

**AGENDA
PLANNING COMMISSION
CITY OF ROELAND PARK, KANSAS
ROELAND PARK
4600 W 51ST STREET
MAY 21, 2019 6:00 PM**

- I. Roll Call**
- II. Approval of Minutes**
 - 1. Planning Commission Minutes - 3/19/19
- III. Public Hearing**
- IV. Action Items**
- V. Discussion Items**
 - 1. Follow up on Residential Design Standards
- VI. Other Matters Before the Planning Commission**
- VII. Adjournment**

Scheduled Meeting Dates

Item Number: **Approval of Minutes- II.-1.**
Committee **5/21/2019**
Meeting Date:



City of Roeland Park
Action Item Summary

Date:
Submitted By:
Committee/Department:
Title: **Planning Commission Minutes - 3/19/19**
Item Type:

Recommendation:

Details:

Financial Impact

Amount of Request:	
Budgeted Item?	Budgeted Amount:
Line Item Code/Description:	

Additional Information

How does item relate to Strategic Plan?

How does item benefit Community for all Ages?

ATTACHMENTS:

Description	Type
☐ Minutes 3.19.19	Cover Memo

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
CITY OF ROELAND PARK
4600 W 51st Street, Roeland Park, KS 66205
March 19, 2019, 6:00 P.M.

The Roeland Park Planning Commission met in a joint meeting with the Roeland Park City Council on March 19, 2019, in City Hall, 4600 West 51st Street.

Planning Commissioners Present:

Darren Nielsen	Mike Hickey	Paula Gleason
Bill Ahrens	Kyle Rogler	

Planning Commissioners Absent:

Mark Kohles
Pete Davis

Staff:

John Jacobson, Building Official
Jennifer Jones-Lacy, Finance Director
Keith Moody, City Administrator
Wade Holtkamp, City Codes Enforcement Officer

I. ROLL CALL

The roll was called and Commissioners Mark Kohles and Pete Davis were absent

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. Minutes from the Joint Planning Commission/Council - 11/13/2018

The minutes were approved as submitted.

III. PUBLIC HEARING

1. Revisit In-Home Daycare Regulations

(The conversation had already begun before the recording began.)

Mr. Holtkamp said there is a lot of oversight with daycare licensing. As a city they want to have a license but not for it to be too much a burden.

Ms. Jones-Lacy provided the redline of the points to be summarized.

Public Comment:

Michelle Trombley (5208 Parish) Ms. Trombley asked what the limit would be for the number of children that would require a special use permit.

Ms. Jones-Lacy said a permit would be required for more than three children.

Jayne Sportsman (5635 Birch) Ms. Sportsman said she was attending the meeting to see what the new rules are. She has been operating a daycare in Roeland Park for 24 years and said a lot of the rules have been changing. She spoke to the amount of fees she pays to the City, the county, the state, the need to be fingerprinted, fire department inspections and food inspections. She said it is all overwhelming and the City fee of \$250 is too steep.

Commissioner Gleason asked if there was any latitude for them on the special use permit cost and would it be enough for the City to know the daycare was licensed and registered and monitored by the state, county and other agencies.

Ms. Jones-Lacy said they do have latitude with the \$250 fee which the usual business amount. It is also a one-time fee and not an annual cost. To date, they have not had any compliance. The City is not trying to put anyone out of business and recognizes it is a delicate type of business issue. She said it is also good for them and the citizens to know what is going on in their city. She added that everything they are requiring is essentially something the state is already requiring. She also said that Johnson County does require a fire inspection.

There were discussions on what the state requires for maximum square footage in a house and in the yard. There are also state regulations on the maximum numbers of children you can have in your home based on age.

There is information available through the Kansas Department of Health and Environment website and it shows the surveys of the last years and you can check the status of a daycare and see if there are any violations.

It was put forth that if they do away with the special use permit and retain the business license requirement and the state inspection, they would ask the applicant to file that inspection with the City so there is a record. Ms. Jones-Lacy added that part of the application requirement is that a copy of the state inspection is submitted to the City as part of the business license application.

