

City of Bel Aire

STAFF REPORT

DATE: 09/08/2026

TO: Bel Aire Planning Commission
FROM: Paula Downs
RE: Goddard Duplex Action

STAFF COMMUNICATION

FOR MEETING OF	9/10/26
CITY COUNCIL	
INFORMATION ONLY	

SUMMARY:

At the August 13, 2026, Planning Commission meeting, the agenda included a discussion item related to the City of Goddard's Resolution regarding duplexes and twin homes. The agenda packet contained a document submitted by Commissioner Sutherland outlining information being considered in that Resolution. No action was taken by the Planning Commission at that time. Commissioner Sutherland has requested time again on the September 10, 2026, agenda to continue this discussion regarding Goddard's actions on duplexes.

Current Discussion

Staff understands that the item has been added to provide an opportunity for the Commission to revisit the previous discussion and begin identifying what types of zoning regulation changes—if any—or new regulations might be needed moving forward. Because staff has not yet been provided clarification on the specific issues or desired outcomes, this discussion may serve as an initial step in understanding how Goddard's approach to duplexes and twin homes could inform Bel Aire's future regulatory considerations.

This meeting may allow the Commission to determine what topics should be explored in more detail at future meetings. Once the Commission clarifies the focus and intended direction, staff can prepare targeted analysis and information.

Conclusion

As a result, this agenda item provides an opportunity for the Commission to define its objectives before determining next steps. After the Commission identifies its priorities and areas of concern, staff can conduct further research and assess the implications for Bel Aire's zoning regulations.

MINUTES JOINT PLANNING COMMISSION AND CITY COUNCIL
CITY OF GODDARD
118 N MAIN ST, GODDARD KS
MEETING MINUTES
MAY 12, 2026

The Goddard Planning Commission and the Goddard City Council met in a Joint Session at Goddard City Hall on Monday, May 12, 2026. *Chairman Coyne* called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m. and led the pledge of allegiance and led the Invocation.

Commissioners present were:

Justin Parks, Daniel Hayden, Jamie Coyne, Jim Milligan, Preston Black, Jim Milligan

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

MOTION: *Commissioner Cline* made a motion to approve the agenda for May 12th, 2026. *Commissioner Hayden* seconded the motion.

The motion carried.

6-0

D. CITIZEN COMMENTS

Ketelsen RV Monument Sign – Pre-Approval Request

Trevor Bisel, representing Ketelsen RV, addressed the Commission to request early consideration of a monument sign base modification ahead of the business's upcoming June grand opening. He explained that the sign is currently in the approval process but will not receive final approval until later in June, and asked whether a 36-inch base could be pre-approved to allow installation prior to the opening.

Pedestrian Access Concerns – Fence Near Senior Homes and Challenger Area

Amanda Treadwell, residing at 410 Richards Road, brought forward a concern on behalf of community members regarding a newly installed fence separating the Goddard Senior Apartments and the Easy Place area from the surrounding neighborhood. She noted that the fence had eliminated a previously accessible walking path used by residents and schoolchildren.

Jessica Bennett, residing at 718 Timmy Court, elaborated on the issue, recounting that her nine-year-old daughter was unable to return home from school after the gate was locked mid-day, forcing Ms. Bennett to leave work early to retrieve her. She asked whether the city had plans to improve sidewalk connectivity and pedestrian access to and from the neighborhood, noting that since a nearby business was constructed, approximately twelve or more children attending Challenger, Oak Street, and other schools in the area have been unable to walk to

school safely. A second resident echoed the concern, emphasizing that the neighborhood has effectively been cut off from walkable access to the downtown core.

E. CONSENT AGENDA

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The Community Development Director summarized that the April 13, 2026 minutes covered several prior items including an area of influence modification, a preliminary and final replat of the 167 West Edition, a road name change for Goddard Galleria, a C-2 zoning amendment, variances for lopsided requirements and Urban Property Group, modifications to R-1 and R-2, official changes, and removal of ROA from zoning regulations.

