




Mission Hills

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

A VISION FOR THE FUTURE



Adopted January 12, 2026

ORDINANCE NO. 1697

AN ORDINANCE ADOPTING AN UPDATED COMPREHENSIVE PLAN FOR THE CITY OF MISSION HILLS, KANSAS.

WHEREAS, pursuant to K.S.A. 12-747, the City of Mission Hills, Kansas (the "City") adopted the Comprehensive Plan and Development Guide For the City of Mission Hills, Kansas, originally prepared by Dr. Thomas D. Galloway in 1982 and last revised by the City effective May 13, 2019 (as amended and updated from time to time, the "Comprehensive Plan");

WHEREAS, the City Council budgeted funds and authorized the expenditure of those funds to hire a consultant to assist the City in updating the Comprehensive Plan;

WHEREAS, following receipt of responses to a Request for Proposals for a consultant to prepare the Comprehensive Plan update, the City hired Confluence, Inc. (the "Consultant");

WHEREAS, throughout 2025, the Consultant met with a Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee and City Staff in order to guide the Comprehensive Plan update;

WHEREAS, notice of a public hearing on the proposed updated Comprehensive Plan was published in *The Legal Record*, the official City newspaper, on November 18, 2025;

WHEREAS, a public hearing on the proposed updated Comprehensive Plan was conducted on December 10, 2025, at which time interested parties were provided an opportunity to provide input, pursuant to K.S.A. 12-747(b);

WHEREAS, at the conclusion of the public hearing, a majority of all members of the Planning Commission recommended approval of the updated Comprehensive Plan and caused a certified copy of such updated Comprehensive Plan, along with a resolution adopting the same and an accurate written summary of the hearing thereon, to be submitted to the Governing Body; and

WHEREAS, the Governing Body has considered the updated Comprehensive Plan, reviewed the meeting minutes and all testimony and evidence submitted in connection therewith, and hereby approves the updated Comprehensive Plan.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE GOVERNING BODY OF THE CITY OF MISSION HILLS, KANSAS:


SECTION 1. The foregoing recitals are affirmed and incorporated by this reference as legislative findings of the Governing Body.

SECTION 2. The Governing Body hereby approves the updated Comprehensive Plan.


SECTION 3. This Ordinance shall take effect and be in force from and after its publication, or the publication of a certified summary hereof, in the official City newspaper.

[Remainder of page intentionally blank; signature page follows.]

PASSED by the City Council on January 12, 2026. **APPROVED** by the Mayor.


W. Andrew Weed, Mayor

ATTEST:


Jason Nickles, City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:


Anna M. Krstulic, City Attorney

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF MISSION HILLS PLANNING COMMISSION ADOPTING AN UPDATED COMPREHENSIVE PLAN FOR THE CITY OF MISSION HILLS, KANSAS.

WHEREAS, pursuant to K.S.A. 12-747, the City of Mission Hills, Kansas (the "City") has adopted a Comprehensive Plan and Development Guide For the City of Mission Hills, Kansas (the "Comprehensive Plan"), originally prepared by Dr. Thomas D. Galloway in 1982, and last revised by the City effective May 13, 2019; and

WHEREAS, the City Council budgeted funds and authorized the expenditure of those funds to hire a consultant to assist the City in updating the Comprehensive Plan; and

WHEREAS, following receipt of responses to a Request for Proposals for a consultant to prepare the Comprehensive Plan update, the City hired Confluence, Inc. (the "Consultant"); and

WHEREAS, throughout 2025, the Consultant met with a Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee and City Staff in order to guide the Comprehensive Plan update; and

WHEREAS, notice of a public hearing on the proposed revised Comprehensive Plan was published in *The Legal Record*, the official City newspaper, on November 18, 2025; and

WHEREAS, a public hearing on the proposed revised Comprehensive Plan was conducted on December 10, 2025, at which time interested parties were provided an opportunity to provide input, pursuant to K.S.A. 12-747(b); and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission is now prepared to recommend approval of the revised Comprehensive Plan to the City Council.


NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF MISSION HILLS, KANSAS:

SECTION 1. The updated Comprehensive Plan for the City is hereby adopted by a majority vote of all members of the Planning Commission, pursuant to K.S.A. 12-747(b), and recommended for final approval by the City Council. The following written presentations, maps and other materials shall comprise the updated Comprehensive Plan: City of Mission Hills, Kansas Comprehensive Plan dated December 10, 2025; Zoning Map approved April 13, 1992; Stormwater Pipe System Master Plan dated November 30, 2016; Stormwater Open Channel Master Plan dated October 20, 2017; Design Guidelines dated January 11, 2020; 5-Year Capital Improvement Program dated September 8, 2025 (updated annually); 5-Year Financial Forecast dated May 7, 2025 (updated annually); and Pavement Condition Ranking for City Streets, as of May 1, 2025 (updated annually).

SECTION 2. The Secretary shall submit a certified copy of the updated Comprehensive Plan, together with a written summary of the public hearing thereon, to the City Council, as required by K.S.A. 12-747(b).

SECTION 3. This Resolution shall be effective upon adoption by the Planning Commission.

ADOPTED THIS 10th DAY OF DECEMBER 2025.


Thomas Roszak, Chair

CERTIFICATION

The undersigned hereby certifies that the attached copy of the Comprehensive Plan is a true and correct copy of the Plan adopted by the Planning Commission at its meeting on December 10, 2025, by Resolution. The undersigned further certifies that the attached minutes are an accurate and written summary of the Planning Commission public hearing held on December 10, 2025.



Jill Clifton

Staff Liaison to the Planning Commission

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION
CITY OF MISSION HILLS, KANSAS**

December 10, 2025

The Planning Commission of the City of Mission Hills, Kansas, held two public hearings and a regular meeting on December 10, 2025, at 5:00 p.m. at the Indian Hills Country Club and virtually by phone and video conference.

PRESIDING: Tom Roszak

PRESENT: Chris Anderson, John Coe, Nick Dosanjh, Sara Greenwood (virtual), Tim McQuaid (virtual), Nancy Ruzicka, Stacey Winfield (virtual)

ABSENT: Wyatt Cobb

ALSO PRESENT: Jill Clifton, City Planner; Jennifer Lee, City Administrator; Bryce Morgan, Planner; Meghan Woolbright, Assistance City Administrator; Anna Krstulic, City Attorney; Andy Weed, Mayor; Dan Sullivan, City Councilperson; Bill Bruning, City Councilperson; Caroline Moran, City Councilperson; Abbey Eckberg, Confluence; PJ Novak, Confluence; Maddy Musson, Stinson LLC

VISITORS: Barbara Nelson, Paul Lewis, Lois Roszak, John Sundeen, Trey Morgan, Sarah Sullivan, Rod Turner, Jason Cole, David Ruisch, David & Noelle Manica, Larry Winter, Joe & Judy Moody, Alison Ward, Henry Bond, Drake Vidrine, Dave Estes, Mina Steen, Bill Ohlemeyer

PUBLIC HEARING – Comprehensive Plan Update

Mr. Roszak welcomed the visitors and asked Abbey Eckberg to explain the process that the City has gone through to update the Comprehensive Plan (“Plan”). Ms. Eckberg indicated that the Planning Commission is required to review the Plan every year to determine if any changes need to be made and the City should undertake a more thorough update of the Plan every 10 years. She said that she was joined by PJ Novak who is also from Confluence, the company that was hired to assist with the update of the Plan. Ms. Eckberg said that she would give an overview of the public input process and data gathering used in creating the draft Plan. [See Attachment] She explained that the first phase consisted of analyzing data regarding the community. Phase two included a public engagement portion as well as a review of the 2023 resident survey results. Phase three included compiling City data and resident input into a draft plan. Phase four includes the public hearing process and review of the draft plan by the Planning Commission and City Council. Ms. Eckberg explained that a steering committee of residents was formed which met six times throughout the year to discuss the Plan. The first public workshop was held in March at the Mission Hills Country Club with over 50 residents attending. Three major themes came out of the public workshop feedback and the resident survey which were community identity, quality of life, and safety. Ms. Eckberg stated that a public open house was held in September at the First Lutheran Church which allowed residents to vote on key

components in the draft Plan. She said a joint workshop with the Planning Commission and the City Council was held in November where the draft Plan was reviewed in detail.

Mr. Roszak said that the Planning Commission would take comments from anyone who wished to speak and asked that they limit their comments to no more than 5 minutes. Paul Lewis explained that he was speaking as a resident of the City and on behalf of a client who lives on Indian Lane. He said that he and his client are opposed to adding sidewalks. He commented that sidewalks go against aspects in the proposed Plan such as protecting greenspace and the existing tree canopy. Mr. Lewis said that he walked 68th Street, which is one of the potential locations of a sidewalk, and counted 104 trees in both the north and south rights-of-way that could potentially be impacted by the installation of a sidewalk. He noted that sidewalks create flooding problems especially in locations such as Indian Lane. Mr. Lewis stated that there can also be a high cost of sidewalk installation due to potential tree removal and movement of utilities.

John Sundeen thanked the City for installing the new sidewalk along a portion of 63rd Street. He said that his wife has to carry their two dogs when she walks along 63rd Street because there is so much traffic. Henry Bond asked what the sidewalk plan is for the City. Ms. Eckberg explained that the draft Plan contains potential sidewalk locations that would connect existing sidewalks or create sidewalk loops on a small scale. Mr. Roszak said that any sidewalk project would need to be discussed and approved by the City Council. There being no further comments, Mr. Roszak closed the public hearing regarding the proposed Comprehensive Plan update.

REGULAR MEETING

Mr. Roszak opened the regular meeting. Mr. Anderson moved to approve the minutes of the November 5, 2025, meeting. Mr. Dosanjh seconded. **Approved 8-0.**

OLD BUSINESS – Comprehensive Plan Update

Mr. Roszak said that given the number of Planning Commission meetings about the proposed Comprehensive Plan, he would recommend a motion be made to present the Plan to the City Council for their review and approval. Mr. Anderson moved to forward the draft Plan to the City Council for approval. Mr. Coe seconded. **Approved 8-0.**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:42 p.m.

/s/ Jill Clifton
City Planner

Acknowledgments

City Council

- David Dickey, Mayor
- Bill Bruning
- Gregg Davidson
- Barbara Nelson
- Eden Thorne
- Andy Weed

Planning Commission

- Thomas Roszak, Chair
- John Coe, Vice Chair
- Chris Anderson
- Wyatt Cobb
- Sherry Coughlin
- Nick Dosanjh
- Sara Greenwood
- Nancy Ruzicka
- Stacy Winfield
- Bill Bruning, Council Liaison

City Staff

- Jennifer Lee, City Administrator
- Meghan Woolbright, Assistant City Administrator
- Jill Clifton, City Planner
- Bryce Morgan, Planner

Steering Committee Members

- Andy Weed
- Bill Bruning
- Bret Knighton
- Caroline Moran
- Carolyn Ellspermann
- Chris Anderson
- Dorsey Troutman
- Jane Jones
- JJ Danker
- Katherine Bruner
- Marc Cortes
- Mary Patonai
- Megan Winters
- Rick Boeshaar
- Sarah Sullivan
- Sheryl Turner
- Thomas Roszak
- Tom Ruddy

Consultant Team

CONFLUENCE


We sincerely thank Chris Anderson for allowing the City of Mission Hills to utilize his photography throughout this plan document.



Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction	4
Chapter 2: History of Mission Hills	8
Chapter 3: Community Profile	20
Chapter 4: Public Input Summary	42
Chapter 5: Future Land Use	68
Chapter 6: Community Identity	86
Chapter 7: Parks + Open Space	102
Chapter 8: Transportation, Mobility + Streetscapes	114
Chapter 9: Plan Implementation	126

Chapter 1. Introduction





What is a Comprehensive Plan and How is it Used?

A comprehensive plan is a long-range document used to guide decision-making in a community. This plan presents an updated vision for land uses, parks and recreation, transportation and mobility, and community identity with recommended goals, policies, and future considerations to guide implementation.

Legal Basis for Comprehensive Plans

The State of Kansas enables communities to adopt comprehensive plans in accordance with Kansas Statutes, Chapter 12-Cities and Municipalities, Article 7-Planning and Zoning (K.S.A. 12-741 – 12-775). The Mission Hills Comprehensive Plan and its Future Land Use Plan serve as support documents for all rezoning requests and development decisions within city limits. All requests should be reviewed for conformity with the adopted Future Land Use Plan and recommendations found within the Comprehensive Plan.

Pursuant to Kansas Statutes, the Planning Commission should review the comprehensive plan and its recommendations at least once a year to ensure that it maintains an accurate representation of the community's vision for the future.



**EXISTING
CONDITIONS
ANALYSIS**



**PUBLIC +
STAKEHOLDER
ENGAGEMENT**



**DRAFT PLAN +
EVALUATION**



**FINAL PLAN +
ADOPTION**

Chapter 1:

Introduction

Overview of the Plan Scope



EXISTING CONDITIONS ANALYSIS

Phase 1 included a kick-off meeting with staff and the Steering Committee to begin the plan update process. The community profile data analysis found in Chapter 3: Community Profile was also completed during this time.



PUBLIC + STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

Phase 2 revolved around public engagement. During this phase, the Public Visioning Workshop was held at the Mission Hills Country Club to help the consultant team gather feedback and guidance on the plan's recommendations.



DRAFT PLAN + EVALUATION

Phase 3 included a series of draft review sessions with the Steering Committee to gather feedback on the draft chapters of the comprehensive plan. A Public Open House was held during this phase to share the draft plan components with the residents.



FINAL PLAN + ADOPTION

Phase 4 was the public hearing process to complete the plan update and adoption process with the Planning Commission and City Council.



Project Schedule


The Mission Hills Comprehensive Plan was completed over the course of eleven months. The process began in December 2024 with the Pre-Kick-Off Meeting with City Staff. The graphic below details the project schedule and checkpoints throughout each phase.

Phase 1: Research + Analysis		
Pre-Kick-Off Meeting with City staff		December 19, 2024
Project Kick-Off with Steering Committee (SC #1)		January 30, 2025 at 5:30 PM
Data Gathering + Existing Conditions Analysis		February 2025
Existing Conditions Analysis Review Meeting w/ SC (SC #2)		February 27, 2025
Existing Conditions Report		February-March 2025
Phase 2: Public + Stakeholder Engagement		
Public Visioning Workshop		March 27, 2025
Analysis + Input Results Review w/ SC (SC #3)		May 6, 2025
Phase 3: Draft Plan + Evaluation		
Draft Plan		May-September 2025
Draft Plan Review Meetings w/ SC (SC #4-6)		June 24 // August 7 // September 9, 2025
Draft Plan Public Open House		September 25, 2025
Draft Plan Joint Workshop		October 8, 2025
Phase 4: Final Plan + Adoption		
Final Draft Plan		October-November 2025
Planning Commission Public Hearing		December 10, 2025
City Council Public Hearing		TBD

PC Planning Commission **CC** City Council **SC** Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee

Denotes total number of months completed in project timeline.

