



CITY OF PARKVILLE • 8880 Clark Avenue • Parkville, MO 64152 • (816) 741-7676 • FAX (816) 741-0015

**Planning & Zoning Commission
Regular Meeting Agenda
City of Parkville, Missouri
Tuesday March 8th, 2016 @ 5:30pm
City Hall Boardroom**

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call
3. General Business
 - A. Approve the Agenda.
 - B. Approve the minutes from the February 9, 2016 Regular Planning and Zoning Commission meeting.
4. Public Hearing
 - A. None
5. Regular Business
 - A. Application for Final Plat of Re-plat of Lot 11, Cider Mill Ridge, Fourth Plat Case# PZ16-01 RP Golf, LLC applicant
6. Other Business
 - A. Parkville Zoning & Subdivision Regulations Project
 - a. Summary of Procedures Analysis
 - b. Updated Project Schedule
 - B. Upcoming meetings & dates of importance:
 - Board of Zoning Adjustment Meeting: Tuesday, March 22, 2016 at 5:30 pm.
 - Board of Aldermen Meetings: Tuesday, March 15, 2016 and Tuesday, April 5th, 2016 at 7:00 pm
 - Planning & Zoning Commission Regular Meeting: Tuesday, April 12, 2015 at 5:30 pm.
7. Adjournment

**Minutes of the
Planning & Zoning Commission Regular Meeting
City of Parkville, Missouri
Tuesday, February 9, 2016 at 5:30 p.m.
City Hall Boardroom**

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Katerndahl called the meeting to order at 5:30 pm.

2. ROLL CALL

Commissioners Present:

Dean Katerndahl, Chairman
Keith Cary, Vice Chairman
John Delich
Doug Krtek
Pam Scott
Barbara Wassmer
Walt Lane

Commissioners Absent with prior notification:

Robert Lock
Michael Wright

A quorum of the Planning Commission was present.

Staff Present:

Lauren Palmer / City Administrator
Paul Giarratana / Building Official
Stephen Lachky / Community Development Director
Zach Tusinger / Community Development Part-Time Planner
Alysen Abel / Public Works Director
Kelly Yulich / Department Assistant

3. Announcements

- A. Introduction of New Planning & Zoning Commissioner Barbara Wassmer by Chairman Dean Katerndahl.

Chairman Katerndahl welcomed new Planning & Zoning Commissioner Barbara Wassmer and also thanked Commissioner Byrant Lamer for all his years and service on the Planning & Zoning Commission.

- B. Introduction of New Community Development Director by City Administrator Lauren Palmer.

City Administrator Palmer thanked the Chairman for allowing her to address the Commission in introducing Stephen Lachky as the new Community Development Director. Palmer gave an overview of his background and described his qualifications and most recent position with Mid America Regional Council, along with his involvement on the Route 9 Corridor Study. Lachky thanked the Commissioners and expressed his excitement in working with the City of Parkville, and the community. Chairman Katerndahl welcomed Lachky to the City.

4. **GENERAL BUSINESS**

A. **Approval of Planning & Zoning Meeting Agenda.**

Chairman Katerndahl called for any discussion of the proposed agenda. Seeing none Chairman Katerndahl called for a motion to approve the agenda as proposed. **Commissioner Delich moved to approve the agenda, Commissioner Scott seconded. Motion passed: 7-0.**

B. **Approve the minutes from the November 30, 2015 Special Planning and Zoning Commission meeting.**

Chairman Katerndahl called for any discussion of the minutes or changes needed. Seeing none Chairman Katerndahl called for a motion to approve the minutes as proposed. **Vice Chairman Cary moved to approve the minutes, Commissioner Krtek seconded. Motion passed: 7-0.**

4. **PUBLIC HEARING**

None.

5. **REGULAR BUSINESS**

A. **Application for a planned district development permit for Park University** *Case PZ15-36, Park University, applicant.*

Chairman Katerndahl addressed the City of Parkville Staff for a description of the proposed application.

