that announce, hey, you're now in Mission. You just left Roeland Park. You've entered into a new community and here's our value system. And also there's other dashed lines following the streets or hugging some of the streets like Nall or Lamar, those are important gateway corridors where different types of streetscape improvements can and should continue. Other roadway improvements are necessary. Trail considerations along Rock Creek. So, really kind of that opportunities of where we're going from there.

So, let's jump into the super important Future Land Use Plan section. And so with that, we're talking about existing land uses today and what we think they can look like in the future and really those impacts and opportunities. This map, as you know, well, I'll get to it. The Future Land Use map again is that map, that go-to map that I'm hoping the Commission, you know, you keep a copy, you have a copy, regularly using a copy to weigh those rezonings, those development requests, see how are we in accordance with our Comprehensive Plan.

So with this, existing land use, no surprise. You guys all know those colors mean something. Yellow, low-density residential, typically single-family residential. That's

your biggest land use percentage at 50 percent. Brown, high density residential. Think apartments. That's kind of your next category. Commercial at 9 percent in red. Office in blue, almost 8 percent. That light blue that's civic, government, things owned by the county, the city, the school district. The light pink is some type of industrial warehouse. Obviously, we have that one quadrant on the north end of town. And then the open space, that's in the pale green. That's different than the dark green that's parks and recreation. So, it's open space versus really programmed park space. And then kind of a lower category, we have less of that is that medium density residential. Typically think townhomes, row houses, things like that. We call it horizontally attached residential.

So, that's what we sit today. And this is just based on county land records. Based on use. So, I would know this is -- that is not a zoning map. So, you might have something zoned differently than how it's actually being used, and then potentially would be a grandfathered case. Very typical.

Let's talk a little bit about these land use categories going forward. So Future Land Use plan going forward. Kind of have the standard kit of parts, but a little bit special for Mission and the different things you have going on. So, low density residential. Single-family homes by attached homes, twin homes, or homes with an accessory dwelling unit, one accessory dwelling unit. I think we've talked a lot about that, but I'm happy to go into more detail about ADUs. We'll talk about it a little bit later. Then again, that medium density residential – townhomes, row houses. Could include some other things as well – daycares. And then high density residential. That's kind of more of your traditional apartment, you know, we're talking two-, three-, four-plus stories, 12-plus dwelling units per acre. So, similar to what you just -- what's under construction at Mission Bowl.

On the next slide, commercial, that's retail uses. Kind of sounds like what it is in contrast to office. And so office is more that professional office setting. It could be a medical office, business office, a little bit in contrast to retail. Sometimes we like to differentiate those because office can be a nice buffer or transition for, say, lower density residential.

And then business park and light industrial. So that's on the cleaner side of industrial, a little less intense.

And then two types of mixed-use. And so mixed-use medium density, that's really kind of the traditional Johnson Drive development. The one-, two-, three-story buildings, ideally two or three, whereas mixed-use high density could be a much taller building, four-, five-story, something a little more intense that we tend to see being developed as we go west along Johnson Drive versus quite kind of in the middle of the traditional Downtown area.

And of course, park space and parks and open space and pathways. So, program space that has a park on it or a trail. And then the public/semi-public things, again owned by the government, or in some cases the school district.

So let's get to what the new map looks like. And you can see a lot has not changed because we are respecting a lot of the existing single-family residential neighborhoods. But we're trying to find areas for new growth or redevelopment or infill development, areas where maybe we can add a little bit of housing overtime. Always up to the property owner. If you have an existing use, even if we color it different on this land use

map, you may have a different zoning. We don't necessarily have to change the zoning today and make somebody not conforming. We can sure leave it alone. So, I always advise people if you see your house and we're showing it as a different color than single-family residential, it's not the end of the world. It's just a potential what if for the future. As a landowner, they still have a right to be there, stay there. And if you don't change the zoning, if they're single-family today and you leave them alone, which is not necessarily a bad plan, they're not even non-conforming of legal non-conforming. And so that's something to think about is this is a what if future redevelopment in some areas. Because I know on the north side of Johnson Drive in the kind of the light orange, we do show some single-family homes, and instead, is that a potential for a new townhome or row house or a little bit higher density residential development. But keeping the city still at that low density. Nearly 50 percent low-density residential consistent.

Where we are making some adjustments or proposed adjustments is really getting away from the commercial/office, kind of traditional model, and a little more flexibility of the mixed-use land use category model. And so there's a lot more of the two purples, the dark purple for the higher density mixed-use and then the light purple for that lighter medium density mixed-use. And then really acknowledging just a few more degrees for high density residential as well as that medium density residential.

So, trying to take advantage of where we can on those redevelopment sites along, say, Johnson Drive or Martway, yet still respecting a lot of our traditional single-family units and thinking maybe over time there will be properties that will be ideal for, say, adding an accessory dwelling unit.

And the next one is just kind of a comparison between the existing land use and Future Land Use. And again, both of these maps are different than the zoning map. Your zoning map is law. It's what you've adopted and zoned over all these properties, and in certain areas it does look different.

MS. CULLINANE: I have a question.

MR. SHIRES: Yes.

MS. CULLINANE: Sorry. Is mixed-use Downtown the same as mixed-use medium density?

MR. SHIRES: Yes.

MS. CULLINANE: Okay.

MR. SHIRES: Yeah. So, you -- that's one that we went back and forth and debated the title. So, you must have caught a typo I have somewhere hidden in this plan.

MS. CULLINANE: I just saw one on the comparison, one of the legends. That's why I just wanted to make sure. It says mixed-use Downtown in the legend.

MS. KNELLER: Oh, yeah.

MS. CULLINANE: But on your descriptions you said mixed-use medium density. So, I just wanted to make sure.

MR. SHIRES: Oh, it sure does. Yeah. Yeah. So, that's one of those where we went back and forth on.

MS. CULLINANE: Okay.

MR. SHIRES: So, it is medium density. Same thing. It's kind of respecting the traditional Downtown that's not, say, six-story mixed-use. It's a lower scale development. And even the one-story retail is something we like and respect. Yeah. Good catch. I got to write myself a note.

MR. TROPBITO: I have a question too.

MR. SHIRES: Yes. Go ahead, please.

MR. TROPBITO: Okay. [Inaudible] semi-public. What is that? What is the definition of that?

MR. SHIRES: Maybe if you want to get a little closer to your mic. I know I had a hard time hearing you.

MR. TROPBITO: What's the difference between public and semi-public when [inaudible].

MS. DUKELOW: If I may, I think that's the AT&T building, and I think it probably is not public.

MR. SHIRES: Oh, you're talking right here.

MR. TROPBITO: No. Well, yeah. There and higher. There and further to the north.

MR. SHIRES: Oh, this [inaudible] right here.

MR. TROPBITO: Right. Well, it's just really a whole strip that just really separated by a little bit of dark purple or dark blue office.

MR. SCOTT: This spot right there?

MR. TROPBITO: Yeah. It's a long, long strip really going from 55th Street all the way up to the highway.

MR. SCOTT: Yeah.

MR. SHIRES: Where I'm pointing on this map, are you talking right here?

MR. TROPBITO: There and then to the north of this.

MR. SHIRES: Here. Are you talking this purple or this dark blue here?

MR. TROPBITO: I'm talking to the light blue that's to the north and the south of the dark blue.

MR. SHIRES: Are you talking about this?

(Mr. Shires showing Mr. Troppito the display board. Conversation away from mics)

MR. TROPPITO: All right. Well, anyway, what is the blue that's to the very north [inaudible].

MR. SCOTT: That parcel of property where Foxridge goes north and turns to the east. That, and Commissioner Snyder asked about that during our work session, that is actually owned by the City of Mission. That is land, remnant land that the City acquired, I don't know when, years ago from a developer. You can't develop that land. It's so steep. If you're familiar with that area –

MR. TROPPITO: [Inaudible; talking off mic]

MR. SCOTT: -- you've got to go around the curve there, it's just like a hillside, basically.

MR. TROPPITO: Okay. So, it's really City's ownership.

MR. SCOTT: Right.

MR. TROPPITO: That's what makes it public.

MR. SCOTT: Yeah. And then.

MR. TROPPITO: That was – that's in answer to my question I was asking. Okay.

MS. CULLINANE: [Inaudible; talking off mic]

MR. TROPPITO: Okay.

MR. SCOTT: And then the – that blue section kind of to the south of that is actually the AT&T building.

MS. CULLINANE: What is that blue?

MS. KNELLER: Office.

MR. SCOTT: Well, it's semi-public. But basically utility is what it is. That's why it's –

MS. KNELLER: Oh, south of there.

MS. CULLINANE: [Inaudible; talking off mic]

MR. SCOTT: Yeah.

MR. SHIRES: [Inaudible] color blue. Yeah.

MR. SCOTT: Yeah. I don't know what that little blue dot, that dark blue dot is I don't know.

MR. SHIRES: Special Olympics, KC.

MR. SCOTT: Okay.

MR. SHIRES: So a little office building there.

MR. SCOTT: Yeah. It's an office building that's owned by the Kansas Special Olympics organization.

MR. SHIRES: Yeah.

MR. TROPBITO: [Inaudible; talking off mic]

MR. SHIRES: Yeah. Good question.

MS. CULLINANE: I have another question. So, there is an area that is light blue. It's – I can show you on the map.

MR. SHIRES: Yeah, please.

MS. CULLINANE: And so it's currently the City owned, and I know that the City owns it. Right here. So it's light blue now. So, what's -- it's turning to purple, which is mixed-use high density. So does that mean the City -- does that mean that the City would sell it? Or what happens because right now it is City owned?

MR. SCOTT: Well, I don't – the City doesn't have any plans to sell it, but potentially in the future, something – if a development were to occur at that location that's a possibility the City might incorporate that with some kind of future development. The City had planned at one time to extend Broadmoor north and to intersect at Foxridge. So, the City had started to acquire property. That purple triangle section right here is predominantly owned by the city. And just the neighborhood is not -- it voiced pretty strong opposition to having a street go through there. And then just the actual, the topography is very steep through there. So, to build a road would be a pretty expensive proposition. So, it just hasn't been a high priority for the City in the past. So, we bought the land several years ago because the opportunity presented itself, but nothing has ever really been done with it since.

MS. CULLINANE: But I know that other residents have raised before, like whenever we were working on that apartment. I forget the name, but that large high-density apartment complex just to that east.

MR. SCOTT: Yeah. The Block project, yeah.

MS. CULLINANE: Yeah. That they were talking about concerns around them acquiring that area. And so that's why, I guess I just phrase it as a concern because I think we should listen to the residents and also give them that opportunity to even purchase it. Like I guess why would we have the high-density, you know, apartments purchase it over like a homeowner that would rather purchase it. And it's a kind of – it definitely is a nice buffer to go between that high-density area to that residential. So I don't know, you know, with what we're doing this evening, if we can propose things like that to be changed or, you know, stay the way they are.

MR. SCOTT: Uh-huh.

MS. CULLINANE: Because I guess, and I voice similar concerns just to the north of that too where we have going straight from high-density to residential low-density residential, and so it's nicer to see that buffer that we have closer to the Downtown area. And so I think having that peach buffer is nice.

MS. KNELLER: I think one of the things that we thought about with this area is that there's a -- like a hedge row and buffer between where that yellow residential neighborhood is already and where you would have some space to possibly develop maybe on the west side of that parcel. That was the quick consideration. There's a couple of other places on here too where you have the dark purple that's next to the yellow, but the topography is such that there's a buffer or an elevation change that would create that, like you said, the buffer --

MS. CULLINANE: Right.

MS. KNELLER: -- between residential and any kind of high density mixed-use type of scenario?

MS. CULLINANE: But whose property is that buffering? Is that on like the purple potentially?

MS. KNELLER: It would be -- it's on the City owned property now. And so we would definitely, if we had a development that came to us and said, hey, I want, and it's unlikely because this is such an awkward place anyway. But if there was development in that area, it would be, you know, contingent upon us to ensure that there's going to remain a buffer between that development and the residential neighborhood adjacent.

MS. CULLINANE: Right. I guess I would -- oh, sorry. Go ahead, Brian.

MR. SCOTT: There is an office building there too. I mean, if you look at the existing land use map, you'll see the small blue dot. That's an existing office building at that location.

MS. CULLINANE: Yeah.

MS. KNELLER: And it's going also [inaudible].

MS. CULLINANE: And it looks like that gets changed in the new one to medium density residential. It gets changed from office to medium density residential. So, I guess I like that. And so what I'm proposing is rather than making that little, tiny square purple, you know, maybe we make that -- leave it as City public, semi-public or whatever it is, or a medium density residential. Because I just think that we've heard concerns from residents for years on that. And so to change it to a high density residential could potentially develop that raises some concerns. Because it is so close to houses, there is no, I mean right there in that specific square there is no opportunity for buffer.