Chapter 2. History of Mission Hills

A stone pillar with a lantern and a sign that reads "MISSION HILLS". The pillar is constructed from light-colored stone blocks with red brick accents. A black lantern is mounted on the pillar. The sign is a rectangular plaque with the words "MISSION" and "HILLS" in a serif font. The pillar is set in a garden with green grass and white flowers. In the background, there are evergreen trees and a brick archway.

MISSION
HILLS



History of Mission Hills

Mission Hills is a community with a vibrant past. This can be found in the layout of the community, variety of housing designs, use of art and greenways, and many other features present throughout city limits. This chapter is provided to highlight some of the significant movements that influenced design and development in Mission Hills and a timeline of community change since the city was first established.

Significant Movements

The City Beautiful and Garden City Movements both heavily influenced the character and design of Mission Hills. This section highlights the qualities and principles of these movements and how they have been maintained over the years.

Community Timeline

The community timeline summarizes some of the most important points in time in Mission Hills, dating back to the 1800s through to present day.




SIGNIFICANT MOVEMENTS



COMMUNITY TIMELINE

FIGURE 2.1 // HISTORY OF MISSION HILLS SECTIONS



Chapter 2:

History of Mission Hills

Overview

Many of the details found within this chapter are a continuation of previous historic summaries for the City of Mission Hills. The Historical Context of Mission Hills Development and the 2019 Comprehensive Plan reports were utilized to build a summary of the community's history.

This chapter details the history of development throughout Mission Hills; the movements that inspired the vision for the community and major milestones significant to the community.

Early Mission Hills

Located within Johnson County and the greater Kansas City Metropolitan Area, Mission Hills is a unique and significant first ring suburb of the metro. This land, named for the Shawnee Methodist Mission, was first platted by J.C. Nichols in 1912.¹ Due to the success of the Country Club District's development and general population growth in the Metro, momentum was moving south, towards Johnson County and the land that would become Mission Hills.^{2,3}

J.C. Nichols thoughtfully approached the design and creation of Mission Hills and the greater Country Club District. Many of the affluent residents in Kansas City lived on the Missouri side of the Metro at this time. Mission Hills was created as an opportunity to construct luxury living and establish a lifestyle that was embedded in quality design, art and sculpture, and greenways. This is reflected in his use of the City Beautiful and Garden City Movement principles.

The City Beautiful Movement

The City Beautiful Movement came about in the 1890s in response to the accumulation of dirt and disorder that was plaguing industrial cities. It was believed that this disorder threatened the social peace and economic efficiency of the communities. The movement engaged architects and planners, social reformers and journalists, and businessmen and professionals, who all shared the common goal of improving America's urban landscape.⁴


The goal of the City Beautiful Movement was to introduce or restore green open spaces in urban areas to improve the moral and social character of the citizens, aiming to showcase public buildings and art, inspire civic loyalty and moral values. The Movement highlighted art and architecture from the neoclassical period (18th century to the mid-20th century) in European cities and wished to draw social elites back into cities.

The City Beautiful Movement is showcased in the community's developments by connecting road networks with pieces of art and architecture and surrounding the architecture within the community with generous landscapes.

“

In February, 1921, the Ladies Home Journal hailed Mission Hills as the archetype of the City Beautiful Movement.⁵

”



Chapter 2:


History of Mission Hills

Garden City Movement

The Garden City Movement was established by Sir Ebenezer Howard in the United Kingdom at the turn of the 20th century. This theory of design was created in response to the need for improved quality of life in the area due to overcrowding and congestion due to uncontrolled growth following the Industrial Revolution.⁶ The graphic to the right presents Howard's initial diagrams for the Garden City. Key features of this theory include:

- A radial configuration of the city's layout with curvilinear streets that follow the natural topography of the area. This differs from traditional city planning where there is a rigid grid and structure to the mobility of the community.
- A balance and separation by location of residential, industry, and agricultural uses to preserve quality of life and health of residents.
- Integration of greenbelts buffers between land uses, pockets of open space located throughout, and smaller neighborhood parks for the residential areas to utilize.

In Mission Hills, the Garden City Movement is represented in the curvilinear streets that interact with the winding streams and hills, preservation of the topography, smaller blocks of development with opportunities for quiet pockets of neighborhoods, and the lush landscape preserved throughout the city.



“

Curvilinear streets meandered through picturesque rolling hills with cultivated vegetation, transforming the garden setting with wooded hills, winding streams, plateaus, and small sheltered valleys into the first neighborhood of Mission Hills, setting a precedent for the rest of the community to form around.⁷

”



Chapter 2:

History of Mission Hills

Development of the Community

After the land had been acquired, the Kansas City-based landscape architecture firm, Hare and Hare was enlisted to help plan and design the community.⁸ The design incorporated the City Beautiful and Garden City Movements with curvilinear streets, picturesque views, and lush landscaping.

To maintain this vision, restrictions on each lot's setbacks, size and placement of the house, and street fronting were established. Each home had to be approved by the J.C. Nichols Company prior to construction.⁹

Home construction boomed during the 1910s and 1920s. In the 1920s, Nichols began planning for the 'greenbelts' that buffered Mission Hills from the surrounding Metro cities. These came in the form of Mission Hills Country Club, followed by Kansas City Country Club and Indian Hills Country Club.¹⁰

The Mission Hills Homes Company (shown in purple in Figure 2.2) was created in 1914 after the first six lots had been sold and the first five houses were in the process of being built. In 1915, the William Cullen Bryant School was built at 56th Street and Wornall Road to provide easily accessible education centers for residents. The Indian Hills (green) and Tomahawk Road (blue) Homes Association were annexed into the community in the mid-1950s.

Construction did come to a brief halt during World War II. The war marked a shift in the building style in Mission Hills. In 1947, when advertisements and construction restarted, homes designed with modern conveniences and post-war prices were offered to the public.¹¹




FIGURE 2.2 // MAP OF HOAS IN MISSION HILLS

In July of 1949, Mission Hills voted unanimously to incorporate into a third class city under Kansas law. At this point in time, the city was roughly 300 acres in size with 2,500 residents. The current limits of the community were set in place by 1960, with an estimated 1,300 acres and 3,500 residents in Mission Hills. Since 1960, population estimates have remained fairly consistent, as discussed in **Chapter 3: Community Profile**.



City Policy and Progress Through the Years

In the 1960s, the City changed from the Mission Hills Homes Company to a local government structure to help with local governance and services. This transition resulted in the shift of service responsibilities to the city, broadening of the tax base to help fund services, and shifts in regulations on public/private land.

The City Council began discussions regarding constructing a City Hall in 1959 which led to property being purchased in 1960. The grand opening of the City Hall for residents and guests took place in 1961.

Establishing Regulations + Boards

After Mission Hills was incorporated the City added a zoning ordinance to direct and regulate the development of the community, it was adopted in 1952. The zoning ordinance included restricting land use to single-family homes, setting minimum setback requirements, and the establishment of broad land development standards. The zoning ordinance was revised in both 1960 and 1969 to capture the character of Mission Hills to a fuller extent, and in 1978 the Architectural Review Board was established to review new building projects, support the regulations, and maintain the integrity of the historical design of the community.

Previous Comprehensive Plans

Mission Hills adopted its first comprehensive plan in 1982. The plan provided a framework and became the foundation for all future planning and development. Dr. Thomas Galloway, an urban planner, assisted Mission Hills with the creation of a clear vision for the city which would be provided in the zoning ordinances. In 1983, the City revised the zoning ordinances extensively to incorporate the recommendations made in the 1982 revision. The single-family residential zone remained but was sub-divided into seven distinct districts. These sub-districts each had developmental standards

to more closely reflect the original design for the community.

In 1988, the Comprehensive Plan was updated, and a parallel study was completed to review the open space and lot coverage provisions in the Zoning Ordinance. Between 1995 and 2005 the Mission Hills Planning Commission undertook a series of studies to define the character of each of the seven sub-districts.

The studies culminated in a Zoning Ordinance revision in 2005 and an update to the Comprehensive Plan in 2008. The updated ordinances include provisions limiting the building lot coverage percentage within each of the seven sub-districts. A formula was also created to determine the allowable building coverage to help reduce inequalities among the lot size categories.

The 2008 Comprehensive Plan identified multiple key design principles and land development objectives for Mission Hills. These principles were expanded to include the Design Guidelines in 2012 which catalog the neighborhood character areas and provide residents, architects, builders, City Staff, and the Architectural Review Board with objective design preferences. These documents provide a framework for the building permit review process and back the City's objective to be fair, transparent, and consistent.

In 2015, the Planning Commission partnered with a professional consulting team and updated the Comprehensive Plan to provide a more robust framework for long term decision making and crafting a 50-year vision for Mission Hills.

The timeline on the following pages details progress and major milestones in the community and region.

1800-1900

1825 – Native tribes ceded land to the United States.

1854 – Indian territory became Kansas territory.

1839-1864 – Shawnee Methodist Mission ran.

1854 – Kansas opened the territory for settlement.

1855 – 1st Kansas Territorial Legislature was elected at Shawnee Methodist Mission.

1861 – Kansas joins the union as a free state.

1864 – Battle of Westport lasts three days and lead to the end of the civil war. Battle spans what is now Country Club Plaza, Sunset Hills, Loose Park, and Mission Hills.

1908 – Charles Armour sold 229 acres west of State Line and south of 56th street to J.C. Nichols and his business partners.

1912 – Mission Hills is platted and the first brochure advertising the community is released.

1914 – Mission Hills Home Company is created after the first six lots were sold and the first 5 houses were in the process of being built.

1919 – Nichols owns land from Oak to State Line, 51st Street to 55th Street and names it the Country Club District. The first residential development is opened.

1910s-1920s – Mission Hills experienced consistent residential development. Home designs ranged from Italian Villas, English Manors, and French Estates and utilized principles from the Garden City and City Beautiful Movements.

1921 – Ladies Home Journal hails that Mission Hills is the archetype for the City Beautiful Movement.

1923 – European sculptures and art are added to the community to support the vision of the Garden City and City Beautiful Movements.

1926 – Kansas City Country Club relocates to its current location.

1941 – Residential development throughout Mission Hills pauses due to World War II.

1944 – J.C. Nichols Company is formed by the merger of multiple companies owned by J.C. Nichols.

1947 – Homes designed with modern conveniences and post war prices are advertised. Marks a shift in the style of homes being built in Mission Hills.

1949 – Mission Hills is incorporated as a third-class city and first City Council meeting is held. Tomahawk Road Homes Association is annexed into a new city.

1925-1950

1951 – Indian Hills and the Indian Hills Country Club were annexed into Mission Hills.

1952 – First zoning ordinance created.

1956-1957 – The Kansas City Country Club and Mission Hills Country Club, area south of 67th Street and pocket area east of Belinder annexed into the city.

1960 – City Council purchased property for City Hall and the zoning code was revised.

1961 – City Hall's grand opening.

1969 – Zoning ordinances are revised to help capture the character of Mission Hills.

1970s – Indian Hills area sees some of the last new development in the city which resulted in a new wave of residents, sort of a third generation.

1978 – Architectural Review Board is created to help maintain the architectural character of the community during renovations and new builds.

1982 – The first Comprehensive Plan was adopted.

1983 – The zoning ordinances were revised to incorporate Nichols' vision of unique homes that are woven into the landscape with subtle development patterns distinctive to Mission Hills.

1995-2005 – Studies to define city's character and identity are completed to provide guidance for development.

2005 – The zoning ordinance was revised in 2005 because of extensive studies and planning from the Mission Hills Planning Commission.

2008 – The Mission Hills Comprehensive Plan was updated and provided recommendation on design principles that later resulted in the creation of the City's Design Guidelines.

2012 – Design Guidelines are created and placed in a formal report with reference graphics, imagery, and guidance for developing or redeveloping in Mission Hills.

2015 – The most recent update of the comprehensive plan was completed. This document incorporated previous planning efforts and studies to guide decision-making over the next 50 years.

2019 - The Tomahawk Road Safety, Beauty, and Connectivity Ad Hoc Committee is formed to help identify goals and principles to the improvements along Tomahawk Road.

2020 - The Design Guidelines are updated.

2025 - The City of Mission Hills purchases the land the First Lutheran Church is located on. The City will spend the next 12-18 months identifying alternatives and seeking public input.

Chapter 2:

History of Mission Hills

- 1 Dr. Thomas D. Galloway, “The Historical, Context of Mission Hills Development,” in Comprehensive Plan and Development Guide for the City of Mission Hills (Mission Hills, Kansas, April 10, 2013).
- 2 Ibid, 4
- 3 Ibid.
- 4 J. D. Fairfield, “The City Beautiful Movement, 1890-1920. Oxford Research Encyclopedia of American History” (Retrieved from <https://oxfordre.com/americanhistory/view/10.1093/crefore/9780199329175.001.0001/acrefore-9780199329175-e-558>, 2018)
- 5 Madelyn Voigts, “Mission Hills: Reflections on the Past and Present” (Kansas City: The Lowell Press, 1987).
- 6 The Editors of Encyclopedia Britannica. “Garden City” (Retrieved from Britannica: <https://www.britannica.com/topic/garden-city-urban-planning>, 2024)
- 7 Ibid, 3
- 8 Madelyn Voigts, Mission Hills: Reflections on the Past and Present (Kansas City: The Lowell Press, 1987) 12.
- 9 City of Mission Hills, Kansas: Design Guidelines (2014) 4 and Madelyn Voigts, 28.
- 10 Dr. Thomas D. Galloway, 9
- 11 Madelyn Voigts, 29



This page intentionally left blank.

Chapter 3. Community Profile





Community Profile Overview

The intent of this report is to summarize the findings from Phase 1 of the planning process. Within this phase, a series of analyses were completed to better understand the current conditions of Mission Hills from a demographic and physical profile perspective.

Review of Previous Plans

A review of previously completed plans is provided with the intent to highlight past findings and figures that may still be impacting operations in Mission Hills today.

The People

Defining 'The People' of Mission Hills requires an extensive review of U.S. Census data. By learning more about the breakdown of the community, more informed recommendations are able to be produced. Factors, such as average household size, median age and age ranges, an number of children under 18 are all datasets relevant and needed for comprehensive planning efforts.