Building Official Paul Giarratana gave an overview of the application requesting a planned district development permit for modifications for Norrington Hall to create an academic commons for study, research, and learning which is a permitted use in the P-EC (Planned Educational Campus) District. Giarratana stated specifically Section 428.020, A, 1, b allows ancillary uses as are typically associated with public or private institutions for teaching and learning that are customary and subordinate to the primary educational use. Staff explained that such uses include study halls, research facilities, classroom buildings and activity centers. Giarratana stated that this is a creative reuse of an historic structure on Park University's campus. Interior plans for this project have been reviewed by the City staff and interior building permits have been issued.

However, before permits for exterior work can be issued, the site plans must be approved by the City's Planning & Zoning Commission. Giarratana explained that the site plan will improve pedestrian circulation and connectivity in the historic core of the campus.

Staff then directed Park University's Architect, Michael Heule with Helix Architecture and Design, to give their presentation explaining the details and design of the outside changes to Norrington Hall.

Mr. Heule stated the City's staff analysis gave an excellent interpretation of what the University wants to create for Norrington Hall. He stated the exterior renovations will help to improve vehicular and pedestrian circulation. Heule explained the circulations of the parking lot used to be up on the east side of Norrington Hall. With the improvements, this will now be dedicated for pedestrians only, creating a more pedestrian-friendly environment with landscaping and sidewalks. He stated the exterior renovations will include an exterior egress stair on the north side, and a new entry vestibule on the backside of the building. The front entry will not be changed; it will still be retained as the primary entry into the building. The primary building changes consist of these minor renovations; however, the paving, landscaping and pedestrian circulation will be greatly improved.

Commissioner Delich asked how many square feet the building has; Staff stated estimated around 8,200 square feet with two full stories. Staff explained how City code requires an egress balcony since exit widths on the building do not meet requirements based on occupancy. Staff explained how this is being corrected and brought up to current code requirements.

Chairman Katerndahl questioned with the parking being removed up on top of the ridge, which the entrance will be brought in from the east. Heule explained the access routes. Staff also explained how the fire department can access the area as well.

Commissioner Scott questioned whether the egress stairs need to be covered due to the elements. Commissioner Delich asked if the stairs are a required fire egress. Staff stated it is a required egress; however, City codes do not require it to be covered. If covered a sprinkler system would need to be installed. Delich stated he thought it is a requirement for the egress stairs to be covered due to the elements in our area. Building Official Paul Giarratana stated it is not a requirement to have the stairway covered due to the egress width along with the occupancy count; the atrium stairs make up the requirement for evacuation in the event of an emergency. The exterior stairs are not a requirement stairway; it is more of a convenience stairway. Staff considers it more of an added amendment. Commissioner Scott assumed the egress stairs needed to be covered, not necessarily enclosed. She stated that visually it would make a difference upon the elevation. Scott was concerned it needed to be covered by code. Commissioner Delich questioned if the stairs would have open grating. Staff explained it would be an open grate.

Chairman Katerndahl questioned if this application would be going before the Board of Aldermen. Staff stated this is not an application the Board of Aldermen would be giving final approval for.

Commissioner Wassmer questioned whether the door would have similar characteristics to that of the front of the building. Heule explained they are keeping a clean and contemporary look of newly updated doors and windows on that side of the building.

Chairman Katerndahl requested a motion on the application.

Commissioner Scott questioned the conditions; whether they need to be met at the time of approval or if the Commission would be recommending a motion based upon conditions of the staff analysis.

Giarratana explained the Southern Platte Fire Protection District gave their final approval, and has written a memo stating the fact. Public Works Director Aysen Abel stated she has reviewed the application and plans and is satisfied with the proper erosion control put into place. Commissioner Delich asked if the Public Works Director if she was satisfied that the conditions can be met, and Public Works Director Abel responded that she was satisfied with the conditions.

Commissioner Scott moved to recommend approval of the application subject to the conditions herein. Commissioner Delich Seconded. Motion passed 7-0.

Commissioner Scott added to the recommendation. She would like to hear from staff regarding the resolution of the stairwell; whether or not the egress stairs need to be covered or enclosed.

REVISED MOTION Commissioner Scott Moved to recommend approval of the application subject to the conditions recommend by staff and after staff resolution and the reporting back as to whether or not the egress stairway needs to be covered or enclosed. Commissioner Delich Seconded. Motion passed 7-0.

