

Jessica Schuller

From: Aimee Nassif
Sent: Friday, April 9, 2021 2:05 PM
To: Jessica Schuller
Subject: RE: Rezoning RZ21-0003 (College and Ridgeview MFDU)

From: jennifermayes@sbcglobal.net <jennifermayes@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Friday, April 9, 2021 2:03 PM
To: jennifermayes@sbcglobal.net
Subject: Rezoning RZ21-0003 (College and Ridgeview MFDU)

Please see attached regarding rezoning of College and Ridgeview for MFDU.

(Text copy below in the event attachments aren't viewable.)

--

Jennifer Mayes

"Knowing Is Not Enough; We Must Apply. Wishing Is Not Enough; We Must Do." – Johann Wolfgang Von Goethe

LETTER OF CONCERN / OPPOSITION

Proposed R-3 Rezoning and Development at Ridgeview Road and College Boulevard

I am Jennifer Mayes, an Olathe resident living at 18308 W. 114th Street. As a Northwood Trails homeowner for 27 years whose property is in extremely close proximity, I am writing to express my concern and overall opposition to the rezoning and development of the property at Ridgeview Road and College Boulevard to R3, and **specifically the MFDU complex as currently proposed.**

This opposition is based on these potential/probable negative effects:

A. The additional destruction of Olathe green space, nature, and wildlife

- 1) The City of Olathe has been recognized for nearly **40 years as an Arbor Day Foundation Tree City USA recipient.** And yet, our nearby trees and green spaces – particularly mature, old-growth trees - have been significantly, negatively impacted by construction of Ridgeview Village, Johnson County buildings, Aspens at Ridgeview Falls (55+), Ridgeview Falls Apartments, 119th Street and I-35 corridor, K-10 and Ridgeview corridor, College/Ridgeview/Pflumm business corridor, **and the impending 119th Street/Northgate changes.**
 - a. For a visual impact of our area's loss of green space, visit <https://world.time.com/timelapse/>, choose Explore the World, zoom down to Olathe/Johnson County then watch the green disappear even just up to 2018.
- 2) **Wildlife:** This area is known for deer, birds, and other native wildlife. The proposed construction, combined with 300-500+ additional residents and vehicles, means wildlife will be further driven out resulting in habitat destruction, deaths, and biodiversity loss, not to mention potentially serious traffic accidents on adjacent, heavily trafficked roads.
 - a. *"Today, we live in a world in which on average, **wild species have seen their numbers collapse by 90% and the range they inhabit by 90% too.** And those are the lucky ones: across the globe, we precipitated the extinction of thousands of species across dozens of genera in every kingdom of*

life. The world we inhabit today is but a pale shadow of the one in which we lived a mere 20,000 years ago.” European Agroforestry Federation