MS. DUKELOW: I agree. And you know, we've talked about, I don't know what that one is where they wanted land in the middle of all those houses up off of Riggs and 51st Street. But you know, the people never dreamed that that would be developed. I would never have dreamed it either.

MS. KNELLER: Oh, on the Preserve?

MS. DUKELOW: But as it sits right now there's nothing we can do about it. You know what I'm talking about?

MS. KNELLER: Uh-huh.

MR. SCOTT: Mission Preserve project or –

MS. DUKELOW: Yes. Yes. And I don't care how beautiful it is, I never would have anticipated anyone would go in there with that terrain and develop it. And I agree with Megan that where you have the purple against yellow, unless there is already existing, and I mean in the case up north of 55th, I know it's there today, and there is, you know, a big buffer there; it exists. But I really feel for those neighbors on whatever street that is, Broadmoor, if the Comprehensive Plan is followed because it says right there high density in their backyard.

MS. KNELLER: High density mixed-use. Yeah. That's where it is.

MS. DUKELOW: We'd like to see medium there, I believe.

MR. SHIRES: [Inaudible; talking off mic]

MS. KNELLER: Not the yellow, but I think she's talking about the dark purple.

MR. SHIRES: Just to make sure I'm [inaudible] collectively because [inaudible]. Just this little square here.

MS. DUKELOW: Well, and north of it. There's houses all along there.

MS. CULLINANE: Where Karie was saying has a lot of brush right here. But I still think just making this right here –

MR. SHIRES: So, I'll figure –

MS. CULLINANE: Just a little – just a buffer right there.

MR. SHIRES: [Inaudible; talking off mic]

MS. DUKELOW: Because there's yellow right next to the purple.

MS. KNELLER: So, yeah. I think there's an office right here. This is where we're showing some purple right now, and this is the tree cover. And I could pull up parcels too to show more of the parcel outlines. So here's the office here and this would be mixed-use high density, the dark purple, and here is currently open. This is all City owned property right through here.

MS. CULLINANE: Yeah. And I think that's the concern is changing City property to high mixed-use high density. I think it's -- I think it would be better suited to be medium density residential to just give that peach buffer.

MS. KNELLER: Because yeah. See this? This is the strip of the residential yellow that you're showing. Right up here. And then this is where it turns into purple and it comes up and around this way. All of that.

MR. SCOTT: Yeah. All of that, yeah. All of that would be the medium [inaudible].

MR. SHIRES: So, if I were to just stash that in something like this.

MR. SCOTT: Yeah.

MR. SHIRES: That would all be on [inaudible].

MS. KNELLER: Yeah. Because this parcel here could be – it doesn't want to choose it. This one. Could be that – is that what you're talking about, Megan? So, this one right here. This would be all purple and this is purple right now. But we're wanting to take this and make it like a medium density residential or something.

MS. CULLINANE: Uh-huh. Just make like – I think he has it. Like that strip, just an L or peach strip. Yep.

MS. DUKELOW: Yep. Yep. I agree with that.

MR. SNYDER: And, Chris, I have a question with regard to 51st Street and where the letter A and it's a mixed-use high density. Is that where the seniors -- that senior –

MR. SHIRES: Yeah. Right here.

MR. SNYDER: That senior –

MR. SHIRES: Oh, yeah.

MR. SNYDER: Is that where -- is that the Mission Preserve? Is that where that senior place is going in?

MR. SCOTT: No. This is the Retreat. That's the existing apartment building Retreat.

MR. SNYDER: Okay. Okay.

MR. SCOTT: The Mission Preserve project would be this section right here.

MR. SNYDER: Okay.

MR. SHIRES: And I know we had a lot of debate on that corner and that existing apartment complex, and the thought is if you could get its value up a little bit as far as raw land, would it incentivize somebody to do a wholesale redevelopment and improvement of it, something to that effect. So, I was trying to have that flexibility for that little piece.

MS. KNELLER: We were kind of considering this intersection right here at Lamar and 51st Street as a node that you could have some development on and to support the commercial that's there now. It's like a Mexican, like a taco shop now. And you have the higher density residential there. So, what if you had a mixed-use there, would that then become a node of development where it's like a place to be, so.

MS. SMITH: I have a question about the future land use definitions.

MR. SHIRES: Yeah. [Inaudible; talking off mic]

MS. SMITH: So, okay. So, the medium density residential is defined as 6 to 12 dwelling units per acre. And then the mixed-use medium density is defined as 12 to 45 units per acre. I assumed when I was initially looking at this that the medium density residential would have the same density as the mixed-use residential density.

MR. SHIRES: Yeah.

MS. SMITH: Why is that different?

MR. SHIRES: Yeah. So, really great comment. It's the thought that medium density, you know, straight up medium density residential is row house, townhome. Those are really hard to ever develop them beyond 12. Whereas in a mixed-use development that still may be, you know, three-some stories, three to four stories, you sure could get to some higher numbers. I, you know, I think Mission Bowl is kind of a good example. You know, I don't know what that dwelling unit count on that is, but it's up there. They were able to get a lot.

MS. KNELLER: Phase 1 is 170-something, I think.

MR. SHIRES: Yeah.

MS. KNELLER: And Phase 2 is another 96.

MR. SHIRES: Yeah.

MS. SMITH: To me that's a high density development.

MR. SHIRES: And this is one of those things where on these kind of definitions, it's all on the -- it's ultimately really what the City is comfortable with. So, you know, if you thought no, that should be a lower number, sure.

MS. SMITH: Yeah. I think it should be a lower number.

MR. SHIRES: What we're just trying to do is have just the most amount of flexibility for you. So, I don't know if you have even a recommendation. But yeah, I mean, you could see it a lower number.

MS. SMITH: Does that number include the -- is it -- does it include the commercial tenants or just the residential?

MR. SHIRES: Yeah. That's a great question. It's just the residential. So, that would not include the commercial. And that's a little bit why we have that floor area ratio, just building to land area, kind of set some of those upper limits. But yeah. You absolutely could say a different -- instead of 12 to 45, it's 12 to some other number.

MS. SMITH: Okay. Yeah. I guess that's something that I think needs to be explored or looked at.

MR. SHIRES: Uh-huh. Yeah. And then the way you'll implement that long term is, you know, really your next step will be doing some code updates and modifications as you see fit.

MR. SNYDER: Hey, Chris. You know, I know my definition of mixed-use is, is there a definition here in this Comprehensive Plan in terms of how you're defining mixed-use development, I mean, commercial housing? I mean, is that basically standard, or is there one in here that crystalizes it?

MR. SHIRES: So, this is a broad definition. And so really when we say mixed-use in our two categories, and I'll do the medium density one, you know, well, actually they're kind of in order, so I'm going to do the high density one first. So, pedestrian friendly mix of housing, office and retail uses either in a multi-story building. We call that vertical mixed-use, or in a cohesive development, we call that horizontal mixed-use.

MR. SNYDER: Okay. What page are you reading from?

MR. SHIRES: Oh, in this case it was just page 23 of my slide.

MR. SNYDER: Okay. Gotcha. Okay.

MR. SHIRES: So it's just in the land use section --

MR. SNYDER: Okay.

MR. SHIRES: -- in the beginning.

MR. SNYDER: Okay.

MR. SHIRES: So, that would be the best one. And now realistically going forward, what you will do to kind of reinforce like we don't want these type of auto-oriented uses. We do want these kinds of things. Your zoning code, your Form Based Code will all be those perfect places to really kind of sink in if you want to get more specific. And I'd encourage you to look at that. What have you liked, and we talked about this one a lot. What have you liked about your Form Based Code District? What haven't you liked? You know, are there some tweaks to do. Yeah. Good question.

MR. TROPBITO: What does future mean?

MR. SHIRES: What does future mean?

MR. TROPBITO: How many years?

MR. SHIRES: Okay. So, that's another great question. So, in the life of your plan, we are looking to the year 2040. We picked a number in the future. Knowing that your community has done a lot of evolving, we didn't go out to 2050, 2060. So, in this case we were only looking to 2040. But to be fair and all the updates you've done over the years, we tend to think if a plan has a shelf life of 10 years, just because the economy changes, the world changes, things change, so in this case we're looking to the year 2040.

Now, even when we color up the land use plan, we're realistically trying to look even farther out. But there's so many that we can't quite guess, you know, as far as changes in technology that may really change how we live. So you know, we just try to pick a point in space. So, future in this case is 20 -- 17 years out.

MR. TROPBITO: Well, what would you recommend that we do to review the plan [inaudible].

MR. SHIRES: What I would recommend as a Planning Commission, you review just as a part of a regular, you know, Planning Commission meeting, I don't know that you necessarily need a special meeting. Maybe once a year, and just kind of go through the Comprehensive Plan as a refresher. You know, how have you used it? How have you not used it? What's your development, you know, last years' of development projects, rezonings, and what not you've taken through. What have you liked, not liked. How have they coincided with your Future Land Use Plan. And so that I would do on a yearly basis. And realistically, depending on the rate of change, you're probably looking to do a new plan in ten years. Ten years from the date of adoption, start thinking about it real seriously unless something shattering changes, unless there's some really big shift in the community. If we have some kind of a big environmental change, a big financial change, a big technology change. And so that's what I would recommend.

MR. TROPBITO: Well, one of the reasons why I asked it was [inaudible] affects [inaudible].

MR. SHIRES: Yeah.

MR. TROPBITO: So, I think our timeline is going to have to be compressed and reevaluated.

MR. SHIRES: But what I --

MR. TROPBITO: For use.

MR. SHIRES: What I, and I think your plan does really great job of thinking about it. You're one of the few communities that I think takes it very, very seriously as far as the environmental impact. Probably what I think we'll start seeing most in our, in the Midwest, is climate refugees. I think like the Kansas City population, we'll see even more growth pressure. So there will be more housing demand. Now, we're also likely to see maybe stronger weather events, bigger storms, heavier storms, rain, and whatnot. And so you looked at it from the stormwater side, the rain side. And you know, frankly, this plan is trying to push on the housing side too. And so I think there's a lot of components that this is trying to be future ready, focused to the future.

MS. KNELLER: I think one of the things that we look at too as planners and long range planners is that we're considering not just what the political ramifications of updates and changes are, but what are the -- what's the data say and what's the, you know, when we have a new study, let's take a look at that, you know, and apply it in some way to what we're doing, if we're looking at an updated plan and not just on a whim, you know, say, oh, we don't like it. We don't -- whatever it happens to be, that emotional response should be backed up with data. So that's one of the things that we're, you know, I mean strongly I think any consultant would say strongly recommend making sure that we're looking at data and reports that are coming out on demographics and the climate change and all of those things as we tend to want to make updates to the plan too.

MR. SHIRES: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN LEE: Don't we also have the state statute that tell us we have to do every so often? Just how long?

MR. SCOTT: State statutes require that we review the comp plan at least once a year.

MR. SHIRES: And if I can just add one more thing, what I think would be fair is if you have a development application in front of you, a rezoning, and it makes a whole lot of sense, but it doesn't -- I'm just -- I'm blocking. It doesn't match one of our land use colors, consider amending the land use plan as part of it. It doesn't have to slow down the process; it can be a part of that rezoning step. That way you can keep your land use map fresh or up-to-date. And we're going to give you all the background files to be able to do that. Or just call and ask us and to make it.

MS. DUKELOW: I have some areas I'd like to review. I'm looking north of Johnson Drive. I mean sorry. Yes.

MS. KNELLER: Do you want the Future Land Use Plan? Is that okay?

MS. DUKELOW: North of Johnson Drive where there is suddenly medium density over existing single-family homes.

MR. SHIRES: Yeah.

MS. DUKELOW: So, my challenge I guess, or my thought on that is that that shouldn't be west of Lamar. That that area north of Johnson Drive, west of Lamar should remain residential, single family as it is. And if there's resistance, then let's just go ahead and take out Riggs too and see how the Council feels about that.

MR. SHIRES: Yeah. And so, I mean that's another change we can mark up on the map if you want to take that forward. A little background is we were trying to find areas for some residential growth. We also, kind of like we just talked a little bit about is, although there are a lot of existing situations where you have single-family residential up against commercial development today, long-term going forward, can we put a little bit of a buffer, and so that was some of the desire. That way we're not, you know, having, say, redevelopment on these properly zoned commercial sites, but that's still right up against single-family. And so it was really a thought of a transition. So, opportunity for new residential growth, opportunity to kind of have some more buffering and separation between less compatible land uses. And so could you change it? You bet. You're the Commission. You can make that recommendation. That's just the background on, you know, what we were thinking and why.

MS. DUKELOW: Sure. Sure. [Inaudible].

MS. KNELLER: I think we took from the joint workshops we took some input from several folks that we wanted a buffer between the yellow and purple.

