



City of Kansas City, Missouri

Docket Memo

Ordinance/Resolution #: [Click or tap here to enter TMP-#.](#)

Submitted Department/Preparer: Please Select

Revised 11/01/23

Docket memos are required on all ordinances initiated by a Department Director. More information can be found in [Administrative Regulation \(AR\) 4-1](#).

Executive Summary

A request to approve a major amendment to an Master Planned Development to allow for vehicle storage of approximately 3,000 parking spaces in district MPD on about 42.64 acres generally located on the NE corner of Highway 210 and north Brighton Avenue. (CD-CPC-2023-00151)

Discussion

The applicant is requesting a major amendment to an approved MPD to allow for a 3,169-parking space parking lot for the Ford Motor Company. The proposed vehicle storage and towing use will have a wood fence surrounding the parking lot, 24/7 security, and only one access point off of NE Service Road. The parking lot will consist of heavy duty concrete and light-duty asphalt pavement. The applicant will extend the sidewalk on the west side of the property south and has provided a 10' trail easement on the eastern property in compliance with the KC Trails Plan. The proposed amendment does not comply with the purpose of the MPD zoning district or the specific objectives as listed in Section 88-280-01-B.

Staff is recommending denial of the project, therefore believes that the proposed major amendment does not meet the goals of the Citywide Business Plan, which is why the Citywide Business Plan section of the docket memo has remained blank.

The public engagement meeting showed adjoining property owner's concern with the operating hours of the property and a preference of only one access compared to the two access points on N Brighton Avenue of the previously approved plan. The Missouri Department of Transportation has not completed the review of this application, should they required a change in the access point of the property a major amendment to the plan will be required to ensure the adjoining property owners are kept informed of the changes. The applicant completed a public engagement meeting as required by the Zoning and Development Code, where four property owners attended. Staff received a petition signed by 82 of the adjoining neighbors in opposition to the project.

At the City Plan Commission, the Commission discussed the landscaping and fencing to the north, operating characteristics of the proposed use, and the impacts that will affect the surrounding residential properties. Two residents provided public testimony stating concerns with the urban heat island effect, tire particulates, noise, and the current condition of the site. Since the previously approved MPD plan the adjacent properties have seen an increase in uncontrolled dust and increased wind speed due to the removal of the tree buffer along the northern property line.

The City Plan Commission recommended denial of the project with a 3:2 vote.

Fiscal Impact

1. Is this legislation included in the adopted budget? Yes No
2. What is the funding source?
Not applicable as this is a zoning ordinance authorizing the physical development and proposed uses on the subject property.
3. How does the legislation affect the current fiscal year?
Not applicable this fiscal year.
4. Does the legislation have a fiscal impact in future fiscal years? Please notate the difference between one-time and recurring costs.
The proposed ordinances authorizes the construction of a public sidewalk along North Brighton Avenue and proposes a trail easement north/south on the eastern side of the property. Once completed, the infrastructure will be accepted by the city and become the City's responsibility to maintain.
5. Does the legislation generate revenue, leverage outside funding, or deliver a return on investment?
This ordinance authorizes physical development of the subject property. No revenue or return on investment is expected.

Office of Management and Budget Review

(OMB Staff will complete this section.)

1. This legislation is supported by the general fund. Yes No
2. This fund has a structural imbalance. Yes No
3. Account string has been verified/confirmed. Yes No

Additional Discussion (if needed)

Click or tap here to enter text.

Citywide Business Plan (CWBP) Impact

1. View the [FY23 Citywide Business Plan](#)
2. Which CWBP goal is most impacted by this legislation?
Housing and Healthy Communities (Press tab after selecting.)
3. Which objectives are impacted by this legislation (select all that apply):
 - Utilize planning approaches in neighborhoods to reduce blight, ensure sustainable housing, and improve resident wellbeing and cultural diversity.
 - Maintain and increase affordable housing supply to meet the demands of a diverse population.
 - Address the various needs of the City's most vulnerable population by working to reduce disparities.
 - Foster an inclusive environment and regional approach to spur innovative solutions to housing challenges.
 - Ensure all residents have safe, accessible, quality housing by reducing barriers.
 - Protect and promote healthy, active amenities such as parks and trails, play spaces, and green spaces.

Prior Legislation

[CD-CPC-2021-00049](#) – request to approve a Rezoning from District R-6 (Residential 6) to District MPD (Master Planned Development) and approval of an MPD preliminary Development Plan and Preliminary plat for the development of light industrial uses. City Staff and the City Plan Commission recommended Denial. The application was approved with conditions via Ordinance No. 210398 on May 20, 2021.

[CD-CPC-2021-00048](#) – request to approve an Area Plan Amendment to change the recommended land use of the Residential Low Density with Conservation District to Light Industrial. City Staff and the City Plan Commission recommended Denial. The application was approved via Resolution No. 210397 on May 20, 2021.

[CD-CPC-2021-00207](#) – request to approve a Final MPD Plan for Brighton Industrial Park. The application was approved with conditions on January 4, 2022.

[Ordinance No. 220021](#) – calling for a submission to the voters of Kansas City at a special election on April 5, 2022 to remove an area generally located on the west side of Searcy Creek between 210 Highway and approximately NE 36th street and serves as right of way for parkway purpose.

The ordinance was approved 01/13/2022, and the result of the election was to remove the land in the area described previously.

Service Level Impacts

Not applicable at this time, however should the applicant decide to store electric vehicles in the future the project will cause a strain on the Fire Department and Emergency Services if the layout of the use remains unchanged.

Other Impacts

1. What will be the potential health impacts to any affected groups?
The site will operate 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. The surrounding neighborhoods will most likely be affected by the noise of the loading/unloading of the vehicles on site, the lights of the cars, and the smell of idling cars while loading/unloading take place. The operation has also removed a vast majority of the trees on the site, residents to the north have been dealing with an increased wind speed coming from the south.
2. How have those groups been engaged and involved in the development of this ordinance?
Public engagement as required by the Zoning and Development Code was completed. Four people attended the applicant's meeting. Staff received two pieces of public testimony, including one petition signed by 82 of the surrounding neighbors in opposition of the project.
3. How does this legislation contribute to a sustainable Kansas City?
The proposed amendment is for a 3,169-parking space parking lot to allow for the storage of vehicles for the Ford Motor Company. The proposed parking area is made up of heavy duty concrete and light-duty asphalt pavement. The use will contribute significantly to the heat island effect for the surrounding area.
4. Does this legislation create or preserve new housing units?
No (Press tab after selecting)

Click or tap here to enter text.

Click or tap here to enter text.

5. Department staff certifies the submission of any application Affirmative Action Plans or Certificates of Compliance, Contractor Utilization Plans (CUPs), and Letters of Intent to Subcontract (LOIs) to CREO prior to, or simultaneously with, the legislation entry request in Legistar.

No - CREO's review is not applicable (Press tab after selecting)
Please provide reasoning why not:

6. Does this legislation seek to approve a contract resulting from an Invitation for Bid?

No(Press tab after selecting)

Click or tap here to enter text.

7. Does this legislation seek to approve a contract resulting from a Request for Proposal/Qualification (RFP/Q)?
No(Press tab after selecting)