Ms. Sportsman further stated the food program comes to her home four times a year and the state comes out and does their visits all of which are surprise visits. Also the parents come in every day. She said she was hoping that the City would be able to help eliminate or streamline some of the paperwork.

Ms. Jones-Lacy reviewed the redline areas. There are proposed changes to daycare facilities under the special use permit. There are regulations on daycare facilities with more than three children or adults that they shall be licensed by the state, keep the special use permit and obtain an annual city business license.

They are also recommending to add a daycare must obtain and furnish an annual fire inspection from the fire marshal.

It is suggested to remove the maintaining of 100 square feet of open space per child and removing the requirement for a fence. The fence will follow the state requirement that if there are children outside unsupervised, then they would need a fence.

There continue to be requirements for people to load and unload during pickup/drop-off of passengers.

They must also meet all building code requirements.

Any special use permit issued shall be for a period of not more than ten years from the date of issuance.

Commissioner Gleason said if they are trying to get compliance, then she wants to try and make the process as easiest as possible.

Commissioner Nielsen said he does not want to get rid of the one-time lifetime approach for the ability to reassess if something did happen.

Commissioner Gleason did say the fees should be less since they are paying so many other things.

Commissioner Nielsen asked what they need to do to change the special use permit. Ms. Jones-Lacy said that could be handled through the fee resolution. In this case the fees are not specified in Chapter 16, which allows the Planning Commission to make a recommendation to the City Council who would then make the final decision.

Commissioner Gleason said they should make a recommendation to lower the fee to \$25. She said they are trying to get compliance and let neighbors have some input.

Ms. Jones-Lacy said they can make a recommendation on a dollar amount. She said the Council likes to hear staff recommendation or the Commission's recommendation and the reasoning behind that.

Fee comparisons from neighboring cities were shown to the Planning Commission. After further discussion, it was agreed to recommend to the Council a one-time lifetime fee of \$100 with supporting documentation from neighboring cities as to their fee structure.

The redline is proposed to change to lifetime as far as the permit with no need for a renewal.

They will also remove the section in (d)(vii) regarding transfer of property title.

Subsection (viii) enumerates some circumstances for which a permit would be revoked.

Subsection (x) permits daycares to operate in a single-family detached home. This could also include a single-family detached home and duplex. All of the duplexes in the City are rentals, so they would also need permission of the property owner and is also part of the 100-foot notification.

Subsection (e) requires a public notice.

Subsection (5)(iv) will remove the requirement of photos of the inside of the home and (viii) added proof of a fire inspection.

In Section 16.321 the following will be added, “with the exception of special use permits for in-home daycares. In the case of in-home daycares, the applicant shall notify the owners of record of lands located within at least 100 feet of the property which is the subject of the application by certified mail, return receipt requested. All other provisions regarding notification as required by Section 16-313 apply.”

Ms. Jones-Lacy said the Commission has the option to accept the redline changes with the exception for the need for renewal and make it a non-renewal period for the SUP as well as notifying the City should the daycare close.

Ms. Jones-Lacy and City Administrator Moody clarified that the SUP is with the residence and the individual who applied for it. If the person moved, the SUP would not transfer.

MOTION: COMMISSIONER ROGLER MOVED TO APPROVE THE REDLINES AS SUBMITTED WITH THE EXCEPTION OF THE NEED OF RENEWAL TO MADE INDEFINITELY AND TO NOTE THAT IF THE IN-HOME DAYCARE CLOSES THAT THEY NOTIFY THE CITY AND TO REDUCE THE SPECIAL USE PERMIT FEE FROM \$250 TO \$100. (MOTION CARRIED 5-0)

Commissioner Nielsen closed the public hearing.

IV. ACTION ITEMS

There were no items discussed.

V. DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. Building Design Standards Follow Up

Mr. Jacobson said this item took up the largest share of the joint meeting with the City council. Tonight, he wanted to focus on three areas, massing, greenspace and materials. Some of the surrounding jurisdictions have put together a process as reflected in Slides 10-14 in the presentation and he asked does that reflect what the Commissioners want to see in Roeland Park.