MOTION: *Commissioner Milligan* moved to approve the minutes of April 13, 2026.

Commissioner Hayden seconded the motion.

The Motion carried.

6-0

F. OLD BUSINESS

There was no old business.

G. NEW BUSINESS

1. Resolution For Duplexes and Twin Homes (Joint Conversation)

City Attorney Ryan Beck introduced a proposed joint resolution and accompanying restrictive covenant intended to govern two-family residential structures in the R-2, R-3, and R-4 zoning districts. He explained that the resolution would apply on a going-forward basis to new developments only and would not affect previously approved or grandfathered developments. He emphasized that cities have broad police power authority to regulate land use in the interest of public health, welfare, and safety, and that the restrictive covenant would be required as a condition of the rezoning process—though it would not substitute for the full quasi-judicial analysis the Planning Commission and City Council must conduct for each application. He cautioned against "contract zoning," noting that the body cannot waive its legislative discretion simply because a developer agrees to the covenant.

City Planner Micah then walked through the specific provisions of the proposed restrictive covenant:

Non-Monotony Standard: The covenant would require a minimum of six distinct duplex design types within a development, with no two identical designs appearing within five units of one another along a street frontage. City Planner Micah noted that the non-monotony standard was intended to apply to the roadside view, and that units sharing a rear yard out of public sightlines would not be subject to the same restriction. The goal was to eliminate the "cookie cutter" appearance of repetitive garage facades and rooflines along a street.

Percentage Cap – Two-Family Structures: The covenant would cap two-family structures at no more than 40 percent of total structures within a development, with each duplex or twin home counted as one structure regardless of the number of units it contains. City Manager

Craig referenced the Trails In development as a specific case where a supplemental cap of 80 duplexes—whichever is less than 40 percent—had already been applied to prevent expansion of duplex counts through lot additions.

Neighborhood Amenities: The covenant would require at least three amenities per development, including at minimum one active amenity. "Active amenity" was defined as a mandated recreational facility intended for active physical use, such as a swimming pool, playground, splash pad, sport court, gym, or dog park. Passive features such as benches, picnic tables, shade structures, and open lawn areas would not qualify.

A substantial discussion arose regarding whether retention or detention ponds stocked with fish could qualify as active amenities. City Planner Micah and City Manager Craig both expressed concern that broadly worded language could allow any pond in a neighborhood to satisfy the active amenity requirement, effectively rendering it meaningless. Following discussion, the body reached general consensus that a pond would only qualify as an active amenity if a walking trail was incorporated around it, consistent with the definition's inclusion of trails as active recreational improvements.

The body also discussed at length whether required amenities should be publicly accessible or reserved exclusively for HOA members. City Attorney Beck framed the question as a policy decision for the governing body. After deliberation, the consensus was that amenities would be treated as private HOA amenities, with the HOA retaining discretion to restrict or open access as it sees fit. The previously proposed language prohibiting fencing or gates without city consent was agreed to be removed. Concerns were also raised that no comparable amenity requirement exists for R-1 single-family developments, with one council member expressing the view that as the city grows, amenity standards should eventually extend to all residential development types.

Sidewalk Width: The covenant would require five-foot-wide sidewalks, exceeding the typical three-to-four-foot standard.

Tree Planting: Each lot would be required to have two trees with a minimum caliper of 1.5 inches measured six inches off the ground, to be in place prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy. Discussion focused on the longevity of the requirement and whether replacement obligations should extend beyond the initial two-year window currently proposed. Participants noted that most HOA covenants typically carry their own tree maintenance requirements independent of city code, which would effectively continue the obligation beyond the city's two-year window. The body did not reach a formal resolution on extending the replacement requirement but indicated that HOA covenants would serve as the practical long-term enforcement mechanism.