MR. SHIRES: Right.

MS. KNELLER: And so we did that purposely to provide that buffer. And it's, you know, as Chris alluded to earlier, this doesn't necessarily mean that we're going to rezone this area.

MS. DUKELOW: I understand.

MS. KNELLER: This is like a possibility of what, if we need some more development, if we need some more residential because let's say climate change refugees for example, then then we have the possibility because we're building it into our Future Land Use, our possibilities map. And then it allows us that flexibility. It doesn't mean that we have to.

MS. DUKELOW: Okay.

MS. KNELLER: Yeah.

MS. DUKELOW: Let me put it this way then. If you're going to do it to Walmer and Russell, let's do it to Riggs.

MS. KNELLER: And I guess --

MS. DUKELOW: Take it all the way, and I'm not sure how far it's going to go.

MS. KNELLER: Yeah. I was wondering about that too. But there was like a weird --

MS. DUKELOW: That's why they need to back off.

MS. KNELLER: -- because it's commercial development there, it was odd to take it from commercial to residential and make that jump. Whereas, it was more of a natural jump to do medium density residential in those places where we indicated on there. And that's why we left it there particularly.

MS. DUKELOW: I understand.

MS. CULLINANE: But I think what Robin is saying --

MS. DUKELOW: There are existing homes there; people live there.

MS. KNELLER: Yeah, for sure.

MS. DUKELOW: And I don't think anybody is going to want to see that.

MS. KNELLER: Yeah, and some other places in here too where there's some yellow existing where we've made it a higher density area as a possibility. If someone sells, you know, a large chunk of property and you're able to do that, I mean, unless there's a whole lot of selling of small lots going on, it's probably not going to happen. But this gives us the flexibility that we could possibly if that happens.

MS. DUKELOW: Sorry. I'm not budging on this one. I guess you either do it all the way across, lock, stock, and barrel. Take out Riggs too with medium, or you take it off of Russell and Walmer.

MS. KNELLER: I mean I hear what you're saying. I'm just explaining like what our thought process was.

MS. DUKELOW: I understand.

MS. CULLINANE: And I guess I voice similar concerns as Robin. Just because, you know, we're doing this now, we're going to be doing this land use plan in the future, right? So, I think eventually it's just going to keep pushing the boundaries, right. And so, I think it's good for us to look back and say, okay, there are these homes there now. Let's leave them as homes instead of giving that opportunity for that mixed density in the future.

MS. KNELLER: You mean single family homes there?

MS. CULLINANE: Medium density residential, I said there are --

MS. KNELLER: There are single-family homes there, is that what you're saying, and you don't want to see anything that's says single-family home right now?

MS. CULLINANE: No. I'm saying --

MS. KNELLER: So, to become mixed or medium.

MS. CULLINANE: I don't like seeing -- I don't like seeing that, you know, keep pushing up north for increasing the density. I think we should leave some of them the way they are and leave them as single-family homes, the low density residential.

MS. DUKELOW: And then the other thing I'm going to do is I'm going to go down to the quality of these homes. These homes were built in the 40s. They are solid homes. I mean, if we want to take and make a big multi-family area, you know, let's plan on something that was built closer to World War II because there are plenty of that housing stock, and it's not pretty. You know, I just I -- this I disagree with.

MR. SCOTT: Okay. Well --

MS. DUKELOW: I can't recommend it.

MR. SCOTT: We had talked at the work session back in the spring about development opportunities along Johnson Drive, especially when we reconstruct Johnson Drive from Lamar going west to Metcalf, so then there was a desire to see some transitional type of housing kind of to the north or backing up to that potential development area as sort of a transition to the single-family homes further north. That was kind of the message that we got from those work sessions and that's the reason why added this in.

MS. DUKELOW: Well, I understand that would be consistent with what we've done on some other plans. But then let's take out -- let's do Riggs too. And again, we'll see how that works out.

MR. SCOTT: Yeah.

MS. KNELLER: Robin, just to be -- I'm trying to get clarification.

MR. SCOTT: There's no clear delineation if it doesn't go all the way across. That's –

MS. DUKELOW: Okay. Somebody is asking me is why is Riggs not part of this?

MS. KNELLER: I'm not sure about.

MR. SCOTT: There wasn't a clear delineation in terms of like 58th, it was kind of like the dividing line, but it doesn't draw all the way across.

MS. KNELLER: Robin, are you asking for the apricot color to be carried over to Riggs?

MS. DUKELOW: I'm asking for it to be removed --

MR. SCOTT: Removed is what she wants.

MS. KNELLER: Okay.

MS. DUKELOW: -- between Russell and Walmer.

CHAIRMAN LEE: [Inaudible; talking off mic]

MR. SHIRES: These two parcels are at least two areas apart.

CHAIRMAN LEE: I would lean towards it going over to it.

MS. KNELLER: The apricot to be a buffer between the yellow and the purple?

MS. CULLINANE: That's what I think Robin is saying like, why are we stopping there. Like, why aren't we --

MS. KNELLER: So, yeah. That's --

MS. CULLINANE: -- if we're going with the solution of having that peach transition, why didn't we go across.

MR. SCOTT: Yeah. We could I guess draw kind of a natural line at 58th --

MR. TROPITO: No.

MR. SCOTT: -- and just kind of extend it across and include those properties too.

MS. KNELLER: I think there was a reason that we didn't though. And there was, from looking at the map, why -- because I, I mean, yeah, we thought the same thing.

(Commissioners talking amongst themselves)

MR. TROPITO: [Inaudible]

MS. DUKELOW: I'd rather see the orange go away and have it stay as it is.

MS. KNELLER: Oh, you want to see the orange all the way. See that --

CHAIRMAN LEE: She wants it to go away.

MS. KNELLER: Oh, go away.

MS. DUKELOW: But I think you've got to do one or the other. You've got [inaudible].

MS. CULLINANE: You can't have asking why did it stop?

MS. KNELLER: Because there are single-family homes there currently and we, you know, I --

MR. BRADEN: South of that line [inaudible] because I thought the idea was -- so, it's commercial now and we're talking about it being mixed-use medium density. So, if we have got mixed-use medium density here and then we have housing right up against it, then we don't have a buffer at that point. So, are we saying we can really intensify here but then right up against residential.

CHAIRMAN LEE: It should go all the way across.

MR. BRADEN: What's that?

CHAIRMAN LEE: It should go across [inaudible].

MR. SHIRES: And I think it's fair for you to have these kind of debates, and this is the right meeting to do it. And so that's what I've kind of heard and marked on this map, if I can approach kind of the two options.

MS. CULLINANE: But from my understanding this is like the final approval. We're not having any other reviews of this Comprehensive Plan, correct?

MS. KNELLER: There can still be amendments.

MS. CULLINANE: Okay.

MR. SCOTT: Yeah. Obviously, as we stated just a minute ago, we're required once by law, to come back once a year to the Planning Commission to review the Comprehensive Land Use Plan. Now, for the purposes of this adoption, if you all are not comfortable recommending something to the City Council tonight, we can hash out these discussions and then come back again in October for a final review, then make a recommendation --

MR. BRADEN: Well, that's what I was asking.

MR. SCOTT: -- to go to a City Council in November. That's what I was kind of trying to allude earlier when I presented was that although we'd like to kind of get this wrapped up, and at some point, we need to get this wrapped up. It's been dragging on for four years now. We just need to get done with it and move on with our lives. But does it have to be tonight? No.

MS. KNELLER: Is something going to happen in the next year where all of those parcels are going to be developed with high density? No. We can revisit that and say, look, you know, we've looked at it further. We want to update this Comprehensive Plan,

you know, in 2024. We want to update this Comprehensive Plan to, you know, I've really looked at this. I've studied it. I'm looking at the -- all the reasons that we should change what we approved tonight, and that's fine. It's not going to happen in a year that this is -- that that land is --

MS. SMITH: I don't want -- sorry. I don't want anything out there and published that we don't -- that we aren't comfortable with because we use this stuff to make decisions and to inform our, you know, our judgments about whether something should be allowed or not. So, I don't want to have a document out there that I don't agree with, or I think is incorrect that we're all basing our opinions off of.

MR. SCOTT: Yeah.

MS. KNELLER: I'm just wondering about the apricot color. Are we getting rid of that completely off of this map because that's not what we heard.

MS. CULLINANE: I think we have mixed opinions.

MR. SHIRES: And if I can just state one thing just on the background on this, frankly, you guys have actually gone through this map several times. I'm kind of in my own head just thinking, so I'm going to go back to the 2021 Version X. You are going back and forth on parcels. I really would encourage you, have a good discussion tonight. Use the time you have. Make a decision and make a recommendation. And if you all agree, great. And if you don't agree, majority wins. Do that. And then, you know, if you say well, we go back and analyze this and come back. Sure can. But really, at some point I think you do have to decide what you want to do. Take a vote, see if that one wins because I think really if you -- if we want another joint workshop, it'll be like this. You have a couple more meetings. We'll come back and change colors three different ways because we have. We have actually changed many of these parcels multiple, multiple times. So really, back to, you know, what do you guys want. And, you know, vote it up, vote it down. And because then we can communicate it to Council. If that takes a couple of meetings, no worries.

MS. KNELLER: Would it help if I brought this up because looking at the aerial map and looking at this up here, you've got commercial and office buildings here along Johnson Drive. Sorry.

MS. CULLINANE: Can you enlarge it a little bit more?

MR. TROPITO: Can you enlarge it?

MS. KNELLER: I can, but I want to show like, okay.

MR. TROPITO: Can we get the --

MS. DUKELOW: We know the Pizza Hut is there.

MS. KNELLER: Uh-huh.

MS. CULLINANE: Chiropractor.

MS. DUKELOW: That [inaudible] shop is there.

MS. KNELLER: Yeah.

MS. DUKELOW: -- with Plato's Closet. I mean, it's not --

MS. KNELLER: And I think ideally what we were --

MS. DUKELOW: And the Starbucks is there. It used to be Taco Bell. Now, Taco Bell is next door. We've got CVS on the corner and then there's an office building behind it.

MS. KNELLER: Yeah. So I just thought just in case everybody is not super, you know, where this is and not -- doesn't really like conceive of it, I just wanted to look at it real quick --

MS. DUKELOW: Okay. If you want the apricot --

MS. KNELLER: -- so that everybody can be on the same page because that's important.

MS. DUKELOW: -- run the apricot all the way across though.

MS. KNELLER: Well, and that was --

MS. DUKELOW: And that would only take only half [inaudible].

MS. KNELLER: I think that's what we said. And then what happened in the joint workshop was that we -- that you all didn't want that because those were single-family homes there behind and it was already existing the way that it is now in this --

MS. DUKELOW: That's right.

MS. KNELLER: -- in this map right here. So we said, okay, that's fine. If it's already existing like this and everybody is fine with it, let's just leave that part fine. But I thought originally, we did have -- we wanted to take it all the way across, and that was like, that was a non-starter.

MS. DUKELOW: I would rather it go away.

MS. CULLINANE: So, why don't we take a moment to pause and just everyone --

MS. DUKELOW: Make it yellow. It's yellow now. Nobody is --

(Inaudible; talking over one another)

MS. CULLINANE: I forget your name.

MR. SHIRES: Chris.

MS. CULLINANE: As Chris recommended, why don't we go through and say whether or not we agree or disagree with the apricot color.

MR. SHIRES: And what I think to be fair just on kind of a meeting procedure, not to step on the chair's toes, so I apologize. I think it would be fair to do an informal poll. This is not a vote. It doesn't matter. But just to see is everybody comfortable if we do A or B, and then let us make sure we're getting all the other little areas. Because maybe there is consensus tonight.

MR. SNYDER: So --

MS. CULLINANE: It won't be on the record. Well --

CHAIRMAN LEE: It'll be on the minutes.

MS. CULLINANE: It'll be recorded, but what -- as mentioned.

MR. SHIRES: It's not an action.

MS. CULLINANE: It's not a formal poll. It's more of each person allowing the time to share their thoughts on the apricot color.

MR. SHIRES: Because we do need to allow the public, since there's two folks here, to have their public comment part. And so you do need to do the old close and move on. And so I -- but I think with this discussion, which they're probably benefiting from, it would be, you know, what do you guys think? Is there a consensus?

MR. SNYDER: I have a point of clarification.

CHAIRMAN LEE: We need to clarify what we're really talking about.

MR. SHIRES: What?

MR. SNYDER: In regards of what we're doing.

CHAIRMAN LEE: Are we talking about only the apricot down next to the yellow? Or are we talking apricot in general?

MR. SCOTT: Let's do this as an A and B.

(Commissioners talking amongst themselves)

MR. SNYDER: So, Robin, when you were talking that commercial area, that, you know, Plato and all that, so that medium density would possibly in the future about those businesses in the back there.

