



CITY PLAN COMMISSION STAFF REPORT

City of Kansas City, Missouri
City Planning & Development Department
www.kcmo.gov/cpc

March 5, 2025

Project Name

Chapter 88 Amendment, Periodic Review

Docket # 7**Request**

CD-CPC-2025-00011
Periodic Review

Applicant

City Planning and Development

APPROVAL PROCESS**SUMMARY OF REQUEST + KEY POINTS**

The City Planning and Development Department is proposing amendments to the Zoning and Development Code regarding notification requirements for amendments in planned districts, permissible zoning districts for certain building types, and standards for driveways in infill residential districts.

REQUIRED PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT

Standard protocol for periodic review text amendments is to post drafts to the City's website approximately 30 days in advance of the City Plan Commission hearing. This protocol was followed. Public Testimony was received and is attached as Exhibit 4. Additionally, staff held a public engagement meeting on February 13, 2025. Sign in sheet and comments provided in Attachment #3.

CONTROLLING + RELATED CASES

None

PROFESSIONAL STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Docket #7 **Approval-** Amendments 1 & 2
 Hold- Amendment 3

AMENDMENT OVERVIEW

City staff has reviewed Amendment 1 (Amendments to Approved Plans: Sections 88-255-09-B, 88-260-06-A, 88-516-06-C, and 88-520-03-C) and Amendment 2 (Residential Building Types on Corner Lots: Section 88-110-04, 88-110-06) and recommends that both amendments proceed as presented in Attachment #2 (Clean Copy). Following the public engagement meeting, staff recommends that Amendment 3 (Infill Residential Driveway Standards: Section 88-110-07-E) be held for further review to allow for thorough consideration of public comments and feedback.

AMENDMENT 1– Amendments to Approved Plans- Sections 88-255-09-B, 88-260-06-A, 88-516-06-C, 88-520-03-C

The proposed amendments update the Kansas City Zoning and Development Code to clarify the process for modifying approved plans in the Shoal Creek, Urban Redevelopment, Plan Review, and Master Planned Development districts. It proposes that major amendments follow the zoning map amendment process and permits the City Planning and Development Director to approve minor amendments administratively.

SPECIFIC REVIEW CRITERIA - Amendments to Approved Plans**Zoning and Development Code Text Amendments (88-510-07)**

In reviewing and making decisions on zoning and development code text amendments, the City Planning and Development Director, City Plan Commission, and City Council must consider at least the following factors:

- A. Whether the proposed zoning and development Code text amendment corrects an error or inconsistency in the Zoning and Development Code or meets the challenge of a changing condition;**
The text amendment meets the challenge of a changing condition in an effort to aid in development

88-255-09. Amendments to Approved Plans: Shoal Creek

The proposed amendments update the Kansas City Zoning and Development Code to clarify the process for modifying approved plans in the Shoal Creek. It proposes that major amendments follow the zoning map amendment process and permits the City Planning and Development Director to approve minor amendments administratively. Current language for amendments within the Shoal Creek requires notification to all properties within the plan boundaries regardless of distance from the subject site.

88-260-06. Amendments to Approved Preliminary Development Plans: UR (Urban Redevelopment District)

In the course of carrying out any part of the development plan for a UR district, the developer may submit a request for an amendment of the approved preliminary development plan. Requests to amend a preliminary development plan must be processed as a zoning map amendment in accordance with 88-515, expect that the city planning and development director is authorized to approve minor amendments to UR district preliminary development plans in accordance with the administrative adjustment procedures of 88-570

88-516-06. Amendments to Development Plans or Project Plans: Plan Review

Requests to amend an approved development plan must be processed as a zoning map amendment to accordance with 88-515, except that the city planning and development director is authorized to approve minor amendments to an approved plan in accordance with the administrative adjustment procedures of 88-570 (see specifically 88-570-02-H). Current language for amendments within the Development Plan or Project Plan requires notification to all properties within the plan boundaries regardless of distance from the subject site.

88-520-03. Preliminary Development Plans: MPD (Master Planned Developments)

Requests to amend an approved plan must be processed as a zoning map amendment in accordance with 88-515, except that the city planning and development director is authorized to approve minor amendments to a preliminary development plan in accordance with the administrative adjustment procedures of 88-570 (see specifically 88-570-02-H). Current language for amendments within the Master Planned Development requires notification to all properties within the plan boundaries regardless of distance from the subject site.

B. Whether the proposed zoning and development code text amendment is consistent with adopted plans and the stated purpose of this Zoning and Development Code; and

The amendment is consistent with adopted plans and purposes of the code.

C. Whether the proposed zoning and development code text amendment is in the best interests of the City as a whole.

The proposed amendment is in the best interests of the city as a whole.

AMENDMENT 2– Residential Building Types on Corner Lots- Section 88-110-04-A, 88-110-06-4

The proposed amendment refines residential building regulations by permitting two-unit houses and semi-attached houses as allowable building types in the R-6 districts when on a corner lot, regardless of the Development Option. Previously, these building types were only permitted in the Open Space and Conservation Development Options.