The Place

'The Place' includes the landforms, floodplain, streams and other waterbodies, and other similar characteristics. Additional investigation into the physical characteristics of the land will help guide recommendations on the needed best practices, policies to implement, and improvements that would ensure the cities vitality for years to come.



REVIEW OF PREVIOUS PLANS



THE PEOPLE



THE PLACE

FIGURE 3.1 // COMMUNITY PROFILE SECTIONS

Chapter 3:

Community Profile


Review of Previous Plans

The following are plans and surveys that have been completed by the City of Mission Hills to guide community development and decision-making. These documents provide valuable data about the natural and built environment in the community. The information within these plans have been considered and included as part of the Mission Hills Comprehensive Plan to inform goals, policies, and future considerations.

2017 Open Channel Master Plan

In 2017, with guidance from Water Resources Solutions, LLC, the City of Mission Hills updated its Stormwater Open Channel Master Plan, which focuses on the condition and long-term sustainability of the city's natural stream corridors. The plan includes stream studies, improvement project recommendations, and practical guidance for preserving the health of streams, reinforcing retaining walls, and maintaining stream buffers. The findings of this report reveal a need for continued stream buffer expansion and retaining wall improvements along a majority of the stream corridors in Mission Hills.

It is noteworthy that approximately 6% of the open channels in Mission Hills are owned by the City. The remainder are on private property.



2017 Mission Hills Open Channel Masterplan Update Final Report
Prepared for the City of Mission Hills, Kansas
October 20, 2017




2019 Comprehensive Plan

The City of Mission Hills' last comprehensive plan was adopted in 2019 as an update to the 2015 edition of the Comprehensive Plan and provided goals and policies as guidance for decision-making throughout the city. A supplemental Community Profile report was provided in this plan to help provide additional insight into existing conditions and history of the community.



Design Guidelines

In 2012, the City adopted a formalized set of design guidelines to help guide and regulate the character and design of residential properties in Mission Hills. These guidelines were updated in 2020. Due to the historic significance and quality of housing, these guidelines help set the expectation for setbacks, open space requirements, and general design practices. The impacts and use of the Design Guidelines are discussed throughout the core chapters of the Comprehensive Plan.



Chapter 3:

Community Profile

The People

Population Change 1990-2023

Figure 3.2 presents the population trends in Mission Hills from 1990-2023 according to the U.S. Census Bureau's ACS 2023 5-year estimates. The current ACS population counts estimate there are 3,556 residents in Mission Hills today. Due to Mission Hills' land locked nature, population counts have remained fairly consistent in the last three and a half decades. The population peaked in 2009 with an estimated 3,660 residents.

Since 1990, there has been a 3.25% change in population.

While there are minimal fluctuations in total population, there are varied trends in median age and general age composition of the community that were further explored to ensure recommendations are reflective of the community's composition and needs.




FIGURE 3.2 // POPULATION CHANGE 1990-2023

Source: U.S. Census Bureau ACS 5-Year Population Estimates from 1990-2023



Age Pyramid

To better understand the age composition of Mission Hills, an age pyramid analysis was completed to understand where there are higher shares of residents by age cohort, as well as a male to female ratio, compared to Johnson County. In Figure 3.3 below, female residents are shown in green, males in blue, and the county's shares are shown in a dashed line over-top.

The findings from this analysis reveal:

- There are more children, especially those aged 5-9 years, than the shares in Johnson County. This is reflective of the family-oriented character of Mission Hills and is further represented in the age cohorts over 35 years old.
- There are significantly fewer residents aged 20-34 years old in Mission Hills. This is further amplified when compared to the Johnson County shares. This is not concerning or surprising given that the educational attainment rate in Mission Hills is quite high (which would fall under this age range) as well as the cost of housing might serve as a challenge for younger residents to obtain.
- Mission Hills has a senior-centric population today with higher shares of residents over the age of 50.




FIGURE 3.3 // AGE COMPOSITION IN MISSION HILLS

Source: U.S. Census Bureau ACS 2023 5-Year Estimates

Chapter 3:

Community Profile

Median Age Trends

Figure 3.4 presents a comparison line graph illustrating median age and estimated population trends from 2010 through 2023 according to the U.S. Census Bureau. These trendlines help to understand the composition of the community and guide the balance of quality of life improvements. In 2010, Mission Hills had an estimated 3,476 residents with a median age of 44.9 years. This is the youngest median age recorded in the community during this time period, with the trend line steadily increasing through to 2023 with an estimated median age of 50.1 years. As the community evolves, it will be important to ensure the services and amenities support the needs of residents of all ages.




FIGURE 3.4 // YEARLY MEDIAN AGE IN MISSION HILLS VS ESTIMATED POPULATION

Source: U.S. Census Bureau ACS 2010-2023 5-Year Estimates



Educational Attainment

Educational attainment rates for Mission Hills residents are shown in Figure 3.5 below. Almost 90% of the population has a bachelor’s degree or higher. This statistic far exceeds the overall educational rates for the State of Kansas and Kansas City Metros, which are estimated to be 35.2% and 39.2% respectively.



Over half of the population has a post-graduate degree in Mission Hills.




FIGURE 3.5 // EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT

Source: U.S. Census Bureau ACS 2023 5-Year Estimates

Chapter 3:

Community Profile

Household Composition

There are approximately 1,286 occupied residential units in Mission Hills today. Of these, there are an estimated 1,099 families residing in the community. Families, as defined by the U.S. Census Bureau, include a group of two or more people related by birth, marriage, or adoption, and residing together. Figure 3.6 presents household composition trends in Mission Hills. Most of the community is comprised of two-person households (47%), closely followed by three and four person households (39.4%). All households in Mission Hills are owner-occupied and there are no rental homes in the community.



Average Household Size:

2.77 persons



Average Family Size:

3.02 persons




FIGURE 3.6 // HOUSEHOLD SIZES IN MISSION HILLS

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau ACS 2023 5-Year Estimates



Per Capita Income

Per capita income is the average earnings per person per year in a geographic location. In the case of Mission Hills, the per capita income is estimated to be \$244,630 by the U.S. Census Bureau.

Median household income differs from per capita estimates as it sorts all the household incomes for an area and identifies the mid-point estimate. This is a common figure used to better understand earnings and income to home value ratios in a community. The U.S. Census Bureau caps this estimate at \$250,000 and does not provide insight to households with higher median household incomes beyond that. Mission Hills' median household income is \$250,000+ according to the U.S. Census Bureau.




FIGURE 3.7 // PER CAPITA + MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOMES
Source: U.S. Census Bureau ACS 2023 5-Year Estimates

Home Values

Figure 3.8 illustrates home value data for Mission Hills categorized by owners with and without a mortgage. Most homes in the community are valued at or above \$1 million. The median home value for homeowners with a mortgage is \$1,137,600 and homeowners without a mortgage is \$1,469,400. The 3.3% of properties that are valued at \$50K-\$100K could be assumed to be the vacant properties in Mission Hills today.




FIGURE 3.8 // HOME VALUES BY MORTGAGE STATUS
Source: U.S. Census Bureau ACS 2023 5-Year Estimates

Chapter 3:

Community Profile

Commuter Trends

Utilizing U.S. Census Bureau OnTheMap data, a summary of commuter trends was completed to understand where and how far residents are commuting to for work. These datasets are summarized below:




FIGURE 3.9 // COMMUTER FLOW

Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics, LEHD 2022 OnTheMap

Inflow + Outflow Trends

Most residents commute to:

- Kansas City, Missouri and Kansas
- Overland Park
- Prairie Village
- Lenexa
- Leawood

**This data does not account for work-from-home data.*

Outflow (1,654)

Top industries for residents are:

- Healthcare and Social Assistance;
- Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services;
- Finance and Insurance;
- Accommodations and Food Services; and
- Educational Services

Inflow (617)

Top industries for workers are:

- Arts, Entertainment, and Recreation;
- Other Services;
- Finance and Insurance;
- Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services; and
- Wholesale Trade



This page intentionally left blank.

Chapter 3:

Community Profile

The Place

Mission Hills was incorporated in 1949, developed by J.C. Nichols as a community that reflected the City Beautiful and Garden City Movements in design. While the community officially became incorporated in 1949, residential development had been taking place since the early 1910s, establishing the land and community that would later become Mission Hills.

City limits are generally bounded by State Line Road to the east, W 71st Street to the south, Mission Road to the west, and the Kansas City and Mission Hills Country Clubs to the north. Nearby communities include Prairie Village, Fairway, Mission Woods, and Westwood. Due to existing city limits from these adjacent communities and the Kansas/Missouri state line, Mission Hills is a land locked community with little to no opportunity to expand its limits.






FIGURE 3.10 // EXISTING LAND USE MAP

Chapter 3:

Community Profile

Existing Land Use

The map shown in Figure 3.12 presents the existing land uses in Mission Hills today. These land uses differ from the zoning map and demonstrate actual uses of each parcel, rather than the uses permitted by its zoning designation.

Some key themes found from the existing land use map include:

- The vast majority of land in Mission Hills is developed for residential uses. There are a variety of lot sizes, range of ages of homes, and other factors that create distinct neighborhoods and a sense of place.
- Public/Semi-Public land is primarily utilized by a faith-based organization or the City of Mission Hills. These are located throughout the community but mainly stay near the edges of city limits.
- There are three country clubs that offer private access to golf courses and green spaces. There are a number of city-owned and operated parks throughout the community that are generally neighborhood or pocket-sized parks and offer a mix of active and passive amenity spaces.
- There are some instances of vacant land present today that reflect greenfield lots located throughout Mission Hills. In the case of vacant, not buildable parcels, these lots are too small to develop a single-family home per Mission Hills zoning regulations and open space standards.




FIGURE 3.11 // EXISTING LAND USE SHARES




FIGURE 3.12 // EXISTING LAND USE MAP

Residential Year Built

The map in Figure 3.13 details the year built for homes in Mission Hills drawn from Johnson County parcel data. This map, coupled with the timeline of Mission Hills on page 16 and 17, highlights the development patterns of the community with older homes located north of W 63rd Street and the final subdivision located east of Belinder Avenue. The oldest home in Mission Hills was constructed in 1890. This map also illustrates instances of recent lot redevelopment with the lighter pink parcels.

LEGEND

-  City Limits
-  Before 1899
-  1900-1909
-  1910-1919
-  1920-1929
-  1930-1939
-  1940-1939
-  1950-1959
-  1960-1969
-  1970-1979
-  1980-1989
-  1990-1999
-  2000-2009
-  2010-2019
-  2020-2024




FIGURE 3.13 // RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT 1970-PRESENT DAY BY DECADE

Residential Lot Sizes (Acres)

Figure 3.14 presents the residential parcels in Mission Hills categorized by lot sizes in acres. This map illustrates a number of findings:

- Older homes are more often located on 'estate' sized lots that are greater than 1 acre in size.
- Newer developments have smaller lot sizes in comparison but still remain larger than much of the Metro.
- The southeast portion of the community, and most recently developed subdivision, has the smallest lot sizes.




FIGURE 3.14 // GROWTH CONSTRAINTS AND MAJOR ROADWAYS MAP

Chapter 3:

Community Profile

Existing Parks, Country Clubs, and Parklets

Figure 3.15 and Table 3.1 below highlight the size, location, and ownership of existing parks, country clubs, and parklets located throughout Mission Hills. The country clubs are private and require a membership to utilize the facilities. The parks and parklets are publicly owned and accessible to residents and visitors.

Chapter 7: Parks and Open Space presents additional detail and analysis on the level of service for parks and parklets in the community.

Parks + Open Space Name	Map Label	Classification	Ownership
Mission Hills Country Club	A	Country Club	Private
Kansas City Country Club	B	Country Club	Private
Indian Hills Country Club	C	Country Club	Private
Sunken Garden	D	Parks + Recreation	Public
Verona Columns Park	E	Parks + Recreation	Public
Eisenhower Pond	F	Parks + Recreation	Public
City Hall Park Space	G	Parks + Recreation	Public
Hiawasse Park	H	Parks + Recreation	Public
Peetwood Park	I	Parks + Recreation	Public

TABLE 3.1 // EXISTING PARKS AND OPEN SPACE DETAILS




FIGURE 3.15 // EXISTING PARKS AND OPEN SPACE SYSTEM IN MISSION HILLS

Chapter 3:

Community Profile

Natural Features

Figure 3.16 presents the key natural features in Mission Hills today. Natural features include floodplains, streams, and waterbodies and often serve as aesthetic components for the community. These features are critical to inventory to continue to proactively preserve and buffer from future development.

The 100-year floodplain (shown in the light blue hatch) and floodway (shown in the dark blue hatch) span the perimeters of the Mission Hills and Kansas City Country Clubs and into some residential areas along Indian Lane. The areas shown in purple represent the future floodplain designation from Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). These areas have been identified as potential floodplain locations depending on impacts from adjacent development patterns.

Brush Creek, shown in blue, is the primary creek that follows the path of the floodplain. The creek is known for providing scenic views for residents walking throughout the community and the properties that back up to the stream.

Higher sloped areas are shown in light green, yellow, and orange. These areas are at risk for soil erosion and should continue to be monitored to ensure these areas are preserved.






FIGURE 3.16 // KEY NATURAL FEATURES IN MISSION HILLS

Chapter 4. Public Input Summary





Public and Stakeholder Engagement Summary

Phase Two in the planning process for the Mission Hills Comprehensive Plan included public engagement opportunities. This chapter summarizes input received during this phase, with each engagement activity type summarized on the following pages, concluding with the major themes and takeaways.

Public engagement is a critical component of the planning process. The key goals, policies, and future considerations recommended in the core chapters are a reflection of the existing conditions analysis and public input received during this process. Consistent themes and ideas heard from the public helped shape specific recommendations for implementation of the Comprehensive Plan.

Engagement Activities

There were two key engagement milestones that influenced the recommendations in the Mission Hills Comprehensive Plan update.

Prior to the Comprehensive Plan, the City completed a statistically-valid resident survey in 2023. Due to the timing and relevance of input, the feedback from this survey has been included in this chapter.

The Public Visioning Workshop was the primary engagement event in the plan update process. The engagement activity results from this event are summarized herein.



2023 RESIDENT SURVEY



PUBLIC + STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

FIGURE 4.1 // COMPREHENSIVE PLAN PHASES



Chapter 4:

Public Input Summary

2023 Resident Survey

The City of Mission Hills hired Wiese Research Group (WRG) in 2023 to complete a community-wide survey with residents to gauge their use of city services and programs, assess general satisfaction in several areas, measure residents' likelihood to attend various events, as well as obtain feedback on issues currently under consideration (i.e., additional sidewalks, home solar equipment guidelines).

