

**AGENDA-REGULAR MEETING  
GODDARD PLANNING COMMISSION  
118 NORTH MAIN  
GODDARD, KANSAS  
February 10, 2020  
7:00 P.M.**

**A) CALL TO ORDER**

**B) PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE AND INVOCATION**

**C) APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

**D) CITIZEN COMMENTS**

**E) CONSENT AGENDA:**

Items on the Consent Agenda are considered by staff to be routine business items. Approval of the items may be made by a single motion, seconded, and a majority vote with no separate discussion of any item listed. Should a member of the Governing Body desire to discuss any item, the item will be removed from the Consent Agenda and considered separately.

1. Approval of Minutes
  - a. Regular Meeting – January 13, 2020

**F) BOARD of ZONING APPEALS**

None

**G) OLD BUSINESS**

None

**H) NEW BUSINESS**

None

**I) CITY PLANNER REPORT**

1. Design Review Committee – Removal
2. 227 Cedar Rezoning Application
3. 227 Cedar Site Plan Review
4. Sign Variance – Arbor Creek

**J) COMMISSIONER COMMENTS**

**K) ADJOURNMENT**

The Next Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission is scheduled for  
March 9, 2020 at 7pm.

**MINUTES-REGULAR SESSION  
CITY OF GODDARD  
118 NORTH MAIN, GODDARD, KS  
JANUARY 13, 2020**

The Goddard Planning Commission met in a Regular Session at Goddard City Hall on Monday January 13, 2020. Chairman VanAmburg called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m. Chairman VanAmburg led in the Pledge of Allegiance and the Invocation.

Commission members present were:

Justin Parks, Jody Dendurent, Shane Grafing, Doug Hall, Jamie Coyne, Doug VanAmburg

Commissioners absent were:

Darrin Cline

Also present were: Micah Scoggan, City Planner; Thatcher Moddie, Internship Fellow; Tori, Lease Wichita

**APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

**MOTION:** Commissioner *Hall* moved to approve the agenda. Commissioner *Coyne* seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

**MOTION:** Commissioner *Coyne* moved to approve the minutes from December 9, 2019. Commissioner *Grafing* seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

**CITIZEN COMMENTS**

Daniel Carlyle {217 Cedar-Property Owner/121 Swanee Residence}

Mr Carlyle asked the Planning Commission what kind of games were being played. He asked them how many of them were qualified to review building codes. He stated they would have to be responsible for reviewing the building code.

Edward Knox {120 E 1<sup>st</sup>}

Said that the five plex did not fit the community. He said he worked hard on the zoning code and that the Commissioners do not live next to the property. He stated he did not trust this Jack Manion and he knew that rental properties would decrease his property value.

**BOARD OF ZONING**

NONE

**OLD BUSINESS**

**227 Cedar St rezoning**

*Scoggan* introduced the subject. He reminded the Planning Commission that the developer initially wanted to rezone the property located at 227 Cedar to a PUD to accommodate a five plex. After reviewing they decided to move to a three plex development and as such would like to amend their application to an R-3 zoning. *Scoggan* stated that in order to formally review the amended zoning application they would have to publish it in the City paper and allow 20 days to elapse. He stated that for today he was looking for approval for the developer to submit an amended application.

*Chair VanAmburg* asked how long has that property remained vacant?

*Scoggan* replied he did not have a definitive number, but multiple individuals have stated anywhere from 10-20 years.

*Chair VanAmburg* asked the audience member if they knew to which no one was certain.

*Chair VanAmburg* stated that there were no dumps around that area but many of the homes were not new.

*Tori* of Lease Wichita spoke on behalf of AST Investments stating that their properties were considered quality properties and they rent the properties at a high mark as well as do a thorough background check and credit score check.

**MOTION:** Commissioner *Grafing* motioned to allow the developer to resubmit a revised application for R-3 and consider the zoning change request on February 10,2020. Commissioner *Dendurent* seconded the motion.

**6-0** Motion carried

**Sign Ordinance Regulation**

*Scoggan* introduced the subject. He reminded the Planning Commission on October 14, 2019 he introduced a policy revision to the sign ordinance which was tabled until January for further review. He stated that the information provided by Cindy Proett of luminous neon was beneficial and is being used in tandem with other cities sign ordinances to draft a new policy for the City. He was looking for a time extension to present the new sign ordinance in the future no later than July 2020.

**MOTION:** Commissioner *Coyne* motioned to table the sign ordinance revision until such time as it can be presented as a full revision. No later than July 2020. Commissioner *Grafing* seconded the motion.