SPECIFIC REVIEW CRITERIA – Residential Building Types on Corner Lots**Zoning and Development Code Text Amendments (88-510-07)**

In reviewing and making decisions on zoning and development code text amendments, the City Planning and Development Director, City Plan Commission, and City Council must consider at least the following factors:

A. Whether the proposed zoning and development Code text amendment corrects an error or inconsistency in the Zoning and Development Code or meets the challenge of a changing condition;**88-110-04. Residential Building Types**

The proposed amendment refines residential building regulations by permitting two-unit houses and semi-attached houses as allowable building types in the R-6 districts when on a corner lot, regardless of

the Development Option. Previously, these building types were only permitted in the Open Space and Conservation Development Options.

Additionally, this amendment requires that each garage must be oriented toward a different street frontage, ensuring that no single frontage is visually or functionally dominated by both garages.

The Table below highlights proposed changes within the permissible building type table as found in Section 88-110-04 of the Zoning and Development Code.

Building Type	R-80	R-10	R-7.5	R-6	R-5	R-2.5	R-1.5	R-0.75	R-0.5	R-0.3
Detached house	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
Zero lot line house	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
Cottage house	-	-	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
Attached house										
Semi-attached										
on corner lots	-	P[1]	P[1]	P[1]	P	P	P	P	P	P
in other situations	-	-	-	-	P	P	P	P	P	P
Townhouse	-	-	-	-	P	P	P	P	P	P
Two-unit house										
on corner lots	-	P[1]	P[1]	P[1]	P	P	P	P	P	P
in other situations	-	-	-	-	P	P	P	P	P	P
Multi-unit house	-	-	-	-	-	S	P	P	P	P
Colonnade	-	-	-	-	-	-	P	P	P	P
Multiplex	-	-	-	-	-	-	P	P	P	P
Multi-unit building	-	-	-	-	-	-	P	P	P	P

B. Whether the proposed zoning and development code text amendment is consistent with adopted plans and the stated purpose of this Zoning and Development Code; and

The amendment is consistent with adopted plans and purposes of the code.

C. Whether the proposed zoning and development code text amendment is in the best interests of the City as a whole.

The proposed amendment is in the best interests of the city as a whole.

AMENDMENT 3– Infill Residential Driveway Standards- Section 88-110-07-E

This proposed amendment updates the definition of an improved alley, adjusts the context area from the block face to the two closest developed properties, and establishes size standards for driveway width and front yard pavement percentage.

SPECIFIC REVIEW CRITERIA – Infill Residential Driveway Standards

Zoning and Development Code Text Amendments (88-510-07)

In reviewing and making decisions on zoning and development code text amendments, the City Planning and Development Director, City Plan Commission, and City Council must consider at least the following factors:

A. Whether the proposed zoning and development Code text amendment corrects an error or inconsistency in the Zoning and Development Code or meets the challenge of a changing condition; 88-110-07-E. Infill Vehicular Use Standards

This proposed amendment updates infill vehicular use standards, which currently permits driveways from the street when 51% or more of homes in the context area had a driveway and there was no improved alley. This amendment would permit a driveway from the street based on whether more than half of the lots in the context area are developed and if the two adjacent developed properties have a driveway.

For corner lots, driveways are allowed only if the lot abutting the subject lot's side yard has a driveway. When an improved alley is not present and fewer than half of the lots in the context area are developed, driveways are permitted if both abutting lots are vacant or if at least one abutting lot has an existing driveway.

Additionally, the standards are proposed to be updated to restrict driveway width in the front yard to a maximum of 12 feet and limit the percentage of pavement in the front yard to 40%. There are no current standards for driveway width or front yard pavement percentage.

B. Whether the proposed zoning and development code text amendment is consistent with adopted plans and the stated purpose of this Zoning and Development Code; and

The amendment is consistent with adopted plans and purposes of the code.

C. Whether the proposed zoning and development code text amendment is in the best interests of the City as a whole.

The proposed amendment is in the best interests of the city as a whole.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Redline Draft
2. Clean Copy
3. Public Engagement Meeting
4. Public Testimony

PROFESSIONAL STAFF RECOMMENDATION

City staff recommends **Approval of Amendments 1 and 2 and Amendment 3 to be Held.**

Respectfully Submitted,



Matthew Barnes, AICP
Lead Planner

CD-CPC-2025-00011 Periodic Review Text Amendments

Text to be deleted

Text to be added/amended

Amendments to Approved Plans:

88-255 – SC, Shoal Creek District

88-255-09 – Amendments to Approved Plans

~~**88-255-09-B.** In the case of a plan amendment with multiple owners, a single property owner may initiate the application to amend the plan if:~~

- ~~1. The amendment to the plan does not adversely affect the remaining parcels within the plan boundaries as to density, parking, setbacks, or other similar factors as provided in the rules and regulations of the city plan commission; and~~
- ~~2. The applicant property owner has notified all other property owners within the plan boundaries, in the form and manner adopted by the city plan commission and by certified mail, and has received no written objection to such amendment within 30 days after the date such notice is mailed.~~

88-255-09-B. Requests to amend an approved plan must be processed as a zoning map amendment in accordance with 88-515, except that the city planning and development director is authorized to approve minor amendments to the SC plan in accordance with the administrative adjustment procedures of 88-570 (see specifically 88-570-02-H).