Facade and Design Standards: The covenant would require 30 percent masonry on the front facade of two-family structures, varied rooflines and facade treatments for individual dwellings within a building, and limitations on use of earth-tone paint colors limited to incidental accents. A 50 percent window-to-garage-door ratio requirement was also included. Some concern was raised about whether the window ratio was appropriate or overly prescriptive compared to existing single-family homes, though others noted that similar standards had been drawn from comparable developing communities in the region, including Derby. City Manager Craig noted that builders and developers who had previewed drafts of the covenant had responded positively, and that developers were already waiting on passage in order to close on land and apply for R-2 zoning.

Sound Separation: The covenant would incorporate supplemental construction standards for sound attenuation between units, going beyond the minimum requirements of the International Residential Code. City Planner Micah noted that builders consulted during drafting did not object to these standards. Discussion touched on whether alternative insulation materials meeting sound dampening performance standards could be considered, and whether the continuous fire-rated separation wall was required to extend into attic or basement spaces. City Planner Micah acknowledged uncertainty on the technical details and indicated those questions would be vetted through the building inspector and applicable code provisions.

Phasing: The 40 percent cap would apply to each phase of a multi-phase development individually, preventing developers from concentrating all duplex lots in a single early phase while deferring single-family construction.

City Manager Craig noted that the resolution and covenant had been shared with the development community and that reception had been broadly positive. He observed that the three fastest-growing communities in Sedgwick County—Goddard among them—had each denied an R-2 rezoning request in October of the prior year, prompting a regional working group among city managers and planning professionals to develop consistent standards. He indicated that the standards under consideration were broadly aligned with those being pursued in parallel by comparable communities.

Council members expressed the shared view that the intent was not to block duplex development but to ensure that future two-family housing is built to a standard that residents would find desirable. Several members acknowledged community concern over the appearance of existing duplexes and expressed support for a framework that would make Goddard a community where people choose to stay long-term. The discussion was recorded for staff to incorporate feedback into a revised draft for formal consideration at a future meeting.

NO ACTION TAKEN

2. Site Plan Paradise Corner

A site plan for Paradise Corner was presented. Discussion included a requirement for a fence screening the subject parcel from adjacent residential uses. The presentation addressed storm drainage design, with staff noting that the detention basin would be a shallow, dry surface basin approximately three feet deep directing flow eastward. A deteriorated sidewalk along the site's edge was identified as existing on city right-of-way, and staff indicated that discussions were ongoing regarding its replacement or removal. The potential for a pedestrian connection in that corridor was noted as unresolved. Parking was discussed relative to the city's recently updated reduced parking requirements, with the presenter indicating that parking had been maximized in coordination with building design and tenant configuration.

MOTION: *Commissioner Milligan* moved to approve the site plan for Paradise Corner. *Commissioner Hayden* seconded the motion.

The Motion carried.

3. Rachel Brooke Estates Re-Plat Preliminary

The preliminary replat for Rachel Brooke Estates was presented.

MOTION: *Commissioner Milligan* moved to approve the preliminary replat for Rachel Brooke Estates. *Commissioner Hayden* seconded the motion.

The Motion carried.

5-0

4. Rachel Brooke Estates Re-Plat Final

The Rachel Brooke Estates Re-Plat Final was presented for consideration.

MOTION: *Commissioner Black* moved to approve the Rachel Brooke Estates Re-Plat Final. *Commissioner Cline* seconded the motion.

The Motion carried.

5-0

5. Circle C Addition Site Plan

The Circle C Addition site plan was presented. Staff noted that the development is at 16.5 percent lot coverage, well below the 45 percent maximum with the two proposed additions. The setbacks involved required a variance, discussed further under the Board of Zoning Appeals agenda. The facade of the addition was noted to match the existing building.

MOTION: *Commissioner Milligan* moved to approve the Circle C Addition Site Plan. *Commissioner Cline* seconded the motion.

The Motion carried.

5-0