A full summary report of the findings is provided as an appendix to this Plan. Sample characteristics are presented on the following pages to illustrate key findings from the Resident Survey. Additional key findings are presented on the following pages as well.

What is a statistically-valid survey?

A statistically valid survey accurately reflects the opinions or behaviors of the target population. These surveys contain several key factors that ensure the numbers collected reliably speak for the entire group of interest. This is achieved through having a representative sample size, accurate data collection, avoiding bias, and appropriate survey design.

“Each resident was equally likely to receive the survey, and the returned surveys came from all areas of Mission Hills’ community. Residents were given the option to either mail in the survey or take the survey online.”

- Wiese Research Group, 2023

All data was collected from October to November 2023. 476 surveys were returned, and the statistically-valid survey provides Mission Hills with a 95% level of confidence that the views in this survey are reflective of the city as a whole.



What were key characteristics of the 2023 Resident Survey participants?

Participation by Neighborhood

- 33%** Tomahawk Road HA
- 25%** Mission Hills HC
- 32%** Indian Hills HA
- 9%** Do Not Know
- 1%** None of the Above



Of respondents do not have children in the household.



Of respondents are a two-person household.



Of respondents have lived in Mission Hills for 20 or more years.

Chapter 4:

Public Input Summary

Resident Survey Responses Continued

Question: What are the main reasons people choose Mission Hills?

Residents stated that location/convenience was the main reason they choose to live in Mission Hills. Attractive/beautiful, safety/security/low crime, and schools were other top responses to this question. Other reasons respondents provided were related to the aesthetic of the city, including trees, landscaping, and a clean/maintained community.




FIGURE 4.2 // REASON TO LIVE IN MISSION HILLS

Source: Resident Survey, 2023



Resident Survey Responses Continued

Gap Analysis: Importance of factor when deciding where to live vs. Mission Hills rating

The gap analysis compares what residents value as being important when deciding where to live to Mission Hills’ ratings on those same attributes. When considering the “gaps” between the two scores, it is typical to focus on the factors of relatively greater importance, particularly if that is an area where residents are less satisfied with Mission Hills as a place to live.

For most of the factors evaluated, Mission Hills already possesses perceived strengths when compared to the corresponding importance score. When comparing the scores, there were two instances where the importance rating was higher than the rating respondents gave to Mission Hills; this implies that there are opportunities for improvement for the safety and walkability of the community.




FIGURE 4.3 // IMPORTANT FACTOR GAP ANALYSIS

Source: Resident Survey, 2023

Chapter 4:

Public Input Summary

Resident Survey Responses Continued

Volunteered items/issues where Mission Hills should focus additional resources & efforts in the future

This question was asked directly following the questions regarding respondents' opinions on sidewalks and city walkability, which might have inflated the frequency of sidewalks being mentioned in these responses. Other suggestions respondents provided frequently were related to safety/security and beautification/maintenance.




FIGURE 4.4 // AREAS TO FOCUS FUTURE RESOURCES & EFFORTS

Source: Resident Survey, 2023



Resident Survey Responses Continued

Current sidewalk status & opinion on adding new sidewalks to make Mission Hills more walkable

A majority of the respondents live in areas where at least some streets do not have sidewalks. Nearly 8 in 10 residents were in favor of making Mission Hills more walkable if this meant installing sidewalks in neighborhoods where there are none currently. Responses favoring the addition of sidewalks clearly outnumber the opposition across all these segments to a meaningful degree.




FIGURE 4.5 // SIDEWALK STATUS

Source: Resident Survey, 2023




FIGURE 4.6 // OPINIONS ON ADDING NEW SIDEWALKS

Source: Resident Survey, 2023

Chapter 4:

Public Input Summary

Public Visioning Workshop

On March 27, 2025, a Public Visioning Workshop was held to allow for members of the community to better familiarize themselves with the plan and provide input on the community vision. In total there were roughly 50 participants in attendance that provided input on the future of Mission Hills.

A summary of the workshop's components and agenda are summarized to the right. A summary of the input received at the Public Visioning Workshop is provided on the following pages.



About the Workshop

The Public Visioning Workshop was an in-person event that allowed residents to learn more about the plan update and provide input on a variety of topics. The event agenda included:

- A presentation that reviewed the project scope and schedule, overview of existing conditions, and ended with live-polling visioning questions using Mentimeter.
- Existing conditions summary boards were located around the room for residents to review.
- A series of dot voting exercises were available to gather sentiment on a variety of prompts and topics for consideration.
- A mapping activity for the community and church subarea were available to provide specific ideas for connections, land uses, and improvements.



Visioning Questions

During the presentation at the Public Visioning Workshop, a series of visioning questions were asked to the audience. Attendees were able to type in and submit their responses via Mentimeter, a live-polling platform. A summary of the responses received by question are included on the following pages.

What is one word you would use to describe Mission Hills?

The first question tasked participants with describing Mission Hills in one word. A word cloud of responses submitted was generated in real-time. The larger the word, the more often it was submitted as a response in the image shown below.

Survey responses identified several positive descriptors of Mission Hills. The most frequently cited word was “beautiful.” Residents often described their community with pride and praised the community’s atmosphere.



FIGURE 4.7 // VISIONING QUESTIONS - “DESCRIBE MISSION HILLS IN ONE WORD.”

How long have you lived in Mission Hills?



Of respondents have lived in Mission Hills for 25 years or more.

Chapter 4:

Public Input Summary

What has been the best change you have seen in Mission Hills in the last five years?

A larger box indicates that the respondents mentioned this topic more than others. Responses were relatively evenly split between the top five topics. The top two mentioned were an appreciation for the changes to safety and security and attention to trees.



FIGURE 4.8 // VISIONING QUESTIONS - "WHAT HAS BEEN THE BEST CHANGE YOU HAVE SEEN IN MISSION HILLS IN THE LAST FIVE YEARS?"



What, if any, are mobility (walking, biking, driving) related issues and opportunities in Mission Hills?

Some of the common themes in the answers relating to “Sidewalks” included there being a lack of sidewalks along Tomahawk and 63rd Street, not wanting to trade tree canopy for sidewalks, and a need for safer routes for pedestrians and bikes.




FIGURE 4.9 // VISIONING QUESTIONS - “WHAT, IF ANY, ARE MOBILITY (WALKING, BIKING, DRIVING) RELATED ISSUES AND OPPORTUNITIES IN MISSION HILLS?”

What, if any, are housing related issues and opportunities in Mission Hills?

Some common themes in answers relating to ARB included that it is needed to maintain character but is difficult to work with greenspace requirements. Many people mentioned greenspace requirements being too restrictive.




FIGURE 4.10 // VISIONING QUESTIONS - “WHAT, IF ANY, ARE HOUSING RELATED ISSUES AND OPPORTUNITIES IN MISSION HILLS?”

Chapter 4:

Public Input Summary

Have you been involved with a water/flooding issue on your property? If so was it resolved?

Most participants have not had an issue with water/flooding. Of those who did have an issue with water/flooding, many respondents say the issue has since been resolved.




FIGURE 4.11 // VISIONING QUESTIONS - "HAVE YOU BEEN INVOLVED WITH A WATER/FLOODING ISSUE ON YOUR PROPERTY? IF SO WAS IT RESOLVED?"

What would be an appropriate use for the former First Lutheran Church property located at the southwest corner of State Line Road and Tomahawk Road?

A larger box indicates that the respondents mentioned this topic more than others. The majority of participants would like to see the space become a park/green space. There was also a healthy amount of responses for the space to become a community center or café or restaurant.




FIGURE 4.12 // VISIONING QUESTIONS - "WHAT WOULD BE AN APPROPRIATE USE FOR THE FORMER FIRST LUTHERAN CHURCH PROPERTY LOCATED AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF STATE LINE ROAD AND TOMAHAWK ROAD?"

***Note: There will be a future process for the church property to gather more formal/detailed feedback from residents.**



Image Voting

At the Public Visioning Workshop, participants were asked to indicate their preferences by voting for their preferred images within two categories: Parks and Open Space and Streetscaping. The following pages show the key takeaways from this activity, and both the most and least preferred options from each category.

IMAGE VOTING

PARKS + OPEN SPACE

Please place a GREEN dot on the amenity or feature Mission Hills should prioritize and a RED dot on the amenity or feature that is a lower priority.

PICKLEBALL COURT SMALL PAVILION WITH PICNIC TABLES COMMUNITY GARDEN + PROGRAMMING

INCLUSIVE PLAYGROUND NEIGHBORHOOD TRAILS + SHARED USE PATHS NEIGHBORHOOD PARK

INTERACTIVE ART PLAYGROUND SPRAY GROUND POCKET PARK

NATURAL PLAYGROUND SMALL PLAYGROUND ADULT RECREATION PROGRAMS

PASSIVE OPEN SPACE FITNESS OBSTACLE COURSE PARK GAZEBO

MISSION HILLS LANDS PUBLIC WORKSHOP CONFLUENCE

IMAGE VOTING

STREETSCAPING

Please place a GREEN dot on the amenity or feature Mission Hills should prioritize and a RED dot on the amenity or feature that is a lower priority.

PEDESTRIAN-SCALE STREET LIGHTING ORNAMENTAL PLANTER - LARGE MATURE STREET TREE CANOPY

DEFINED PEDESTRIAN CROSSINGS CITY ENTRY MONUMENT

INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS ORNAMENTAL PLANTER - STANDARD

PEDESTRIAN STREET LIGHTING WITH PLANTERS BENCH AND TRASH RECEPTACLE LARGE CITY ENTRY MONUMENT

STREET + PEDESTRIAN LIGHTING WITH BANNER SIGNAGE CORNER TREATMENTS (SIGNAGE, PLANTING, LIGHTING) DEDICATED PEDESTRIAN CROSSINGS

MISSION HILLS LANDS PUBLIC WORKSHOP CONFLUENCE

FIGURE 4.13 // IMAGE VOTING BOARD RESULTS FROM THE PUBLIC VISIONING WORKSHOP

Chapter 4:

Public Input Summary

Parks + Open Space

- **Strong** support for pocket parks and neighborhood trails and shared use paths.
- **Mixed** support for community garden + programming, inclusive playground, natural playground, and neighborhood parks.
- **Dislike** for pickleball courts, pavilions with picnic tables, spray grounds, obstacle courses, park gazebos, and interactive art playgrounds.

Most Preferred Improvement Types from Dot Voting



POCKET PARK



NEIGHBORHOOD TRAILS + SHARED USE PATHS

Least Preferred Improvement Types from Dot Voting



PICKLEBALL COURT



FITNESS OBSTACLE COURSE



PICKLEBALL COURT



SMALL PAVILION WITH PICNIC TABLES



COMMUNITY GARDEN + PROGRAMMING



INCLUSIVE PLAYGROUND



NEIGHBORHOOD TRAILS + SHARED USE PATHS



NEIGHBORHOOD PARK



INTERACTIVE ART PLAYGROUND



SPRAY GROUND



POCKET PARK



NATURAL PLAYGROUND



SMALL PLAYGROUND




ADULT RECREATION PROGRAMS



PASSIVE OPEN SPACE



FITNESS OBSTACLE COURSE



PARK GAZEBO

FIGURE 4.14 // IMAGE VOTING BOARD FOR PARKS + OPEN SPACES

Chapter 4:

Public Input Summary

Streetscaping

- **Strong** support for pedestrian-scale lighting, mature street tree canopy, defined pedestrian crossings, corner treatments, and dedicated pedestrian crossings.
- **Dislike** for ornamental planters, large city entry monument sign, pedestrian street lighting with planters, and street + pedestrian lighting with banner signage.

Most Preferred Improvement Types from Dot Voting



DEDICATED PEDESTRIAN CROSSINGS



MATURE STREET TREE CANOPY

Least Preferred Improvement Types from Dot Voting



LARGE CITY ENTRY MONUMENT



PEDESTRIAN STREET LIGHTING WITH PLANTERS (RIGHT) AND STREET AND PEDESTRIAN LIGHTING WITH BANNER SIGNAGE (LEFT)





PEDESTRIAN-SCALE STREET LIGHTING




ORNAMENTAL PLANTER - LARGE



MATURE STREET TREE CANOPY



PEDESTRIAN STREET LIGHTING WITH PLANTERS



DEFINED PEDESTRIAN CROSSINGS



CITY ENTRY MONUMENT



INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS




ORNAMENTAL PLANTER - STANDARD



STREET + PEDESTRIAN LIGHTING WITH BANNER SIGNAGE



BENCH AND TRASH RECEPTACLE



LARGE CITY ENTRY MONUMENT



CORNER TREATMENTS (SIGNAGE, PLANTING, LIGHTING)



DEDICATED PEDESTRIAN CROSSINGS

FIGURE 4.15 // IMAGE VOTING BOARD FOR STREETScape

Chapter 4:

Public Input Summary

Preference Scales

Participants were asked to place a dot along a scale for statements relating to several future improvement options in Mission Hills to help determine where future efforts should be focused. These results are presented to the right and on the opposite page.


Generally, there were **strong levels of agreement** on the following improvements:

- Prioritizing investments in new public parks and open spaces.
- Strengthening initiatives to maintain and expand the tree canopy.
- Evaluating opportunities to expand the sidewalk network and enhance safety for children and pedestrians.
- Opportunities to recognize historically significant properties in the community.

The responses were **less supportive or had mixed responses** on:

- Adopting guidelines to regulate and permit accessory solar panels on the front of residential units.
- Allowing Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU) with some reasonable rules and regulations.
- Providing recognition to historically significant properties.

Most Preferred



Least Preferred





FIGURE 4.16 // PREFERENCE SCALE BOARD RESULTS

Chapter 4:

Public Input Summary

Mapping Activity

The last activity available at the Public Visioning Workshop was the mapping activity. This activity allowed participants to place map markers, pinpoint troubles, add comments and draw potential pedestrian connections throughout and around city limits. The available map markers are presented to the right.

This activity is helpful with hosting round table discussions with residents to understand challenges and opportunities for improvements.