Public Works Director Aysen Abel left the meeting at 6:51 pm.

6. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None.

7. OTHER BUSINESS

A. Update on the final report for the Route 9 Corridor Study

City Administrator Lauren Palmer gave an overview of the Route 9 Corridor Study report which was approved by the Board of Aldermen the previous month. Palmer explained the plan has 12 different project segments and gave an overview of each

segment. Design elements include a 4 foot sidewalk on the west side of the corridor and a 10 foot multi-use trail on the west side of the corridor. Some areas will incorporate a center turn lane where warranted, along with a new traffic signal at Clark Ave. Access control points were displayed along certain segments. The report includes strategy to determine which segments should be implemented first. Palmer explained different impacts and developmental strategies on the different segments of the corridor and how they reflect with the *Vision Downtown Parkville* plan.

Commissioner Lane questioned whether utilities along the corridor would need to be underground. Administrator Palmer said cost analysis projections in the report are optimistic this can be accomplished. Commissioner Delich questioned implementation with the Missouri Department of Transportation (MoDOT) and how funding is needed now. Palmer stated the City is going to be seeking federal grants to help fund implementation of the projects. She elaborated saying how transportation funding strategies would be needed, and that Community Improvement District's (CID) or other tools could be used alongside public/private partnerships to fund the projects and implement the report's vision.

Commissioner Delich asked if there is a fixed priority to start the segments. Palmer stated that each segment was scored on a variety of factors. The report includes a project prioritization matrix and the highest priority is 62nd St. to Lakeview Dr.

Chairman Katerndahl asked whether a segment could be implemented sooner if a developer came forward and wanted to do a large development along the corridor. Palmer said this is correct and that implementation of project segments could possibly trigger additional development along the corridor.

B. Update on the Zoning & Subdivision Regulations Project

Chris Brewster with Gould Evans gave an overview of the Zoning & Subdivision Regulations Project. He stated the project goals will help development context in the City and balance the City's growth with character. Gould Evans staff is working on linking the City's code regulations to plans and policies, and making these regulations more user-friendly.

Brewster explained the firm's "plain language" approach to help make the regulations more useable and easier to understand. Gould Evans uses graphics and tables along with purpose and intent statements. The firm allows flexibility with the criteria to help determine logical framework and structure with the regulations. Brewster described the different phases and tasks which have been completed and which phrases and tasks still need to be completed. Gould Evans has wrapped up Phase 2 at this time. They are hoping to get into Phase 3 within the next two months, and believe the City can have an adoptable draft by either October or November.

City Administrator Lauren Palmer stated the project is six months behind schedule. Staff has reviewed the scope of work and initially thought of having a different steering committee other than the Planning & Zoning Commission; however staff

decided the Planning & Zoning Commission needs to be the steering committee. Mr. Brewster explained the different phases and the additional meetings that will need to be conducted with the Planning & Zoning Commission. The six phases are:

- Phase 1 – Initiation
- Phase 2 – Analysis
- Phase 3 – Discussion
- Phase 4 – Initial Drafts
- Phase 5 – Final Drafts
- Phase 6 – Adoption

Staff would also like to have broad public meetings/open houses for members of the public to engage in. Chris Brewster gave an overview how the City's current code repeats itself in definitions and procedures in several different areas. His firm believes they can streamline this. He showed examples of in the City's code and which pages could be condensed into tables. Issues Gould Evans has identified include unclear/internal conflicts in procedure and criteria, scattered definitions, and lack of planning and urban design standards in subdivision regulations. Additionally, Chris said there are too many zoning districts in his opinion. His firm will also streamline and narrow the City's Board of Zoning Adjustments expectations.

Commissioner Scott stated that property annexed from Platte County into the City of Parkville needs to be properly zoned to a City district in order for any development to occur, and asked if the update would address and rectify this? Mr. Brewster stated that there is a zoning map component to the project and that his firm will confer to determine the correct process for addressing this issue.