88-260 – UR, Urban Redevelopment District

88-260-06 – Amendments to Approved Preliminary Development Plans

88-260-06-A. In the course of carrying out any part of the development plan for a UR district, the developer may submit a request for an amendment of the [approved](#) preliminary development plan ~~approved at the time of rezoning to the UR district~~. Requests to amend a preliminary development plan must be processed as a zoning map amendment in accordance with 88-515, except that the city planning and development director is authorized to approve minor amendments to UR district preliminary development plans in

accordance with the administrative adjustment procedures of [88-570](#) (see specifically, 88-570-02-H).

88-516 – Plan Review

88-516-06 – Amendments to Development Plans or Project Plans

88-516-06-C. PLAN AMENDMENT – MULTIPLE OWNERS

~~In the case of a plan amendment with multiple owners, a single property owner may initiate the application to amend the plan if:~~

- ~~1. The amendment to the plan does not adversely affect the remaining parcels within the plan boundaries as to density, parking, setbacks, or other similar factors as provided in the rules and regulations of the city plan commission; and~~
- ~~2. The applicant property owner has notified all other property owners within the plan boundaries, in the form and manner adopted by the city plan commission and by certified mail, and has received no written objection to such amendment within 30 days after the date such notice is mailed.~~

88-516-06-C. Plan Amendment

Requests to amend an approved development plan must be processed as a zoning map amendment in accordance with 88-515, except that the city planning and development director is authorized to approve minor amendments to an approved plan in accordance with the administrative adjustment procedures of 88-570 (see specifically 88-570-02-H).

88-520 Master Planned Developments

88-520-03 – Preliminary Development Plans

88-520-03-C. PLAN AMENDMENT

~~In the case of a plan amendment with multiple owners, a single property owner may initiate the application to amend the plan if:~~

- ~~1. The amendment to the plan does not adversely affect the remaining parcels within the plan boundaries as to density, parking, setbacks, or other similar factors as provided in the rules and regulations of the city plan commission; and~~

2. The applicant property owner has notified all other property owners within the plan boundaries, in the form and manner adopted by the city plan commission and by certified mail, and has received no written objection to such amendment within 30 days after the date such notice is mailed.

Requests to amend an approved plan must be processed as a zoning map amendment in accordance with 88-515, except that the city planning and development director is authorized to approve minor amendments to a preliminary development plan in accordance with the administrative adjustment procedures of 88-570 (see specifically 88-570-02-H).

Duplexes on Corner Lots:

88-110 – Residential Building Types

88-110-04-A Residential Building Types Allowed

The residential uses allowed in R districts must be located in residential buildings. The following residential building types are allowed in R districts. Many residential building types are subject to supplemental standards, as referenced in 88-110-06-C.

Building Type	R-80	R-10	R-7.5	R-6	R-5	R-2.5	R-1.5	R-0.75	R-0.5	R-0.3
Detached house	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
Zero lot line house	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
Cottage house	-	-	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
Attached house										
Semi-attached										
on corner lots	-	P[1]	P[1]	P[1]	P	P	P	P	P	P
in other situations	-	-	-	-	P	P	P	P	P	P
Townhouse	-	-	-	-	P	P	P	P	P	P
Two-unit house										
on corner lots	-	P[1]	P[1]	P[1]	P	P	P	P	P	P
in other situations	-	-	-	-	P	P	P	P	P	P
Multi-unit house	-	-	-	-	-	S	P	P	P	P
Colonnade	-	-	-	-	-	-	P	P	P	P
Multiplex	-	-	-	-	-	-	P	P	P	P
Multi-unit building	-	-	-	-	-	-	P	P	P	P

88-110-06-4 TWO-UNIT HOUSES AND SEMI-ATTACHED HOUSES ON CORNER LOTS

Under the conventional development option, two-unit houses and semi-attached houses are subject to the standards of Section 88-110-06-B (Table 110-2). In approved open space or conservation developments two-unit houses and semi-attached houses are allowed on corner lots in all R districts except R-80. In R-10, R-7.5 and R-6 districts they are subject to the following additional standards.

(a) Two-unit houses and semi-attached houses are allowed on corner lots in situations in which such building types would not otherwise be allowed because they can be designed so each unit is oriented towards a different street. This gives the two-unit house and the semi-attached house the overall appearance of a detached house when viewed from either street.

(b) The corner lot must comply with the minimum lot area standard of the subject zoning district. No lot with less than 3,000 square feet of lot area may be used for the corner lot option.

(c) Each dwelling unit within the two-unit house or semi-attached house must have its ~~address and main entrance~~ address, main entrance, and garage oriented towards a separate street frontage. Conversion of an existing detached house may provide one main entrance with internal access to both units.