Participants helped to identify:

- A series of intersection improvements
- Opportunities for gateway signage/city monument signage at State Line Road/63rd Street, Mission Road/63rd Street, or Indian Lane/63rd Street
- Streetscaping needs were identified along Indian Lane
- Pedestrian connections identified along Indian Lane

High priority intersections for improvements were identified at:

- Belinder Ave + 63rd Street
- Mission Drive + Brookwood Road
- Mission Drive + 63rd Street
- Tomahawk Road + Mission Drive

Mapping Activity Icons



GATEWAY

Use this icon to indicate key places for gateway signage to welcome people into the community. Key intersections and roadways are typical locations



HIDDEN TREASURE

Use this icon to showcase the hidden treasures throughout the community. These could be scenic viewpoints, local establishments, parks, etc.



STREETSCAPE IMPROVEMENTS

Use this icon to identify roadways that are in need of streetscape improvements. These improvements could range from sidewalk expansions, planters, signage, street trees, and more.



WAYFINDING

Use this icon to locate roadways and points for the placement of wayfinding signage. Wayfinding signage is used to direct visitors to key features and amenities throughout the community.



INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS

Use this icon to identify intersections in need of safety improvements. Use RED to represent a high priority intersection. Use YELLOW to represent a moderate priority intersection. Use GREEN to represent a low priority intersection.



YELLOW YARN

Use the yellow yarn to pin down routes and connections for new trail and sidewalks within the community.



RED YARN

Use the red yarn to pin down roads that need improvement within the community.




FIGURE 4.17 // MAPPING ACTIVITY RESULTS BY RESIDENTS - CITY-WIDE

Chapter 4:

Public Input Summary

Church Subarea Mapping Activity

This mapping activity explored opportunities to reuse or modify the former First Lutheran Church property located at the southwest corner of State Line Road and Tomahawk Road. The City of Mission Hills recently purchased this property and is interested in beginning high-level, preliminary conversations on the parcel. The opportunity was available to include this location as part of the conversation at the Workshop and participants helped provide suggestions and ideas that are later referenced in **Chapter 5: Future Land Use**.

Participants identified the following items and ideas for improvements:

- Opportunities for gateway signage/ city monument signage along State Line Road between West 63rd Street and West 64th Street
- Streetscaping needs were identified along West 63rd Street west of Mission Drive
- High priority intersection improvements marked at Tomahawk Road + Willow Lane
- Suggestions were made to turn the current City Hall into a community building or library, and to turn the former First Lutheran Church into a City Hall administration building or new homes/lots



FIGURE 4.18 // FIRST LUTHERAN CHURCH PROPERTY



FIGURE 4.19 // MAPPING ACTIVITY RESULTS – CHURCH SITE

Chapter 4:

Public Input Summary

Key Themes for the Comprehensive Plan

Based upon a review of all the feedback received from the resident survey and Public Visioning Workshop, a series of key themes have been identified.

The three major themes include:

- Community Identity
- Quality of Life
- Safety

These major themes paired with the findings from the Existing Conditions Summary Report, will be leveraged to develop the goals, policies, and future considerations of the Mission Hills Comprehensive Plan.



COMMUNITY IDENTITY

- Tree maintenance and replacement
- Preservation of housing character
- Adaptability and modernization of homes
- Community signage
- Streetscaping



QUALITY OF LIFE

- New sidewalks and trail connections
- Open space and art, statuary, and fountain maintenance
- Park and recreation improvements
- Church site use and improvements




SAFETY

- Sidewalks and trail crossings
- Pedestrian and bike safety
- Flooding



This page intentionally left blank.

Chapter 5. Future Land Use





Chapter Overview

Chapter 5. Future Land Use serves as a critical component to the Mission Hills Comprehensive Plan. State statutes enable communities to plan for their futures in the form of Comprehensive Plans and Future Land Use Plans. This chapter and its contents set the stage for the remaining core chapters of the Plan and provides recommendations for the City to follow related to growth, redevelopment, and emerging trends to be aware of for decision-making.

The chapter's main topics are illustrated in Figure 5.1 to the right. These main topics are further explored in the following pages and will be referenced throughout the rest of the plan.

Legal Basis for the Future Land Use Plan

The intent of **Chapter 5. Future Land Use** is primarily to provide a guide for land uses and related decision-making processes in Mission Hills. Any future development or redevelopment should take existing land uses, presence of natural and/or sensitive features, and accessibility factors into consideration.

See Kansas Statutes, Chapter 12 - Cities and Municipalities, Article 7 - Planning and Zoning (K.S.A. 12-741 through 12-775) for the full detail and context of the state enabling statutes related to comprehensive plans, Future Land Use Plans, and zoning codes.



FIGURE 5.1 // MAIN CHAPTER TOPICS

Chapter 5:

Future Land Use

Existing Land Use

The map shown in Figure 5.3 presents the existing land uses in Mission Hills today. These land uses differ from the zoning map and demonstrate actual uses of each parcel, rather than the uses permitted by its zoning designation.

Some key themes found from the existing land use map include:

- The vast majority of land in Mission Hills is developed as residential. There are a variety of lot sizes, range of ages of homes, and other similar factors that establish a unique built environment.
- Public/Semi-Public land is primarily utilized by a faith-based organization or the City of Mission Hills.
- There are three country clubs that offer private access to golf courses and green spaces. There are a number of city-owned and operated parks throughout the community that are generally neighborhood or pocket-sized parks and offer a mix of active and passive amenity spaces. [Chapter 7: Parks and Open Space](#) discusses the parks system and level of service in greater detail.
- There are some instances of vacant land present today that reflect greenfield lots located throughout Mission Hills. In the case of vacant, not buildable parcels, these lots are too small to develop a single-family home per Mission Hills zoning regulations and open space standards.




FIGURE 5.2 // EXISTING LAND USE SHARES




FIGURE 5.3 // EXISTING LAND USE MAP

Chapter 5:

Future Land Use

Key Considerations

Several key considerations influenced the Mission Hills Future Land Use Plan and the chapter's recommendations. These key considerations were identified through the existing conditions analysis and input from residents and the Steering Committee.

These key considerations include:

- Floodplain and sensitive natural features
- Residential redevelopments
- Growth constraints and major roadways
- Church subarea opportunities

Each consideration is presented and highlighted on the following pages.



Floodplain + Sensitive Natural Areas

The map in Figure 5.4 presents the floodplain and sensitive natural features found within city limits. Brush Creek is the primary stream found throughout Mission Hills, flowing along the northwestern bounds of the city, through Mission Hills and Kansas City Country Clubs and some residential areas. The floodplain extends beyond the Brush Creek stream alignment and includes a 100-year floodplain and “future floodplain” designation should development occur in these locations. The areas shown in light yellow, orange, and red highlight steep slopes, which are a concern for development or soil erosion.

These sensitive features are worth consideration for any future development or redevelopment practices in Mission Hills in order to preserve the natural scenery, stream health, and the protection of property. Any negative impacts, such as soil erosion or stream degradation, can cause a ripple effect throughout the community.




FIGURE 5.4 // FLOODPLAIN AND SENSITIVE NATURAL FEATURES MAP

Residential Development Patterns

Figure 5.5 presents residential development patterns throughout Mission Hills from 1970 through 2024 utilizing Johnson County parcel data. In **Chapter 3. Community Profile**, year built residential data identifies older homes in the Mission Hills Homes Company area, followed by Indian Hills Homes Association, and newer homes built in the Tomahawk Road Homes Association area. This map helps to identify areas where residential redevelopment has taken place in recent decades. The 1970 start decade was chosen due to the time period the homes in the Tomahawk Road Homes Association were completed. These trends were identified as a key consideration because of their impact on land and sensitive areas, and built character throughout Mission Hills. Due to this the Future Land Use Plan, in combination with the Design Guidelines, will remain a critical component to decision-making related to residential redevelopment throughout Mission Hills.




FIGURE 5.5 // RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT 1970-PRESENT DAY BY DECADE

Growth Constraints + Major Roadways

Major roadways also play a part in the Future Land Use Plan for their impacts on access, gateways, and redevelopment in Mission Hills. The key roadways in Mission Hills include W 63rd Street, State Line Road, Mission Drive, Mission Road, Belinder Avenue, Tomahawk Road, and Indian Lane. Over the years, there have been many roadway improvement projects taken on by the City to help increase safety and road conditions in Mission Hills. In some instances, added mobility facilities, such as sidewalks, were constructed. These efforts and their impacts are further discussed in *Chapter 8. Transportation, Mobility, and Streetscapes.*




FIGURE 5.6 // GROWTH CONSTRAINTS AND MAJOR ROADWAYS MAP

Chapter 5:

Future Land Use

Church Subarea Overview

The First Lutheran Church, “church subarea,” is located at the corner of State Line Road and Tomahawk Road, directly south of Mission Hills City Hall. During the writing phase of this plan, the City of Mission Hills completed a purchase agreement for the property. This marks a significant point in time for the community as an opportunity for redevelopment and visioning within the city. This church subarea was included as part of this planning process to note this significant point in time in the community’s development and progress; however, the findings within this section should be viewed as high-level observations by the consultant team and residents. Additional surveying, both of the site and residents, needs to be considered as the future of this property is explored.

6400 Taskforce

During the process of completing the Comprehensive Plan update, the City formed the 6400 Taskforce to assist with recommending next steps for the parcel where the First Lutheran Church is located. The intent of this taskforce is to explore options for potential use of the parcel, receive rough estimates of cost and provide recommendations to city officials.

Site Analysis

Figure 5.7 presents a high-level site map that details some of the existing conditions in and around the church subarea. Some observations include:

- The parcel is roughly 2.1 acres in size and located at a major node of activity along State Line Road and Tomahawk Road. This is a critical node that serves as a gateway into Mission Hills.
- Mission Hills City Hall is located directly north of the parcel. The City Hall parcel has a large open lawn on its eastern half and a small playground south of the City Hall structure. Both of these spaces offer active and passive recreation spaces for residents.
- The church structure (shown in blue) is located on the northeast corner of the parcel, with a paved parking lot (shown in grey) on the southwest half.
- The light blue shaded area illustrates the FEMA designated ‘future floodplain’ land. This designation will limit the amount of buildable area on the parcel; however, it will also offer opportunities for natural spaces or retained parking that are resilient to potential flood risks.
- The light green paths designate sidewalk alignments on and around the church subarea. The sidewalk along State Line Road terminates on the church property as it exits Mission Hills city limits. There are sidewalks on the property that connect to Tomahawk Road and City Hall property and beyond.
- There is a significant tree buffer between the current church structure and the adjacent residential neighborhood.



FIGURE 5.7 // CHURCH SUBAREA OPPORTUNITIES MAP

Chapter 5:

Future Land Use


Future Land Use Categories

The Future Land Use Plan utilizes a series of land use categories to guide development and redevelopment land use types throughout the community. These land use categories are defined and the corresponding compatible zoning districts are identified as well.

Residential

The Residential land use category is reserved for all residential properties within Mission Hills. These parcels are comprised of detached, single-family structures with lot sizes ranging from 16,000 to 87,120 square feet. Some accessory structures, such as noncommercial greenhouses/ garden storage buildings, garages and driveways, patios, pools, solar energy systems, retaining walls, and other features may be permitted on-site with approval from the City.


Compatible with the R-1 One-Family Dwelling zoning district and its corresponding subdistricts: R-1(10), R-1(16), R-1(20), R-1(25), R-1(30), R-1(E1), and R-1(E2).



Public/Semi-Public

The Public/Semi-Public land use category includes land owned or operated by a public or semi-public entity or institution. This could include city-owned properties, such as city hall. This land use category would also include any county-owned parcels. Institutional uses could include libraries, communication and utility facilities, places of worship, government offices, and civic centers.

Compatible with the C-1 Church and Public Building Use Regulations zoning district.






Parks and Open Space

The Parks and Open Space land use category is reserved for public recreational land such as parks, parklets, trails, greenways, and recreational fields.


Most compatible with the R-1 One-Family Dwelling zoning districts.



Country Club

The Country Club land use category is reserved for land developed as golf courses within city limits. These are privately owned developments that may include a golf course, club house, and other appropriate accessory uses and structures for amenities and operations.

Most compatible with the D-1 Golf Club zoning district.



Chapter 5:

Future Land Use

Future Land Use Plan

Figure 5.9 presents the Future Land Use Plan for Mission Hills and the corresponding land use shares as presented below in Figure 5.8. The Future Land Use Plan retains the residential dominant landscape present in Mission Hills today, with supplemental land uses in the form of country club, public/semi-public, and parks and open spaces located throughout the community.

Why a Future Land Use Plan is Important

This Future Land Use Plan is meant to be a guide for development-related decision-making within city limits; however, this Plan should remain flexible and adaptable to any major changes in growth or development.

As parcels redevelop, it will be important for the Planning Commission and City Council to consult this map to ensure that the proposed use reflects the desired development pattern found in Figure 5.9.



FIGURE 5.8 // FUTURE LAND USE SHARES




FIGURE 5.9 // FUTURE LAND USE PLAN

Chapter 5:

Future Land Use

Goals, Policies, and Future Considerations

To help implement the Future Land Use Plan and guide decision-making, a series of goals, policies, and future considerations have been created.

Goal

Goals are objectives or aims which may be broad or specific.

Policies

Policies represent on-going principles which the City should adhere to when approving new development or planning future investments.

Future Considerations

Future Considerations are specific steps and activities the City should consider.



Goal 5.1:

Follow best practices for all development and redevelopment projects throughout Mission Hills.

POLICIES

Policy 5.1.1: Maintain strong development practices via pre-development studies, analyses, and approval processes to ensure quality development practices.

Policy 5.1.2: Enforce the guidelines and procedures for all development and redevelopment projects to minimize impacts to adjacent properties and residents.

Policy 5.1.3: Any project that may impact or disturb the floodplain shall comply with the floodplain development requirements.

Policy 5.1.4: Preserve sensitive environmental areas throughout Mission Hills.

Policy 5.1.5: Redevelopment shall respect the common greenspace (trees, landscapes, and natural areas) found throughout the community.

Policy 5.1.6: Impacts to the stormwater system shall be minimized by redevelopment, as expressed in the Open Channel Master Plan and City Ordinances.

Policy 5.1.7: Continue to build on the original City Beautiful and Garden City Movement principles as community values.

FUTURE CONSIDERATIONS

Future Consideration 5.1.1: Continue to identify and implement any infrastructure projects needed to support effective capital improvements through the annually adopted 5-year Capital Improvement Plan.

Future Consideration 5.1.2: Continue to annually review the goals, policies, and future considerations of the Comprehensive Plan and consider updates and modifications as may be warranted due to changing community preferences and priorities.

Future Consideration 5.1.3: Continue to identify any necessary updates and amendments to the City's Zoning Regulations, Subdivision Regulations, and Design Guidelines to ensure the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan are being followed.