Other areas being addressed include housing choices and neighborhood design, open and civic spaces, streets and streetscape design and general design standards (i.e., landscape, signs, storm water and parking), planned districts and their flexibility with regard to the integrated vision of downtown Parkville districts (e.g., OTD-R, OTD, TND), and the Highway 45 Corridor Plan and Route 9 Corridor Study. Mr. Brewster said the scope and public meetings will focus on these areas. Brewster stated that Gould Evans is currently writing papers and requested the Commissioners to review their drafts and contribute any ideas, thoughts or additional areas to address.

Commissioner Scott stated a task is for the Commission to approve a paint palette or design within the Old Town District since there currently isn't one in code, making it difficult for the Planning & Zoning Commission to approve projects. She stated the approval process is frustrating without criteria in place and asked if the project team could address this. Mr. Brewster said this could be done and that the Planning & Zoning Commission should think about the level of standards and review the Commission would like to have in the criteria; he also added that too many standards leads to differing interpretations.

Chairman Katerndahl stated the Commission should look within the documents that have been provided by Gould Evans to determine any additional questions or feedback that should be provided to Gould Evans.

Commissioner Scott asked if there are firm dates in place for the project timeline. Mr. Brewster explained the dates listed in the packet are tentative, but said his firm is looking at late March / early April for having an initial draft completed. Commissioner Scott stated her concern is there won't be enough time for the steering committee to review the initial draft papers prior to the first public meeting.

City Administrator Palmer stated she wants the Commission to make a recommendation to Mr. Brewster. Mr. Brewster stated there will be several additional meetings. Chairman Katerndahl asked the commissioners to please send any questions, thoughts or feedback to Community Development Director Stephen Lachky so he can communicate them to Mr. Brewster.

Commissioner Scott was still concerned the steering committee needs more information prior to the first public meeting. Mr. Brewster related the first public meeting is more of a relaxed informal public meeting for discussion. Discussion ensued as to the timeframe when the initial draft would be presented to the steering committee. Commissioner Scott reiterated her concern that the steering committee would be seeing initial draft papers for the first time at the public meeting. She prefers to see papers prior to them, and then convene following the public meeting to review information discussed. Administrator Palmer did not disagree; however, she was concerned this may interfere with the number of allowable meetings currently budgeted in the City's project scope with Gould Evans.

Commissioner Scott questioned if the Commission are going to be too involved in the project than what the consultant team anticipated. Mr. Brewster responded that he encourages participation and doesn't want to limit the amount of involvement by the Commission.

C. Update on the adopted Parkville Property Maintenance Code via Board of Aldermen

Building Official Paul Giarratana gave an update to the newly adopted Parkville Property Maintenance Code. The Board of Aldermen approved the update at the last Board of Aldermen meeting. Giarratana explained that staff had currently been working under two separate codes which were conflicting with one another. Giarratana had rewritten and combined the two codes making it one document. The new document is streamlined and cleaned up. Additionally, the Property Maintenance Code is tailored to our City and has given staff easier methods for notifying code violator's and helps staff in addressing code violation issues. We are making it more of a community effort other than a city effort.

D. Upcoming Meetings & Dates of Importance:

- Board of Zoning Adjustment Meeting: Wednesday, February 10, 2016 at 5:30pm
- Board of Aldermen Meetings: Tuesday, February 16, 2016 and Tuesday, March 1st, 2016 at 7:00 pm.
- Planning & Zoning Commission Regular Meeting: Tuesday, March 8th, 2016 at 5:30 pm.

City Administer Lauren Palmer recognized Part-Time Planner Zach Tusinger for his service. She said Mr. Tusinger will be graduating in May and moving to the west coast.

8. ADJOURNMENT

Seeing no other discussion, Chairman Katerndahl called for a motion to adjourn. **Commissioner Scott moved to adjourn, Commissioner Delich seconded. Motion passed: 7-0.** Meeting adjourned at 7:08 p.m.

Submitted by:

Kelly Yulich
Community Development Department Assistant

2-10-16
Date



Staff Analysis

Agenda Item: 5.A

Proposal: Application for Final Plat of Replat of Lot 11, Cider Mill Ridge, Fourth Plat.