Residential Infill Driveway Standards:

88-110-07 – Infill Residential Development Standards

88-110-07-E. Infill Vehicular Use Standards

a. DRIVEWAYS –

i. When an improved alley is present, driveways from the street are prohibited. ~~For this section, improved shall mean paved with a hard surface or gravel. It shall not mean that such alleys must be improved to current Public Works Department standards.~~

ii. When an improved alley is not present, ~~and more than half of lots in the context area are developed,~~ driveways from the street shall be permitted only when ~~both lots abutting the subject lot have a driveway from the street. 51% or more of the homes in the infill residential context area have a driveway from the same street.~~ ~~For corner lots, driveways from the street shall be permitted only when the lot abutting the subject lot's~~

side yard has a driveway from the street. The city planning and development director is authorized to allow driveways from streets where neither abutting lot or only one abutting lot has a driveway from the street fewer than 51% of the homes in the infill residential context area have them only when such a driveway is shared with at least one adjacent home, any garage the driveways lead to is not visible from the street, the driveway does not exceed 12 feet in width in the front yard, and subject to recording a cross-access easement. For this section, improved shall mean paved with a hard surface or gravel. It shall not mean that such alleys must be improved to current Public Works Department standards.

iii. When an improved alley is not present and fewer than half of lots in the context area are developed, driveways from the street shall be permitted when the lots abutting the subject lot are both vacant or at least one abutting lot is developed with a driveway from the street. The driveway may not exceed 12 feet in width in the front yard and may not result in more than 40% of the front yard being paved.

CD-CPC-2025-00011 Periodic Review Text Amendments

Amendments to Approved Plans:

88-255 – SC, Shoal Creek District

88-255-09 – Amendments to Approved Plans

88-255-09-B. Requests to amend an approved plan must be processed as a zoning map amendment in accordance with 88-515, except that the city planning and development director is authorized to approve minor amendments to the SC plan in accordance with the administrative adjustment procedures of 88-570 (see specifically 88-570-02-H).

88-260 – UR, Urban Redevelopment District

88-260-06 – Amendments to Approved Preliminary Development Plans

88-260-06-A. In the course of carrying out any part of the development plan for a UR district, the developer may submit a request for an amendment of the approved preliminary development plan. Requests to amend a preliminary development plan must be processed as a zoning map amendment in accordance with 88-515, except that the city planning and development director is authorized to approve minor amendments to UR district preliminary development plans in accordance with the administrative adjustment procedures of [88-570](#) (see specifically, 88-570-02-H).

88-516 – Plan Review

88-516-06 – Amendments to Development Plans or Project Plans

88-516-06-C. Plan Amendment

Requests to amend an approved development plan must be processed as a zoning map amendment in accordance with 88-515, except that the city planning and development director is authorized to approve minor amendments to an approved plan in accordance with the administrative adjustment procedures of 88-570 (see specifically 88-570-02-H).

88-520 Master Planned Developments

88-520-03 – Preliminary Development Plans

88-520-03-C. PLAN AMENDMENT

Requests to amend an approved plan must be processed as a zoning map amendment in accordance with 88-515, except that the city planning and development director is authorized to approve minor amendments to a preliminary development plan in accordance with the administrative adjustment procedures of 88-570 (see specifically 88-570-02-H).

Duplexes on Corner Lots:

88-110 – Residential Building Types

88-110-04-A Residential Building Types Allowed

The residential uses allowed in R districts must be located in residential buildings. The following residential building types are allowed in R districts. Many residential building types are subject to supplemental standards, as referenced in 88-110-06-C.

Building Type	R-80	R-10	R-7.5	R-6	R-5	R-2.5	R-1.5	R-0.75	R-0.5	R-0.3
Detached house	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
Zero lot line house	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
Cottage house	-	-	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
Attached house										
Semi-attached										
on corner lots	-	P[1]	P[1]	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
in other situations	-	-	-	-	P	P	P	P	P	P
Townhouse	-	-	-	-	P	P	P	P	P	P
Two-unit house										
on corner lots	-	P[1]	P[1]	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
in other situations	-	-	-	-	P	P	P	P	P	P
Multi-unit house	-	-	-	-	-	S	P	P	P	P
Colonnade	-	-	-	-	-	-	P	P	P	P
Multiplex	-	-	-	-	-	-	P	P	P	P
Multi-unit building	-	-	-	-	-	-	P	P	P	P

88-110-06-4 TWO-UNIT HOUSES AND SEMI-ATTACHED HOUSES ON CORNER LOTS

Under the conventional development option, two-unit houses and semi-attached houses are subject to the standards of Section 88-110-06-B (Table 110-2). In approved open space or conservation developments two-unit houses and semi-attached houses are allowed on corner lots in all R districts except R-80. In R-10, R-7.5 and R-6 districts they are subject to the following additional standards.

(a) Two-unit houses and semi-attached houses are allowed on corner lots in situations in which such building types would not otherwise be allowed because they can be designed so each unit is oriented towards a different street. This gives the two-unit house and the semi-attached house the overall appearance of a detached house when viewed from either street.

