

**MINUTES-REGULAR SESSION
CITY OF GODDARD
118 NORTH MAIN, GODDARD, KS
September 13, 2021**

The Goddard Planning Commission met in regular session at Goddard City Hall on Monday September 13, 2021. Chair VanAmburg called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m. Chair VanAmburg led in the Pledge of Allegiance and Commissioner Cline led the Invocation.

Commission members present were:

Doug VanAmburg, Shane Grafing, Jody Crow, Jamie Coyne, Darrin Cline, Justin Parks

Commissioners absent were:

Doug Hall

Also present were: Micah Scoggan Community Development Director; Thatcher Moddie Assistant to the City Administrator; William Clevenger of Garver Inc. Mark Hanney of Hanney Architecture.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

MOTION: *Commissioner Grafing* moved to approve the agenda. *Commissioner Cline* seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

5-0

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

MOTION: *Commissioner Crow* moved to approve the minutes from August 9th, 2021 with the correction to item H.1. *Commissioner Grafing* seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

6-0

CITIZEN COMMENTS

Marian Adams [16 Argon] wanted to know what kind of buildings will be built on that property. She said most of the people in the meeting that night were concerned about getting reduced property values. She also said she wanted the properties to be built to meet the standards of the neighborhood.

Kendra Mork [Lives at 102 W 23rd St owns 17 Swanee] She stated when they built there house the Brentwood apartments were already there. She stated that she was concerned about adding more apartments to that little section of the community. She also mentioned her concern for

***Planning Commission Regular Session
September 13, 2021***

property values and the pipeline and how they are going to run parking and streets through the pipeline. She said she knows Goddard is growing and she has no problem with that but do they really need more apartments in that one little block area.

Christina Wark [Lives at 4100 S 199th St W owns 18 Swanee] Said she bought 18 Swanee as an investment and she believes in private property rights but she is concerned about traffic and the amount of people trying to go up and down 199th and the intersection by the high school. She said she moved from a plantation in Maize but that property has decreased in value but not in the value of the home but in the traffic increase they were experiencing in that area. She reiterated her belief in private property rights she would want to see the infrastructure that would support the additional traffic and vehicles and kids walking to and from school in that area.

Chair VanAmburg [closed the portion of citizens comments]

BOARD OF ZONING

F.1 Rezoning request for 1001 N Goddard Rd & Adjoining property.

Scoggan introduced the subject. He stated that Garver LLC has submitted a rezoning application on behalf of the developer Pio Hernandez and Bob Armstrong for the property located at 1001 S Goddard RD and the adjoining land to the west as shown on the map on Exhibit F.1a. The properties are bounded by S Goddard Rd on the east, Swanee Dr on the North, S Main St on the West and W 23rd St on the south.

This property is currently zoned R-1 and the developer would like to rezone it to R-2 to allow for the development of duplexes on the property.

The property to the east is in the county and it is zoned Rural Residential. The properties to the north are zoned Single Family R-1 and the properties to the west are zoned R-3 multi-family.

Scoggan outlined the 17 criteria for guiding the discussion and showed his answers to the questions. He mentioned that they are not weighted for determining an answer only to help guide the conversation.

He stated that the following requirements are found in Article 13: Amendments, Section 100.H.1-17

1. What are the existing uses and their character and condition on the subject property and in the surrounding neighborhood?

There is a church building that is not in use on one lot. The adjoining lot is vacant. Properties to the north are single family detached. Properties to the west are multi- family developments. To the east the property is agricultural.

2. What is the current zoning of the subject property and that of the surrounding neighborhood in relation to the request?

The subject property is R-1 currently. The property to the north is R-1, the property to the west is R-3 multi-family. The property to the east is Rural Residential (County) and the property to the south is R-1.

3. Is the length of time that the subject property has remained undeveloped/vacant as zoned a factor in the consideration?

It could be considered a factor but not the dominant factor. The dominant factor would be it existed as church land prior to 2018 when it was sold.

4. Would the request correct an error in the application of these regulations?

No.

5. Is the request caused by changed or changing conditions in the area of the subject property

and, if so, what is the nature and significance of such changed or changing conditions?