Case No: PZ16-01

Applicant: RP Golf, LLC

Owner: RP Golf, LLC

Location: SW Corner of South National Drive and Barn Hill Road on all of Lot 11 of the Cider Mill Ridge 4th plat and a portion of the abutting unplatted property to the east and south.

Zoning: "R-2 CUP" Single Family Residential District with a Community Unit Plan overlay

Parcel #: 20-7.0-26-300-005-017.00 and part of parcel number 20-7.0-26-300-000-001.000

Exhibits:

- A. This staff report
- B. Application for Final Plat
- C. Final Plat of Replat of Lot 11, Cider Mill Ridge – Fourth Plat drawing by Robert G. Young, R.L. Buford & Associates, LLC and last dated 1-27-2016
- D. Additional information as may be submitted during the meeting

By Reference:

- A. The Parkville Municipal Code including Title IV, Zoning Code, including but not limited to Chapters 415, "R-2" Single Family Residential District Regulations, 467, Height, Area, and Bulk Requirements and Title V, including but not limited to Chapter 505, Subdivision Regulations
- B. Agenda Item 4A, Amended National Golf Course Community Unit Plan to allow a new neighborhood swimming pool on lot #11, Cider Mill Ridge 4th Plat & part of vacant land to the south & east. Case PZ14-10

Overview

The applicant, RP Golf, LLC proposes to replat Lot 11 of the Cider Mill Ridge Fourth Plat and a portion of the abutting unplatted property to the east and south, Changing lot 11-A to Tract H and adding new Tract G which consists of a median on Barn Hill Road at the intersection of National Drive. Tract H retains the same dimensions and is not changing other than removing the lot designation and creating a tract designation. The addition of Tract G consists of 2,561 square feet or 0.06 acres. Both tracts will now be maintained by the Home Owners Association of the National Cider Mill Ridge.

Review and Analysis

The application has been reviewed against the City of Parkville's Municipal Codes, including the subdivision regulations, the R-2 district regulations, and the height, area and bulk requirements. The application has also been reviewed against the previously approved Cider Mill Ridge Fourth Plat. The primary consideration for approval of the plat is the ability to meet the minimum applicable subdivision regulations and standards for permitted uses, area, width, depth, setbacks, adequate utilities, grading and drainage and parkland donation. Following is a summary of our review:

1. **Area, Width, Depth and Setbacks** – The proposed Tract H meets the minimum area, width, depth and setback requirements for the R-2 district. Per Parkville Municipal Code Chapter 467, the minimum lot area for the R-2 district is 10,000 square feet and there is no additional area requirement for the non-residential use. The proposed Tract H would be 38,298 square feet. The minimum required width is 75 feet at the front setback (25 feet). The proposed tract H exceeds this width. The minimum required depth is 100 feet. The proposed tract H far exceeds this minimum. Lastly, the district requires a minimum 25 foot front setback, 30 foot rear setback and 10 foot side setback. The layout proposed exceeds these setbacks.
2. **Utilities** – Existing utility easements are adequate and no easements beyond those shown on the plat are necessary at this time. However, approval of the plat should be subject to final approval by the utility providers and providing additional easement by separate instrument as may be required.
3. **Parkland Dedication** – Parkland dedication has previously been calculated for the National Subdivision. No additional parkland dedication is required as a result of this application.
4. **Landscape/Maintenance** – The final plat includes a landscape island within the right-of-way of Barn Hill Road. This landscape island is a private improvement located within the public right-of-way. The City and developer will need to enter into a right-of-way maintenance agreement, which outlines the responsibilities of the developer for the maintenance of the landscape island.

Staff Conclusion and Recommendation

Based on the final plat and supporting information submitted to date, Staff concludes that all applicable standards and requirements have been met, with the exception of a right-of-way maintenance agreement, which outlines the responsibilities of the developer for the maintenance of the landscape island. Accordingly, staff recommends approval of the proposed *Replat of Lot 11, Cider Mill Ridge – Fourth Plat* subject to the following conditions:

- Completion of the Public Works Department punch list which includes repair of a sidewalk ramp.
- Right-of-Way maintenance agreement which outlines the responsibilities of the developer for the maintenance of the landscape island, approved by the Public Works Director.
- Any other conditions deemed necessary by the Planning Commission.