Goal 5.2:

Preserve the original community design philosophies and built character. *(Based on Goal 3 from the 2019 Comprehensive Plan)*

POLICIES

Policy 5.2.1: The design and redevelopment of property shall be reviewed and approved in accordance with city ordinances and the established Design Guidelines, and the impact and relationship of redevelopment on the site, the neighboring properties, and the neighborhood context shall be understood prior to approval by the Architectural Review Board.

Policy 5.2.2: Redevelopment should preserve and enhance the character and/or history of the individual neighborhood or community and shall be evaluated for its impact to the neighborhood and community context prior to approval.

Policy 5.2.3: Redevelopment that requires demolition of a principal building shall require an approved building or non-building plan prior to demolition approval.

Policy 5.2.4: A single architectural style should define a property and its principal and accessory structures, and accessory structures shall maintain or enhance the neighborhood pattern and character and complement the design of the principal structure.

Policy 5.2.5: The rules regarding building permit construction timeline limitations should continue to be enforced.

FUTURE CONSIDERATIONS

Future Consideration 5.2.1: Continue to reference the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan when evaluating and reviewing a redevelopment proposal as found in the ARB Factors (Code Section 5-147) and Findings (Code Section 5-146).

Future Consideration 5.2.2: Recommend the Planning Commission explore the City's Subdivision Regulations to limit or restrict the size of lot mergers and lot consolidations to respect the scale, design, and context of the neighboring properties.



Goal 5.3:

Evaluate the First Lutheran Church property's strengths, challenges, and opportunities for redevelopment and/or reuse.

POLICIES

Policy 5.3.1: Consider the input from residents of Mission Hills to help inform decision-making by the City.


FUTURE CONSIDERATIONS

Future Consideration 5.3.1: Complete a structural analysis of the building to inform future decisions.

Future Consideration 5.3.2: Evaluate opportunities for use of the property and what would best serve the community.

Future Consideration 5.3.3: Consider opportunities to fully master plan this site as part of a larger planning effort and serve as a formal document and guide for the future of this parcel.

Chapter 6. Community Identity





Chapter Overview

Chapter 6. Community Identity provides insight into the key components that define Mission Hills: the people, arts and culture, tree canopy, and architectural character. This section includes a brief summary and insight into each of these features and how this culminates to form the community's overall identity.

The People

There are nearly 4,000 people that call Mission Hills home today. These residents all join together to create community and intentionally plan events to gather and get to know one another.

Arts and Culture

J.C. Nichols was intentional in his use and placement of art, sculptures, and ornamental planters to create nodes of interest and culture throughout the community. This section highlights the locations and art placed throughout Mission Hills.

Tree Canopy

The mature tree canopy lines the neighborhood streets and is a major contributing factor in both shade and character of the area. This section provides insight into the inventory and best practices associated with urban reforestation for the long-term health of the tree canopy.

Architectural Character

This section builds on the summary of built history in Chapter 2: History of Mission Hills and presents the formal procedures and practices for retaining strong architectural characteristics in the city.



**THE
PEOPLE**



**ARTS AND
CULTURE**



**TREE
CANOPY**



**ARCHITECTURAL
CHARACTER**

FIGURE 6.1 // COMMUNITY IDENTITY CHAPTER TOPICS

Chapter 6:

Community Identity

Arts and Culture in Mission Hills

At the heart of Mission Hills' community character lies a commitment to arts and culture—a dedication visible in every piece of sculpture or art, gathering space, and fountain. These elements are expressions of the community's prioritization in maintaining J.C. Nichols' initial vision, connection, and timeless design. The city's collection of art, each uniquely positioned and meticulously designed, reflects the City Beautiful ideals: blending art, nature, and public life in harmony. Together, these features define not only the physical landscape but also the collective passion for quality design that shapes Mission Hills.



Sculptures + Art

There are approximately 22 pieces of art or sculpture located throughout the city today. These features are located on parklets in Mission Hills and vary from standalone marble sculptures to ornamental planters. These elements are essential in reflecting J.C. Nichols' vision to build a community that reflected the City Beautiful and Garden City Movements.



Community Gathering Space

There are eight gathering spaces currently available in Mission Hills, which are used for events and recreational activities by residents. These community spaces are the Verona Columns, Sunken Garden, the lawn in front of City Hall, Peetwood Park, Hiawasse Park, Belinder Court, and Colonial Court.



Fountains

As part of the Metropolitan Area known as "The City of Fountains," Mission Hills exemplifies this designation with nine fountains strategically positioned at prominent locations within the community. These fountains vary in scale and provide inviting spaces for relaxation within the city's parklets.




FIGURE 6.2 // ART, SCULPTURE, FOUNTAIN, AND FORMAL GATHERING SPACE LOCATIONS

Chapter 6:

Community Identity

Community Events + Programming

Community events and programming are a great way to instill a sense of place and community for residents. In Mission Hills, the Community Engagement Committee (CEC) coordinates events and programs throughout the city today. Photos from events in 2025 are presented on the opposite page.

Future Events in Mission Hills

Many times events start out as grass-roots efforts to garner interest and momentum from residents before becoming CEC events. Additionally, the HOAs throughout Mission Hills also offer their own neighborhood-organized events that supplement CEC events throughout the year. The events listed to the right are examples of previous events hosted by the CEC in Mission Hills.

To ensure events and programs offered by the City respond to the desires of the community, it is encouraged to maintain this grass-roots approach and organize events to create events around this. Since the HOAs offer their own events, finding gaps in event types and service age ranges would be beneficial.



**Concert in the Park
Annual Keim Street Fair**



Food Truck Pop-Ups



Diner à Verona



Fall Fest



**Annual Holiday
Tree Lighting**





SUNKEN GARDEN POP-UP



FALL FEST 2025



FALL FEST 2025



DINER À VERONA 2025



DINER À VERONA 2025



DINER À VERONA 2025



DINER À VERONA 2025

Chapter 6:

Community Identity

Mission Hills Tree Canopy

One of the most distinct characteristics of Mission Hills is its tree canopy. With data provided by the City of Mission Hills, an analysis of the City right-of-way tree inventory was completed. The inventory summarizes the number of trees, diameter at breast height, and condition to better understand the health of the tree canopy today and provides recommendations on maintenance and expansion through urban reforestation.

In Figure 6.3 below, the share of trees by homeowners associations (HOA) is shown. This graph demonstrates the fairly even spread of trees in each HOA, with the total counts within 100-200 of one another.

The following pages present a series of maps detailing tree maturity and condition.

~4,000 trees
on public property (right-of way, parks, and public spaces) in Mission Hills today.

**Note: The data used in this section utilizes 2025 data from the City of Mission Hills which only tracks the trees on public properties. This section does not account for private-property trees; however, all recommendations and best practices should be implemented when possible.*




FIGURE 6.3 // LOCATION OF TREES IN MISSION HILLS BY HOA (2025)

Diameter at Breast Height (DBH) Map

Diameter at breast height (DBH) utilizes tree diameters - typically 4 1/2 feet up from the ground plane - to standardize tree measurements and track tree growth rates and maturity.

The map in Figure 6.4 illustrates the DBH of public trees in Mission Hills today in graduated symbology to represent the small to large variation in diameter. This map shows where various clusterings of mature trees are located along Belinder Avenue, W 63rd Street, Indian Lane, portions of Tomahawk Road, and Brookwood Road. There are some more sparsely covered areas along more neighborhood streets, that should be considered for targeted tree plantings.




FIGURE 6.4 // DIAMETER AT BREAST HEIGHT (DBH) MAP

*The trees depicted on this map represent those in the public right-of-way and does not include any trees on private property.

Chapter 6:

Community Identity

Tree Canopy Condition Ratings Analysis

An analysis of tree canopy conditions in Mission Hills was conducted using data from the City's tree inventory in collaboration with the City Arborist. As shown in Figure 6.6 and the accompanying graph in Figure 6.5, most trees in the area received a rating of fair or better. Approximately 65%, or 2,607 trees, were classified as fair, indicating their status could change if health declines. The City continues to monitor these ratings to preserve the overall tree population in Mission Hills. Trees rated as poor are located throughout the community, rather than concentrated in a single area, which benefits the overall resilience of the tree canopy.

Tree Rating Descriptions

-  **Poor:** Major defects are evident. The tree may be in decline or present a structural hazard. Removal or substantial mitigation may be necessary. Trees in this category are on the City's schedule for removal.
-  **Fair:** Noticeable defects or moderate stress are present. The tree's health or structure may deteriorate if unaddressed. Corrective care or intervention is likely needed.
-  **Good:** Minor defects or stress symptoms may be present, but overall the tree part is healthy and structurally sound. Some minor maintenance or monitoring may be appropriate.
-  **Excellent:** The tree part displays no visible defects or stress. Health and structure are ideal, and no corrective action is needed.




FIGURE 6.5 // TREE CONDITION RATING GRAPH




FIGURE 6.6 // TREE CONDITION RATING MAP

*The trees depicted on this map represent those in the public right-of-way and does not include any trees on private property.

Chapter 6:

Community Identity

Mission Hills Tree Ordinance + Replacement Practices


[Chapter 5, Article 9: Tree Protections](#) provides protocols for tree replacements on private properties with active building permits located in Mission Hills. [Table 5-904.C](#) in the Code defines the replacement ratios based on the size and location of the original tree and specifies which trees require approval to remove. Before permits are issued for land disturbance, construction, or demolition, all trees designated for retention must be properly protected. Property owners are responsible for ensuring that protected trees are not removed or damaged without prior written authorization from the City Administrator, who may grant exceptions only with sufficient justification. If removal is authorized, replacement trees must meet specific size standards, be approved in location and species, and support the city's goal of expanding the tree canopy. These tree replacement standards are comparable to other communities similar to Mission Hills and highlight the City's efforts to maintain its tree canopy.

The City also has a variety of documents on its website that detail recommended tree varieties that would thrive in the Kansas City region. These documents detail over 100 types of tree varieties that would do well in Mission Hills with additional information on its drought tolerance, expected lifespan, mature height, and other factors. To further support tree replanting opportunities and general best practices, the City should continue to educate residents on the importance of caring for their private trees.

Best Practices + Recommendations

The City of Mission Hills has many competitive practices in place for preserving its tree canopy. Some additional best practices and recommendations include:

- Utilizing 10-20-30 Rule for tree replanting.
- Identify and implement a target percent for tree canopy growth.
- Emphasize quality over quantity with tree replanting initiatives.





10-20-30 Rule

The 10-20-30 Rule helps to ensure there is a diverse mix of trees throughout the community. Including a variety of tree species increases resiliency against disease or insects. The City of Mission Hills should consider formalizing this rule as part of its replanting process.




No more than **30%** of the tree canopy should be comprised of the same **tree family**

No more than **20%** of the tree canopy should be comprised of the same **tree genus**

No more than **10%** of the tree canopy should be comprised of the same **tree species**

Target Percent for Tree Canopy Growth

In order to continue expanding and preserving the tree canopy in Mission Hills, the City should identify and implement a target percent for tree canopy growth in public spaces. The example to the right shows one target percentage and year that could be considered.



Example: The Mission Hills tree canopy should increase by 5% (or 200 trees) by 2045 to have a total of roughly 4,200 trees in public spaces in the city.

Quality Over Quantity

The City of Mission Hills is adapting its tree management strategy to emphasize quality over quantity. In several areas, the canopy is overcrowded which contributes to structural problems, aesthetic concerns, and increased maintenance demands. Creating more space for existing trees to thrive is expected to reduce long-term maintenance needs, enhance structural soundness, and improve overall visual appeal. This approach supports a more resilient and sustainable urban forest.



Chapter 6:

Community Identity

Architectural Built Character

Mission Hills is well known for its tree-lined streets, various architectural building styles, and homes designed within the context of their lot and surroundings. As the community continues to experience pressure to construct home additions and replace older homes with newer structures, there is a risk the character and charm of the community may be lost. However, if homes cannot be updated to meet the changing needs and desires of families and future residents, the community is further at risk of not remaining a highly desirable place to live.

Architectural Review Board

The Architectural Review Board (ARB) plays an important role in maintaining the form and aesthetics of the Mission Hills community. The current Design Guidelines are very thorough; however some residents feel they are overly restrictive and limit the design options for additions and new builds. *(See Chapter 5, Goal 5.1 and Future Consideration 5.1.3.)*

Architectural Principles from the Comprehensive Plan

The ARB cannot approve a project unless the criterion identified in the zoning code have been met, including “the proposed structure conforms to the principles of the Comprehensive Plan.” The principles identified as part of the Mission Hills Comprehensive Plan update were created in coordination with resident input and the Steering Committee. These principles are included and considered as part of the approval process with the ARB.

What are the comprehensive plan’s principles for architectural character in Mission Hills?

Preserve the historic character of Mission Hills in a thoughtful manner.

Strike a balance between architectural design and character to allow the layout and function desired by new residents.

Consider the core principles of the City Beautiful and Garden City Movements to retain the identity of Mission Hills in the built environment.

Utilize previous plans and guidelines as a guide for decision-making related to architecture and redevelopment.



Mission Hills' Key Design Principles

Preserving and conserving open space areas.

Preserving and conserving natural features and the natural beauty of the Mission Hills landscape.

Incorporating and preserving the viability of development design, including street design, block lengths and widths, lot configurations, and lot siting, among others.

Maintaining sensitive design to walkways, public facilities and parks, and street appurtenances, e.g. lighting, street furniture, monuments, entrances, etc.

Maintaining and preserving existing greenbelt areas in the form of golf courses and/or open space areas.

Preserving and maintaining the pastoral and garden character of the area.

Maintaining the visual diversity of the area.


Maintaining and protecting the cultural and aesthetic artifacts incorporated in the original development, e.g. statuary, fountains, monuments, etc.

Preserving and maintaining the physical massing and scale of a neighborhood in terms of the proportional relationships between the size of a lot and the size of the principal building and other structures located on the lot, while allowing for reasonable expansion of existing structures on the lot or development or redevelopment of the lot.

Lot Mergers in Redevelopment Practices

Lot mergers within established residential development can have a significant negative impact on the community if not handled in an appropriate manner. When two lots are merged, the outcome can have an unintended impact on the surrounding properties. A lot that is significantly larger than the adjacent properties can often look out of character and may result in a home that is much larger than is typical of the area. In addition, a residential lot merger can result in a larger green space for the homeowner creating a potential appearance that is out of place along the street frontage when compared to the surrounding homes.

