

**LEE'S SUMMIT PLANNING COMMISSION**

**Minutes of Tuesday, June 13, 2017**

---

The Tuesday, June 13, 2017, Lee's Summit Planning Commission meeting was called to order by Chairperson Norbury at 5:00 p.m., at City Council Chambers, 220 SE Green Street, Lee's Summit, Missouri.

**OPENING ROLL CALL:**

Chairperson Jason Norbury	Present	Mr. Herman Watson	Present
Ms. Colene Roberts, Vice Chair	Absent	Mr. Beto Lopez	Present
Mr. Donnie Funk	Present	Ms. Carla Dial	Absent
Mr. Don Gustafson	Present	Mr. Brandon Rader	Absent
Ms. Dana Arth	Present		

Also present were Hector Soto, Planning Division Manager; Michael Anderson, Construction Manager; Christina Stanton, Senior Planner; Jennifer Thompson, Staff Planner; Victoria Nelson, Staff Planner; Shannon McGuire, Staff Planner; Michael Weisenborn, Project Manager; Chris Hughey, Project Manager; Dawn Bell, Project Manager; Nancy Yendes, Chief Counsel Infrastructure and Zoning; Kent Monter, Development Engineering Manager; Michael Park, City Traffic Engineer; Bob McKay, Director of Planning and Special Projects; Ryan Elam, Director of Development Services; Jim Eden, Assistant Fire Chief I, Fire Department; and Jeanne Nixon, Development Center Secretary.

Chairperson Norbury welcomed Ms. Arth to the Planning Commission.

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA:**

Chairperson Norbury announced that \*there were no changes to the agenda, and asked for a motion to approve. On the motion of Mr. Lopez, seconded by Mr. Funk, the Planning Commission voted unanimously by voice vote to **APPROVE** the agenda as published.

**1. APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA**

- A. Application #PL2017-089 - FINAL PLAT** - The Grove at Lee's Summit, 1st Plat, Lots 1, 2 & Tract A; The Grove at Lee's Summit, LLC, applicant
- B. Application #PL2017-098 - PRELIMINARY PLAT** - Arborwalk South, Lots 1-381 & Tracts A-N; Inspired Homes, LLC, applicant
- C. Minutes** of the May 9, 2017 Planning Commission meeting
- D. Minutes** of the May 23, 2017 Planning Commission meeting

On the motion of Mr. Lopez, seconded by Mr. Funk, the Planning Commission voted unanimously by voice vote to **APPROVE** the Consent Agenda, Item 1A-D as published.

2. **Continued Application #PL2016-209 - REZONING** from R-1 & CP-2 to PMIX and **PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN** - Pryor Lakes, approximately 32 acres located at the northwest corner of NW Chipman Rd. and NW Pryor Rd.; Christie Development Association, LLC, applicant

Chairperson Norbury opened the hearing at 5:04 p.m. and stated that the City had requested that Application PL2016-209 be continued, to a date uncertain. He asked for a motion.

Mr. Lopez made a motion to continue Application PL2016-209, Rezoning from R-1 & CP-2 to PMIX and Preliminary Development Plan, Pryor Lakes, approximately 32 acres located at the northwest corner of NW Chipman Rd. and NW Pryor Rd.; Christie Development Association, LLC, applicant. Mr. Gustafson seconded.

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

On the motion of Mr. Lopez, seconded by Mr. Gustafson, the Planning Commission members voted unanimously by voice vote to **CONTINUE** Application 2016-209 to a date uncertain.

(The foregoing is a digest of the secretary's notes of the public hearing. The transcript may be obtained.)

3. **Continued Application #PL2017-017 - VACATION OF RIGHT-OF-WAY** - an approximately 600' section of NW Lowenstein Dr. located at the northwest corner of NW Chipman Rd. and NW Pryor Rd.; Christie Development Association, LLC, applicant

Chairperson Norbury opened the hearing at 5:05 p.m. and stated that the City had requested that Application PL2017-017 be continued, to a date uncertain. He asked for a motion.

Mr. Lopez made a motion to continue Application PL2017-017, Vacation Of Right-Of-Way: an approximately 600' section of NW Lowenstein Dr. located at the northwest corner of NW Chipman Rd. and NW Pryor Rd.; Christie Development Association, LLC, applicant. Mr. Gustafson seconded.

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

On the motion of Mr. Lopez, seconded by Gustafson, the Planning Commission members voted unanimously by voice vote to **CONTINUE** Application 2017-017 to a date uncertain.

(The foregoing is a digest of the secretary's notes of the public hearing. The transcript may be obtained.)

Chairperson Norbury asked staff how an application continued to a date uncertain would be brought back. Mr. Soto answered that the applicant would contact staff and get a date set for a public hearing. They would then be required to send out notices to residents within 185 feet, as well as a legal notice in the local paper, at least 15 days before the public hearing date.