(b) The corner lot must comply with the minimum lot area standard of the subject zoning district. No lot with less than 3,000 square feet of lot area may be used for the corner lot option.

(c) Each dwelling unit within the two-unit house or semi-attached house must have its address, main entrance, and garage oriented towards a separate street frontage. Conversion of an existing detached house may provide one main entrance with internal access to both units.

Residential Infill Driveway Standards:

88-110-07 – Infill Residential Development Standards

88-110-07-E. Infill Vehicular Use Standards

a. DRIVEWAYS –

i. When an improved alley is present, driveways from the street are prohibited. For this section, improved shall mean paved with a hard surface or gravel. It shall not mean that such alleys must be improved to current Public Works Department standards.

ii. When an improved alley is not present, and more than half of lots in the context area are developed, driveways from the street shall be permitted only when both lots abutting the subject lot have a driveway from the street. For corner lots, driveways from the street shall be permitted only when the lot abutting the subject lot's side yard has a driveway from the street. The city planning and development director is authorized to allow

driveways from streets where neither abutting lot or only one abutting lot has a driveway from the street only when such a driveway is shared with at least one adjacent home, any garage the driveways lead to is not visible from the street, the driveway does not exceed 12 feet in width in the front yard, and subject to recording a cross-access easement.

iii. When an improved alley is not present and fewer than half of lots in the context area are developed, driveways from the street shall be permitted when the lots abutting the subject lot are both vacant or at least one abutting lot is developed with a driveway from the street. The driveway may not exceed 12 feet in width in the front yard and may not result in more than 40% of the front yard being paved.

TEXT AMENDMENT TOWN HALL, THURSDAY 13TH 9:00-11:00, CITY HALL - 14TH FLOOR

NAME	ARE YOU A RESIDENT OR PART OF AN ORGANIZATION?	ADDRESS	EMAIL ADDRESS	TELEPHONE NUMBER
James McInerney	Potomac	700 WYOMING	James@potomac.com	
CHRIS KOCH	HYDE PARK	3927 HARESON	KOCHRS6@ME.COM	816-769-9589
K-TRATZ		3315 N. OAK TRAFFIC WAY	KTRATZ@NORTHPOINTVC.COM	
Tiffany Moore	YES KUNAC	6581 Rockhill	tiffanyinkc116@gmail.com	816-945-6862
Trish Anceca-Hogan	Westside	1844 Holly	TrishHogan@gmail.com	816-286-8074
Abby Newsham	CENTER CITY	3412 FOREST AVE	abbynewsham@comcast.net	314-578-2931
Amelia McIntyre	PWNA & HRC	4545 Wornall RD	mcintyre.amelia@gmail.com	(816) 863-4063

Summary of Public Engagement Meeting Held February 13, 2025

Amendments to approved plans 88-255, 260, 516:

- Clarified that this is to standardize the process for all the amendments and will still require public engagement.
- Some of the MPD's and UR are very large so the requirement to notify all the property owners is very costly, additionally the code does not mention what happens if one property owner objects to the proposal.

Duplexes on Corner Lots:


- Discussed what the driver for the change was.
- Discussed the relationship between the areas of the city zoned R-6 and the infill areas, that meet the 1954 platting requirement (map will be shown during CPC presentation). Map of R-6 areas below.
 - o A question was asked if there was a consideration to limiting the change to just undeveloped lots.
- Neighborhood groups mentioned that northernmost/southernmost areas of the city zoned R-6 would likely not support the change because the development type doesn't match the suburban feel of the areas.
 - o There was discussion between two attendees regarding the validity of that concern. Duplexes provide additional housing options, there are many duplexes already located within the areas of concern. Additionally the option of requiring garages to face a separate street could be added to avoid potential snout houses on the corners.
- Discussed the impact of a single family residence and ADU (2 units) and a duplex (2 units). The main impact is the demolition and removal of existing housing stock.

Residential Infill Driveway Standards:

- Need a lookback to see if a change to the infill standards themselves need to happen instead of a change to just one section of the new standards.
 - o Discussion of keeping the context area the same throughout the infill standards. If the context area language is not changed the attendees would be more supportive of the change.
- Attendees mentioned they were happy with the clarification on what an improved alley means.

Map of R-6 zoning:

All R-6 Zoning Districts in KCMO





February 13, 2025

RE: Chapter 88 Code Amendments

Matthew Barnes
City Planning & Development
414 E 12th Street, 15th Floor
Kansas City, MO 64106

Dear Mr. Barnes,

I'd like to thank you for publishing the draft of Chapter 88 Code Amendments for public review and engagement along with hosting the engagement meeting this morning to discuss these revisions with us. It is through this spirit of openness and dialogue that we can collaboratively work together for the benefit of our city. I'd like to provide some feedback specifically on the proposed revision of Chapter 88-110-07 as I was one of the 10 members who regularly participated in the work group established in 2022 to write the original ordinance for the transformative Infill Residential Development Standards, and personally assisted City Planner Najma Muhammad with the text as currently written. I would like to start by adding that while the group made every effort for the Infill Residential Development Standards to be high-level and attempt to address the hundreds of scenarios that exist around the city, the truth is that it was practically impossible to draft every scenario and challenge that may be presented during the process of an infill development. Because of this, there was an understanding that there should be a 12 or 24 month 'look-back', where city staff would gather statistics of the benefits and challenges that were faced by applicants and planners since the adoption of these new development standards. These statistics were to be shared with the original work group to discuss what changes that might be necessary knowing that the original version was by no means perfect. To date, the release of this information and sharing with the work group has not occurred (to my knowledge) and I'd encourage this to occur prior to amending any text within chapter 88-110-07.