Following the adoption of the Mission Hills Comprehensive Plan update, it is recommended that the Planning Commission explore updates to the zoning code related to lot mergers. *(See Chapter 5, Goal 5.2, Future Consideration 5.2.2.)*



SEE PAGE 74 FOR A LARGER VERSION OF THE RESIDENTIAL REDEVELOPMENT MAP AND ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON THIS DATA.

THE PRINCIPLES NOTED ABOVE ARE PULLED DIRECTLY FROM THE 2020 MISSION HILLS DESIGN GUIDELINES AS OF AUGUST 2025. THIS DOCUMENT IS AVAILABLE FOR REFERENCE ON THE CITY'S WEBSITE.

Goal 6.1:

Maintain and expand the tree canopy and species diversity in Mission Hills.

POLICIES

Policy 6.1.1: Prioritize routine tree pruning throughout Mission Hills.

Policy 6.1.2: Maintain status as a Tree City USA city.

Policy 6.1.3: Continue to require an urban forestry license for tree work in Mission Hills.

FUTURE CONSIDERATIONS

Future Consideration 6.1.1: Continue to regularly evaluate tree conditions throughout Mission Hills.

Future Consideration 6.1.2: Continue to prioritize the quality of the tree canopy over the quantity of trees in the public tree inventory.

Future Consideration 6.1.3: Consider the development of an Urban Forest Management Plan to proactively be prepared in the event of major tree canopy loss.

Future Consideration 6.1.4: Consider formally adopting the 10-20-30 Rule for new trees on public property.



Goal 6.2:

Support arts, culture, and community events in Mission Hills.

POLICIES

Policy 6.2.1: Continue to support the Community Engagement Committee and their local events.

Policy 6.2.2: Retain a high-quality inventory of art and sculptural elements throughout the community.

Policy 6.2.3: Continue to support the Park Board and their efforts to maintain and enhance the beauty of the city.

FUTURE CONSIDERATIONS

Future Consideration 6.2.1: Explore opportunities to expand City-based events throughout the calendar year for residents of all ages.

Chapter 7. Parks and Open Space





Chapter Overview

Chapter 7. Parks and Open Space examines the current parks and open spaces in Mission Hills that provide both active and passive recreational opportunities to its residents. Recommendations for enhancing the level of service and preserving the floodplain and open space are provided in the following pages.

Current Parks + Open Space System

There are roughly 18 acres of public parkland in Mission Hills today, provided through a mix of neighborhood parks and parklets.

Level of Service


Level of service (LOS) is a measurement used to determine how well residents in a particular community are served based upon standards determined by the National Recreation and Parks Association (NRPA).

Preservation of Open Space

Brush Creek, the floodway, and 100-year floodplain contribute greatly to the lush greens and tree canopy found in Mission Hills today. This section explores these areas, best practices, and opportunities to preserve the scenic views.



**CURRENT PARKS
+ OPEN SPACE
SYSTEM**



**LEVEL OF
SERVICE**



**PRESERVATION
OF OPEN SPACE**

FIGURE 7.1 // PARKS AND OPEN SPACE CHAPTER TOPICS

Chapter 7:

Parks and Open Space

Existing Parks and Open Space System in Mission Hills

Figure 7.2 and Table 7.1 present the locations, types, and ownership statuses for parks and open spaces in Mission Hills today. The open spaces take the form of country clubs that span the perimeter of city limits to the northwest and southwest. Mission Hills, Kansas City, and Indian Hills Country Clubs all maintain member-only access and were excluded from the level of service analysis due to this. There are a number of neighborhood-scale parks throughout Mission Hills. Due to the way in which Mission Hills was designed, there are also a series of parklets located at key nodes and intersections throughout the community. Ranging in size, these parklets provide additional passive spaces for residents, with some parklets having benches or fountains.

Parks + Open Space Name	Map Label	Classification	Ownership
Mission Hills Country Club	A	Country Club	Private
Kansas City Country Club	B	Country Club	Private
Indian Hills Country Club	C	Country Club	Private
Sunken Garden	D	Parks + Recreation	Public
Verona Columns Park	E	Parks + Recreation	Public
Eisenhower Pond	F	Parks + Recreation	Private
City Hall Park Space	G	Parks + Recreation	Public
Hiawasse Park	H	Parks + Recreation	Public
Peetwood Park	I	Parks + Recreation	Public

TABLE 7.1 // EXISTING PARKS AND OPEN SPACE DETAILS




FIGURE 7.2 // EXISTING PARKS AND OPEN SPACE SYSTEM IN MISSION HILLS

Chapter 7:

Parks and Open Space

Parkland Level of Service

Level of service (LOS) is a standard measurement used to understand how well-served residents are by the available parkland in a given community. The National Recreation and Parks Association (NRPA) has set a recommended standard of 10.5 acres per 1,000 residents.

The LOS Analysis for Mission Hills is presented below in Table 7.2. Each neighborhood park and parklet is considered for its contribution to the overall parks system today, coupled with the existing population estimate of 3,556 residents. The actual LOS in Mission Hills is 4.89 acres per 1,000 residents which is below the standard recommended by the NRPA. Mission Hills is a unique community due to its landlocked city limits and unlikelihood that new parkland will come through typical channels for land acquisition. Due to this limitation, it is expected that the City's LOS is unlikely to change. Mission Hills residents however, have access to many existing parks and facilities that are located just beyond city limits. These nearby parks and facilities are not included in the LOS analysis. Additional alternative improvements can enhance resident access to parkland in nearby communities and destinations, as discussed in the Mobility Plan.

Parks/Parklets Names	Park Type	Size (Acres)
Sunken Garden	Neighborhood	0.6
Verona Columns Park	Neighborhood	0.3
Hiawasse Park	Neighborhood	4.0
Peetwood Park	Neighborhood	2.0
City Hall Park Space	Neighborhood	2.2
Parklets	Parklets	8.0
TOTAL ACRES	-	17.4
EXISTING POPULATION	-	3,556
EXISTING LEVEL OF SERVICE	-	4.89

TABLE 7.2 // EXISTING PARKS LEVEL OF SERVICE



Parkland Opportunity to Consider


The Existing Land Use Map, identified some parcels as "Vacant, Not Buildable." These parcels remain not buildable due to the zoning regulations tied to the residential designations and offer an opportunity for parkland in Mission Hills.

The City of Mission Hills could consider exploring the acquisition of these parcels to provide additional parkland in the community. These potential parks should be designed to fill a gap in service based on existing facilities and resident needs in mind.

Service Buffer Areas

The service buffers shown in Figure 7.3 present the immediate service areas for neighborhood parks and some parklets in Mission Hills today. These service areas are intended to represent the areas that are within a reasonable walking distance and provide access to parkland or open space. Neighborhood parks often have a service area of a quarter mile, whereas the smaller parklets have a smaller service area of 750 feet.

The white areas in the map delineate gaps in service locations for neighborhoods throughout the community that would benefit from walking paths or added open space.



LEGEND

- City Limits
- Country Clubs
- Parks + Open Space
- Parklets
- 750' Service Area
- .25-mile Service Area (10-Minute Walk-Time Equivalent)

FIGURE 7.3 // PARKLAND SERVICE AREA MAP

Chapter 7:

Parks and Open Space

Regional Park Amenities Near Mission Hills

Due to the landlocked nature of Mission Hills, nearby regional park and play facilities help supplement the community's need for recreational spaces. The map in Figure 7.4 highlights the locations of adjacent schools and parks that residents could access for parks, walking tracks, playgrounds, and other parkland facilities.

The community should continue to improve mobility throughout Mission Hills to enhance the City's level of service and access to nearby parkland. Since the City has few opportunities to create new parks within its limits, providing new walking paths or trail connections to these destinations will help enhance the quality of life for residents.

Schools

Parks



SOURCE: CITY OF PRAIRIE VILLAGE



SOURCE: CITY OF FAIRWAY



SOURCE: KANSAS TOURISM



SOURCE: KANSAS CITY PARKS AND RECREATION




FIGURE 7.4 // REGIONAL PARK AMENITIES NEAR MISSION HILLS

Chapter 7:

Parks and Open Space

Preservation of Floodplain and Open Space Systems

The City of Mission Hills has practices and policies currently in place to limit disturbance to the floodway and floodplain in the community. Figure 7.5 highlights the existing streams, floodway, 100-year floodplain, and areas designated as future floodplain by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). Brush Creek is the stream that runs through Mission Hills and provides scenic views for many of the residences and country clubs. The floodway and floodplain areas are primarily located along the Mission Hills and Kansas City Country Clubs, with some small extensions in the residential areas along the western portions of the city.



Future Floodplain Hazard Areas

FEMA is the regulatory organization that designates areas for floodway, 100-year floodplain, and 500-year floodplain. FEMA also identifies areas for “Future Conditions 1% Annual Chance Flood Hazard” or “Future Floodplain” as shown on Figure 7.5. When FEMA adds the Future Floodplain designation, it is based on not only the existing conditions but also anticipated changes such as urbanization, land use changes, and projected climate or hydrologic changes. These designated areas are not impacted by regulations set by the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) and should be used more as a consideration when planning a new construction project or building.

Floodplain Processes in Mission Hills Today

[Chapter 5, Article 2](#) of the Code of Ordinances for the City of Mission Hills outlines the necessary requirements and expectations for any disturbances to the floodplain. The Floodplain Administrator (the City Administrator) is responsible for reviewing all applications for floodplain development permits and providing notice to the appropriate parties seeking approval of the permit. The floodplain development permit is a required permit for any property owner who may be disturbing the floodplain on their parcel. A variety of information, including a description of work to be completed, base flood elevations, and plans and specifications, is needed to complete the permit application.

Related Planning Efforts

The City’s last update to its Stormwater Open Channel Master Plan was completed in 2017. This plan evaluates the stream conditions, status of retaining walls, and existing stream buffers in the community today. At the time of this last update, many of the stream reaches that were evaluated were deemed “poor” or “fair.” As noted in Chapter 3: Community Profile, the City owns approximately 6% of the open channels in Mission Hills today. The rest are privately-held. The City is planning to update this plan in the next 2-3 years to track any progress and potential improvements.

Partnerships + Programs

The City’s stormwater utility fee (SUF) is assessed annually with property taxes and is correlated to the amount of impervious surface on the property. This fee has been reauthorized through 2029 and allows the City to leverage funding from Johnson County’s stormwater asset management program. Continued evaluation of the SUF and participation with Johnson County’s programming is recommended.

Best Practices to Consider

There are a variety of physical and policy best practices the City could implement or encourage to support the preservation of floodplains and open spaces. These include:

- Continued maintenance of retaining walls where noted in the Open Channel Master Plan
- Encourage the use of native plants and shrubs, especially near streambeds to stabilize soils and mitigate erosion
- Support and encourage rain gardens near streams and floodplains to alleviate runoff
- Identify locations to supplement the tree cover along the channel and floodplain to help slow and filter stormwater runoff
- Continue to support the use of pervious surfaces in development




FIGURE 7.5 // EXISTING OPEN SPACES AND FLOODPLAIN CONSIDERATIONS

Goal 7.1:

Maintain the parks and open space systems throughout Mission Hills to support resident quality of life.

POLICIES

Policy 7.1.1: Continue to implement the Tree Planting Plan as adopted by the Park Board.

Policy 7.1.2: Protect and preserve all existing parks, parklets, and open spaces in Mission Hills.

Policy 7.1.3: Explore opportunities to expand the level of service for parkland through acquisition of vacant, not buildable or floodplain parcels throughout Mission Hills.

FUTURE CONSIDERATIONS

Future Consideration 7.1.1: Formalize a schedule for park equipment updates to stagger improvements by the City and ensure all updates match the quality of existing elements.

Future Consideration 7.1.2: As part of Capital Improvement Planning efforts, continue to focus on fountain and statuary maintenance and restoration to maintain quality features throughout the parklets system.



Goal 7.2:

Continue to have an ecological focus on the health and preservation of streams and floodplains in Mission Hills.

POLICIES

Policy 7.2.1: Continue to leverage assistance from Johnson County related to stormwater management and preservation.

Policy 7.2.2: Continue to participate in stormwater management practices, such as Contain the Rain, through Johnson County.

Policy 7.2.3: Encourage the use of native plants, rain gardens, and other pervious features to assist with rainwater runoff mitigation.

FUTURE CONSIDERATIONS


Future Consideration 7.2.2: Continue to leverage the Johnson County SMAC marketing campaign to educate residents on programming and services available to them through the City and its partnerships.

Future Consideration 7.2.1: Continue to serve as a resource to property owners located along streams and floodplains to educate them on best practices and opportunities to improve the health of these waterways.

Future Consideration 7.2.3: Continue to enforce the City's floodplain development ordinance.

Future Consideration 7.2.4: Complete an updated assessment to identify city-owned versus privately-owned stream right-of-way.

Future Consideration 7.2.5: Continue to evaluate the use and implementation of the Stormwater Utility Fee (SUF) as reauthorization is needed.

A long, straight asphalt road stretches into the distance, flanked by trees with vibrant autumn foliage in shades of yellow, orange, and red. The ground is covered with fallen leaves. A black street lamp stands on the left side of the road. In the background, a building is visible through the trees.

Chapter 8. Transportation, Mobility, and Streetscapes



Chapter Overview

Chapter 8. Transportation, Mobility, and Streetscapes examines the current facilities residents utilize to move through the community and opportunities for enhancing streetscaping and expanding connectivity in the city. The following sections are discussed in greater detail throughout this chapter:

Existing Roadway System

The existing roadway system includes collector streets, thoroughfares, and local roads. These roadways and connections to nearby facilities and communities are integral components of the City's infrastructure.

Vehicular Crash Data

The Kansas Department of Transportation has datasets available to highlight crashes in Kansas communities from 2014 to early 2025. Mission Hills' crashes have been mapped and analyzed for trends.

Mobility Plan

The Mobility Plan is a key contribution of the Mission Hills Comprehensive Plan that highlights potential mobility improvements for pedestrians and bicyclists for near-term and long-term improvements. This Plan should be used as a guide to begin additional analysis and planning for the future of Mission Hills in response to public input and desire for added connections.

Policy Considerations

Road safety for electric vehicles, such as bicycles and scooters, was identified as a growing concern in the community. This section examines current policies and opportunities for updates.

Streetscape Best Practices

Mission Hills is a picturesque community with winding streets and art hidden throughout. Enhancing streetscape design will only add to the aesthetics and quality of the roadways.