Necessary Action

Following consideration of the application, the factors discussed above and any testimony presented during the meeting, the Planning Commission must recommend approval or denial of the application (with or without conditions) unless otherwise postponed. Unless postponed, the Planning Commission's action will be forwarded to the Board of Aldermen along with any explanation thereof for final action.

End of Memorandum

3-8-16

Stephen Lachky, AICP
Community Development Director



ITEM ##
For 3-8-2016
Planning Commission

CITY OF PARKVILLE • 8880 Clark Avenue • Parkville, MO 64152 • (816) 741-7676 • FAX (816) 741-0013

Staff Analysis

Date: March 3, 2016

To: Planning Commission

From: Alysen Abel, P.E. – Public Works Director

CC: Stephen Lachky, AICP – Community Development Director
Paul Giarratana, CBO, CBI, CFM – Building Official
Kelly Yulich – Assistant to the Community Development Director

RE: Cider Mill 11th Plat – Final Plat

The property located within the Replat of Lot 11, Cider Mill Ridge – Fourth Plat is the current location of the Cider Mill Pool house. The site development plans for the pool house were approved on January 28, 2015. Construction of the building and the site amenities commenced soon after the permit approval. The asphalt parking area and drive were completed in May 2015, the sanitary sewer was completed in June 2015, and the punch list was issued in September 2015.

The building and site amenities have been constructed. The building currently operates under a Temporary Certificate of Occupancy (TCO). The Public Works Inspector completed a punch list of remaining site issues that remain. Once the contractor has addressed the issues outlined in the punch list, a Final Certificate of Occupancy (CO) can be issued. The only outstanding issue is the repair of a sidewalk ramp.

The final plat includes a landscape island within the right-of-way of Barn Hill Road. This landscape island is a private improvement located within the public right-of-way. The City and developer will need to enter into a right-of-way maintenance agreement, which outlines the responsibilities of the developer for the maintenance of the landscape island.

Public Works recommends approval of the Final Plat, with the following conditions:

1. Prior to recording of the Final Plat, the developer's contractor shall complete the outstanding items on the punch list for the building and site improvements.
2. Concurrent with the recording of the Final Plat, the City and Developer shall enter into a Right-of-Way Maintenance Agreement that outlines the maintenance responsibilities for the private improvements in the public right-of-way.

MEMORANDUM

To: Stephen Lachky, Community Development Director
From: Chris Brewster, Project Manager, Gould Evans
Date: 3/1/16
RE: Procedures Outline

Attached are two tables regarding development review procedures. The first is a log of all of the sections in the current regulations that address procedures, and a summary of what is explicitly required by those sections. The second table indicates how those procedures could be simplified and streamlined into a single procedures section for all applications.

The benefits of this approach are:

1. Better organization of the code (fewer words/ less pages);
2. Greater understanding for applicants on what is required and when;
3. Clear expectations for all involved in the process, including staff, public officials, applicants and interested parties;
4. Streamlining development review – if not in actual timelines, at least in the approach and systematic way applications are handled;
5. Fewer interpretation issues and conflicts, and better alignment with procedures required by statute.

The Potential Procedures table reorganizes all of the existing procedures, so it will accommodate everything that is handled now in the code, but it may rely on common procedures for certain topics.

Below is an outline of how the procedures section is being drafted, using “Chapter 2” as the procedures chapter under the working draft. The Potential Procedures table and outline will be discussed at the March 8, 2016 Advisory Committee meeting.

