

The City of Lee's Summit

Action Letter

Planning Commission

Thursday, June 24, 2021

5:00 PM

Videoconference and

City Council Chambers

City Hall

220 SE Green Street

Lee's Summit, MO 64063

Notice is hereby given that the Planning Commission of the City of Lee's Summit will meet on June 24, 2021, at 5:00 pm in person in the City Council Chambers at City Hall, 220 SE Green Street, Lee's Summit, Missouri, and by video conference as provided by Section 610.015 of the Revised Statutes of the State of Missouri. Due to the ongoing Covid-19 pandemic, public attendance in the meeting room at City Hall is limited. The public may attend in person at the location listed above or by one of these methods:

- By viewing the meeting on the City website at www.WatchLS.net, and various cable providers (Spectrum channel 2, Google TV channel 143, AT&T U-Verse channel 99 and Comcast channel 7) for those whose cable providers carry the City of Lee's Summit meetings.
- By sending a request to the City Clerk at clerk@cityofls.net to attend the meeting on the Zoom platform. The City Clerk will provide instructions regarding how to attend by this method.

Persons wishing to comment on any item of business on the agenda may do so in-person at the meeting location specified above at the time of the meeting or in writing prior to 5:00 p.m. on June 23, 2021, by one of the following methods:

- By sending an e-mail to clerk@cityofls.net,
- By leaving a voicemail at 816-969-1005 or
- By leaving written printed comments in the utility payments drop boxes located in the alley behind City Hall or inside the foyer at the north end of City Hall, both located at 220 SE Green Street, Lee's Summit, MO 64063.

Written comments submitted by these methods will be presented at the June 24, 2021, meeting. Persons wishing to speak at a public hearing on this agenda may do so by contacting the City Clerk prior to 5:00 p.m. on June 23, 2021, by e-mail at clerk@cityofls.net, and they will be provided with instructions regarding how to provide their live testimony via videoconference during the public hearing.

In the event that the meeting cannot be broadcast via www.WatchLS.net and the cable channels noted above, this agenda will be amended to include directions for the public to attend via the Zoom software platform at www.Zoom.com; such amendment will include a specific link to attend the Planning Commission meeting.

Planning Commission

Action Letter

June 24, 2021

Call to Order

Roll Call

Present: 5 - Chairperson Donnie Funk
Board Member Jake Loveless
Board Member Cynda Rader
Board Member Matt Sanning
Board Member Terry Trafton

Absent: 3 - Vice Chair Dana Arth
Board Member Tanya Jana-Ford
Board Member Mark Kitchens

Approval of Agenda

Chairperson Funk announced that Item 4 would be heard before Item 3. He asked for a motion to approve. A motion was made by Board Member Trafton, seconded by Board Member Sanning, that this agenda be approved as amended. The motion carried unanimously.

Public Comments

There were no public comments at the meeting.

1. Approval of Consent Agenda

A. [2021-4212](#) Minutes of the June 10, 2021, Planning Commission meeting

A motion was made by Board Member Trafton, seconded by Board Member Sanning, that the minutes be approved. The motion carried unanimously.

Public Hearings

2. [2021-4148](#) Continued Appl. #PL2021-157 - COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT - Airport Master Plan; City of Lee's Summit, applicant

Chairperson Funk opened the hearing at 5:08 p.m. and asked those wishing to speak, or provide testimony, to stand and be sworn in.

Mr. Mike Anderson entered Exhibit (A), list of exhibits 1-7 into the record. He gave a summary of the history of this application. Around November of 2019 staff had started the process of updating both the Master Plan and the Business Plan. The Master Plan was 20 years old and primarily focused on the Airport's air side infrastructure. That plan had been implemented, other than a small portion of taxiway Alpha. This amendment would focus on the land side development. That would include bringing businesses to the Airport. Mr. Anderson remarked that when people thought of airports it was in terms of hangars and terminal buildings; but the plan could include non-aviation growth.

Mr. Anderson commended CMT for providing ways of keeping stakeholders engaged during the recent pandemic. The business plan had been adopted by the City Council; and the master plan was presented to the Board of Aeronautical Commissioners on April 12th. That Board had recommended adoption of the update. The City Council had adopted the master plan update on June 8th. The application tonight was a request for a resolution to amend the Ignite Comprehensive Plan by adding the updated master plan.