Yes. The City of Goddard is experiencing a large residential increase. Most of this increase is Single Family-detached owner-occupied dwellings. There is a need for rental units and as well as a need for density building.

6. Do adequate sewage disposal and water supply and all other necessary public facilities including street access exist or can they be provided to serve the uses that would be permitted on the subject property?

Yes. City water and sewer exist and can service the area as well as streets.

7. Would the subject property need to be platted or replatted or in lieu of dedications made for rights-of-way, easements, and access control or building setback lines?

Yes, one lot is platted and the other more prominent lot is unplatted.

8. Would a screening plan be necessary for existing and/or potential uses of the subject property?

No. The adjoining properties are residential, and the proposed use is residential.

9. Is suitable vacant land or buildings available or not available for development that currently has the same zoning as is requested?

No. Current zoning for R-2 is around 81 acres out of approximately 1,946 which accounts for about 4% of available land for duplexes without having to go through a CUP.

10. If the request is for business or industrial uses, are such uses needed to provide more services or employment opportunities?

This is residential

11. Is the subject property suitable for the uses in the current zoning to which it has been restricted?

Yes. It could go through a conditional use permit, and it is remaining residential.

12. To what extent would the removal of the restrictions, i.e. the approval of the zoning request detrimentally affect other property in the neighborhood?

According to Jack Manion (Residential Land Analyst) since the lot is empty this development would increase the property values of the surrounding property. Negative impact could be increased car traffic on Goddard Rd.

13. Would the request be consistent with the purpose of the zoning district classification and the intent and purpose of these regulations?

Yes. The use would remain residential, and the City is desirous of focusing on infill development to maximize property values and increases density.

14. Is the request in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan and does it further enhance the implementation of the Plan?

Yes. Page 17 of the comprehensive plan outlines housing objectives to include, "Provide for multiple family dwellings, retirement housing and other specialized housing as required to meet the needs of defined user groups within the community"

15. What is the nature of the support or opposition to the request?

Support comes in the request for more rental properties in Goddard to host those who are either unwilling or unable to purchase a home in the moment. Opposition comes in the desire for

certain neighborhoods to remain relatively unchanged in their land use composition of single-family detached housing.

16. Is there any information or are there recommendations on this request available from professional persons or persons with related expertise which would be helpful in its evaluation? General planning practice encourages the introduction of increased density developments to help sustain commercial development in proximity to residential neighborhoods, while increasing walkability for health and wellness. This as well as maximizing existing city infrastructure to offset maintenance costs long term.

17. By comparison, does the relative gain to the public health, safety or general welfare outweigh the loss in property value or the hardship imposed upon the applicant by not approving the request?

No. The health of individuals within the City of Goddard would benefit from more walkable developments. Property values would increase according to Jack Manion (Sedgwick County Residential Land Analyst) since it is considered residential, and the land is vacant.

William Clevenger stated he was excited about the project and feels it is a great location. He mentioned the traffic would exit unto Goddard Rd and the pipeline that was mentioned is on the south side of the property and they will steer clear of that.

He stated they won't be changing any of the pipeline and with its proximity to existing multi-family and it being located on the outskirts of town it would have minimal impact.

Commissioner Cline asked how many units there would be

William Clevenger said he was not sure yet how many they could fit on the land but the property value of those residence were going to be around \$300,000.

Commissioner Crow asked if there were going to be sidewalks included in the development.

William Clevenger said during plating if it was determined it would be required it could be addressed at that time.

Commissioner Cline asked what portion of the property will be used.

William Clevenger said all of it except where the pipeline is located at. The existing church building is going to remain.

Commissioner Cline asked if it was going to be south of the existing building.

William Clevenger said that was correct.

Commissioner Crow asked if it was one cul-de-sac.

William Clevenger said that was correct.

Chair VanAmburg asked if there was a dedicated purpose for the church building

William Clevenger said it has not been discussed yet.

Commissioner Grafing said there was not a lot of room to put units in there.

Commissioner Crow wanted to see the map again.

Commissioner Cline asked if they knew where the pipeline goes through the property.