MR. BRADEN: That's what I'm asking.

MR. SHIRES: Yeah.

MR. BRADEN: Are we allowing a higher density where the commercial is, so it's got Plato's whatever we get it.

MR. SHIRES: Not from your current zoning. It's pretty intense zoning right now. So, let's just ask -- let's have that talk quick here, A and a B. A is the get rid of the medium density that we've kind of shown in, and if you want to, Karie, even highlight.

MS. KNELLER: Apricot here.

MR. SHIRES: Okay. So Option A, and I'll show each of the Commissioners is to get rid of west of Lamar at medium density, that density that's up against the proposed [inaudible].

MS. DUKELOW: The existing.

MS. CULLINANE: And leave this purple.

MS. DUKELOW: Yeah. Leave the purple.

MR. SHIRES: Yeah. We would take out this [inaudible] take this back to single-family [Inaudible, talking off mic] That's A. B --

(Commissioners talking amongst themselves)

MR. SHIRES: That's A and it would be. So that's those -- your first preferred one. A is going to those single-family. B is to leave those alone but extend the medium density over all the way to Riggs. That's medium.

MS. SMITH: I feel like I can't even consider that question until we pin down what mixed-use medium density is.

MR. SHIRES: Well, I'd say do you have a proposal for that? What would you think is that right density?

MS. SMITH: Well, I mean, well, like not more than three stories. And I don't know like a certain, I mean, I would have to like think, like see an elevation of something and like see what -- how many feet tall it is. Like I want that kind of like restraints on this.

MR. SHIRES: So your comp plan would not be your best tool to actually set like a height limit. Now, if you wanted to say generally not more than three story --

MS. SMITH: Okay.

MR. SHIRES: -- I think that would be very fair. And even to say, you know, if we're going to three story, what I might say your upper limit is 18 to 24 dwelling units per acre. Somewhere in that ballpark would be probably about the right one.

MS. SMITH: Okay.

MR. SHIRES: So, that's what I'd say is if you said medium density, to make me feel better about mixed-use medium density, you know, it's three story max and it's 18, 20, 24 dwelling units per acre. I'm kind of mixed on that one.

MS. SMITH: And yeah. I mean we can add that to this. Then I could think about this other question.

MR. SHIRES: And again, this is just an informal poll just to kind of get us somewhere. Does anybody disagree with that? Does that kind of make sense with what, in general, all the Commissioners are thinking? Because ultimately what we'd need with your motion if you're recommending approval tonight is that we'll just outline these things for it to be official after you get public input.

MS. SMITH: But I mean honestly, like I, I mean is that the right answer, how many stories?

MR. SHIRES: It's not an uncommon answer. I don't want to say it. There's more than one right way to do this, and so it comes down to your value decision, your value. So, that wouldn't be a bad thing to do. Sometimes we worry about why we gave you so much more is we wanted to have more options, more flexibility, not lock you down so tight. But if there's a concern there's no reason why you couldn't.

MS. SMITH: Yeah. I mean like five is too tall.

MR. SHIRES: Yeah. And three is a common height.

MS. SMITH: [Inaudible; talking off mic]

MR. SHIRES: That's before we get to next level construction.

MR. SCOTT: So this is an example. The 58 Nall project that was approved, the three-story building, that's got 37 units in it.

MS. SMITH: Okay. That's probably --

MR. SCOTT: That's 37 units per acre -- 73 units per acre since --

MS. SMITH: That's probably -- that thing was really tall.

MR. SCOTT: It was three stories.

MS. SMITH: I think that's too tall.

MR. SCOTT: Yeah. It was three stories tall.

MS. CULLINANE: It did exceed the last, remember, I think you called it out --

MS. SMITH: Yeah.

MS. CULLINANE: -- that it exceeded the height, but we still approved it.

MR. SCOTT: And we actually shorted the roof is what we did.

MS. KNELLER: We brought the roof down at a different angle.

MS. CULLINANE: Sorry.

MR. SCOTT: We brought the roof line down.

MS. DUKELOW: That's not mixed use. So, that was just straight up medium-density residential [inaudible].

MS. KNELLER: Uh-huh.

MR. SCOTT: Yeah. Under this definition, it would be high density residential --

MS. KNELLER: It's high density under this, yeah.

MR. SCOTT: -- if it's 12 or more dwelling units, and it was about 37 dwelling units per acre that project. So that would be a high density residential under this definition.

CHAIRMAN LEE: [Inaudible] a show of hands?

MR. SHIRES: I think it could just be consensus and then --

CHAIRMAN LEE: Just to get it moving.

MR. SHIRES: Yeah. Yeah. Just as anybody --

CHAIRMAN LEE: [Inaudible; talking off mic]

MR. SHIRES: I think back to being fair, does anybody disagree with the three-story limit, maybe 24 dwelling units per acre kind of limit on the medium density mixed-use, the mixed-use medium density?

MR. SCHMID: Brian, can you say again one more time how -- what was the density of what was already?

MS. KNELLER: Brian, can you speak into the microphone?

MR. SCHMID: Sorry. Can staff tell me one more time what was the per acreage density of the example we were just talking about?

MR. SCOTT: It was I believe about 37 units per acre.

MR. SCHMID: Thirty-seven (37), okay. And we are now recommending that we reduce that to?

MR. SHIRES: Whatever number you guys are comfortable with.

MS. CULLINANE: I think, Brian, let's just say that would be considered high density.

MR. SCHMID: Yeah. Okay.

MR. SCOTT: There's medium density residential, high density residential, that --

MS. KNELLER: Anything over, I think, what is it 24, was what we said was high density.

MR. SCHMID: Well, here it's 12.

MR. SCOTT: It did say 12 or more dwelling units per acre.

(Inaudible; talking over one another)

MR. SCOTT: That's the definition of medium density residential.

MR. SHIRES: And that's really the difference between horizontal and vertical. Horizontal, it's hard to get ever above 12.

MR. SCOTT: So, the definition of medium density residential here is 6 to 12 dwelling units. That would be like some of the small apartment buildings along 58th Street.

MS. KNELLER: Or like townhomes like the one across the way.

MR. SCOTT: Yeah. Going to the west, you know, near like Outlook and Riggs, 58th and Riggs, kind of that area.

MR. SCHMID: I think that answer you just gave is kind of what I was looking for. Is the notion that with horizontally attached buildings, you can't really get above 12.

MR. SHIRES: It's hard, right.

MR. SCHMID: When we think about kind of that missing middle housing, duplexes, townhomes, row homes, if that's what we're looking to slide in here those are not vertically expanded, and 12 would make sense.

MS. KNELLER: That's a great point.

MR. SCOTT: Yeah.

MS. KNELLER: Because yeah, you can't get -- you can't get the high density on this -- on these parcels and on the -- in this area for the amount of density that we're talking about by the definitions.

MR. SHIRES: So, for the medium, or for the mixed-use medium density, do you want to say 24? 30? 18? I wouldn't go any lower than 18. Any lower and it's just not practical. I'd say 18, 20, 24, you know, maybe 36, if you feel that's too much.

MS. DUKELOW: I liked 24.

MR. SHIRES: Is there kind of consensus? Anybody disagree with this new definition?

(Inaudible; talking over one another)

MR. SCOTT: Medium density residential.

MR. SHIRES: For the mixed-use medium density residential, three-story max, 24 DU per acre. And I like the idea of just saying generically three story. When we get to any kind of zoning code work, it could be, is that 45 feet? Is it -- what's the right actual height and design standard, things like that. Yeah. Okay. So, I think there's general

consensus on that. So, back to the land use map. A is pull back that medium density west of Lamar. B is extend it all the way through Riggs.

MS. KNELLER: Riggs.

MR. SCHMID: And would C just be leave it exactly as it is.

MR. SHIRES: There you go. C, yes. So, is there consensus? Like is there consensus on A? Does everybody think A --

MR. TROPBITO: A.

MR. SHIRES: Pull back the single family. B, extend the medium density across.

MS. DUKELOW: Okay. Let's do it one at a time.

MR. SHIRES: Yeah. So sorry. A. I just -- I was hoping there was like more unanimous.

CHAIRMAN LEE: Show hands for A.

MR. SHIRES: So, like there's three for A.

MR. SCOTT: Three. Three hands for A.

MR. SHIRES: And then B, which is the extend across. There are four.

MS. CULLINANE: I never voted.

MR. SCOTT: Four.

MS. CULLINANE: Because I don't even know if I want -- I might leave it as it is or do A. I may not even -- I don't want B.

MR. SCHMID: Can we do a rank choice voting process here?

MR. SHIRES: Let me set that up on the computer real quick.

(Commissioners talking amongst themselves)

MR. SHIRES: So, how many for A?

(Inaudible; talking over one another)

MS. CULLINANE: No. A is you remove it.

MS. DUKELOW: A means take off these two apricot squares and return them to yellow.

MR. SHIRES: Right. That's A. So, how many for A again? Three. And you don't know yet. Three. Four. So, or you B? And then B, we'll run all the way across. B, one, two, three, four. So, it's really three to four. So, what it'll come down to is just later tonight you can decide if you want to make a motion and approve some change to the

map. But at least we kind of know what you have consensus on. The other map change, and then we have consensus on this zoning definition change. But I feel like maybe there's some more map questions.

MS. CULLINANE: We were just discussing whether or not, sorry, we had a side conversation of maybe we just leave it as is.

MR. SHIRES: Yeah. And that's C. How many people are leave it as we have shown today? One-ish. Maybe two. One or two. So, we don't really have a hundred -- the closest thing we have is B extended across.

But let's move on and maybe it'll kind of settle itself out a little bit. Any other map areas we want to discuss?

MS. DUKELOW: Yeah. I want to talk about the park that is on Beverly, on Beverly Avenue south of 55th Street. I don't think that exists. This should be an easy one.

MR. SHIRES: Put this one out.

MS. DUKELOW: Yeah. Right here. Well, that's Pius.

MS. KNELLER: Thank you.

MS. CULLINANE: This is homes.

MR. SHIRES: Okay. Mistakes are always possible. Is that a park right there on Beverly and south of West 55th?

MS. KNELLER: Is it, or it just [inaudible].

(Off Record Conversation)

MS. KNELLER: Yeah. Here it is. Beverly and 55th?

MR. SCOTT: No. Just north of -- yeah. Just south of --

MR. SHIRES: We screwed that up.

MS. KNELLER: Oh.

MR. SCOTT: It's a church.

MS. KNELLER: That's a church and there's some open space, but --

CHAIRMAN LEE: The blue area is the church.

MR. SCOTT: That's St. Pius, yeah.

MS. KNELLER: Yeah. That's all single-family over there.

MR. SHIRES: Yeah. I'll strike that mistake.

MR. SCOTT: Yeah. That's all single family.

MS. KNELLER: Oh, wait. It's on the west side of Beverly? Yeah. That's not the [inaudible]

MR. SHIRES: Yeah. No. I don't know how we messed that up. Sorry.

MS. DUKELOW: The garden is part of the part of the blue. It's part of Pius.

MR. SCOTT: Yeah.

MS. DUKELOW: Pius is a -- their community garden is back here. Their church is here.

MS. KNELLER: And then that would definitely be something that if we over time see anything more, we can always update this.

MR. SHIRES: What's it again?

MS. KNELLER: And again it's okay.

MS. DUKELOW: That doesn't belong here.

MS. KNELLER: Now, we'll change it now that we know. But we would catch things like this the next time we look at it too and say that's not correct or accurate.

MS. DUKELOW: So I don't think it's okay for us to make this area adjacent to our Roeland Park neighbors' mixed-use medium. I mean, I don't know. Can we do what -- then shoot. But that's, yeah.

MS. CULLINANE: Those are all those like homes long-term businesses. Those are those homes turned businesses.

MS. DUKELOW: I know what they are, but they're -- they had bought our neighbors in Roeland Park and we're saying that we might build something that's -- what did we say? Three stories in their backyard.

CHAIRMAN LEE: So, where -- we would -- those businesses.

MS. DUKELOW: They're like a childcare.

MS. KNELLER: Right here. These, all these along Johnson Drive.

(Inaudible; Commissioners talking over one another.)

MS. KNELLER: Some of them are Mission.

MS. DUKELOW: No, not on Johnson Drive.

CHAIRMAN LEE: She's talking about --

MS. DUKELOW: North of Johnson Drive. Okay.

MS. KNELLER: Yes.

MS. DUKELOW: We've got a project that just was approved for there.

MS. KNELLER: Are you talking about these?

CHAIRMAN LEE: At Nall.

MR. SCOTT: Well, she's talking about that blue -- that blue square.

MS. DUKELOW: At Nall.

CHAIRMAN LEE: So, that's where the --

MS. KNELLER: That's office.

CHAIRMAN LEE: West of [inaudible].