Mr. Esteban Aguirre stated that he was an aviation planner for the engineering firm of Crawford, Murphy and Tilly. He first thanked all the stakeholder involved in the process for their support and engagement in the process. The document represented a 20-year vision for the city in general and its airport in particular. The plan would take future cost effectiveness into account as well as environmental and socioeconomic factors. The document would show

what the Airport would look like over the next two decades.

The elements of the master plan were actually a series of events, divided into chapters. Each served as a kind of input for the next chapter, in a logical sequence.

Inventory: The main objective of the inventory was to understand the extent of the Airport's resources and what it was capable of at present. A displayed slide of the "General Aviation Facilities" showed examples of the different pieces of information taken into account in this process. Some examples were how many GA hangars the Airport had and how they were being used, what parking facilities the Airport currently had and how much fuel storage was available. The map showed the northwest corner getting rather crowded due to all the general aviation development. This was the reasoning behind the development for the next few years being focused on the east side.

Demand projections: The idea was to determine what the Airport's traffic would look like in the future. That would drive all the future developments. A displayed chart gave a summary of the different projections. In 2019, the base year for the forecast, Airport had 137 base aircraft. The current projection was 177 for 2040. At present there were 29,000 operations, with about 69,000 by 2040. The fleet mix would also change over the next few decades, with an increase of jet aircraft and a decline in the number of piston engine aircraft.

Facility requirements: The next step was to use the information gathered in the inventory and projects, and make comparisons to determine what facilities were needed and find means to support the anticipated traffic. That would include determine the total area requirements for the GA hangars, whether to expand the aprons and determine how to provide adequate parking as well as landside access. They had looked the total area requirement for the GA hangars and the number of parking spaces expected to be needed over the next two decades; as well as the Aircraft Rescue and Fire Fighting at the facility. This was an opportunity to have a Fire station at the Airport. Regarding electric aircraft requirements, they were evaluating the storage area and charging for potential electric aircraft.

Developing Alternatives: This particular chapter focused on coordination with the stakeholders. Mr. Aguirre displayed a color-coded aerial map with the criteria for non-airside alternatives in the master plan. The planners had evaluated different concepts, with development on the east side including relocating the terminal building. Community hangars would be added for GA tenants and a commercial development area that would provide the Airport with non-aeronautical revenue. This had taken several discussions and evaluations of possible concepts. The next slide showed the locations of the commercial development, self-service fuel tanks and the electrical vault. Mr. Aguirre pointed out the location of the new Airport terminal.

One of the topics of discussions was how to make the Airport a center of activity in Lee's Summit. A family restaurant was planned next to the new terminal, as well as observation decks and the commercial development area. This was one of the approaches in looking for additional sources of revenue for the Airport.

Land Use Compatibility plan: This chapter looked at how the land around the Airport was being developed. It would involve the city's Comprehensive Plan, as well as some input and cooperation with Shockey Consulting and the Lee's Summit Economic Development Council. They had been helpful in determining the Airport's boundary, surrounding land uses, and the city's demographics. Making sure that the adjacent land uses were compatible with airport activity was essential. A displayed slide listed both compatible (industrial, commercial, hotels/restaurants, warehouses, parks/golf courses and aircraft related development) and not compatible (residential, schools, community centers, hospitals, churches and other religious structures, tall buildings and anything that attracted wildlife). These were to ensure that the space around the Airport was safe for both aircraft and the community.

Another color-coded map showed what the evaluation process looked like. It divided the area around the Airport into different zones, with each being individually evaluated in terms of development. The highest priority was keeping both the community and the Airport safe.

CIP and implementation plan: This chapter provided a guide for how projects in this part of town should be developed over the next 20 years. The Capital Improvement Plan would be developed in the contexts of short, medium and long-term time frames. The next slide showed lists of what should be developed in the short, medium or long term; with a total development cost of \$20.6 million. A major focus in the second phase would be creating FAA requirements to obtain funding for these proposed projects. Making sure that the utility infrastructure was completed. Some parts of the Airport's east side were ready for development in terms of earth work; but utilities being established and made available had to be the next step.