He also asked the Commissioner if they would like to see a variant of what was proposed and he wanted to know what they wanted to do with the standards and the materials. He felt they should decide on three to five materials that they can universally say is acceptable in Roeland Park.

Mr. Jacobson reviewed the slides for the proposed design guidelines changes dealing with frontage greenspace requirements, windows, doors, and building addition side.

Commissioner Gleason said she did not want to regulate the number of windows on the side of a house.

Commissioner Rogler said in new home construction there are very rarely any windows on the side of a home.

Following the discussion Mr. Jacobson asked the Commissioners to e-mail him their opinions on what they would like see pertaining to Slides 10-14. He asked them to think about what they see as the character of Roeland Park and how they see that in the future. He will condense their opinions and present it for review at the next meeting. He agreed that the charm of the community is the eclectic mix of the different architectural styles, land uses and other elements. He also wanted them to think about the 200 square feet number, is it too small, too big, and when do they want the changes to take place.

VI. OTHER MATTERS BEFORE THE PLANNING COMMISSION

There were no items discussed.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

City Administrator Moody said that Planning Sustainable Places was having their first committee meeting tomorrow night. They will discuss a question that relates to the comprehensive plan and look into the architecture and design standards as well as the universal designs.

MOTION: COMMISSIONER GLEASON MOVED AND COMMISSIONER NIELSEN SECONDED TO ADJOURN. (MOTION CARRIED 5-0)

(Roeland Park Joint Planning Commission and City Council Meeting Adjourned)

Item Number: Discussion Items- V.-1.
Committee 5/21/2019
Meeting Date:



City of Roeland Park
Action Item Summary

Date: 5/16/2019
Submitted By: John Jacobson
Committee/Department: Neighborhood Services
Title: **Follow up on Residential Design Standards**
Item Type: Discussion

Recommendation:

Staff would recommend discussion of policies that:

- Define massing and potentially building materials for new residential construction.
- No changes to Window/ Door requirements
- Define a more dense residential zoning district to accommodate redevelopment in areas of the community with existing platted lots of less than 7,500ft².
- Lot coverage relative to setbacks

Details:

Due to formatting issues in Novus, the staff report is attached.

Financial Impact

Amount of Request: NA	
Budgeted Item?	Budgeted Amount: NA
Line Item Code/Description: NA	

Additional Information

How does item relate to Strategic Plan?

May impact future land use and transportation sections of the plan.

How does item benefit Community for all Ages?

ATTACHMENTS:

Description	Type
📎 Staff Report - Residential Design Standards	Cover Memo
📎 All Comments from Planning Commissioners	Exhibit

BACKGROUND: The policy consideration began as a review of residential development standards in conjunction with a new comprehensive plan document. A presentation was given to both City Council and Planning Commission citing newly adopted standards of a neighboring community. These standards were reviewed by planning commission and staff to determine possible policy direction.

ANALYSIS: Surrounding community policies were reviewed and recommendations were to the commission. PC was asked to review the recommendations individually and submit comments back to staff. There seems to be support for the following:

1. **Massing and Residential Design Standards.** From the comments received, some restriction on garage size was suggested by a member with several others suggesting the massing component is fine as it is. The consensus was that the diversity of both structure and lots are considered an amenity in the eyes of many looking to locate in the community. Staff recommends no change at this time. Below are comments from those who submitted them regarding massing:

- a. current massing guidelines are acceptable and should stay the same
- b. The math does not work the garage massing. The minimum lot frontage for R-1 allowed is 60'-0" across. The minimum side yard is 5'-0" on each side, but the minimum building width is 80% of the lot width. The largest a house could be on a 60'-0" lot with these parameters is 48' wide. If we are getting to redevelopments or renovations, a 2-car garage will likely be a hot item that is added on. The minimum standard width of a 2-car garage is 20'. A 20' garage on a 46' wide house encompasses 41.67% of the frontage and would therefore not be allowed. The easiest change is to increase the total garage coverage to be **no more than 42% or 24' wide**. This would allow this massing to work on the standard smallest lot while preserving the intent of the ordinance that the City does not want the front of the house being comprised entirely of a garage. The importance of making this change is this will put the standard lot in jeopardy of not being improved as a zoning rule prohibits a value-added feature.