MR. SCOTT: Yeah. There's former homes and turned into businesses. One is a daycare. One is a --

MS. DUKELOW: Oh, yeah, yeah, yeah. You're right.

MS. KNELLER: On 58th Terrace.

MR. SCOTT: CBA or law firm.

MS. DUKELOW: I see what you're saying. I was lost. I'm sorry.

MR. SHIRES: Yeah. Well, it's a good way to be thinking but yeah.

MR. SCOTT: And that's still commercial. That's still identified in the future land use plan as office.

MS. KNELLER: Those are daycares.

MS. DUKELOW: Oh, okay. I'm sorry. I was lost.

MS. CULLINANE: And can you remind me again who owns the open space/undeveloped?

MS. KNELLER: That's that 58th Nall.

MR. BRADEN: Then why don't we have peach above [inaudible].

MS. KNELLER: That's that 58th Nall.

MR. BRADEN: No. Just north of there where the yellow is. Why don't we have a buffer there at all?

MS. KNELLER: Because we were -- what we heard in the joint workshop is what -- that we were adding too much density like everywhere and we should keep single-family residential in some cases.

MR. BRADEN: Okay. So, what's the buffer now? Is it just the street itself?

MS. KNELLER: Yeah.

MR. SCOTT: Yeah.

MS. DUKELOW: So, did we decide that 58 Nall is high density residential?

MS. KNELLER: That would be according to our definitions.

MS. DUKELOW: Even though it's only three stories.

MR. SCOTT: It's the number of units.

MS. KNELLER: Per acre.

MR. SCOTT: So, it's 37 dwelling units per acre.

MR. SHIRES: And that is typical for, say, a three-story multi-family building. That's a very common thing to consider that high.

MS. DUKELOW: But we also said that mixed-use medium dense -- medium density would only be 3 stories.

MS. KNELLER: And so that would leave you one commercial on the bottom. And it's a higher intensity of use because you have retail. You got people coming in, driving through, parking, leaving. And you've got, you know, the traffic of that.

MS. DUKELOW: So, you've got high density residential at three story and you got mixed-use medium density at three story.

MR. SCOTT: Uh-huh.

MR. SCHMID: It sounds like what we're hearing is just mixed-use is higher density than residential, regardless of whether or not it's medium or high.

MS. KNELLER: Higher intensity maybe or --

MR. SHIRES: And then your high density could be much taller than three stories, of course. High density residential. Yeah. Was there an open space question? I think we got those other ones solved.

MS. CULLINANE: Yeah. So, who owns like that open space/undeveloped today? Is that just like a -- it could be the City, or it could be private owners on the existing land use plan.

MS. KNELLER: At where? I can look it up for you.

MS. CULLINANE: Yeah. There's like a light green that says Open Space/Undeveloped.

MR. SCOTT: That's land that's not currently developed. So, that included the Gateway site or the Mission Preserve site up north. So it's mostly privately owned. You know, there's that one spot we identified earlier off of Foxridge that's owned by the City that's undeveloped.

MS. CULLINANE: Yeah. And I see a lot, just like a lot of this also along Johnson Drive, so that's why I was just curious.

MR. SHIRES: Those are just any undeveloped parcel. The county just considers them as kind of this vacant open space.

MS. CULLINANE: Which is --

MR. SCOTT: That green, that light green along Johnson Drive is the Mission Farmers' Market.

MS. DUKELOW: And what are the --

MS. KNELLER: And there's Beverly Park over there also. Yeah.

MS. CULLINANE: And I saw one that's also, you know, I just see them scattered around, so.

MR. SHIRES: Yeah. And it's, again, it's how the county has properties designated. We're just taking the county land records on how they're taxing them.

MR. SCOTT: We consider the Mission Farmers' Market to be a park, but the county has it as undeveloped land for some reason I don't know why.

MR. SHIRES: Yeah.

MR. SCOTT: Probably something we need to correct with the county.

MS. CULLINANE: I was just trying to figure out, like looking at the specific colors and when they are changing from that lighter green to a different color.

MS. DUKELOW: So what are the two blue parcels that are on Outlook south of Johnson Drive? What is the light blue? These little guys right here.

MS. KNELLER: Those two right there.

MS. DUKELOW: Is that Hollywood, the old Hollywood?

MS. KNELLER: Oh yeah.

MR. SCOTT: Yeah.

MS. DUKELOW: Yeah. That's what I was thinking.

MS. KNELLER: Because they're vacant parcels now, but they were office.

MR. SCOTT: Those are the two City owned lots on Outlook. And again, I don't know why they're classified as blue.

MS. KNELLER: They were commercial.

MR. SCOTT: But, yeah, they were commercial at one time.

MS. DUKELOW: Got it.

MS. CULLINANE: So, why are we leaving those public/semi-public instead of making them a --

MS. KNELLER: That's a good question.

MR. SHIRES: Yeah. We could sure change those.

MS. CULLINANE: I mean I just feel like we're doing it in other places.

MR. SCOTT: Well, it is, isn't it.

MR. SHIRES: Yeah.

MR. SCOTT: The future land plan shows it as --

MS. KNELLER: Well, so --

MS. CULLINANE: As public/semi-public.

MR. SCOTT: Yeah.

MS. KNELLER: One of the things that we have considered and we're doing this now at the Rock Creek Corridor project, the plan and study that we're undergoing right now is that we could have some public parking in those areas. And just because there's some public parking doesn't mean the whole thing has to be parking. There can be green space, green infrastructure, but there may be some opportunity for some public parking including EV charging. So, that's sort of -- if we just designated it as park or open space, we may not be able to use it like that if we change it to that now. So, it's just -- we're keeping it as City owned property until we figure out what we want to do with it.

MS. CULLINANE: So, why don't we do that over on the other one on the west side of town by Metcalf.

MS. KNELLER: It is.

MS. CULLINANE: No. We have it -- we were talking earlier about making it peach. So why not leave it in?

MS. KNELLER: Which one?

MR. SCOTT: She's talking about these properties over here.

MS. DUKELOW: The City owned property. Consistency.

MS. CULLINANE: Right.

MS. KNELLER: Oh, those.

MS. CULLINANE: So, let's leave that square too.

MR. SHIRES: I think that a little bit of the differentiation is, is the City going to own it long-term? That one, yes. The other one, no. Right. So, I mean, I think that's how I'd look at it.

MS. CULLINANE: Oh.

MR. SHIRES: If City is going to own it long term, it's pretty honest to classify it as Civic. And if we think it's going to be a redevelopment parcel, yeah, it would be good to have a different land use color.

MS. KNELLER: I guess there's opportunity for revenue up there on the north side, on the west side there.

MR. SHIRES: Yeah.

MS. KNELLER: There's opportunity for the City to gain revenue if we sold it. But right now we're just holding onto it and nothing is, it's not benefiting the public in any way other than having being, you know, natural open space, which is also -- it's a benefit but.

MR. SCOTT: That's part of the Form Based Code District. So, I think that was kind of the logic --

MS. KNELLER: Yeah.

MR. SCOTT: -- of keeping that as a mixed-use.

MS. KNELLER: Yeah.

MR. SCOTT: High density, yeah, high density mixed-use. So, that's part of the Form Based Code District.

MS. CULLINANE: Which one is?

MR. SCOTT: That one that we were talking about earlier that's --

MR. SHIRES: Changing it to medium density.

MR. SCOTT: Yeah.

MS. KNELLER: Right.

CHAIRMAN LEE: Foxridge.

MR. SCOTT: Yeah. Foxridge is basically north of 56th Street.

MR. SHIRES: Any other land use map questions or edits?

MS. GAMESON: I would just mention the fact that you are showing, it looks like Shawnee Mission Parkway as 63rd Street --

MR. SCOTT: Yeah.

MS. GAMESON: -- all the way on that.

MS. KNELLER: Jacque, would you, I'm sorry. Would you tell us your name just for the record?

MS. GAMESON: Jacque Gameson.

MS. KNELLER: Okay.

MR. SCOTT: Yes. That's just the base map. It shows that it's 63rd Street all the way through. We know it as Shawnee Mission Parkway.

MR. SHIRES: A lot of streets have dual names.

MR. SCOTT: Yeah.

MR. SHIRES: But we can label it however you guys want.

MR. SCOTT: The base map shows it that way.

MR. SHIRES: So, I do have more on the presentation if there's not, for the maps, I'd be happy to go through the goals. And then I think to be very fair since we have folks in the audience, you know, you could open it up for public comment. And I'll take notes, so if there's any public comments you want us to respond to, we can sure do it after they're done speaking.

CHAIRMAN LEE: Fair enough.

MS. KNELLER: No.

MR. SHIRES: This one. One of them. Yeah. Okay.

MS. KNELLER: You going?

MR. SHIRES: Yes, please. Just really quick on all the chapters. I know you guys have been going through all those main goals. There's been a lot of work on them. Boy, those last two joint workshops. Your staff has been going through them in great detail as well.

So, I'm just going to hit some of the highlights. And so that Natural Features and Environment chapter about flood abatement, stormwater, KC Climate Action Plan, your own sustainability efforts, tree cover, tree canopy. So, a really solid chapter.

On the next slide, just hitting some of the highlights. And so again, it's about Rock Creek flood abatement and some of the improvements we've done. Even these two parcels we were just talking about, and then the Kansas City Climate Action Plan, climate action policies of the City itself. Protect and expand tree cover, New development and redevelopment, a Mission that is sustainable. So, a lot of good goals in there.

On the next slide when we look at the Parks and Rec chapter, another solid chapter. It's about preserving some of that existing green space, parks and rec enhancements, ADA compliance and accessibility. Compliance, and this is where we got a little bit more into universal design and City facilities. And so that next level of ADA, kind of really thinking about the use of things.

Those main park goals, preserving existing open space and our national features. Enhance our parks and our rec space. Invest in that ongoing maintenance. And then work on that ADA compliance, and where possible, making things accessible in universal design for people of all ages and abilities.

On the Transportation and Mobility chapter, some key themes on that is pedestrian safety, where we can impact multimodal transportation, getting around by all those different means. We want it to be safe. We want to be a part of the SmartMoves 3.0 Regional Plan. And then street access and improvements the City has already put a lot of thought into, has made some improvements, and we do know there's more to go.

So, those big goals, pedestrian safety, high priority, especially Downtown and on Johnson Drive. Plan for multimodal transportation and mobility. That will be one of those future-ready things. I think as things change, maybe there will be more opportunities. Adapt to future needs with criteria regarding safety, efficiency and access. And then these mobility plans as part of the City's economic development strategies and neighborhood stabilization.

Continuing on, it's all about Johnson Drive in this case. Slowing the traffic, good pedestrian crosswalks, being part of the regional SmartMoves 3.0 plan, improved access to Downtown. And then really when we get to the Form Based Code District and those future street alignments being really key with improving that connection through connection and access.

All right. Economic Development or Economic Revitalization. Again, Johnson Drive comes up. And this is where you see in the land use plan that big push for mixed-use that will add a little more flexibility in land development. We want a sustainable, diverse economy, positive redevelopment. We want our gateways. Building façades being a big issue. And then of course City broadband internet service.

So, a full stack of goals on this one. Johnson Drive enhancements. We want a mix of office, retail and residential. We want our economy to be sustainable yet diverse. And we want a consistent identity that we know we're entering Mission from our neighbors, and we want that positive redevelopment that is long-term viable for our community without losing our character.

We want to build on the success of what we've already done along Johnson Drive. We want an authentic Downtown with character, respond to our history. And we want fresh and innovative signage. I laugh because those are one of the hardest things to ever

write is a really good sign code. It's no fun. Refresh building façades and outdated storefronts. And then the broadband access as well as kind of Smart City initiatives. This is where we're having a lot of our City facilities, infrastructure, interconnected.

Housing and Neighborhoods. That was another really big chapter we spent a lot of thought on and energy on. Affordable housing, that missing middle. So, think that's all that light orange land use category. Transitional land uses, buffers between, which we just had great debates on. Code enforcement, yay. And then those accessory dwelling units where we can kind of infill on existing single-family neighborhoods.

So on those goals, we want sustainable single-family and affordable multi-family options of all ages. We want to encourage residential revitalization. We want effective transitional land uses and policies and get that missing middle housing development where we can.

Positive redevelopment. Code enforcement to help protect our existing neighborhoods. We want to expand affordable housing where we can, and then create an environment that supports accessory dwelling units within our neighborhoods.

And then Infrastructure and Maintenance. Okay. This one gets a little more boring, but we'll go quick. So, it's how we spend money on our infrastructure. How do we prioritize. Where are we going to spend it. And then coordinating those improvements with our utilities and really that sustainable practice. If we're wanting it from the private side, we should do it on the public side.