A variety of funding sources existed. Lee's Summit's Airport was competing for every dollar; and some GA airports with less in terms of operations were getting the same funding. Phase I had been adopted earlier this month and the City was moving forward with Phase II. It focused on two main documents: getting the Airport layout plan ready and the plan's exhibit A. "Next Steps" included the Tower Feasibility Study and the need to add a control tower. Considering the number of operations, Phase 2 would be the time. The ALP [Airport Layout Plan] and the "Exhibit A Update" would also be a major focus of that phase.

Following Mr. Aguirre's presentation, Chairperson Funk asked Mr. Anderson if he had any more information to share. As he did not, Chairperson Funk asked for any public comments. As there were none, he then opened the hearing for questions from the Commissioners.

Commissioner Sanning recalled some public comments regarding the noise. He asked staff about reaction, is from nearby residents, and if the City's noise ordinance would apply. In view of the evolving technology of electric aircraft, a possibility existed of little to no noise at all in the near future. Assuming that residential development would continue, he asked about ensuring that residents would be comfortable in that environment.

Mr. Aguirre responded that they had responded to neighbors' comments during the process. He added that the FAA was able to measure the 'noise contours' at airports and noise contours were included in the master plan's land use chapter. Basically this made it possible to determine the distance at which noise would affect people and cause problems. In this case, they were not within any residential development and were contained within the property. A certain amount of noise would be inevitable; but the airport's management had done a good job of working together with the community and keeping up with the airport's activity. They often talked and worked with pilots as well.

With the number of operations increased, the airport's management would need to re-evaluate those noise contours to ensure they kept up with new operations and new aircraft. The FAA might provide funding for noise mitigation programs. Soundproofing houses in the vicinity and putting restrictions on hourly operations for some types of aircraft were also possibilities.

Commissioner Trafton thanked Mr. Anderson and Mr. Aguirre for their reports. They had described a very complete and detailed plan and he had learned a lot in hearing about it. He also commended staff and community members who had participated. He had heard a number of conversations around investment of the City in the Airport, with \$3 million or \$4 million put forth from State and Federal sources as well as from the City. Commissioner Trafton asked if these funds had been approved for the next five years in the next bond issue election.

Planning Commission

Action Letter

June 24, 2021

Mr. Anderson explained that the Airport CIP was part of the more comprehensive CIP that had been adopted. Everything in it had been funded, partly through the matching dollars for the Airport via the transportation sales tax. Some of these dollars were used to get Federal grants. Typically, the City would provide 5 percent local funds, which the State would then match; with the Federal government providing the other 90 percent. Development of other infrastructure such as the terminal building and hangar space was more locally than federally funded.

Commissioner Trafton asked how big the terminal would be, noting that it did not look very big on the plan. Mr. Aguirre answered that it was about 5,000 square feet. He emphasized that the concept plan basically showed what the use of the space would look like; but demand would determine the size of the terminal. Commissioner Trafton noted that there was some undesignated space to the south that could be used for an expansion. He remarked that 5,000 or 6,000 square feet was not much for a facility like an airport terminal, adding that as the Airport got more jet traffic, the terminal might get more commercial and public use. Mr. Aguirre agreed, saying that if a bigger terminal building was needed, it could be done. This airport was fortunate to have the flexibility provided by a lot of space on each side.

Mr. Anderson clarified that the mention of commercial jet service into the Airport was a reference to corporate planes used for business and did not reference commercial airline planes.

Commissioner Trafton asked if Runway 1129 would be extended or enlarged to be the same size as Runway 1838. Mr. Aguirre replied that it would not; however, the Comprehensive Plan showed an expansion of the parallel taxiway.

Commissioner Rader commented that she had a history with the Airport. Several years ago, she and her husband had flown out of there with Mr. John Ohrazda; and the Airport becoming bigger and more diverse was a very exciting development.

Chairperson Funk asked if there were further questions for the applicant or staff. Hearing none, he closed the public hearing at 5:40 p.m. and asked for discussion among the Commission members, or for a motion.

Commissioner Sanning made a motion to recommend approval of Resolution 2021, A Resolution of the Planning Commission of the City of Lee's Summit, Missouri, adopting the Lee's Summit Airport Master Plan Update as an Amendment to the City of Lee's Summit Ignite Comprehensive Plan. Commissioner Trafton seconded.

Chairperson Funk asked if there was any discussion of the motion. Hearing none, he called for a vote.

A motion was made by Board Member Sanning, seconded by Board Member Trafton, that this application be approved. The motion carried unanimously.