- 3) **Natural topography dangers and code conflicts:** This land has significant natural topography including a stream and 100-year flood plain lines.
 - a. The construction as proposed does **not** appear to incorporate Olathe Municipal Codes (18.20.090) stating **R-3 is intended to implement the Conventional Residential Neighborhood and Conservation/Cluster Neighborhood** future land use categories, specifically:
 - (1) promote integrated site design that is considerate to the natural features and topography.
 - (2) protect environmentally sensitive areas of the development site, as well as permanently preserve important natural features, prime agricultural land, and open space.
 - (3) minimize non-point source pollution through reducing the area of impervious surfaces on site.
 - b. Specific to the stream and flood plain, significant areas of turfgrass and impervious parking lots are proposed adjacent the stream corridor. **Runoff from chemical turf applications, road and parking lot de-icing, and other pollutants, etc. into the stream is inevitable** given the topography and would result in significant detrimental environmental effects WELL beyond just this property. This definitely seems in **direct contrast to Conservation/Cluster Neighborhood principles #2 and #3.**
- 4) **Old growth trees/natural characteristics:** The Planning Committee’s expressed concern for protection of the existing mature trees is shared and greatly appreciated. However, in addition to just the trees, the overall proposed construction is not in keeping with residences that both protect and utilize the property’s **beautiful and increasingly rare natural characteristics.**
- 5) **Human Health:** While it is understood development, desire for increased tax base, and progress are largely inevitable, it is also increasingly clear how much human health is impacted by nature.
 - a. *Many cities worldwide are “re-wilding” to provide MORE nature and green space. “The closer green spaces in cities can replicate the natural conditions that existed before urbanization, the greater the benefit for the region’s native species. These benefits also extend to the human inhabitants, whose physical and psychological health can be enhanced by interacting with nature.”* ([“Cities Across Europe Are Making Space for Nature”](#), Yes Magazine 2/24/21)
- B. **Grave concerns about fire danger** from “stick” construction of MFDUs, particularly after the devastating 2017 8-alarm fire at Overland Park City Place which reached nearby homes, burning 17 and **destroying eight**. This is exponentially more worrisome considering the woods surrounding both the proposed development and our neighborhood, the potential for significant additional spread and the ever-increasing frequency of fire danger warnings in our area.
- C. **Increased traffic congestion**, especially after K10/Ridgeview construction, current commercial construction on College between Pflumm and Ridgeview, proposed rezoning of College and Woodland to residential, etc. Access from 114th St. to Ridgeview is already far more congested due to increased Ridgeview traffic; this added residential density will add significantly.
- D. **Increased strain on area infrastructure** from such a large, dense potential addition of residents, especially considering proposed rezoning of College and Woodland.
- E. **Increased air, noise, and light pollution** both traffic- and MFDU resident-related.
 - 1) The existing MFDU plan includes both a pool and likely highly lit multiple parking lots on the back (south) side of the property, closest to Northwood Trails. This will **significantly increase our air, noise and light pollution** given the proposed density of the complex.
- F. **Density: R-3 is described as “Residential low-density.”** At 283 units this proposed complex would be one of the two LARGEST of 10 complexes zoned either R-3 OR R-4 in the nearby area. Further, of just those zoned R-3 or RP-3, this would be the HIGHEST density complex. Finally, it is #7 of 10 most dense compared to ALL 10 nearby complexes.
- G. **Elevations:** We were thrilled the Planning committee did not approve the proposed elevations which are a MAJOR concern, and one understood to be in direct contrast to **Conservation/Cluster Neighborhood principle #1 AND with R-3 guidelines.**
 - 1) For the record, the developer’s claims and simulations of elevation views from nearby property are, frankly **complete “bunk”**. I can see both a fair distance down into this property - and right to the traffic on College Blvd from my home - quite clearly from my second-story windows. Contrary to claims, there is NO question a four-story – or even a three-story building would be visible from my home and those of nearby neighbors.

H. The study determining the need for “affordable Johnson County housing” doesn’t seem to apply given the developer’s claims these will be “very high-end” apartments with estimated rents of approximately \$2,000+/month.

- 1) As rapidly as single-family homes are selling in this area, it seems clear what is most needed are residences equal or as close to single-family as possible.

In summary, the overwhelming preference would be to leave this property zoned in majority as R1. A secondary preference would be granting of residences with MUCH lower elevations (1-2 story), of MUCH lower density, which carefully protect and utilize the spectacular existing natural green space, wildlife and topography.

Additional, significant requirements to protect existing nature, wildlife, topography, and nearby stream/flood plain from chemical and other contamination should be essential. ALL trees removed should be replaced with those of comparable size.

“Size really matters with trees. The annual net ecological benefit of planting a large species tree is 92% greater than planting a small one. Mature street trees do everything from having a positive effect on infant birth weight in lower socio-economic demographics, to increasing resilience to major life events among people who live within sight of them. Consumers spend more on streets that are lined with large trees.” ([Why keeping one mature street tree is far better for humans and nature than planting lots of new ones](#) - February 1, 2021)

This should include **plants** known to filter and/or prevent contaminants from washing into streams/creeks; required use of only **organic lawn/turf chemicals**; landscaping which includes plants and trees native to the area and supportive of beneficial insects; **permeable pavement** for parking lots, etc.