With that said, the revision to better defining "improved alley" seems to be a great suggestion. Several city blocks in midtown technically have a platted alley but the alleys were never built out, leaving the area to be assumed under adjacent property owners.

www.hydeparkkc.org

P.O. Box 32551 Kansas City, MO 64171



This definitely deserves clarity because it creates a loophole that could negatively impact an applicant's ability to add a driveway to their property should an alley be platted but not actually present. The proposed amendment adds clarity to help resolve this confusion.

However, the reduction of the defined context area for driveways down from "51% or more of homes within the context area" to simply "both lots abutting the subject lot" is a huge reduction in what we originally defined as "context area" and erodes the purpose behind the original Infill Residential Development Standards. The two abutting lots are not enough to establish a true context area because either of these abutting lots could be an outlier for that specific residential block. An example might be that an adjacent property was demolished and rebuilt several years ago (prior to the establishment of this code) where the new structure completely deviates from all other homes on the street. This is true for a majority replacement/infill structures built after 1954, where more suburban design principles were often applied such as the presence of attached, multi-vehicle garages and, consequently, oversized driveways. These suburban standards are in stark contrast to the more historic residential districts of the city, such as Midtown, yet they do exist. This is precisely why the larger 'context area', as currently defined, is so important to establish because outliers exist everywhere but aren't necessarily indicative of the true context in which a development may be proposed. While I do understand that some blocks may have several undeveloped lots within the context area and agree that something should be codified to account for this scenario, I think the proposed text amendment is not being made in the spirit in which the Infill Residential Development Standards were created. Instead of reducing the defined context area for this one design standard (driveways), perhaps the required threshold within the already defined "context area" could be reduced from 51% to 25% (or other) to address this challenge while maintaining and utilizing "context area" as currently defined. Now do I believe driveways are the most critical component of the Infill Residential Development Standards? No, but I do strongly believe that consistency in how we define "context area" and the way it is applied throughout the code is critical. When one aspect of the development standards utilizes a different definition of its surrounding context, the clarity and consistency that we strived to create for this code is eroded, making the standards more complicated and difficult to follow for both applicants and planners alike.



I appreciate the opportunity to provide the above feedback and hope that a meeting can occur soon to discuss the look-back for Chapter 88-110-07. I have seen how this code has made development challenging for some individuals and agree changes may be necessary. Please feel free to reach out to me with feedback or insight. I also have most of our meeting workshop notes when the Infill Residential Development Standards were created, if additional context is needed. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Chris Koch", written in a cursive style.

Christopher Koch, AIA
President; Hyde Park Neighborhood Association
President@hydeparkkc.org
816.769.9089

From: Abby Newsham <anewsham@olsson.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 13, 2025 12:01 PM
To: Barnes, Matthew
Cc: abbykatkc@gmail.com; planning; Clarke, Andrew; Copeland, Sara
Subject: Support for Amendments to Section 88-110-04-A. Residential Building Types Allowed

EXTERNAL: This email originated from outside the kcmo.org organization. Use caution and examine the sender address before replying or clicking links.

Hello Matthew, thank you for organizing this public forum and presenting the proposed code amendments this morning. **Below are my comments in support of the changes to: 88-110-04-A. Residential Building Types Allowed (Two-unit houses on Corner Lots).**

To whom it may concern,

I support allowing duplexes on corner lots in R-6 districts, regardless of context.

In legacy neighborhoods, we celebrate the opportunities provided by a diversity of housing -- duplexes, colonnades, townhomes, small apartments -- but in newer neighborhoods, it is perceived as "risky". Why?

Arguments against duplexes speculate about the potential impact of physical aesthetic, presence of renters, investor speculation/demolition, mismanagement/disregard for maintenance, property value devaluation, etc. These perceived risks are not distinct from what could happen with any single-family house today. Duplexes are of similar scale to detached houses, and do not change the development pattern. Homeowners can be just as bad of neighbors as renters can be, and maintenance is a code issue. New construction of any housing type is unlikely to be inexpensive, and will may reinforce property values. I would also ask staff and decision-makers to consider that broader upzoning may be less likely to introduce speculation than narrowly-targeted ones.

The idea that duplexes as a housing type objectively harms neighborhoods is one that stems from an earlier era of KCMO politics that is not reflective of today's construction market or sociodemographic needs. It is also a misconception to assume people do not want duplexes where they do not exist already. We should transcend stereotype of what "suburban" versus "urban" people want in terms of housing options, and stop validating the perception that two units in one building isn't a viable or appropriate option in many different contexts.