3. [2021-4218](#) Appl. #PL2021-134 - REZONING from AG to RP-3 and PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN - Osage, 3rd Plat, 2151 SW M-150 Hwy; Clayton Properties Group, Inc. d/b/a Summit Homes, applicant

Chairperson Funk opened the hearing at 6:12 p.m. and asked those wishing to speak, or provide testimony, to stand and be sworn in.

Mr. Chris Holmquist of Olsson Associates Inc. gave his business address as 1301 Burlington Street in North Kansas City, Missouri. He stated that Osage 3rd Plat consisted of 12 twin gallery buildings, with a total of 24 units. It was an extension of the first and second plats, with the same architecture and building types, incorporating a five-acre parcel not previously included in the development plans for the first two plats.

Planning Commission

Action Letter

June 24, 2021

Following Mr. Holmquist's presentation, Chairperson Funk asked for staff comments.

Mr. McGuire entered Exhibit (A), list of exhibits 1-15 into the record. The applicants were proposing to rezone 4.59 acres located at 2151 M-150 Highway from AG to RP-3. The proposed development would consist of 12 two-family lots plus two common areas. He added that the preliminary development plan would also serve as the preliminary plat. A displayed zoning/aerial map showed the surrounding area as a mix of single-family and undeveloped lots. The lots across M-150 were large lots with single-family homes; and the previously approved Osage subdivisions were to the east and south. An undeveloped parcel zoned AG was to the west. Mr. McGuire then displayed colored renderings of elevations, and stated that the proposed materials and architectural style would be similar and compatible with existing residential subdivisions in the area. Exterior materials would be stone veneer, lap and panel siding, LP shake shingles and composite roof shingles.

The proposed location was limited by a narrow width, and allowed for only a single north-south street. This would require a modification to the number of cul-de-sacs. The maximum was no more than 10 percent of the total number of lots; and for this development it would be 12.6 percent. The property was not part of the original Osage development, so no provision had been made for a connection to SW Osage Drive at the south part of the lot. Given this circumstance and the infill nature of the property, staff considered this requested modification to be reasonable.

The proposed 12-lot subdivision was consistent with residential mixed-use as recommended by the Comprehensive Plan. It met the Comprehensive Plan's objectives and was consistent with the previously approved Osage phases. Increased traffic caused by this development would be mitigated by the improvements previously approved as part of the original project. The proposed development would satisfy any requirements applicable to the zoning district via the UDO. With the four Conditions of Approval, the project met the requirements of both the UDO and the Design and Construction Manual.

Following Mr. McGuire's comments, Chairperson Funk asked if there were any questions or comments about the application from the public. Hearing none, he then asked if the Commission had questions for the applicant or staff.

Commissioner Rader asked if these would be rental units or for sale. Ms. Tiffany Ford of Summit Homes replied that these would be sold individually.

Chairperson Funk asked if there were further questions for the applicant or staff. Hearing none, he closed the public hearing at 6:18 p.m. and asked for discussion among the Commission members, or for a motion.

Ms. Nancy Yendes noted that this was an item that one of the Commissioners would be recusing, and asked if this could be part of the record. Chairperson Funk announced that Commissioner Loveless had recused himself from this application.

Hearing no further discussion, Chairperson Funk called for a motion.

Commissioner Rader made a motion to recommend approval of Application PL2021-134, Rezoning from AG to RP-3 and Preliminary Development Plan: Osage, 3rd Plat, 2151 SW M-150 Hwy; Clayton Properties Group, Inc. d/b/a Summit Homes, applicant. Commissioner Sanning seconded.

Chairperson Funk asked if there was any discussion of the motion. Hearing none, he called for a vote.

Planning Commission

Action Letter

June 24, 2021

A motion was made by Board Member Rader, seconded by Board Member Sanning, that this application be recommended for approval to the City Council - Regular Session. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 4 - Chairperson Funk
Board Member Rader
Board Member Sanning
Board Member Trafton

Absent: 4 - Vice Chair Arth
Board Member Jana-Ford
Board Member Kitchens
Lovell

Recused: 1 - Board Member Loveless

- a. [TMP-1956](#) An Ordinance approving a rezoning from AG (Agricultural) to district RP-3 (Planned Residential Mixed Use) and preliminary development plan for Osage 3rd plat, located at 2151 SW M-150 Hwy, in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 33, the Unified Development Ordinance of Lee's Summit Code of Ordinances, for the City of Lee's Summit, Missouri.