Finally, depending on the final type of construction approved, requirements for the type of construction (e.g., steel vs “stick”) should be seriously considered to mitigate extensive and potentially devastating fire damage amid serious, ongoing drought conditions.

Our city’s very name, “Olathe”, means beautiful, or lovely. And while other cities work to “rewild” their areas, **we have the opportunity for economic growth which is NOT at the expense of nature but rather preserves it and its beauty** to the extent possible for the benefit of residents, the City of Olathe, and Johnson County overall.

Thank you for your service, attention, and consideration of this lengthy list of concerns.

Respectfully,
Jennifer Mayes

Jessica Schuller

From: Joe Fasulo <joefasulo63@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 8, 2021 4:28 PM
To: Marge Vogt
Cc: Aimee Nassif; Jessica Schuller
Subject: RZ21-0003 Staff Report

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Marge,

I have a question regarding section 5. a of the staff report. I have copied below for convenience.

"The applicant is proposing vertically attached multifamily units with a density of 6.89 dwelling units per acre, which is less than the maximum density allowed under the R-3 District of 15 dwelling units per acre."

I am curious how this is calculated. It is my understanding that about 20 acres is in the flood plain and can not be built upon. That leaves about 21 acres that can be built on. 285 units on 21 acres is 13.57 units per acre.

Can you please explain how the calculation of 6.89 units per acre was derived?

It appears the 6.89 units per acre is counting land that can not be built on as part of the acreage. If the units were spread out of the full 41 acres the 6.89 per acre would be accurate. The buildable acreage footprint is much smaller.

I believe the 13.57 units per acre is more accurate and should be used in making decisions on this request.

Thanks,

Joe Fasulo
18307 W 114th St.
913 599 0367

Jessica Schuller

Subject: RE: Northwest Trails citizen concern on SW Corner College/Ridgeview

From: Peter Mundo <peterfmundo@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, April 12, 2021 11:51 AM

To: Aimee Nassif <AENassif@OLATHEKS.ORG>

Subject: Northwest Trails citizen concern on SW Corner College/Ridgeview

Hi Aimee,

Per the recommendation of my city councilwoman Marge Vogt, I am passing on this note to be filed with you and become a part of the official record provided to the Planning Commission and the City Council.

As a resident of Northwood Trails on Ridgeview between College and 119th, I can't help but continue to be very bothered by the possibility of this project to rezone the SW corner of college and ridgeview to allow for a big multi-family unit complex.

Especially as I look at how empty the 119th/Ridgeview monster remains, while knowing the demand in Johnson County is for single family homes and not multi family, I very much hope you will deny the request to re-zone the SW corner of College and Ridgeview to multi family.

This new report from National Relators Association shows the KC Metro is #2 in having limited housing inventory: <https://magazine.realtor/daily-news/2021/03/04/report-50-fewer-homes-for-sale-this-year>

I am not against development that is needed in our area. But to be clear, the data shows that single family homes are of need and want in the area, not M/F. And as someone who used to live in downtown KC, no one is going to spend \$2,000 on a nice apartment on the SW corner of college/ridgeview. Those folks will find a highrise down who want that type of living experience. That's what my wife and I wanted before we started our family and looked for a perfect community of single family homes and that is what we found with Northwood Trails. Those with \$2,000 for a monthly payment looking in Olathe want a house.

I fail to see the benefit to the community at large. The big beneficiaries here appear to be the out-of-state developers. Multi Family continues to put strains on resources, water, sewer, schools, roads, etc, which can cost the taxpayer in the end.

Thank you so much for the consideration.

Best
Pete Mundo

--
Peter Mundo
(201)-406-6542
www.petemundo.com