Allowing more types of housing throughout all of Kansas City expands options for both owners and renters. It enables the housing market to adapt to the changing household types and consumer preferences and needs. It creates an accessible option for citizen developers or homeowners to be a part of the development of our city. The status quo is a policy choice with its own risks.

Thank you,

Abby Newsham

Project Planner / Community Planning
C 314.578.2931

1814 Main
Kansas City, MO 64108
O 816.842.8844



Follow Us: [Facebook](#) / [Instagram](#) / [LinkedIn](#) / [YouTube](#)
[View Legal Disclaimer](#)

From: Andrew Ganahl <andrew@andkc.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 13, 2025 1:30 PM
To: Barnes, Matthew
Cc: Abby Newsham; abbykatkc@gmail.com; planning; Clarke, Andrew; Copeland, Sara; Dennis Strait
Subject: Re: Support for Amendments to Section 88-110-04-A. Residential Building Types Allowed

EXTERNAL: This email originated from outside the kcmo.org organization. Use caution and examine the sender address before replying or clicking links.

Matthew,

As a Brookside resident, I also strongly support allowing duplexes on corner lots in R-6 zones. I have many neighbors who would love to stay in Brookside but no longer need or want their larger single family home. A duplex would be perfect for them. This would allow current residents to downsize and stay close to their friends, family, church, library, etc. while also allowing new families and individuals to move into the neighborhood. Many R-6 zoned areas have populations far below peak when household sizes were much larger. Gently increasing density would help grow the population and provide both additional tax support and customers for neighborhood businesses.

Regards,

Andrew

21 E 57th St
KCMO

On Thu, Feb 13, 2025 at 12:09 PM Dennis Strait <Dennis.Strait@multi.studio> wrote:

Thank you, Abby. Well said.

Matthew, I support the proposed changes for all the same reasons Abby outlines.

This is good work. Thanks to all who are helping our city become more equitable, affordable, and prosperous.

Dennis

Dennis Strait
Emeritus Principal

o [816.701.5347](tel:816.701.5347) c [816.506.1044](tel:816.506.1044)
w Multi.studio

From: Abby Newsham <anewsham@olsson.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 13, 2025 12:01 PM
To: matthew.barnes@kcmo.org
Cc: abbykatkc@gmail.com; planning@kcmo.org; andrew.clarke@kcmo.org;
sara.copeland@kcmo.org
Subject: Support for Amendments to Section 88-110-04-A. Residential Building Types Allowed

Hello Matthew, thank you for organizing this public forum and presenting the proposed code amendments this morning. **Below are my comments in support of the changes to: 88-110-04-A. Residential Building Types Allowed (Two-unit houses on Corner Lots).**

To whom it may concern,

I support allowing duplexes on corner lots in R-6 districts, regardless of context.

In legacy neighborhoods, we celebrate the opportunities provided by a diversity of housing -- duplexes, colonnades, townhomes, small apartments -- but in newer neighborhoods, it is perceived as "risky". Why?

Arguments against duplexes speculate about the potential impact of physical aesthetic, presence of renters, investor speculation/demolition, mismanagement/disregard for maintenance, property value devaluation, etc. These perceived risks are not distinct from what could happen with any single-family house today. Duplexes are of similar scale to detached houses, and do not change the development pattern. Homeowners can be just as bad of neighbors as renters can be, and maintenance is a code issue. New construction of any housing type is unlikely to be inexpensive, and will may reinforce property values. I would also ask staff and decision-makers to consider that broader upzoning may be less likely to introduce speculation than narrowly-targeted ones.

The idea that duplexes as a housing type objectively harms neighborhoods is one that stems from an earlier era of KCMO politics that is not reflective of today's construction market or sociodemographic needs. It is also a misconception to assume people do not want duplexes where they do not exist already. We should transcend stereotype of what "suburban" versus "urban" people want in terms of housing options, and stop validating the perception that two units in one building isn't a viable or appropriate option in many different contexts.

Allowing more types of housing throughout all of Kansas City expands options for both owners and renters. It enables the housing market to adapt to the changing household types and consumer preferences and needs. It creates an accessible option for citizen developers or homeowners to be a part of the development of our city. The status quo is a policy choice with its own risks.

Thank you,

Abby Newsham

Project Planner / Community Planning
C 314.578.2931

1814 Main
Kansas City, MO 64108
O 816.842.8844



Follow Us: [Facebook](#) / [Instagram](#) / [LinkedIn](#) / [YouTube](#)
[View Legal Disclaimer](#)

--

Andrew Ganahl

Managing Partner
AND Real Estate, LLC
andrew@andkc.com

202.841.4876 (mobile)

From: Jason Carter-Solomon <JCarter-Solomon@banklandmark.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 13, 2025 5:59 PM
To: Abby Newsham; Barnes, Matthew
Cc: abbykatkc@gmail.com; planning; Clarke, Andrew; Copeland, Sara
Subject: Re: Support for Amendments to Section 88-110-04-A. Residential Building Types Allowed

EXTERNAL: This email originated from outside the kcmo.org organization. Use caution and examine the sender address before replying or clicking links.