4. [2021-4214](#) Appl. #PL2021-145 - PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN - Chapel Ridge Business Park out-building, 3680 NE Akin Dr; VAAP Chapel Ridge, LLC, applicant

Chairperson Funk opened the hearing at 5:40 p.m. and asked those wishing to speak, or provide testimony, to stand and be sworn in.

Mr. Jim Gamble stated that he was president of the Gamble Company Inc., a design, architecture and planning firm. He gave his business address as 3500 S. Mize Ridge Court in Independence, Missouri. The owners of Lee's Summit's Chapel Ridge Shopping Center wanted to add a new outbuilding on their property. It would have a completed exterior but an incomplete interior; as the tenant had not yet been determined. Typically, the designs had drive-thru for customers and sold products such as coffee, non-alcoholic drinks, bakery goods and basic fast food items.

The building would be 1,096 square feet, and would have a additional drive through window and a small dining room. It would also have an outdoor pergola patio when weather permitted. City staff had recommended a limited, self-generated parking study, which showed that since the shopping center was under-utilized, the parking was as well. It was at the intersection of I-470 and Woods Chapel. One of the owners, Dr. Verryl Boot, and VAAP Chapel Ridge, LLC, the applicant, were investors in the subject property and commercial other properties as well in Lee's Summit, Blue Springs and Overland Park.

Following Mr. Gamble's presentation, Chairperson Funk asked for staff comments.

Mr. Soto entered Exhibit (A), list of exhibits 1-14 into the record. He first displayed an aerial photo of the subject property. One image outlined in red on the left side of the slide was a shopping center, about 34,500 square feet in area, at the southwest corner of Ralph Powell Road and Woods Chapel. A yellow star at the southeast corner indicated the proposed location of the outbuilding. Mr. Soto pointed out the Ralph Powell commercial corridor as well as a Sonic nearby at the north corner, and some townhouse development to the south. Some undeveloped land was a little south of that, across Akin Drive. Retail and office development was happening both north and south of the site.

The existing building was about 35,500 square feet and the proposed out-building would be 1,096 square feet. The total shopping center parking lot had 181 parking spaces. It would have

Planning Commission

Action Letter

June 24, 2021

166 spaces, as the development would require removing 15 spaces lining a private drive that connected Akin Drive with Woods Chapel.

Drawings of the proposed exterior showed brick and EIFS materials. They had no identified users at present, but the applicants were seeking certain types of users including restaurant related uses. This architecture and materials were consistent with those on other commercial corridors throughout Lee's Summit, and were compatible with the existing building on the same property.

The map on the right showed existing zoning. This property was a kind of dividing line between adjacent RP-zoned property to the west and south and CP-2 zoning extending north toward Woods Chapel as well as along the Ralph Powell corridor.

The applicants were proposing an alternate parking plan. A calculation of the required parking based on the overall square footage of the center would yield a required 188 parking spaces. The UDO did allow for an alternate parking plan that would be designed specifically to the actual use and users of a particular development. Currently the property had 181 parking spaces, which would be 166 spaces after 15 spaces were removed. Mr. Soto confirmed that staff had asked for a parking demand survey, particularly at peak hours and on weekends. It indicated that parking demand at various times of day ranged from 38 to 77 spaces. That left about 100 available parking spaces. Based on this information, staff did not believe that removing 15 parking spaces for the proposed building would have any negative effect.

The proposed restaurant and coffee shop uses were allowed in the CP-2 zoning district. This was consistent with the recommended land use in the 2005 Comprehensive Plan. It was also compatible with the existing commercial development along the Ralph Powell and Woods Chapel commercial corridors.

This application had two Conditions of Approval. One was that the development comply "with plans and specifications submitted to and on file in the Development Services Department dated June 3, 2021. The other provided that "an Alternate Parking Plan allowing for 166 parking spaces to serve the subject property (a reduction from 181 existing parking spaces) shall be approved as part of the preliminary development plan."

Following Mr. Soto's comments, Chairperson Funk asked if there were any public comments, either in support for or opposition to the application. As there were none, he then asked if the Commission had questions for the applicant or staff.