CHAPTER 2. PROCEDURES

2.01 Common Procedures for All Applications

- A. *Applications and Fees*
- B. *Timeline and Review Cycles*
- C. *Pre-application and Staff Review*
- D. *Notice*
- E. *Action by Official Review Bodies*
- F. *Appeals*
- G. *Technical Studies*
- H. *Successive Applications*

2.02 **Platting** (administrative, preliminary and final)

2.03 **Zoning Map Amendments (Rezoning)**

2.04 **Planned Developments**

2.05 **Conditional Use Permits**

- 2.06 **Site Plan** (major and minor)
- 2.07 **Variance**
- 2.08 **Appeal of Administrative Decision**
- 2.09 **Text Amendments**

Each of the specific procedures sections (2.02 – 2.09) is then organized under the following sub-sections:

- A. *Applicability*
- B. *Specific Procedures or Submittals [if any]*
- C. *Review Criteria*
- D. *Effect of Decision*

Parkville, MO Zoning and Subdivision Standards Current Procedures

Process (Section #)	City of Parkville			City of Independence			City of Platteau			City of Platteau		
	Owner	Staff	PC	QC	Posted	Published	Mailed	Staff	PC	Board	BZA	Protest Permitted
BZA variance (480.025.A.3 / 480.050)											D	
Special Use Exceptions (480.030)											D	
Special Yard and Height Exceptions (480.040)											D	

- = required
- = authorized
- PC = Planning Commission
- CC = City Council
- BA = Board of Adjustment

- * Resubmittal Limitation
- R = review and recommending authority
- D = Decision making authority
- PH = public hearing required (distinguished from a public meeting generally open to the public)
- A = Appeal of Decision

End Notes to Current Procedures Table:

- [1] A preliminary plat that has dedicated park land requires approval by the Board of Alderman prior to submission to the Planning Commission.
- [2] This seems to confuse the statutory role of BZA in appeals of administrative decisions generally (480.025.A.1), vs. specific procedures where the city may set up its own administrative appeal body to review certain types of appeals subject to specific criteria.
- [3] Unclear and competing authority from legislative body (Board of Alderman) and quasi-judicial body (Board of Adjustment)
- [4] Confusion between Section 478.010/040 and 428.040

Parkville, MO Zoning and Subdivision Regulations - Potential Procedures

	Public Input				Public Hearing				Public Meeting			
	Owner	Staff	PC	CC	Posted	Published	Mailed	Staff	PC	Board	BZA	Protest Permitted
Subdivision – Administrative Plat	■				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			D				
Subdivision – Preliminary Plat	■				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			R	D	A		
Subdivision – Final Plat	■				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			R	R	D		
Subdivision Waiver	■				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		R	D	A		
Zoning Map Amendment*	■	■	■	■	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	R	R/PH	D		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Planned Development Concept Plan	■		■	■	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	R	R/PH	D		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Planned Development Final Plan	■							D	A			
Conditional Use Permit	■				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	R	R/PH	D		
Site Plan – Minor	■							D	A			
Site Plan - Major	■							R	D	A		
Variance	■				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	R			D/PH	
Appeal of Administrative Decision	■		■	■	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				D/PH	
Text Amendment		■	■	■		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		R	R/PH	D		

= required

■ = authorized

PC = Planning Commission

CC = City Council

BA = Board of Adjustment

* Resubmittal Limitation

R = review and recommending authority

D = Decision making authority

PH = public hearing required (distinguished from a public meeting generally open to the public)

A = Appeal of Decision

**PARKVILLE MISSOURI
STEERING COMMITTEE DRAFT SCHEDULE
2/26/16**

Meeting Date*	Phase	Topics
March 8, 2016	Phase 2 - Analysis	Summary of Procedures
April 12	Phase 3 - Discussion	First Issue Papers review discussion
May 10	Phase 3 - Discussion	Second Issue Papers review discussion
Public Open House #1 - Issue Papers (TBD late May / early June)	Phase 3 Discussion	All Issue Papers
June 14	Phase 4 Initial Draft	Open House summary / Initial Draft status
July 12	Phase 4 Initial Draft	Initial Draft introduction / executive summary review
August 9	Phase 5 Final Draft	Final Draft status discussion (if necessary)
September 13	Phase 5 Final Draft	Final Draft introduction / executive summary review
Open House # 2 - Final Draft Review (TBD late September)	Phase 5 Final Draft	Final Draft Discussion
October 11	Phase 6 Adoption	Open House summary / Adoption Draft Status
November 8	Phase 6 Adoption	Adoption Draft Public Hearing

* In the event the Planning Commission agenda is full for any proposed date, a special meeting for the Steering Committee will be scheduled near this date.