I agree with Abby's assessment and also offer my support for the change. I apologize I was not able to attend the meeting, but can make myself available for a meeting if you want a commercial lending and community banking perspective.

JCS
Landmark Bank

Sent from my Cell. Please excuse any typos.

From: "Abby Newsham" <anewsham@olsson.com<<mailto:anewsham@olsson.com>>>

Subject: Support for Amendments to Section 88-110-04-A. Residential Building Types Allowed

Date: 13 February 2025 12:01

To: "matthew.barnes@kcmo.org<<mailto:matthew.barnes@kcmo.org>>"

<matthew.barnes@kcmo.org<<mailto:matthew.barnes@kcmo.org>>>

Cc: "abbykatkc@gmail.com<<mailto:abbykatkc@gmail.com>>"

<abbykatkc@gmail.com<<mailto:abbykatkc@gmail.com>>>, "

planning@kcmo.org<<mailto:planning@kcmo.org>>"

<planning@kcmo.org<<mailto:planning@kcmo.org>>>, "

andrew.clarke@kcmo.org<<mailto:andrew.clarke@kcmo.org>>"

<andrew.clarke@kcmo.org<<mailto:andrew.clarke@kcmo.org>>>, "

sara.copeland@kcmo.org<<mailto:sara.copeland@kcmo.org>>"

<sara.copeland@kcmo.org<<mailto:sara.copeland@kcmo.org>>>

Hello Matthew, thank you for organizing this public forum and presenting the proposed code amendments this morning. Below are my comments in support of the changes to: 88-110-04-A. Residential Building Types Allowed (Two-unit houses on Corner Lots).

External sender <anewsham@olsson.com>

Make sure you trust this sender before taking any actions.

Hello Matthew, thank you for organizing this public forum and presenting the proposed code amendments this morning. Below are my comments in support of the changes to: 88-

110-04-A. Residential Building Types Allowed (Two-unit houses on Corner Lots).

To whom it may concern,

I support allowing duplexes on corner lots in R-6 districts, regardless of context.

In legacy neighborhoods, we celebrate the opportunities provided by a diversity of housing -- duplexes, colonnades, townhomes, small apartments -- but in newer neighborhoods, it is perceived as "risky". Why?

Arguments against duplexes speculate about the potential impact of physical aesthetic, presence of renters, investor speculation/demolition, mismanagement/disregard for maintenance, property value devaluation, etc. These perceived risks are not distinct from what could happen with any single-family house today. Duplexes are of similar scale to detached houses, and do not change the development pattern. Homeowners can be just as bad of neighbors as renters can be, and maintenance is a code issue. New construction of any housing type is unlikely to be inexpensive, and will may reinforce property values. I would also ask staff and decision-makers to consider that broader upzoning may be less likely to introduce speculation than narrowly-targeted ones.

The idea that duplexes as a housing type objectively harms neighborhoods is one that stems from an earlier era of KCMO politics that is not reflective of today's construction market or sociodemographic needs. It is also a misconception to assume people do not want duplexes where they do not exist already. We should transcend stereotype of what "suburban" versus "urban" people want in terms of housing options, and stop validating the perception that two units in one building isn't a viable or appropriate option in many different contexts.

Allowing more types of housing throughout all of Kansas City expands options for both owners and renters. It enables the housing market to adapt to the changing household types and consumer preferences and needs. It creates an accessible option for citizen developers or homeowners to be a part of the development of our city. The status quo is a policy choice with its own risks.

Thank you,

Abby Newsham
Project Planner / Community Planning
C 314.578.2931

1814 Main

Kansas City, MO 64108
O 816.842.8844

[Olsson

logo]<<https://linkprotect.cudasvc.com/url?a=https%3a%2f%2folsson.com%2f&c=E,1,lq169r4LBIs55Z9UXZzVRUG2kaIJVrwMtP0hmd0NC6T2VpczPRg9SidHTp5olc04gzWBIVH59UQFgsuwwpK3sFkowLVHZrfPVDpQlnKnyRgdNIY6yXmU&typo=1>>

Follow Us: Facebook / <<https://www.facebook.com/WeAreOlsson/>> Instagram /

<<https://www.instagram.com/weareolsson/>> LinkedIn /

<<https://www.linkedin.com/in/abigailnewsham/>> YouTube

<<https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCfCGdcQ8yP3YoP2CgSSw2uw>>View Legal

Disclaimer<https://linkprotect.cudasvc.com/url?a=https%3a%2f%2fwww.olsson.com%2fdisclaimer&c=E,1,DbyppZvrGHleV8JInR7SUka7lBT3lqvayLGYhGDCFeLy0uh_KsYdlEjzplaYlu2HjIwmBviyqBrN5irmpaouDb-LWdzUyiwGOF1knD8Uw5Vey5Uu2w1wU2xf&typo=1>