I am ok with the limit of the garage taking no more than 24' as this would allow (2) 8' garage doors side by side of giving a larger garage to help with ADA and community of all ages requirements. This requirement does mean that for the front elevation, there will only be 1 car or 2 car garages, never a 3-car garage unless there is an appeal made.

- c. I think the massing is ok. If we are going to use the mandates in remodeling i feel it should be 500 sqft or require them only on new. We could recommend that people who are remodeling follow them but may be not require it. By mandating them the cost of remodeling will go up.
- d. Front greenspace – I agree with requiring minimum 60% between the front lot line and front building line.
- e. Massing – I agree with our current limitation to 2.5 stories/35' for residential.
- f. We need to make sure we are not acting as a subdivision restricting what can we used on your home. The diversity we see in homes in RP is one of the things that draws people to out city, we are not a cookie cutter city.
- g. Building Design Standards should kick in for all new homes and substantial rebuilds/remodels. (need to discuss what would constitute "substantial") Existing homes and minor remodeling and expansions would not be applicable.

- h. Unsure if we should list acceptable building materials. I don't want us to be too prescriptive and not allow something that might be perfectly acceptable for the sole reason that we don't have it listed. But if we make it solely at the discretion of the building official, then he has nothing to back him up if the decision is disputed
- 2. **Windows/ Doors:** Given the size of lots and structure coupled with small setbacks in Roeland Park most felt the city should stay away from requiring minimum fenestration outside the normal application of the building code. Below are the comments associated with doors/windows:
 - a. Assuming the standard minimum lot (60'-0"), the widest building (48'-0), and a 9'-0" 1st floor plate line for a ranch, the total front elevation area is totaled at 432 SF. With a 15% window requirement, 64.8 SF of the front must be windows. Assuming a standard 36" x 72" is 18 SF. You would need at least (3.6) Windows for the front elevation. That is a hefty amount of windows for 28' of allowable frontage. and does impact the overall floor plan of the home that would front load features like a living room or office, but I think this is in the realm of being a reasonable percentage to start with. I think this should be lowered from 15% to **12%**. That would put the square footage requirement of a home at 51.84 SF (which is still 20% area of the 28' section of the home that is not garage)
 - b. Side-window requirement should be eliminated. For smaller homes the requirement of adding a window can disrupt the function of a home and with the general use of homes, these windows would be present to provide daylight or egress, not for their view of aesthetic purpose. On corner lots, I do think there would be a window requirement of 8% to provide a public face to the street. With renovations, this 8% to me appears to be a feasible goal for older homes looking to upgrade without causing a large amount of additional costs.
 - c. Window & door opening – I agree with requiring minimum 15% on the front façade. Disagree with requiring window opening on side facades.
- 3. **Additional Residential Zoning District:** Some respondents agreed a second (or modification of an existing district) of more dense residential district made sense in areas where the opportunity existed. Staff recommends identifying areas in the community where it may be possible. Below is a summary of associated comments.
 - a. Higher residential density should be considered in areas where there is the easiest opportunity for future walkable development. The two areas I see with this potential at are 47th & Mission and neighborhood of Southridge. Both areas already have non-conforming lot sizes but also have a tighter street network that is ideal for walkable communities (the ideal longest length of any street is between 500' to 800' linear feet). These communities were also developed in 1909 with the Strang Line streetcar, so the street structure is already set up for a time before cars were commonplace. The third place of potential higher residential density is to enact the buffer zones laid out in the last comprehensive plan. These areas would be the Bella Roe shopping center and the site known as the Northeast cloverleaf. The rest of Roeland Park should generally be left alone as the return from higher development will have a smaller return on the overall neighborhood gaining from

the increased density. The rest of Roeland Park may want to consider relaxing certain zoning.