Okay. Implementation. Now let's go through every single -- no. You guys have been -- you've seen it. This is that catch all. And so this is summarizing all those previous chapters in one spot, all the goals and those action steps, timelines and the detail and the prioritization.

So we've spent quite a bit of time on this before, so I'm not going to go through them all. I'm hoping it's kind of in a form, I think that it's ready to go. We can always parse words or verbs or things here and there, but I feel like it's had a lot of attention. So, next steps, what I'd say is tell me to sit down. Ask for public comments. I'll write notes. If you want me to come back up and respond, and then you guys decide what you want to do next. So, we're just here to help facilitate too.

CHAIRMAN LEE: Great. Thank you.

MR. SHIRES: Yeah. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN LEE: As he said, now would be the time for anyone in the public to get up and speak either for or against or their opinion. Identify yourself, please.

MR. THEDE: Hello. My name is Josh Thede. I live at 4701 West 60th Street. I am on the Sustainability Commission, and I was on the steering committee. Those are for reference. Tonight my comments are my own opinions.

In general, the last two years have been very frustrating as a member of the steering committee of this process. We have not had public input since November of 2021, as outlined in this timeline. Another case in point is exactly how this meeting has unfolded

today. We've put private developers ahead of any of the public comment and public input. And I just want to make sure that that frustration was expressed out loud and in public today, that we need to make sure we're doing public engagement as robustly as we started with. It was very great at the beginning of the process. But the last few years have been very frustrating as a volunteer and a citizen that's been trying to be as publicly involved as possible. It was pretty frustrating sitting here for the amount of time just to wait to hear if we're opening a public hearing or not that was announced.

My one specific item I want to ask for this plan is in the transportation. I am a walkability advocate. And I think there's a lot of interconnected things with the walkability and a little more density, and instead of tear downs and rebuilds being McMansions, I think tear downs and rebuilds should be the row houses or duplexes or fourplexes and in that medium density residential range. So, I think a lot of the public input that's expressed in those appendices and the steering committee's work as well, came through pretty clearly that it aligns with sustainability and the economic development and the housing needs that we're definitely seeing, and the housing affordability to increase that to the next level of increment of density of use. So, I would encourage that density there.

But my primary item that I want added is in the transportation section on walkability, and that is the reference to the NACTO standard. I was just at the Kansas Active Transportation Summit and this standard of NACTO, in addition to what is called the AASHTO Green Book and the MUTCD. The NACTO Urban Design Guide is really for spaces that are walkable, share the biking, and not just car-oriented development, which is not what we want in Mission. Throughout all the public hearing processes, everybody wants more walkable. And so adding the NACTO Urban Design Guidelines is my primary ask tonight.

Overall, I think the public input at the beginning was great. The mapping feature was very helpful to see everybody's ideas and the good participation there. I thank you for the creativity of staff and the consultant during the challenging times of COVID to get that public input. I think we have a really great plan here. I can nitpick a couple of things, but 95 percent of this is very strong, very aggressive, and what the City needs to aim for in the future. And so I'm really proud of most of what's in this document and how dense it is and the whole process, excluding the last two years. And the whole process was generally resulting in a very strong plan and something I'm happy with besides those couple of points I made earlier. And with that, I thank you for your time and thank you for everybody being on the Commission.

CHAIRMAN LEE: Thank you. Anyone else that would wish to speak? Okay. It's back to you.

MR. SHIRES: So, I'm really ready to help facilitate how you wish to move forward. So, kind of in response, you know, we followed the public input process that we outlined originally. Obviously, there's a long delay in kind of trying to get the document reviewed and finalized, everyone happy with it. And so, I definitely appreciate that. You know, the reference to NACTO standards, that's an interesting add. If that's something you said, please add that into our transportation section, we could sure as heck do that. I kind of like that as an idea. It is a pretty good standard book. There's the urban design version and then there's a rural one. So, you'd want the urban version, so absolutely. We can figure out a spot to pocket that in there.

MR. TROPBITO: While I'm looking at this, it looks pretty comprehensive. And say if we want to this, then what's the staff's position? [Inaudible] add anything you want depending on how you phrase it. But is the Comprehensive Plan really the place to add this as opposed this being adopted separately such as the building code would be adopted? That's my question for staff is what's the most appropriate route to consider the adoption of a guidance of a design guide like this?

MS. KNELLER: I think Josh has -- I'll add it and then Brian, maybe, I don't know. I think that as an urban designer myself, I would say that that is a stellar document. And I agree with Josh that this is something that we should consider. I don't know at this juncture, at this point to add it. But again, we can update later when we have time to consider it more fully. This is kind of one of those things where we don't want to make a snap judgment right away but --

MR. TROPBITO: Well, after looking at this [inaudible].

MS. KNELLER: If it hasn't come up before, I'm not sure -- I don't know if it has come up before.

MR. TROPBITO: I don't want [inaudible] it's value. It looks like it is. We want to be [inaudible] detail. I think we're going to be able to go through that and make a decision to add it or not add it tonight.

MR. SCOTT: Yeah. I don't think we're necessarily adding it. I'm looking at Goal 3 of Transportation and Mobility. Develop flexible policies that allow the City to adapt to future needs within prepared criteria regarding safety, efficiency, and access." 3(b), Implement a flexible Complete Streets ordinance. And there's a reference to NACTO's Blueprint for Autonomous Urbanism for specific policy and planning action items related to future transportation technologies. I don't know if that's what Mr. Theede is referencing, or if there's something broader than that. But I think it's simply a suggestion, kind of when we're looking at Complete Streets or policies around Complete Streets that we consider looking at NACTO as a guideline. And we can certainly do that. It's not, to me, we're going to adopt it tonight as a body, but it's just a reference point for staff to kind of look at when we develop these policies further into something meaningful and actionable that we consider that as a guideline.

MR. TROPBITO: That makes -- it sounds like a good plan.

MS. DUKELOW: I agree it looks like a valuable document.

CHAIRMAN LEE: Where are we?

MR. SHIRES: And I'd be happy to summarize, as I've taken notes of everything, I think you've said, that these are changes we'd like to see in this document. And I think there's only one part that there's a contention.

MS. CULLINANE: So would we like, propose an amendment and like vote on that first if you want to make changes to this? And then would they be made changes -- made, changed before they go to City Council, or what is the process?

MR. SHIRES: So, what you can do is say, you know, I move that we adopt the Comprehensive Plan as presented with the following changes. Or adopt a

recommendation that the City Council consider this plan with the following changes. And then if you all agree, it's done. You could always instead go one by one through each one of those amendments. But I think there's consensus on all the changes minus the one land use change where you didn't have consensus. And so that would be a possibility. Because what you can do is you're instructing us by that is to up -- make all these changes and updates and hand that off, make that as the presentation to Council at whatever the appropriate next meeting is with them.

MS. CULLINANE: And then they can either -- they can look at that then and decide if they want to make those changes or not.

MR. SHIRES: What we'll do is we'll outline some of the discussion and then the edits, in essence, that the Commission made. They can accept your recommendation as is. They could take away or add. I mean they can make any -- they're the final deciding body, so they can make any changes, not approve it, hopefully they do.

MS. CULLINANE: Right.

MS. DUKELOW: Can I get a clarification on this, please? It seems to me that when we send a recommendation to Council, if they want to make changes to it and they want to --

MS. KNELLER: Remand or something.

MS. DUKELOW: -- not accept or remand or whatever, it turns into a lot. So, do we -- are we really comfortable with that lot, or do we need to make it clear here today what changes we recommend, and then present that to them as completed?

MR. SHIRES: And what we would be giving them is a complete document. Just in the staff report, we'd probably outline the discussion today. They might want to hear what you guys talked about.

MS. DUKELOW: Okay. All right.

MR. SHIRES: But either way, they're going to get a complete document because it's the Planning Commission's recommendation that we take forward. Unless we see something fatal that we as staff might want to have an alternative position, but I don't know that we do that. I don't want to put words into in you guys' mouth.

MS. CULLINANE: Well, I guess to kind of echo Robin's point say even further is, would it be helpful to have like one of us to be there to just kind of talk through what we had talked through during our meeting, to have like a representative to kind of share, hey, these are things that we went back and forth on. These are things on how our thoughts were. Like what could help bridge that gap, maybe?

MR. SCOTT: I think that would certainly help. And it's a public meeting, and I'm sure the Mayor will open it up for public comments. So, that would be the opportunity to do that.

MS. KNELLER: I mean we do do -- we do that as staff. Anytime a project comes to you all --

MR. SCOTT: Yeah.

MS. KNELLER: -- and you recommend approval, if there was any kind of contention, any kind of discussion, those are points of discussion that we bring up. And we read through the staff report, kind of really very much amended, or abbreviated I should say.

MS. CULLINANE: Right.

MS. KNELLER: But I stress to the Council what the points were. Reading through the minutes, make sure that I've got them all and go through those points that the Planning Commission were either hung up on or what was discussed and what needs to be considered and all of that. Those are always in my reports to them.

MS. CULLINANE: I definitely, I believe you. I know you do.

MS. KNELLER: And you could certainly have representative there too, but yeah.

MS. CULLINANE: And I'm just wondering like if it would be more helpful to have a representative to be like hey, I know this is in there, but I want to, you know, stress this - this, that, like we talked about this, you know, we couldn't make a decision on this. This is why -- and just kind of share some of that feeling.

MS. KNELLER: I would say as long as nothing is accidentally mischaracterized as like, we decided that this was what it was, and saying, you know, if there was some course of contention, just say we were -- we were divided on this issue and leave it at that because we don't want to steer -- the representative shouldn't steer one way or another, but that's the only thing that I would say.

MS. CULLINANE: Yep.

MS. KNELLER: Because as staff, we're supposed to be neutral --

MS. CULLINANE: Yep.

MS. KNELLER: -- and say just what the facts were of the matter.

MR. SCHMID: I think my opinion on that is to take a page from Josh's book and show up to the public hearing. Make it clear that yes, while we were a part of this process, opinions that we may be giving at that time are our own, and that gives everybody the floor to express their own opinion.

MS. SMITH: I had some other [inaudible] and comments for Planning.

MS. KNELLER: We need to speak into the microphones.

MS. SMITH: What?

MS. KNELLER: Will you speak into the microphone?

MS. SMITH: Oh. I have some other comments and questions about the plan. Is now the time for that?

MR. SHIRES: I'd say absolutely. Yes, please.

MS. SMITH: Okay. In one of the appendices, I noticed a lot of the data where there was a lot of, yeah, a considerable amount of data that was from 2020 or before. And like in reference to home values and such, and I -- is that relevant anymore?

MR. SHIRES: Well.

MS. SMITH: I mean, I don't think so.

MR. SHIRES: The plan dragged on and without an increase in the fee, this consultant is not updating it.

MS. SMITH: Okay.

MR. SHIRES: Just to be very straight.

MS. SMITH: Okay. Okay. I think that's a big flaw in this plan if we have data.

MR. SCOTT: Well, just remember the plan is a snapshot in time, especially that information from the appendices it's just a snapshot in time. And it'll change over the 20-year timeframe of the plan.

MS. SMITH: I'm struggling with this because I'm here in 2023, and I was not a part of this plan or a part of any of this in 2020. And so all I can do is see what I see now and work with that. Like I'm not going back and seeing what was like happening back at that time.

MS. KNELLER: Some of the data is coming from census data too. And what we glean from that is what it is. We have ACS data, sorry, American Community Survey data. It's updated every several years, but that's all we have to go on because a lot of times these studies of what the actual demographics and the housing --

MS. SMITH: But like for housing values.

MS. KNELLER: -- values and things like that are only -- we can't do it continuously. We just can't.

MR. BRADEN: And this document goes for another ten years. [Inaudible; talking off mic]

MR. SCOTT: Right.

MS. KNELLER: And that's why we should revisit those studies and those things that I, yeah.

MS. SMITH: What I'm saying was that there was a, like a paradigm shift in 2020. So, anything before that, like pre-COVID is very different than post-COVID.

MR. SHIRES: So, a lot of that data still does not exist. So, some of the demographic housing and employment data is still 2020. The Census Bureau has been incredibly slow on the release. So, even if you said, hey, Chris, here's some more money, update

it, you're not going to get some of those updates you're hoping are there. That data is not there. So we, in a lot of our recommendations, took it with a grain of salt, and said we need to post-COVID proof this. We need to post-COVID retail this. And so a lot of those recommendations, hence even the mixed-use recommendations are already taking that into consideration.

MS. SMITH: Okay.

MR. SHIRES: But I, and sometimes we want data that's better than it is. And without some dramatic efforts, which would mean fees you wouldn't pay, it's just not there.

MS. SMITH: So, and that, to further that point, there is one point in the -- let's see. Okay. On page 114 of the first appendices.

MR. SHIRES: I'm sorry. I didn't bring the appendices.

