

# TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC)

## AREA LAND USE PLAN MEETING #5 NOTES

JUNE 18, 2008 10:30 A.M.  
AVIATION DEPARTMENT

### PARTICIPANTS

Frank Saleski	AT&T
Mark Crossley	AT&T
Jim Monnig	AT&T
Jared Gulbranson	KCATA
Daniel Gates	Kansas City Police Department
Brian Nowotny	Platte County Parks and Rec
Mell Henderson	MARC Director Transportation
Beth Wright	MoDOT
Kirsten Munck	MoDOT
Kellee Wood	EDC of Kansas City
Pam Levetzow	Missouri Gas Energy
Lapondzia Jones	Aviation Department, Project Manager
Jade Liska	City Planning and Development, Project Manager
Mark VanLoh	Aviation Department, Director
Kyle Elliott	City Planning and Development
Russell Blanck	Landrum & Brown
Jon Woodward	Landrum & Brown
Nick Brown	Landrum & Brown
Lisa Briscoe	Patti Banks Associates
Lynnis Jameson	Patti Banks Associates
Blair Sells	Patti Banks Associates
Frank Weatherford	TranSystems
Carrie Stapleton	Phillips West
Emiel Cleaver	Phillips West

### Presentation of Draft Area Plan

Lisa Briscoe presented the status of the KCI Draft Area Plan; including the Plan development process to date, preferred land use scenario, priority development zones, transportation framework priorities, transit oriented development prototypes, urban design framework (e.g. gateways, primary and secondary image streets), and stormwater management framework.

The Draft Plan will be posted online on June 2, 2008, on the Airport's website: [www.flykci.com/kcistudies](http://www.flykci.com/kcistudies). The fully-illustrated Final Area Plan will include a chapter on Implementation, and will also include information on the Part 150 Noise Compatibility Overlay District, as well as the updated Area Plan study boundary. The Final Plan will be completed and available for review in August 2008.

## **Facilitated Discussion**

Lisa Briscoe and Lynn Jameson walked the group through the different Plan elements shown on the presentation boards. The goal of the discussion was to get the TAC's response related to the proposed land use, transportation framework priorities, and priority development zones. Until the Final Plan is complete, there is time to review the Draft Plan and change these elements to more closely reflect the TAC, PAC and public's opinion.

### **Preferred Land Use**

- **Comment:** Generally, the land uses shown have not changed since the last series of TAC, PAC and public meetings; although the preferred land use near Harley-Davidson has been changed from medium-high residential to mixed use community.
  
- **Question:** Do you agree with the preferred land uses as shown? Do you disagree with anything presented here?
  - **Answer:**  
Everyone agreed with the preferred land use scenario as presented at today's meeting.

### **Transportation Framework/Roadway Priorities**

- **Comment:** The transportation framework and roadway development priorities were a culmination of TAC, PAC and Northland Chamber input from previous meetings. The top priorities as recommended by these committees include Green Hills Road and Tiffany Springs Parkway. The medium priorities include 112<sup>th</sup> St., 108<sup>th</sup> St., 96<sup>th</sup> St., and Line Creek Parkway. It was confirmed that improving and extending existing roadways to complete the local network was more important than constructing new roadways.
  
- **Question:** Do you agree with the transportation framework and roadway priorities as shown? Do you have any concerns about these priorities or do you have other suggestions for roadway improvements?
  - **Answer:**  
The TAC's general consensus was that they agree with the transportation framework and roadway priorities.

- **Comment:** From MoDOT's perspective, we are happy to see the network made continuous, including new east-west connections/improvements.
- **Question:** How was the number of lanes determined in the transportation framework?
  - **Answer:**  
The number of lanes was based on the proposed land use map, assuming full build-out in 2025. This may differ from the City's Major Street Plan.
- **Question:** How does the number of lanes affect bicycle accommodations?
  - **Answer:**  
The roads are not built to standard and when rebuilt to city standards, even with the same number of lanes, you can add bicycle lanes. Some roads are not shown as changing the number of lanes.

### **Priority Development Zones**

- **Comment:** These priority development zones are important to plan for future growth, especially based on the size of the study area (50 sq. mi. and twice the size of Liberty, MO). The zones are meant to help "build out from what we have." The priorities give direction for development cases and give guidelines for the future.
- **Question:** Do you agree with the priority development zones shown? Do they seem logical?
  - **Answer:**  
The TAC seemed to agree with the priority zones.
- **Comment:** The transportation framework priorities seem to move in an east-west direction, while the priority development zones are more north-south. Skyview is a primary north-south route in the medium-high priority development zone and may need more attention.
  - A portion of Skyview is already constructed to city standards but will need to check.
- **Question:** Is there enough capacity on I-435 to meet the future demand?
  - **Answer:**  
Yes, I-435 can handle transportation needs to 2025.
- **Comment:** There will be interchange issues on I-29 and "spot issues" at Hwy 152 (e.g. the signalized intersection at Shoal Creek would function better as an interchange) to deal with in the future as the area grows. It is likely that Hwy 92

will also need improvements after the 2025 timeframe. Spot improvements will be needed, but it is most important to build the local network.

- **Comment:** An east-west connector spine (possibly 108<sup>th</sup> St.) will be needed to help build the local connection.
- **Comment:** Zona Rosa is doubling, meaning more rooftops will want to get to that area. As a result, Hwy 152 may need improvements, as well as other local streets to meet capacity.
- **Comment:** MoDOT's highest priority is to provide 4 lanes on Hwy 92 from Leavenworth to Platte City, and then to Kearney. Additionally, the sooner the local street network is completed, the better the regional highways will function as intended.
- **Question:** There is concern leaving out the Cookingham Corridor from the high development priority zone, as the use may become or stay single family. This is the only area of high density mixed use development in the Planning Area. Will the order of these priority development zones drive more low-density uses where they are not intended?
  - **Answer:**  
Development zone priorities can be shifted; current classifications are not static. If there were a stronger transit system in place or soon to be in place, then perhaps medium-high or medium-low priority zones would jump up on the list. The same could be said for the availability (existing or future) of sewers. It comes down to what concerns we want to address.
- **Comment:** Where existing sewers are located and where future sewers can be installed greatly impact the priority development zones and subsequently, have implications on transit. The area identified as a high priority development zone may also contain higher densities than we originally thought a few years ago. Areas can move up and down the priority list depending on infrastructure.
- **Question:** Is the TAC in agreement regarding the very low and low priority development areas?
  - **Answer:**  
Low priority development areas are situated in locations where no sewers are currently in place, are furthest from existing development, and have low levels of existing transportation infrastructure. It makes sense that contiguous development moves from a south to north direction, but there is a concern with the pattern of land uses. It is important to protect the proposed mixed use development along the Cookingham corridor.

- **Comment:** The concept of these zones is great; “good job”. From MARC’s perspective, this method of prioritizing development zones is needed regionally.
- **Comment:** It is also important to remember that the TOD prototypes outlined in the Draft Plan can change locations and densities. These locations were chosen, however, because there is a real possibility for transit and this type of development along this corridor.

### **Urban Design Framework**

- **Question:** Do you agree with the Urban Design Framework, gateways, and image streets as shown in the Draft Plan?
  - **Answer:**  
The TAC affirmed this portion of the Plan as presented today.
- **Question:** Do you feel that the Plan is too heavily weighted in any cases or is it missing anything?
  - **TAC’s Answer:**  
The TAC made no further recommendations regarding the plan and had no concerns.
- **Comment:** Current zoning is not affected by anything in the Plan; the Plan is meant to direct future growth and development. Therefore, current property owner rights stay in place.

The meeting concluded at 12:00 PM.