

**MEETING  
DATE:**

August 25, 2020

**STAFF:** Brian L. Harker, Planner

**PROJECT NAME:** Kentucky Place

**CASE NUMBER/REQUEST:** Case 20-810-02 – Preliminary Development Plan – 3206 N. Spring Street – Shawn Caton, on behalf of Isosceles Properties, LLC, requests approval for a duplex development

---

The neighborhood meeting was held online via Zoom beginning at 5:35 pm in the evening on Wednesday, August 19, 2020. Its duration was about 25 minutes of which 15 minutes was taken by the presenters, applicant and owner. This provided little opportunity for community participation.

People who participated virtually:

Mary Wilcox

Lori Wilson

Cindy Keith

Evelyn Bray

**Ownership:** It was indicated that in the short-term, the entire development would remain in the hands of Isosceles. The individual lots and buildings may be sold off at a later time. With the splintering ownership, the Home Association, called forth in the covenants, would become then relevant.

**Schools:** Neighbors were concerned that the development would impact the local schools with additional children, but the applicant countered they will market their development to older adults. Neighbors wondered if guarantees of this could be made by some mechanism like the covenants, but the applicant stated their belief that this would not be legal.

**Parking:** Neighbors voiced the belief that the development would negatively contribute to congestion in the neighborhood. The applicant did not counter the assertion, except that congestion was already a problem on the streets in the vicinity.

The applicant has one e-mail from a neighbor supporting the application (however; the actual owner of the property signed the legal petition), all other vocal and written statements of other residents appear to be in opposition to the proposal.

Also included in this supplement are three letters we received after the original packet was distributed.

Received on: August 20, 2020 at 8:29 p.m.  
Via e-mail to: Planning Commission  
From: Conda Mullnix, 3308 N Osage

"Dear Planning Commission,

I live at Lot 44 in Kentucky Hills; and part of my lot is within 250 feet of the proposed development. I would like to oppose this development for several reasons.

1. Our neighborhood charter (active or not) intended this subdivision to be limited to single family structures.
2. Our sewer system is aging and at capacity now.
3. Our schools are at capacity; and some kids are bussed to other areas.
4. Colonel Drive is the main east/west street in & out of our neighborhood. An additional 11-22 (or more) cars would congest the Pleasant and Spring intersections at Colonel. This would increase the chance of auto accidents, and endanger the kids that walk along these streets (especially since there is no sidewalk along Colonel at the proposed development area).
5. Isosceles Properties, LLC has no vested interest in our neighborhood other than to make a quick buck. Kentucky Hills is an older neighborhood that the city considers blighted. I believe all the absent-tee homeowners of rental properties is the primary reason we are blighted. I fear duplexes and multi family dwellings would drop surrounding property values even more.
6. Single family structures would not impact our area as severely as multi family dwellings.

These are the reasons why I oppose the duplex development.

Question:

Should your commission approve the duplex plan, could you require the property owner to put in and keep up a park area for the neighborhood kids at the south end of the property? (In their plan, this is an empty area where the retention pond will be. My understanding is the retention pond would be filled in.) This would be a small way for Isosceles Properties, LLC to show they are vested in and care about the neighborhood.

I ask this because our neighborhood does not have a park, and the development area is the only common space for kids to play. (It's too far for the kids to walk to Mill Creek Park, and there are no sidewalks along Liberty or River Blvd - high traffic streets. )

Sincerely,

CJM (Lot 44)"

---

Received on: August 24, 2020 at 10:45 a.m.  
Via e-mail/letter to: Planning Commission  
From: Martha Pittman, 3209 N Spring St

"To Whom it may Concern,

I live at 3209 N spring Street across from the property owned by Isosceles property (3206 Spring). Last year they submitted plans to build apartments i was and still am against the building of apartments. I would prefer to see single family houses . I have looked over the plans of the duplexes the others in the neighborhood said it is for Senior Citizen housing and I am ok with that, I feel there is already not enough housing for Senior Citizens in a good neighborhood. Over the last year i have had to call the police several times over the vacant property, the police are slow to respond or dont respond at all so like most neighbors I have just quit calling . I have seen people park over there to do drug deals, young people having sex , neighborhood teenagers smoking pot , and people looking in the building to try to break in . Neighborhood adults and children on their ATV, Dirtbikes tear up the property and leave a Rut in the ground . , If this proposal is not approved i suggest a 6 foot chain link fence with locking gate be put up around the entire property, because it is private property , if someone was to get hurt the owners I am sure will be sued.

There are others in the neighborhood who also feel the duplexes should be approved , and I hope that they send in their letters of support.

Martha Pittman  
3209 N Spring Street  
Independence, Mo 64050"

---

Received on: August 24, 2020 at 2:50 p.m.  
Via e-mail/letter to: Planning Commission  
From: Paula Frazee, 3201 N Union St

"Dear Ms. Rice,

I apologize for the late response to the letter, but we have just returned yesterday from two weeks out of town. I would like to comment on the Development Plan for Kentucky Hills as the property owner for 3306 North Osage Street, Independence, Missouri.

My husband Richard and I are opposed to the plan to build duplexes in the middle of our single family home subdivision. We live in the subdivision at 3201 North Union Street, and we also own seven additional properties which we have managed as single family rental homes for the last ten years. Many prospective tenants move here because they are currently in duplexes and are unhappy. The close proximity of another family with a shared yard and driveway often lead to interpersonal disputes. I would prefer that the property remain undeveloped as the green space it now provides is often required in new developments. But if that is not possible, the best solution to maintain the character of the neighborhood would be to construct single family homes which would fit into the current neighborhood.

My second issue is with the proposed open retention pond which I feel is extremely dangerous in an area with so many children.

Thank you,

Paula Frazee”