MS. SMITH: Okay. There's a paragraph saying how there's a shortage of single-family homes, saying --

MR. SHIRES: And that's still true.

MS. SMITH: Okay. And saying increasing high density won't solve that. And then we are using, like the data is saying one thing -- like the data can say one thing and then we do the other thing. I'm not expressing myself properly.

MR. SHIRES: I appreciate that. I can sure go back and look at that point if we've got a typo in a paragraph somewhere.

MS. SMITH: Okay.

MR. SHIRES: It really does -- the data would still sell -- tell us is we need housing at all levels. We need entry-level, affordable single-family which is impossible to construct. But you need move-up housing.

MS. SMITH: So --

MR. SHIRES: You need that missing middle. You need multi-family.

MS. SMITH: One of the --

MR. SHIRES: You need everything.

MS. SMITH: And I don't know how you would solve this, but one of the big deficits of this document is that it only addresses high density housing. It doesn't really seem to address like the, you know, like the low density or the move up. It just comes -- it just has solutions for where we can put high density.

MR. SHIRES: Yeah.

MS. SMITH: And I don't know that there's a solution for that, but it -- I feel like we need to address it better than we do in this.

MR. SHIRES: And a little bit of that was the early on direction where you received from the steering committee, the elected official, and the commission in place at that time.

MS. SMITH: Okay. And again, it's like --

MR. SHIRES: That was the focus is to be high density. Yeah.

MS. SMITH: Okay.

MR. SHIRES: Yeah. A question though, yeah.

MS. SMITH: So, I mean, again, it's like since I wasn't there at that time, I'm looking at it through, you know, where I am today.

MR. SHIRES: Sure. Right.

MS. SMITH: And so I'm just looking at this and wondering lots of things about it.

MR. SHIRES: Sure.

MS. SMITH: And another thing I have to point out is that I am afraid of the four-story mixed-use developments because they're simply the cheapest things that builders or that developers can do. And they aren't very -- they aren't really like thinking about sustainability or our place, our place making. I mean the cheapest thing to do is to build a concrete podium and then the second story is two by sixes and then the third and the fourth are two by four framing. And I think that's kind of what's starting to -- you see it everywhere, that formula. And it seems like this document is biased towards allowing that kind of thing.

MR. SHIRES: I appreciate and respect your perspective on this. That's actually one of the more expensive forms of construction. What you're not likely to see is full steel or full masonry construction. But most multi-family construction is actually all stick built. So, the fact that you're getting that first floor concrete pedestal is pretty amazing, and that has to do with just the value of Mission.

MS. SMITH: Okay. Well, that aside, like it's -- it seems like we're putting a lot of preference on developers building the cheapest thing that they can do, and we're not putting a lot of value on what the residents who are here want.

MR. SHIRES: I appreciate your point on that. Just to reiterate because it's what we heard. A lot of the design standard -- no one would show up in your community and say, I get to do the cheapest thing I want to do. You have very strict design standards, very serious code requirements. Many other communities do not go to this level. And so I don't want you to kind of feel that this plan is very developer biased because it's not because I do this everywhere. Most communities are not to your level of standard. And you have a very high level of standard and you should, and I think that's a good thing. So I don't want to poo-poo that. I just don't want you to think that you don't. Now, what you could say is, you know what, we don't want to see anything four story, or we want everything to be one story or two story, or we don't want to see more multi-family development. That would be an option, and some communities do do that.

What we heard early on and kind of throughout the process is density, more housing availability, density at all levels. And so what this plan does reflect about really what we

feel like we heard from the majority was more multi-family, more infill development, more redevelopment, but we want some pretty high standards. In fact, I think a fresh look at the Form Code, is it still getting you what you want?

MS. SMITH: Okay. And so I guess what I'm saying is that that's what you're -- you're looking at the data and you're reading that. But I think you can also read something different from the same data, and I just want that to be noted.

MR. SHIRES: Okay. Yeah. Anything else?

MS. SMITH: I'm done for now.

MR. SHIRES: Okay.

CHAIRMAN LEE: [Inaudible; talking off mic] duly noted.

MS. DUKELOW: I can't help after that especially, but bring up the apricot north of, again, the apricot north of Johnson Drive and west of Lamar. I just can't do it. I mean, we're talking about single-family homes.

MR. SHIRES: Do we have more A votes?

MS. DUKELOW: Or take it all away.

MR. SHIRES: No. It's one or the other.

MS. DUKELOW: I don't think we can do it partway.

MR. SNYDER: So, Robin, you're saying take it out? You did kind of say take it out. I mean, go back to just single-family dwelling or take it all the way across. I mean it's [inaudible].

MR. SHIRES: A or B. That was A or B.

MR. SNYDER: That would make it real simple.

MS. DUKELOW: Right.

MR. SNYDER: It would pretty much be, either go all the way across or take the apricot out altogether.

MS. DUKELOW: I can live with actually either one of those. But as it is --

MR. SHIRES: Yeah.

MS. DUKELOW: -- I think it -- I don't get it.

MR. SHIRES: Do we feel like there is movement? So, A is just to take out the medium density west of Lamar and B is to extend that medium density all the way across to the west. So, that first one is A. Are there more A's now?

MS. CULLINANE: A was remove it all together?

MR. SHIRES: Yeah.

MR. SCOTT: Yeah.

MR. SHIRES: So, maybe that's -- one, two, three, four. Maybe that's where we're headed. And then B is to extend it all the way across. Three. So, I guess in somebody's motion they could say remove that, and then all the other things we told you to do, Chris, and that could be your motion. And you can see if that lives or dies.

MR. SCHMID: I think my stance on that is for removal of that housing inventory is at odds with what we're actually lacking, which is missing middle housing. What the public has told us they want, which is more access to affordable housing. Additionally, a lot of what is driving the need for the density is the public's request for access to improved services, improved infrastructure. And going through a lot of the comments, higher quality developers, which only come when there is a higher density of people to serve them. So, all of these things they're asking for are really only attainable through higher taxes, which nobody really wants, greater density and funding. And my feeling is if we take more of the density off the table, we're really only leaving ourselves with two additional options to provide those services, one of which is extremely unpopular, the taxation. Also looking through that data while we're talking about it, Mission was one of the -- was one of the cities with the least household income in Johnson County. So, continuing to take away that affordable housing inventory population that can afford it the least doesn't sit well with me.

MR. BRADEN: [Inaudible; talking off mic]

MR. SCHMID: Not if we don't -- but we don't encourage it.

MR. BRADEN: But we're not taking it away. It's just that zoning for the developers that come back to it. And again, unless you've got a large section of it, it's going to come up all at one time. It's not going to change anyway.

MR. SCHMID: That may be true, but we would be explicitly taking away the possibility of developing it that way. And that does just -- it seem at odds with everything that we've been hearing.

MS. CULLINANE: But with that purple, that lighter purple area, along Johnson Drive, since it is a mixed-use medium density, it does allow for housing, office, and retail. So, you could have the affordable housing above an office. So, we're not removing it completely. It doesn't mean that someone -- we're not restricting that. We're allowing it. We're actually extending where you can have that purple area. We've extended it north of Johnson Drive, so we've converted a lot of offices into that availability for those housing. So, I think -- I don't think it's negative. I think we've definitely increased it in a lot of other places.

CHAIRMAN LEE: And you're also, again, you're putting that buffer back in between that area that is more dense and taller to the rest of the residential area back there. So, you've got to keep -- you got to remember all those people as well.

MS. CULLINANE: So, Mr. Chair, I move to approve Case #23-10, Comprehensive Plan with the condition to change the mixed-use high density area to medium density

residential on the east side of Metcalf. I don't know, Chris, how you want me to represent that better

MS. DUKELOW: Let's understand it.

MR. SHIRES: And it's as I've maybe even marked on this exhibit map. And I can bring it up. So, I've marked it as one on the exhibit map that we're taking out the mixed-use high density and changing it to medium density residential.

MR. BRADEN: So, the purple turns apricot.

MR. SHIRES: Yes. [Inaudible; talking off mic] Okay. That's one.

MS. CULLINANE: And I think that we maybe leave the plan as it is now, and we go and individually vocalize our thoughts to the City Council.

CHAIRMAN LEE: [Inaudible; talking off mic]

MS. SMITH: I'd like to make an amendment too.

MS. CULLINANE: Well, I guess I should have said I don't move to approve, then I guess I should have said that I move to make an amendment.

MR. SHIRES: Let me, if I can be so broad --

MR. SCOTT: [Inaudible; talking off mic]

MS. CULLINANE: I just feel like I'm --

(Inaudible; Commissioners talking over one another)

MR. SHIRES: Do this. I move that we adopt the plan as-is with these changes. If somebody wants to suggest you add something, would you accept a friendly amendment to your motion? Yes, no, then they're your second if they accept it. Or if you accept it, they would become your second. So, you don't need to necessarily vote on changing the motion. You can as the motion maker. It's just a -- the motion lives, then you -- somebody -- you do need to take action on it. So, do you want to make any of those other changes? Because I believe what you might be suggesting is the change to the medium -- mixed-use medium density, three-story limit, 24 DU per acre limit?

MS. SMITH: Exactly.

MS. CULLINANE: Or would it be easier for me to just make an amendment approve that and then move on to individuals? I didn't keep track of everyone's --

MR. SHIRES: Do you want me to re-summarize them and I'll leave that last one off? So, I think the map changes.

MR. SCOTT: What might be easier, Chris, is to go through each suggestion --

MR. SHIRES: Yeah.

MR. SCOTT: -- and maybe that one we can --

MR. SHIRES: And then that could be a part of your motion.

MR. SCOTT: And yea or nay that one.

MS. CULLINANE: Because I just --

MR. SHIRES: Because I think you have consensus.

MR. SCOTT: It's a motion to [inaudible].

MR. SHIRES: So, that purple area that I marked as one, changing that to medium density residential, that error we made on the park on -- we had open space or green space on Beverly, but that's actually low-density residential. That we change the land use definition of mixed-use medium density to no greater than three story and no greater 24 dwelling units per acre. That we add a reference to NACTO in the Transportation chapter, Goal 3, subsection 3(b). We can extend that language just to make reference that the City look at NACTO as the standard.

MS. KNELLER: That's already in there though, correct?

MR. SHIRES: It doesn't specifically say NACTO; it's just kind of as a general comment. Does it say NACTO?

MS. KNELLER: It says refer to NACTO's Blueprint.

MR. SHIRES: Oh, my mistake. Yeah. So, we're already good on that. I'm sorry.

MR. SCHMID: It does refer to NACTO, but it refers to a different guide than I believe what was proposed. So this is referring currently to the Blueprint for Autonomous Urbanism, whereas we want to also be looking at the Urban Street Design Guide. So, I think it's just adding the Urban Street Design Guide to the language.

MR. SCOTT: Thank you.

MR. SHIRES: So that. So one, two, that's the four because we also had the map -- the second map change. So, two map changes. The land use definition changed. The NACTO reference to urban streets and then urban design. And then the -- really the one I've left off is the question about the medium density north of Johnson Drive west of Lamar. So, that could be a motion all right there. And then you could get a second and then you could vote on that as just as far as amendments to this plan. And then if you guys wanted then separately vote on that last one that's tough as an amendment to this plan. And then based on that, you can take, if you will, a final adoption. If you want to do it in kind of a three-part, or you can do it all at once.

(Commissioner talking amongst themselves)

MR. SHIRES: So I'd say, Megan, you kind of had the floor with your amendment. Do you want to amend your motion?

MS. CULLINANE: I do. So, Mr. Chair, I move to approve Case #23-10 Comprehensive Plan with the following conditions. I would like to change the mixed-use high density

area east of Metcalf to the medium density residential that we've outlined. I would like to change the rules, or I guess the requirements of the medium density to three stories and 24 units maximum per square acre. And then also add in rules around the NACTO street considerations to the considerations for the future, and also remove the park at Beverly as it is existing residential as an error.

MR. SCHMID: Second.

CHAIRMAN LEE: [Inaudible; talking off mic]

MS. STEFFENS: Snyder.

MR. SNYDER: Aye.

MS. STEFFENS: Lee.

CHAIRMAN LEE: Aye.

MS. STEFFENS: Cullinane.

MS. CULLINANE: Aye.

MS. STEFFENS: Schmid.

MR. SCHMID: Aye.

MS. STEFFENS: Troppito.

MR. TROPBITO: Aye.

MS. STEFFENS: Richards is absent. Sorry. Braden.

MR. BRADEN: Aye.

MS. STEFFENS: Smith.

MS. SMITH: Abstain.

MS. STEFFENS: Dukelow.

MS. DUKELOW: Aye. Motion passes.