Scoggan showed on the map where the pipeline was located on the property mentioning it was a diagonal line on the south side. He also mentioned there was an easement for utility and drainage that goes north and south through the lot.

Commissioner Crow asked if there was any further discussion developing the land to the west of the land in question.

Scoggan replied there is some discussion but none that are progressing due to restrictive covenants on the land limiting what can be built.

Chair VanAmburg said he knew they didn't have an idea yet but he was curious if there was any idea at all of how many units there would be.

William Clevenger said he really couldn't say at this time other than there will be a cul-de-sac coming off the street. If zoning was approved, they would move to platting and be able to calculate how many lots would be available.

Commissioner Crow said she did not think there could be more than 12 in that space.

Commissioner Grafing agreed.

Scoggan mentioned that engineering review would include drainage which would have to be taken into account.

Chair VanAmburg said he thinks that answers all the questions.

MOTION: *Commissioner Grafing* moved to approve the rezoning of the land outlined in exhibit F.1a. *Commissioner Crow* seconded the motion. The motion carried **5-1** with *Commissioner Cline* opposed.

OLD BUSINESS

None

NEW BUSINESS

H.1 STAR Bond phase 2 softball diamonds.

Scoggan introduced the subject. He stated that Martin Hanney of Hanney Architects has submitted a site plan for the phase 2 softball diamonds at the Goddard Genesis development. The original site plan for the overall development included a second phase of five baseball diamonds. This amended phase would shift the baseball diamonds to softball diamonds to allow for more future amenities to be allowed on the site given space requirements and drainage considerations.

Site plans are required for all commercial developments. This development has already been addressed in anticipation of the future diamonds but with the change from baseball to softball it was determined that such a change should be reviewed first by the Planning Commission and any comments or concerns be taken into account by the Architect who represents the developer.

An additional 279 parking spots will be added to accommodate the parking for the softball portion of phase 2.

With the reduction in impervious surface from baseball diamonds to softball diamonds the current retention is more than sufficient, with future phases needing to be taken into account to meet drainage requirements.

Scoggan stated there would be five softball diamonds, 1 concession stand, 279 parking spots and the drainage is sufficient given the reduction in impervious area.

Hanney said that what they had found was there is a real demand for youth sports. Not only softball but youth baseball. Adding the softball diamonds would allow for more variety of play in that area. He said they determined that with the construction going on the parking was tight. They had determined that 250 parking spaces were necessary for a tournament when they came

in and the fire department wanted a second exit coming out to Goddard Rd. So, the future parking curves around the west side of the lot. There are 170 parking spaces on the west side and that is for overflow.

Hanney mentioned there will be an arch and a connection walkway between the baseball and the softball. The softball will be lit and will be all turf.

He further mentioned that the city engineer is working on the retention for the site and all the drainage will be heading to the southeast and there will be no water contributing to the north side.

Commissioner Cline asked if the south retention ponds drain to the south?

Hanney replied that was correct.

Hanney stated that the change from two stories to one was due to a demand for shade and so the overhang on the concession stand changes to accommodate that.

Commissioner Coyne asked if the diamonds would be multi-use baseball and softball.

Hanney replied that was correct.

Commissioner Grafing asked if the 279 spots was what was highlighted in blue on the map not including what was on the curve?

Hanney replied that was correct.

MOTION: *Commissioner Coyne* moved to approve the amended site plan for Phase 2 of the Goddard Genesis softball diamonds. *Commissioner Cline* seconded the motion.
Motion carried **6-0**

CITY PLANNER REPORT

I.1 Subdivision regulation changes 2021 to date.

Scoggan introduced the subject. He stated that on May 10, 2021, the Planning Commission and the City Council along with the mayor met for a joint session workshop to discuss zoning regulation amendments. The items discussed during that meeting are in multiple different steps for approval and *Scoggan* went through each item and their stage of approval.

PLANNING COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

None

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: *Commissioner Grafing* motioned to adjourn the meeting. *Commissioner Cline* seconded the motion.
Motion carried **6-0**

Meeting adjourned at 7:32 pm.
Micah Scoggan, Community Development Director