Chairperson Funk asked the applicant what the current occupancy level of the center, noting a statement during the applicant's presentation that the center was under-utilized. He wanted to now specifically if that pertained to occupancy or if the center was not getting much traffic. Mr. Gamble responded that most of his information pertained to the parking, based on the traffic study. He was not sure how many vacancies the shopping center had. As far as he knew there were few; but the parking was definitely under-utilized, with only about one third to one half being used at present. One purpose of this project was to boost the viability of the center with additional services for the public.

Mr. Soto stated that he had visited the site and the general area a few times last week. He had observed that all the tenant spaces were currently occupied.

Commissioner Sanning noted to Mr. Soto that he had done a site survey and a parking survey had been done. He asked if it would be appropriate that the City did its official evaluation of the parking study to get a better estimate. He corrected the reference to "March 17, 2021 at 12:15 a.m." to "12:15 p.m." He observed if the proposed coffee shop opened at 6:00 or 7:00 a.m. there would not be a heavy demand for parking, and asked if it would be appropriate for the City to do an official evaluation of the parking study as well. Mr. Soto answered that based

on staff's observation of the site, both recently and over a period of years, they were confident that the site had more than enough available parking. They would not likely recommend requiring any additional study.

Commissioner Trafton stated that he had a copy of the study. It had three different days at varying times; 9:30 a.m., 3:35 p.m. and 5:26 p.m. on one day; 10:00 a.m. and 12:15 p.m. on the second day and 10:16 a.m., 12:46 p.m. and 4:00 p.m. on the day after that.

Commissioner Loveless said he had questions about the flow of traffic, and was not familiar with the outbuilding structures in a retail center. Regarding the flow of traffic at the drive-through, he asked if it was typical to have drive-through traffic that went in front of the access points into the business. What he was looking at did not indicate the usual location of a drive-through at the back or side of the building but rather in the front where someone might be walking across the parking lot to get to a store entrance. He wanted to know if there were any safety concerns about that. Mr. Brad Cooley answered that this was not a typical kind of route for traffic. However, in the circumstance of the parking lot being under-utilized, there was not a safety concern about the location or direction of the drive-through.

Commissioner Loveless remarked that assuming that traffic would be coming back from the center of the development at the northwest corner and traveling across, he wanted to know where the traffic would exit, and if it would have to go through the parking lot to get to an exit. On the aerial and zoning map, Mr. Cooley noted that the traffic could circle south around the front of the building and back out through the same entrance point. Mr. Soto added that if the traffic was circulating through the center clockwise, it could also use the additional access point on the building's back side that would provide access to Akin Circle. Traffic could move from there onto Ralph Powell Road. He pointed out that along the internal private drive was the center driveway, and another just off the corner closest to the current Jimmy John's tenant. Two access points were along the private drive, with a third at the back.

Commissioner Loveless remarked that commercial tenants in retail centers did change from time to time. He wanted to confirm that the Commission was comfortable with the spacing and that it would be safe for people to walk from the parking lot through a drive-through lane. Mr. Cooley responded that if the stacking at the potential coffee shop was taking up 15 spaces, that was the same number of vehicles that could be using that drive aisle in any case. Further, a stacking lane would be slow-moving traffic.

Commissioner Sanning remarked that the existing Andy's Ice Cream business had a similar footprint at the end of the drive, and asked if this was a similar situation. Mr. Cooley answered that it was. He pointed out that coffee shops were typically high traffic generators; but the footprint of this building was small enough for limited traffic. He acknowledged that Andy's Ice Cream might not have expected the amount of traffic they got. Commissioner Sanning clarified that he was referring to the footprint of the lot above a strip shopping center; and he was referring to a potential situation where traffic would be exiting the parking lot by crossing a traffic lane. Mr. Cooley pointed out that the Andy's parking lot was more utilized than the lot at the subject property; though tenants did change. It was likely to be slightly less congested than the traffic at Andy's.

Commissioner Trafton asked if the Development staff had considered and discussed a possible need for an additional exit from the parking lot. If it went straight out, meandering back through the parking lot would not be necessary. He noted that the restaurant and coffee shop were high traffic businesses. Mr. Cooley answered that an exit at the end of that drive aisle, that close to the entrance, could involve an access management conflict. If the coffee shop did attract a lot of traffic, there could be some congestion getting traffic into the private drive and then out the exit, especially during peak business hours. He added that the three existing exit points should be sufficient.