Motion 6: **Megan Cullinane-Ward III/ Brian Schmid - Ward III:**
Recommend City Council approval of Case #23-10;
Comprehensive Plan with the following conditions: Change area east of Metcalf from mixed-use high density to medium density residential; medium density requirements would be limited to three stories and 24 dwelling units per acre; to consider NACTO Blueprint in future considerations; and remove park at Beverly as it is existing residential. **The motion carried 7-0-1 with Cynthia Smith - Ward II abstaining.**

MS. DUKELOW: All right. Now, we get to talk about [inaudible].

(Commissioners talking over one another)

MS. CULLINANE: What are we talking about now?

MS. DUKELOW: This is our favorite -- our favorite apricot area.

MS. CULLINANE: Oh.

MR. SCHMID: On affordable housing or not.

MS. DUKELOW: I say do it or don't do it.

MR. SHIRES: I think at this point maybe just make a motion one way or the other and call it, like you know, get a second and call it.

MS. DUKELOW: Okay. Mr. Chair, I would like to make a motion that we revise the Future Land Use Plan to eliminate the medium density residential south of 58th Street west of Lamar.

MR. TROPBITO: Second.

MS. STEFFENS: Charlie, that was you, wasn't it? The second.

MR. TROPBITO: It was me.

MS. STEFFENS: Thank you, sir.

MS. SMITH: I'm sorry. Can you say it again?

MS. DUKELOW: I'll let Chris show.

MR. SHIRES: [Inaudible; talking off mic]

MS. SMITH: Okay. Okay. No. That's what I just -- I just wanted to -- yeah.

MS. DUKELOW: And if I can say just add that the intent is to preserve the existing single-family homes.

MR. SHIRES: Yes. And I have that on that map, on the exhibit map marked as B just to be confusing.

MS. CULLINANE: I gotcha.

(Commissioners talking amongst themselves)

MS. STEFFENS: Ready?

CHAIRMAN LEE: Yeah. Call the roll.

MS. STEFFENS: Smith.

MS. SMITH: Aye.

MS. STEFFENS: Lee.

CHAIRMAN LEE: Nay.

MS. STEFFENS: Cullinane.

MS. CULLINANE: Aye.

MS. STEFFENS: Troppito.

MR. TROPPITO: Aye.

MS. STEFFENS: Richards.

MR. SCOTT: Absent.

MS. STEFFENS: Oh. Braden.

MR. BRADEN: Nay.

MS. STEFFENS: Dukelow.

MS. DUKELOW: Aye.

MS. STEFFENS: Snyder.

MR. SNYDER: Nay.

MS. STEFFENS: Schmid.

MR. SCHMID: Nay.

MR. SHIRES: Now, look what you've done.

MS. STEFFENS: Tie. It's a tie.

MS. CULLINANE: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN LEE: Four-four.

MS. CULLINANE: Oh, it is?

MS. STEFFENS: Yeah.

MS. CULLINANE: I lost count.

MS. DUKELOW: It's what? Four-four, a tie?

CHAIRMAN LEE: Yes.

MS. STEFFENS: Yeah.

MR. SCOTT: [Inaudible; talking off mic]

(Inaudible; Commissioners talking amongst themselves away from the mics)

MS. DUKELOW: Mr. Chairman.

MR. SCOTT: That motion fails.

Motion 7: **Robin Dukelow - Ward IV/Charlie Troppito - Ward III:** Approve revision to the Future Land Use Plan to eliminate medium density residential south of 58th Street and west of Lamar. **The motion failed 4-4-0 for lack of a majority with Stuart Braden - Ward I, Wayne Snyder - Ward I, Brian Schmid - Ward III, and Mike Lee - Ward IV voting no.**

MS. DUKELOW: I would like to make a motion that we extend the apricot across Riggs at north of Johnson Drive and south of 58th Street.

MR. BRADEN: Second.

CHAIRMAN LEE: Call the roll, please.

MS. STEFFENS: Robin did the first and that was -- Stuart, you did second that time didn't you?

MR. BRADEN: Yes.

MS. STEFFENS: Thank you. Okay. Snyder.

MR. SNYDER: Aye.

MS. STEFFENS: Cullinane.

MS. CULLINANE: Nay.

MS. STEFFENS: Troppito.

MR. TROPPITO: Aye.

MS. STEFFENS: Braden.

MR. BRADEN: Aye.

MS. STEFFENS: Lee.

CHAIRMAN LEE: Aye.

MS. STEFFENS: Smith.

MS. SMITH: Aye.

MS. STEFFENS: Schmid.

MR. SCHMID: Aye.

MS. STEFFENS: Dukelow.

MS. DUKELOW: Aye.

MS. STEFFENS: Motion passed.

Motion 8: Robin Dukelow - Ward IV/Stuart Braden - Ward I: Motion to approve extending the apricot (Commercial) across Riggs north of Johnson Drive and south of 58th Street. **Motion carried 7-1-0 with Megan Cullinane- Ward III voting no.**

MR. SCOTT: So, do we have a motion to recommend with the amendments to the City Council?

MS. CULLINANE: We need that too.

MS. SMITH: I thought we did that.

MR. SCOTT: Yeah. We kind of did that already, didn't we?

MR. SHIRES: Yeah. I think we --

MR. SCOTT: Yeah.

MR. SHIRES: You guys are ready for us to take this forward.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Did we though?

MR. SCOTT: That was the first motion. Then we did the second

MR. SHIRES: Just a debate on that one item. I mean if you're --

MR. SCOTT: We can [inaudible] City Council with the following the amendments [inaudible].

MR. SHIRES: Do you want to, I mean, if it's cleaner now --

MS. KNELLER: Because I thought we were supposed to do amendment -- vote on the amendment first and then vote on the passing of it with the amendment. That's why we've done before.

MR. SHIRES: Maybe to be clean, just one -- somebody --

MS. CULLINANE: So, Mr. Chair, I move to approve Case #23-10, Comprehensive Plan, with the just approved amendments. The two approved amendments that were just approved.

MR. SHIRES: Yes, that seems reasonable.

MR. SCHMID: I'll second.

CHAIRMAN LEE: Roll, please.

MS. STEFFENS: I can't keep up with you guys. Just a minute.

MR. SCOTT: Who seconded?

MR. SCHMID: I did.

MS. CULLINANE: Brian.

MS. STEFFENS: Brian seconded.

MS. SMITH: I have to say that I thought that that's what we were voting on with the first one, so my answer would have been different.

MS. KNELLER: So, oh.

MR. SHIRES: Okay.

MS. SMITH: So, there is a misunderstanding there. It wouldn't change anything, but just for the record.

MR. SCOTT: Yeah.

MS. KNELLER: On the first one that failed.

MR. SHIRES: Yeah.

MS. KNELLER: Okay.

MS. DUKELOW: On the first one or the second --

(Inaudible; talking over one another)

MS. SMITH: On the first one where I said I abstained.

MS. KNELLER: I see.

MR. SCOTT: Yeah. She abstained or -- yeah.

MS. KNELLER: Right. That was the first motion that did not pass, and then the second one --

MS. SMITH: No, it passed.

MR. SCOTT: The first motion with all the amendments was approved seven with one abstention.

MR. SHIRES: So, I think we could extrapolate to say you really meant to say aye.

MS. SMITH: Yeah.

MS. KNELLER: Okay.

MR. SHIRES: Fair enough.

MS. CULLINANE: But this is just to move to City Council with the approved amendments, the two approved amendments this evening.

MR. SHIRES: Yes.

MS. STEFFENS: Okay. I'm with my new fresh sheet of paper. Who did the first?

MS. CULLINANE: Cullinane --

MS. STEFFENS: Robin -- Cullinane. And second?

MR. SCHMID: Schmid.

MS. STEFFENS: Okay. And Richards is absent. Okay. Braden.

MR. BRADEN: Aye.

MS. STEFFENS: Troppito.

MR. TROPBITO: Aye.

MS. STEFFENS: Schmid.

MR. SCHMID: Aye.

MS. STEFFENS: Lee.

CHAIRMAN LEE: Aye.

MS. STEFFENS: Snyder.

MR. SNYDER: Aye.

MS. STEFFENS: Smith.

MS. SMITH: Abstain.

MS. STEFFENS: Dukelow.

MS. DUKELOW: Aye.

MS. STEFFENS: Cullinane.

MS. CULLINANE: Abstain.

MS. STEFFENS: Six to two. Passes.

Motion 9: **Megan Cullinane - Ward III/Brian Schmid - Ward III:** Motion to forward to City Council for approval the Mission Comprehensive Plan with the Planning Commission approved amendments.
Motion carried 6-0-2 with Cynthia Smith - Ward II and Megan Cullinane - Ward III abstaining.

MR. SHIRES: So, we will make these updates and then in the report to the Council, we will explain the Commission discussion.

CHAIRMAN LEE: Thank you.

MR. SHIRES: And I appreciate everybody's time listening to me talk.

MR. SCOTT: That Council meeting will be October 18th, Wednesday night.

IV. OLD BUSINESS

CHAIRMAN LEE: What do we have for Old Business tonight?

MR. SCOTT: Nothing.

V. PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS

CHAIRMAN LEE: Any Planning Commission comments?

MS. DUKELOW: I have a couple. I'll be brief because I know it's late. Can we get a north arrow on all the plans? That's standard. I mean I know they do the same thing everywhere and they probably just flipped it the right way and did, you know, they're just blowing and going. But it's really important.

MS. KNELLER: I'm sorry.

MR. SCOTT: The north arrow.

MS. KNELLER: Oh, yeah. It should have a north arrow.

MS. DUKELOW: And it would be nice if all the stuff matched, but I know the tags were small, I guess.

And the other question I have is regarding The Other Place. They seem to be putting in a lot of time and a lot of money and I'm beginning to wonder why we haven't seen anything.

MR. SCOTT: I'm sorry.

MS. DUKELOW: A lot of time [inaudible] not seeing anything.

MR. SCOTT: That's an existing use. I mean, it was a restaurant before and it's still going to be a restaurant, so we don't typically bring back existing uses like that.

MS. KNELLER: They're not extending the footprint or anything like that, so it doesn't trigger Planning Commission. They've got a [inaudible]. That's it.

MS. DUKELOW: Pouring footings [inaudible] to the parking lot that --

MS. KNELLER: For a patio and drainage.

MS. DUKELOW: So, what's going on?

MR. SCOTT: They're putting a patio out front. So, that's all it is.

MS. DUKELOW: Well, it will be lovely but --

MR. SCOTT: Yeah. And the only changes they're going to make exterior wise are the awning. And then painting has been a big issue. We haven't really resolved that yet. They want to paint it a different color, and we're kind of pushing back on the idea of painting the brick.

MS. DUKELOW: Yeah. That's not good.

MR. SCOTT: Yeah. So, that's --

MS. DUKELOW: [Inaudible; talking off mic]

MR. SCOTT: You know, now the developer is going to tell us or has told us that these, for instance, there's buildings too where rainwater will actually penetrate that brick and it penetrates that CMU block behind it and it creates a water dam up and other issues inside. And so they believe that painting it actually prevents some of that penetration.

CHAIRMAN LEE: [Inaudible].

MS. DUKELOW: They need to seal it if they're worried about it.

MS. KNELLER: We actually kind of -- when they came to us with the plans, we wanted them to come up with a plan for the entire shopping center because it needs an upgrade across the board. And we did put a hold temporarily on any kind of exterior improvements. But I noticed that as I drove by the other day, they were doing some exterior painting of that, and I'm not sure -- I'm not sure how that -- those -- I don't know what they're planning on doing, so we need to touch base with them.

MS. DUKELOW: That's all I have. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LEE: Any other comments?

VI. STAFF UPDATES

There were no staff updates.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

MR. TROPBITO: Move we adjourn.

MR. SCHMID: Second.

MS. STEFFENS: The first is Troppito.

CHAIRMAN LEE: Call the roll.

MS. STEFFENS: Braden.

MR. BRADEN: Aye.

MS. STEFFENS: Dukelow.

MS. DUKELOW: Aye.

MS. STEFFENS: Richards. Absent. Troppito.

MR. TROPPITO: Aye.

MS. STEFFENS: Cullinane.

MS. CULLINANE: Aye.

MS. STEFFENS: Lee.

CHAIRMAN LEE: Aye.

MS. STEFFENS: Snyder.

MR. SNYDER: Aye.

MS. STEFFENS: Smith.

MS. SMITH: Aye.

MS. STEFFENS: And Schmid.

MR. SCHMID: Aye.

MS. STEFFENS: Okay.

Motion 10: Charlie Troppito - Ward III/Brian Schmid - Ward III: Motion to adjourn. Motion carried 8-0-0.

(Mission Planning Commission adjourned at 9:46 p.m.)

CERTIFICATE

I certify that the foregoing is a transcript to the best of my ability from the electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the above-entitled matter.

/das _____

October 18, 2023

Deborah A. Sweeney

APPROVED BY:

Kimberly Steffens, Permit Technician