**EXISTING
ROADWAY
SYSTEM**



**VEHICULAR
CRASH ANALYSIS**



**MOBILITY
PLAN**



**POLICY
CONSIDERATIONS**



**STREETSCAPE BEST
PRACTICES**

**FIGURE 8.1 // TRANSPORTATION, MOBILITY AND
STREETSCAPE CHAPTER TOPICS**

Chapter 8:

Transportation, Mobility, and Streetscapes

Existing Roadway System

Figure 8.2 presents the existing roadways, their respective classifications by type and status as a major trafficway. The city primarily has a mix of local streets and collector streets that connect residents to other major roads, such as State Line Road, Shawnee Mission Parkway, Ward Parkway, and Mission Road. W 63rd Street serves as a major thoroughfare through Mission Hills and gateway into the community.

Tomahawk Roadway Improvements

The most recent major roadway project in Mission Hills was the reconstruction of Tomahawk Road. Tomahawk Road is a primary collector streets that provides entry into the city near City Hall and the Shops at Prairie Village, with connections extending to the residential areas.

In 2019, Mayor Dickey established the Tomahawk Road Safety, Beauty, and Connectivity Ad Hoc Committee to help identify goals and principles for these improvements. A series of recommendations were created as part of the Committee's efforts and are available on the City's website for reference.


Capital Improvement Planning

Capital Improvement Planning (CIP) is annually reviewed and updated to identify a timeline for projects and priority improvements in the community. The City's CIP through 2030 identifies several roads for planned updates and repaving. The City should continue to annually evaluate the timeline of improvements to maintain quality infrastructure and connectivity throughout the community.



Major Trafficways in Mission Hills

Chapter 5, Article 11 of the Mission Hills Code of Ordinances identifies the major trafficways located throughout the city. These are roadways with concentrated activity within the community. Figure 8.2 highlights these major trafficways in a red underlay to showcase the roadway classifications.



LEGEND

- City Limits
- Collector Streets
- Thoroughfares
- Local Roads
- Major Trafficways


FIGURE 8.2 // EXISTING ROADWAY CLASSIFICATIONS MAP

Chapter 8:

Transportation, Mobility, and Streetscapes


Vehicular Crash Analysis

Figure 8.3 presents data from vehicular crashes that occurred in Mission Hills from 2014-2025. In total, there were 253 logged accidents during this eleven-year period.



Accident Type

82% of the logged accidents resulted in property damage. These crashes are represented in the blue dots in Figure 8.3. The majority of these are located in high-traffic areas such as the Tomahawk Road/Belinder Avenue intersection, State Line Road/W 63rd Street intersection, and various locations along Mission Road. An additional 17% of the crashes resulted in injury and 1% in a fatality. 74 of the logged crashes were a result of distracted driving.



Accident Counts by Year

2016 had the highest recorded number of crashes in Mission Hills. During discussion of this dataset, this year was identified to have had road construction that pushed drivers to alternate routes and congested roads. On average, there have been 23 crashes per year. In recent years, there has been a downward trend in crashes. This trend should continue to be monitored.

Datapoints represent 2014 through March 2025 logged crashes.




FIGURE 8.3 // VEHICULAR CRASH DATA FOR MISSION HILLS 2014-2025
 SOURCE: KANSAS DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Chapter 8:

Transportation, Mobility, and Streetscapes

Mobility Plan

In the last five years, sidewalks and mobility have been priority improvements identified by Mission Hills residents. In the 2023 Resident Survey, nearly 80% of respondents stated they would be in favor of adding sidewalks in neighborhoods where there are none currently. Sidewalks were also noted as the top response when asked what additional resources and efforts the City should pursue in the future. At the Public Workshop held during Phase 2 of this planning process, sidewalks were the top response for desired mobility improvements in the community.


In response, the consultant team investigated options for near-term and long-term potential mobility connections. Figure 8.4 illustrates the Mobility Plan with existing sidewalks and bike lanes, potential connections for near-term and long-term consideration, and locations for pedestrian crossing signalizations. Near-term connections are potential projects to consider over the next ten years, the long-term connections extend beyond the ten years. This Mobility Plan is a high-level vision that will require further analysis, public input, and phasing considerations prior to construction.

Summary of Connections

The Mobility Plan identifies opportunities for looped inner-network connections throughout Mission Hills and additional considerations to connect to nearby activity nodes. The Tomahawk Road HOA has the most defined existing sidewalk network that offers immediate opportunities to enhance connections. In this area, there are some smaller stretches for near-term connections that would create a range of walking loop sizes for this neighborhood. Moving west, there are two preliminary

options identified for a prominent east-west connection to Mission Road. Due to the golf course's proximity to Option 2, consideration for appropriate buffers or netting would be needed. Moving north, there are a number of near-term pathways identified that would connect existing parks, schools, and neighborhoods. The crossing of W 63rd Street is a safety concern. Pedestrian crossing signalizations have been identified as a need at the Belinder Avenue and Wenonga Road/Indian Lane intersections. In the more established neighborhoods added connections may be more difficult due to limited right-of-way and are therefore classified as long-term potential connections.





LEGEND

- City Limits
- Country Clubs
- Parks + Open Space
- Parklets
- Existing Sidewalk
- Potential Connection, Near-Term (Less than 10 Years)
- Potential Connection, Long-Term (10+ Years)
- Existing Bike Facilities
- Existing Doggie Pots
- In-Ground Trash Can
- Schools
- Pedestrian Crossing Signalization Needed

FIGURE 8.4 // MOBILITY PLAN

Chapter 8:

Transportation, Mobility, and Streetscapes

Electric-Assisted Bicycles, Scooters, and Skateboards Policy Considerations

The City of Mission Hills' Code of Ordinances has a set of regulations to guide the use and operation of electric-assisted bicycles, scooters, and skateboards in city limits. [Chapter 3, Article 2](#) presents the operating requirements for Class 1, 2, and 3 electric-assisted vehicles. These are generally defined to the right.

Electric-assisted bicycles, scooters, and skateboards were frequently identified as issues or challenges in the community today and should be the focus in the future. Investigation into opportunities to update the regulations are presented below.

What the Code Says Today

The City's regulations currently define operating requirements to include:

- All minors, including non-operators, on electric-assisted bicycles, electric-assisted scooters, motorized bicycles and motorized skateboards within the City are required to wear a secured helmet while riding.
- Electric-assisted bicycles, electric-assisted scooters, motorized bicycles and motorized skateboards shall not be used to carry more persons at one time than the number for which they are designed and equipped.
- Electric-assisted bicycles and motorized bicycles shall not be operated on sidewalks within the City.

Class 1: E-bikes with a motor that provides assistance only when the driver is pedaling and ceases to provide assistance when the bicycle reaches a speed of 20 miles per hour.

Class 2: E-bikes with a motor that may be used exclusively to propel the bike and reaches a maximum speed of 20 miles per hour.

Class 3: E-bikes with a motor that may be used exclusively to propel the bike and reaches a maximum speed of 28 miles per hour.

Code Amendments to Explore

The City of Mission Hills' current code responds to immediate needs with regulating electric-assisted bicycles, scooters, and skateboards. The City should continue to evaluate opportunities to update the code to ensure the code remains current and addresses emerging trends with this topic.



Streetscape Design Best Practices

To help maintain quality streetscape and scenic views along the roads of Mission Hills, the City could consider installing additional streetscape elements in the public right-of-way. These streetscape installations could include lighting, planters, stormwater infrastructure, rain gardens, dedicated pedestrian crossing facilities, signage, and trees. Best practices suggest the City include a variety of installations with a consistent theme or aesthetic to create a cohesive standard. The collage of images below are the highest voted images from Phase 2 of this plan update and are intended to represent ideas for installation types but should be further investigated with public input considered.



FIGURE 8.5 // CONCEPT IMAGERY FOR STREETScape ELEMENTS

Goal 8.1:

Maintain a transportation system that provides for safe and efficient mobility throughout the city.

POLICIES

Policy 8.1.1: Minimize conflicts between vehicular and pedestrian circulation where appropriate.

Policy 8.1.2: Expand the pedestrian and bicyclist facilities throughout Mission Hills to enhance safety and connectivity to amenities and activity hubs.

Policy 8.1.3: Continue to improve roadways and street design throughout Mission Hills.

FUTURE CONSIDERATIONS

Future Consideration 8.1.1: Investigate opportunities to improve safety and implement the Mobility Plan in Mission Hills.

Future Consideration 8.1.2: Complete a pedestrian and bicycle safety audit to identify areas for potential improvements including marked crosswalks, protected bike lanes, signage, updates to safety regulations, proactive traffic enforcement, and resident awareness and education programs.

Future Consideration 8.1.3: Continue to evaluate opportunities to update the electric bicycle, scooter, and skateboard code to maintain roadway safety for all users.



This page intentionally left blank.

Chapter 9.

Plan Implementation





How to Use the Implementation Tables

Chapter 9. Plan Implementation summarizes each chapter’s goals and future considerations. A timeframe and priority level is assigned to each future consideration to help organize and provide a timeline for approaching implementation of these recommendations. Many of the chapter’s policies are practices already in place that the City intends to continue implementing. New initiatives in the form of future considerations are highlighted in this chapter separated by the individual goals.

The table format is summarized below before introducing the Plan’s recommendations.

Chapter 9: Plan Implementation			
Goal 9.1: Goals are objectives or aims which may be broad or specific.			
Future Consideration		Timeframe	Priority
FC 5.1.2	Future Considerations are specific steps and activities the City should consider.	Ongoing Annual Basis 1-3 Years 4-6 Years 6-9 Years 10+ Years	Low Moderate High

FIGURE 9.1 // EXAMPLE PLAN IMPLEMENTATION TABLE

Chapter 9:

Implementation

Chapter 5: Future Land Use

Goal 5.1: Follow best practices for all development and redevelopment projects throughout Mission Hills.

Future Consideration		Timeframe	Priority
FC 5.1.1	Continue to identify and implement any infrastructure projects needed to support effective capital improvements through the annually adopted 5-year Capital Improvement Plan.	Annual Basis	Moderate
FC 5.1.2	Continue to annually review the goals, policies, and future considerations of the Comprehensive Plan and consider updates and modifications as may be warranted due to changing community preferences and priorities.	Annual Basis	High
FC 5.1.3	Continue to identify any necessary updates and amendments to the City's Zoning Regulations, Subdivision Regulations, and Design Guidelines to ensure the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan are being followed.	Ongoing	Moderate



Chapter 5: Future Land Use

Goal 5.2: Preserve the original community design philosophies and built character. *(Based on Goal 3 from the 2019 Comprehensive Plan)*

	Future Consideration	Timeframe	Priority
FC 5.2.1	Continue to reference the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan when evaluating and reviewing a redevelopment proposal as found in the ARB Factors (Code Section 5-147) and Findings (Code Section 5-146).	Ongoing	Moderate
FC 5.2.2	Recommend the Planning Commission explore the City's Subdivision Regulations to limit or restrict the size of lot mergers and lot consolidations to respect the scale, design, and context of the neighboring properties.	1-3 Years	Moderate

Chapter 9:

Implementation

Chapter 5: Future Land Use

Goal 5.3: Evaluate the First Lutheran Church property's strengths, challenges, and opportunities for redevelopment and/or reuse.

	Future Consideration	Timeframe	Priority
FC 5.3.1	Complete a structural analysis of the building to inform future decisions.	In Process	High
FC 5.3.2	Evaluate opportunities for use of the property and what would best serve the community.	1-3 Years	High
FC 5.3.3	Consider opportunities to fully master plan this site as part of a larger planning effort and serve as a formal document and guide for the future of this parcel.	1-3 Years	High



Chapter 6: Community Identity

Goal 6.1: Maintain and expand the tree canopy and species diversity in Mission Hills.

	Future Consideration	Timeframe	Priority
FC 6.1.1	Continue to regularly evaluate tree conditions throughout Mission Hills.	Ongoing	High
FC 6.1.2	Continue to prioritize the quality of the tree canopy over the quantity of trees in the public tree inventory.	Ongoing	High
FC 6.1.3	Consider the development of an Urban Forest Management Plan to proactively be prepared in the event of major tree canopy loss.	1-3 Years	High
FC 6.1.4	Consider formally adopting the 10-20-30 Rule for new trees on public property.	1-3 Years	High

Chapter 9:

Implementation

Chapter 6: Community Identity

Goal 6.2: Support arts, culture, and community events in Mission Hills.

	Future Consideration	Timeframe	Priority
FC 6.2.1	Explore opportunities to expand City-based events throughout the calendar year for residents of all ages.	Annual Basis	Moderate



Chapter 7: Parks and Open Space

Goal 7.1: Maintain the parks and open space systems throughout Mission Hills to support resident quality of life.

	Future Consideration	Timeframe	Priority
FC 7.1.1	Formalize a schedule for park equipment updates to stagger improvements by the City and ensure all updates match the quality of existing elements.	1-3 Years	Moderate
FC 7.1.2	As part of Capital Improvement Planning efforts, continue to focus on fountain and statuary maintenance and restoration to maintain quality features throughout the parklets system.	Annual Basis	Moderate

Chapter 9:

Implementation

Chapter 7: Parks and Open Space

Goal 7.2: Continue to have an ecological focus on the health and preservation of streams and floodplains in Mission Hills.

	Future Consideration	Timeframe	Priority
FC 7.2.1	Continue to leverage the Johnson County SMAC marketing campaign to educate residents on programming and services available to them through the City and its partnerships.	Ongoing	Moderate
FC 7.2.2	Continue to serve as a resource to property owners located along streams and floodplains to educate them on best practices and opportunities to improve the health of these waterways.	Ongoing	Moderate
FC 7.2.3	Continue to enforce the City's floodplain development ordinance.	Ongoing	High
FC 7.2.4	Complete an updated assessment to identify city-owned versus privately-owned stream right-of-way.	1-3 Years	High
FC 7.2.5	Continue to evaluate the use and implementation of the Stormwater Utility Fee (SUF) as reauthorization is needed.	Annual Basis	Moderate



Chapter 8: Transportation, Mobility and Streetscapes

Goal 8.1: Maintain a transportation system that provides for safe and efficient mobility throughout the city.

	Future Consideration	Timeframe	Priority
FC 8.1.1	Investigate opportunities to improve safety and implement the Mobility Plan in Mission Hills.	1-10+ Years	High
FC 8.1.2	Complete a pedestrian and bicycle safety audit to identify areas for potential improvements including marked crosswalks, protected bike lanes, signage, updates to safety regulations, proactive traffic enforcement, and resident awareness and education programs.	Ongoing with Capital Improvement Plan Projects	High
FC 8.1.3	Continue to evaluate opportunities to update the electric bicycle, scooter, and skateboard code to maintain roadway safety for all users.	Ongoing	High



Mission Hills

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

A VISION FOR THE FUTURE