- b. We should discuss either a new residential zoning category or revising an existing category to permit higher densities, such as row houses/townhomes or smaller-lot/smaller-home single family developments. These are being seen in some other cities' first-ring suburbs and might be appropriate for Roeland Park to consider
4. **Lot Coverage:** Lot coverage (at the front building setback line) has been addressed in the comments. The ordinance references a maximum of 80%- Proposed homes would be approved so long as structure coverage (again at the building setback line) does not exceed this number on the plans. Staff recommends no change at this time. Below is a summary of the comments relative to lot coverage.
- a. For the purpose of a general lot, the side-yard setbacks should be taken down to either 5' or 6' to allow the minimum lot to have the maximize build potential.
- This will be covered later, but if the City is looking to develop parts of the city in to walkable area that aligns with the goals of Community of All Ages, then the front setback needs to be reduced or completely eliminated as much of what make a walkable neighborhood is smaller front setbacks to encourage interaction with neighbors with porch, reduce the distance from the house to the sidewalk, frame/form the space of the street to be at least a 3:1 ratio of width to height (i.e. a 30' street (20' of street, 5' minimum of sidewalks on both sides)), should have a street front height of at least 10' and the ratio not exceeding 1:1 (30'-0" in height). The closer the value is to 1:1 the more defined the street becomes. Street trees can also be used as the space defining elements.
- b. Regarding lot coverage : - 80% coverage is a heavy percentage ,however if RP is to compete for new builds (revenue) , then people will need to be able to build above grade homes on a lots which exist in Roeland Park that wouldn't except anything other than 80% coverage . They could adopt different zones, districts in Roeland Park that could go to 70% if the lot is big enough
 - c. Lot coverage and setbacks – Agree with requirement for 30% (or up to 45%) lot coverage. I agree with our current requirements for 30' front, 25' rear, and 5' side setbacks. We should not allow zero-lot-line development unless in an overlay district that specifically allows it.

IMPACTS: There is a substantial concern that additional architectural requirements may be viewed as cumbersome by potential investors. If new standards are adopted there is little to no support to apply those standards to remodels, in new construction only.

POLICY ISSUES: Current policy takes a generalized approach to materials and relies on staff to make a judgement call on compliance. To date, that approach has worked reasonably well but the absence of a defined requirement relies heavily on the subjective view of the staff member making the decision.

Staff takes the approach that policies should be complementing with a reasonable degree of continuity as to the spirit and intent of the planning goals of the community. Writing policy around a single issue can create conflicting requirements and create a less comprehensive document resulting in enforcement issues and policy confusion in all phases of the process.

Hi John and Jennifer,

I reached out to an architect and builder since this isn't my area of expertise. Comments from the builder below. Hope to have comments from the architect by Thurs. I'm sure the architects on the PC will have more educated input for you.

I agree with Joe's comments below. (Builder). I think PVs new design standards are arbitrary and overbearingly specific in some cases and that they are going to add significant expense to homeowner's projects and delays in finish time (which translates to expense). I would hate to see RP head down the same road as PV in that regard.

Paula Gleason

Senior Real Estate Consultant – Associate Broker

Low & Gleason Team @ Reece Nichols Southgate

Top 5% of Agents in Customer Satisfaction

Cell 913-908-9078 * Fax 913-981-0894

Realtor - Licensed in KS & MO

[Click Here to Get an Instant Valuation on your Home](#)

www.paulagleason.com

[Click here to download my mobile Home Search app](#)

A referral is the nicest compliment I can receive

From: josephelder2@gmail.com [<mailto:josephelder2@gmail.com>]

Sent: Tuesday, May 14, 2019 9:41 AM

To: Chris Castrop

Cc: Paula Gleason

Subject: Re: Design Guideline Input for Roeland Park

Hi Paula ,

Regarding lot coverage : - 80% coverage is a heavy percentage ,however if RP is to compete for new builds (revenue) , then people will need to be able to build above grade homes on a lots which exist in Roeland Park that wouldn't except anything other than 80% coverage . They could adopt different zones, districts in Roeland Park that could go to 70% if the lot is big enough (of course I like it the way it is ☺) .