Planning Commission

Action Letter

June 24, 2021

Commissioner Trafton noted that the building was about 1,100 square feet, which was a fairly small footprint. He asked what would be the maximum occupancy of a building that size with a restaurant or coffee shop, and what approximate percentage of the building would be used for food preparation. He also wanted to know if this would go through the Development office to finalize. Mr. Mike Weisenborn responded that typically a business with dining in and kitchen, 40 or 50 percent of the facility would be kitchen space. Density for dining areas with tables and chairs were about one person per 15 square feet. For this size, the capacity would be about 33 or 34 people. With 3 or 4 people in the kitchen, capacity would be limited. The restaurant staff would typically park in the back of the lots, with customer parking near the building. Traffic across the drive lane would be limited just due to the limited space and low occupancy.

Commissioner Trafton then asked if there had been an opportunity for the tenants of the existing building to comment, or if they had been solicited for feedback. Mr. Soto answered that at the time, they were not required to have a neighborhood, due to the emergency order about the pandemic. Staff had been encouraging people to have remote meetings. Mr. Gamble stated that he had sent out notifications to land owners within about 300 feet, using a list provided by the City. He had not received any negative feedback, and the tenants were aware of the project. They had supplied some of the photographs used for the parking plan.

Chairperson Funk remarked that he had some concerns about a trend for parking lots having drive-through options, though it did present a financial opportunity for land owners and developers. He asked if this was now common. Mr. Soto answered that this was essentially a pad site development that had not been made a separate lot. Staff had not been approached for any other 'retrofit' developments of this kind. This application could be evaluated with the same standards of adequate parking and internal traffic circulation. Staff generally approached these standards on a case by case basis. They would certainly consider other applications involving older retail centers; but again, these would be evaluated individually.

Chairperson Funk asked if there were further questions for the applicant or staff. Hearing none, he closed the public hearing at 6:08 p.m. and asked for discussion among the Commission members.

Commissioner Trafton said he had seen examples around town of like Andy's, where a parking lot generated too much traffic. He could also understand the appeal of a drive-through coffee area in this part of town; and it could be a benefit for the area in the near future. He noted that if the parking lot had twice as many cars, it would still not reach the maximum. The biggest concern would be traffic through the parking lot. The only adjustment that could be made once the business was up and running would be requiring them to add another entrance and exit. He added that many other parking lots in town had drive-throughs for restaurants and other services.

Commissioner Sanning remarked that the number of these businesses included were service-oriented, and customer based. He noted that the pictures were taken in March of 2021, and wondered if the pandemic might still be having an impact in terms of how busy some of the newly re-opened businesses would get.

Chairperson Funk shared the concern about a proliferation of pad sites and drive-throughs. As there was no further discussion, he called for a motion.

Commissioner Trafton made a motion to recommend approval of Application PL2021-145, Preliminary Development Plan: Chapel Ridge Business Park out-building, 3680 NE Akin Dr; VAAP Chapel Ridge, LLC, applicant. Commissioner Rader seconded.

Chairperson Funk asked if there was any discussion of the motion. Hearing none, he called for a vote.

Planning Commission

Action Letter

June 24, 2021

A motion was made by Board Member Trafton, seconded by Board Member Rader, that this application be recommended for approval to the City Council - Regular Session. The motion carried unanimously.

- a. [TMP-1954](#) An Ordinance approving a preliminary development plan for the proposed Chapel Ridge Business Park outbuilding, 3680 NE Akin Dr, in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 33, the Unified Development Ordinance of Lee's Summit Code of Ordinances, for the city of Lee's Summit, Missouri.

Other Agenda Items

5. [2021-4149](#) RESOLUTION NO. 2021-02 - A Resolution of the Planning Commission of the City of Lee's Summit, Missouri, adopting the Lee's Summit Airport Master Plan Update as an Amendment to the City of Lee's Summit Ignite Comprehensive Plan.

This item was voted on during the meeting.

Chairperson Funk asked Mr. Soto if the Commissioners needed to sign the resolution at tonight's meeting, and Mr. Soto answered that he had a copy ready for signatures.

Roundtable

There were no Roundtable items at the meeting.

Adjournment

There being no further business, Chairperson Funk adjourned the meeting at 6:16 p.m.

For your convenience, Planning Commission agendas, as well as videos of Planning Commission meetings, may be viewed on the City's Legislative Information Center website at "lsmo.legistar.com"