**6-0** Motion carried

## **NEW BUSINESS**

### **New Chair & Vice-Chair**

**Scoggan** introduced the subject. He stated that according to the Planning Commission by laws each year the Planning Commission shall choose from amongst the appointed members a Chair and Vice-chair

He mentioned there were sheets in front of the Planning Commissioners to use to identify which Planning Commissioner would move forward as chair and which would move forward as vice chair for the year 2020. After tallying the votes, it was determined that **Doug VanAmburg** would remain as Chair of the Planning Commission and **Shane Grafing** would move into position as the new Vice Chair.

### **Annual Review of Regulations**

**Scoggan** introduced the subject. He stated that according to Article 13.105 of the subdivision regulations the Planning Commission could make considerations for amendments, if any, to the subdivision regulations.

**Scoggan** showed areas of the city where rental properties existed inside traditional owner-occupied zoning. He spoke on the market demand for zoning within the City that was leading to this trend of renter occupied single family zoning.

**Scoggan** also showed a slide depicting vacant lots around clustered around “Old Goddard” and mentioned that typically someone will not want to build a single family residence in that area and as such they would probably continue to see multi-family CUP being pulled for that area. As such he stated he was leaning towards “upzoning” a portion of Old Goddard to encourage private development in that area.

**Scoggan** spoke on the comments he had received from **Commissioner Cline** who could not be in attendance. He stated the **Commissioner Cline** felt that sidewalks should be a requirement in all new developments. He also mentioned that He would like to see a requirement in the subdivision regulations stating that each developer must donate a lot for a neighborhood park.

**Commissioner Dendurent** thought that Commissioner Clines comments were reasonable but felt that those sidewalks should be required on the main thoroughfares.

**Commissioner Grafing** agreed. He noted Developers are putting in sidewalks regardless of the requirement as common practice.

**Commissioner Dendurent** thought it made sense to have more density abutting the Central Business District.

**Chair VanAmburg** mentioned he thought about selling his property originally and then decided to rent his property for awhile and he became inundated with phone calls since the demand was so high.

*Commissioner Dendurent* asked if you can build a Single-Family house in an R-3 zoned lot.

*Scoggan* replied yes you can build anything in R-1 and R-2 inside of an R-3 zoned lot.

*Commissioner Coyne* asked if the City had enough commercially zoned lots?

*Chair VanAmburg* asked is that the direction they felt the City wanted to go in?

*Scoggan* replied he felt they had enough Commercial lots just not enough commercial builds on those lots which he expected to change as residential continued to escalate.

*Chair VanAmburg* asked about the School District and if the City should consider setting aside land for them?

*Scoggan* stated the School district acts as a semi-autonomous entity within the City and they typically handle land acquisition by themselves.

### **CITY PLANNER REPORT**

*Scoggan* informed the Planning Commission that except for Commissioner Dendurent, the Planning Commissioners will need to have their 3-year terms renewed by the Governing Body. This is a formality that simply requires a recommendation by the Mayor and formal adoption by the Governing Body.

City staff is putting together the agenda items for the governing body for consideration.

### **GOVERNING BODY COMMENTS**

None

### **ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION:** Commissioner *Grafing* moved to adjourn the regular meeting. Commissioner *Coyne* seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

*Meeting adjourned at 8:18 pm.  
Micah Scoggan, City Planner*

**City of Goddard  
Goddard Planning Commission  
February 10, 2020  
7:00 PM**

**TO:** Planning Commission  
**SUBJECT:** Several items of note for informative purposes but not for voting on  
**PREPARED BY:** City Planner  
**AGENDA:** Staff Report

---

**Background:** Micah Scoggan, City Planner, compiles a short concise report outlining relevant information and presents it to the Planning Commission.

**1. Design Review Committee**

- The Design Review Committee (DRC) is a subcommittee of the Planning Commission that is allowed in the subdivision regulations for site plan review.
- Previous we spoke of the need to remove the DRC as an option for developers since the DRC does not exist currently and the purposes of the DRC were redundant to a certain extent.
- This will be considered formally on March 9, 2020

**2. 227 Cedar Rezoning Application**

- On January, the Planning Commission allowed the developer to re-submit an application for 227 Cedar St for consideration for re-zoning to an R-3.
- Due to publication requirements this request was deferred to the next Planning Commission meeting.
- This will be considered formally on March 9, 2020

**3. 227 Cedar Site Plan Review**

- In consideration of time, the City Planner allowed the developer to submit a site plan to be considered concurrently with the re-zoning application.
- This will allow the Planning Commission to review what is being proposed in terms of design should they approve the re-zoning application

**4. Sign Variance – Arbor Creek**

- Arbor Creek want to erect a marketing sign as is common in the are for the promotion of housing in the new subdivision.
- Since Arbor Creek has been formally annexed and is zoned as an R-1 we are requiring them to submit a variance application for the sign since it exceeds the sign regulations for an R-1 zoned property.