- in my opinion ,keep section 16-406.1 the same or Roeland Park will Teeter on an architectural review board scenario and that is a dictatorship of the people (especially those who don't like change)

- current massing guidelines are acceptable and should stay the same

- I believe any new addition whatever size should stay true to (as much as possible) existing building like material on the home.

Hope that helps ,

Joe

Bill Ahrens

- Front greenspace – I agree with requiring minimum 60% between the front lot line and front building line.
- Window & door opening – I agree with requiring minimum 15% on the front façade. Disagree with requiring window opening on side facades.
- Lot coverage and setbacks – Agree with requirement for 30% (or up to 45%) lot coverage. I agree with our current requirements for 30' front, 25' rear, and 5' side setbacks. We should not allow zero-lot-line development unless in an overlay district that specifically allows it.
- Massing – I agree with our current limitation to 2.5 stories/35' for residential.
- Building Design Standards should kick in for all new homes and substantial rebuilds/remodels. (need to discuss what would constitute “substantial”) Existing homes and minor remodeling and expansions would not be applicable.
- We should discuss either a new residential zoning category or revising an existing category to permit higher densities, such as row houses/townhomes or smaller-lot/smaller-home single family developments. These are being seen in some other cities' first-ring suburbs and might be appropriate for Roeland Park to consider.
- Unsure if we should list acceptable building materials. I don't want us to be too prescriptive and not allow something that might be perfectly acceptable for the sole reason that we don't have it listed. But if we make it solely at the discretion of the building official, then he has nothing to back him up if the decision is disputed.

John,

Here are my comments regarding the March presentation to Planning Commission:

pg. 10 Garage Massing on Front Elevation

The math does not work the garage massing. The minimum lot frontage for R-1 allowed is 60'-0" across. The minimum side yard is 5'-0" on each side, but the minimum building width is 80% of the lot width. The largest a house could be on a 60'-0" lot with these parameters is 48' wide. If we are getting to redevelopments or renovations, a 2-car garage will likely be a hot item that is added on. The minimum standard width of a 2-car garage is 20'. A 20' garage on a 46' wide house encompasses 41.67% of the frontage and would therefore not be allowed. The easiest change is to increase the total garage coverage to be **no more than 42% or 24' wide**. This would allow this massing to work on the standard smallest lot while preserving the intent of the ordinance that the City does not want the front of the house being comprised entirely of a garage. The importance of making this change is this will put the standard lot in jeopardy of not being improved as a zoning rule prohibits a value-added feature.

I am ok with the limit of the garage taking no more than 24' as this would allow (2) 8' garage doors side by side of giving a larger garage to help with ADA and community of all ages requirements. This requirement does mean that for the front elevation, there will only be 1 car or 2 car garages, never a 3-car garage unless there is an appeal made.

pg.11 Frontage Greenspace requires

As noted above, the math does not work on a 60'-0" wide lot that is trying to put in a 2-car garage. The minimum should be reduced down to **58%** for the 2-car garage to be placed on site. This again keeps the intent of the ordinance while making improvement feasible.

pg. 12 Windows and Door Openings

Assuming the standard minimum lot (60'-0"), the widest building (48'-0), and a 9'-0" 1st floor plate line for a ranch, the total front elevation area is totaled at 432 SF. With a 15% window requirement, 64.8 SF of the front must be windows. Assuming a standard 36" x 72" is 18 SF. You would need at least (3.6) Windows for the front elevation. That is a hefty amount of windows for 28' of allowable frontage. and does impact the overall floor plan of the home that would front load features like a living room or office, but I think this is in the realm of being a reasonable percentage to start with. I think this should be lowered from 15% to **12%**. That would put the square footage requirement of a home at 51.84 SF (which is still 20% area of the 28' section of the home that is not garage)

Side-window requirement should be eliminated. For smaller homes the requirement of adding a window can disrupt the function of a home and with the general use of homes, these windows would be present to provide daylight or egress, not for their view of asethic purpose. On corner lots, I do think there would be a window requirement of 8% to provide a public face to the street.

With renovations, this 8% to me appears to be a feasible goal for older homes looking to upgrade without causing a large amount of additional costs.

pg. 13 Lot Coverages and Setbacks

For the purpose of a general lot, the side-yard setbacks should be taken down to either 5' or 6' to allow the minimum lot to have the maximize build potential.

This will be covered later, but if the City is looking to develop parts of the city in to walkable area that aligns with the goals of Community of All Ages, then the front setback needs to be reduced or completely eliminated as much of what make a walkable neighborhood is smaller front setbacks to encourage interaction with neighbors with porch, reduce the distance from the house to the sidewalk, frame/form the space of the street to be at least a 3:1 ratio of width to height (i.e. a 30' street (20' of street, 5' minimum of sidewalks on both sides)), should have a street front height of at least 10' and the ratio not exceeding 1:1 (30'-0" in height). The closer the value is to 1:1 the more defined the street becomes. Street trees can also be used as the space defining elements.

pg. 16 Higher Residential Density

Higher residential density should be considered in areas where there is the easiest opportunity for future walkable development. The two areas I see with this potential at are 47th & Mission and neighborhood of Southridge. Both areas already have non-conforming lot sizes but also have a tighter street network that is ideal for walkable communities (the ideal longest length of any street is between 500' to 800' linear feet). These communities were also developed in 1909 with the Strang Line streetcar, so the street structure is already set up for a time before cars were commonplace. The third place of potential higher residential density is to enact the buffer zones laid out in the last comprehensive plan. These areas would be the Bella Roe shopping center and the site knows as the Northeast cloverleaf. The rest of Roeland Park should generally be left alone as the return from higher development with have a smaller return on the overall neighborhood gaining from the increased density. The rest of Roeland Park may want to consider relaxing certain zoning.

pg. 17-18 Strategies

In order to get small-town development, there need to be allowances to build in this manner. The first key is to eliminate all parking requirements for the new Town Center or targeted areas for walkable development. This changes parking from being a mandate to being a market-driven approach. Old Town Lenexa has a historic business district that only requires a parking study. This would reduce the total amount of land needed for the impervious surfaces of parking lots reducing stormwater water runoff, encourage shared parking districts, allow smaller building footprints which allow for small entrepreneurs to have lower overhead to start up new businesses, and create the small town field that 4 parking spaces per 1000 SF requirements will never do. The height limitation should be addressed by allowing only a certain number of stories (i.e. 3 stories), rather than by building height. The story requirement is a better visually to people on the overall proposed either than a straight building height limit. Conjunction could also be

used (i.e. no more than 3 stories or 45'-0"). In residential areas that are determined to be potential areas of walkable development, the minimum lot size and area should be eliminated or reduced down to 4000 SF. Parameters such as side setbacks and floor plan function will still keep lots to be around 30 - 50 ft wide, but this now allows the non-comforting lots to have the development potential with running into unnecessary roadblocks.

Another low hanging fruit is to allow limited business functions in R-1 areas. With the future of the workplace being remote, many entrepreneurs will start businesses out of their homes. Due to the limited space of the city, allowing businesses to start ground-up (and have them register with the city), would allow for micro-businesses to be part of the larger business community forming in Roeland Park.

I am sure other issues will be popping up at the next meeting, but here are my initial comments.

Kyle Rogler

From: Michael Hickey <michaelhickey5008@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, April 12, 2019 8:34 AM

To: Jones-Lacy, Jennifer <jjoneslacy@roelandpark.org>

Subject: Re: FW: Planning Commission for 4.16.19 Cancelled + Homework

Jennifer i believe that we should leave the 80% threshold in place for the impervious surfaces. If you look at many of the lots size on the west side of Roe as you reduce that percent you start limiting what can be built on those lots.

We need to be careful requiring what is acceptable or required if you want to build a new home in RP. We need to make sure we are not acting as a subdivision restricting what can be used on your home. The diversity we see in homes in RP is one of the things that draws people to our city, we are not a cookie cutter city.

I think the massing is ok. If we are going to use the mandates in remodeling i feel it should be 500 sqft or require them only on new. We could recommend that people who are remodeling follow them but may not require it. By mandating them the cost of remodeling will go up. hope that helps, have a great weekend. mike