4. **Continued Application #PL2017-075 - COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT -**  
Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) 2018-2022; City of Lee's Summit, applicant

Chairperson Norbury opened the hearing at 5:07 p.m. and asked those wishing to speak, or provide testimony, to stand and be sworn in.

Mr. Anderson entered Exhibit (A), list of exhibits 1-12 into the record. Exhibit 12, which he had brought with him to the meeting, showed a modified portion of the Bridges, Streets and Signals portion of the fiscal year 2018 CIP. It had incorporated the changes that would become part of the CIP if it was approved by the Commission and the City Council.

Mr. Anderson then gave an update on the CIP status following the City Council meeting. The Public Works Committee had recommended eliminating the 5th Terrace project that would connect Country Lane and Greenridge (Project 15). Also on Public Works' recommendation, the Council had voted to add the Ward Road project, which extended from Tudor Road north to Blue Parkway. Exhibit 12 identified both these changes. The resolution had referred to adopting the original plan; and the proposed new resolution had referred to the 2018-2022 CIP "as adopted by City Council."

Following Mr. Anderson's presentation, Chairperson Norbury asked if there was anyone present wishing to give testimony, either in support for or opposition to the application.

Councilmember Rob Binney gave his address as 503 NW O'Brien and confirmed that the Council had deleted the 5th Terrace project and replaced it with the Ward Road project.

Chairperson Norbury then asked if the Commission had questions for City staff. Hearing none, he closed the public hearing at 5:09 p.m. and asked for discussion among the Commission members, or for a motion.

Mr. Lopez made a motion to direct staff to present a resolution adopting the Capital Improvement Plan 2018-2022, as adopted by the City Council, as an amendment to the City of Lee's Summit Comprehensive Plan, as amended; and approving the location, extent and character of all public improvements described in the City of Lee's Summit Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) 2018-2022. Mr. Gustafson seconded.

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

On the motion of Mr. Lopez, seconded by Mr. Gustafson, the Planning Commission members voted unanimously by voice vote to **PRESENT A RESOLUTION** adopting the Capital Improvement Plan 2018-2022, as adopted by the City Council, as an amendment to the City of Lee's Summit Comprehensive Plan, as amended; and approving the location, extent and character of all public improvements described in the City of Lee's Summit Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) 2018-2022.

(The foregoing is a digest of the secretary's notes of the public hearing. The transcript may be obtained.)

**5. Application #PL2017-093 - PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN – Pine Tree Plaza Renovations, 300 SW Blue Parkway, Pine Tree Plaza, LLC, applicant**

Chairperson Norbury opened the hearing at 5:13 p.m. and asked those wishing to speak, or provide testimony, to stand and be sworn in.

Mr. Danny Potts of Klover Architects gave his address as 10955 Lowell Avenue in Overland Park, Kansas. He introduced Mr. Trent Overhill, owner of Pine Tree Plaza, who gave his address as 5871 South Tettters Court in Springfield, Missouri. Mr. Potts noted that Pine Tree Plaza was at the northwest corner of the new US 50 interchange project. It was an older shopping center, with the former Price Chopper space now empty, and in need of renovation. The PMIX zoning required a preliminary development plan. The project was in two phases, the first portion being repurposing and finding three new tenants for the Price Chopper building. Mr. Potts displayed a conceptual rendering of the front, as well as a site plan. He emphasized that the applicants did not plan to either add to or reduce the leaseable area but intended only to renovate the facades, add new landscape islands as the ordinance required, and install LED heads on the existing light poles.

Mr. Potts then displayed the proposed elevations for the second phase, which was the rest of the shopping center. They intended the visual design to bring the center more up to date. The proposed materials would be used throughout both portions.

Following Mr. Potts' presentation, Chairperson Norbury asked for staff comments.

Ms. Stanton entered Exhibit (A), list of exhibits 1-13 into the record. She confirmed that the purpose was to update and repurpose the shopping center. Staff recommended approval, with a recommended modification to Section 7.250.D.3 of the UDO. It would allow the project to retain the light poles' height of 40 feet and 8 inches. This was shown on the preliminary development plan, which was date stamped May 22, 2017. The applicants were considering taking a few of the existing poles out, and change the fixtures on the rest.

Following Ms. Stanton's comments, Chairperson Norbury asked if there was anyone present wishing to give testimony, either in support for or opposition to the application. Seeing none, he opened the hearing for questions from the Commissioners for the applicant or staff.

Mr. Funk asked if the facades would be replaced on all the stores during the first portion, or if that would only be the Price Chopper facade. Mr. Potts stated that it would be only the Price Chopper. The primary concern at that point would be finding the tenants. The future changes, including the pad sites and other stores in the strip center, would be contingent on leasing the Price Chopper space.

Chairperson Norbury asked if the modification was due to the poles being taller than the UDO specified. Ms. Stanton answered that it was. The update and change would be replacing the incandescent or halogen fixtures with LED ones.

Chairperson Norbury asked if there were further questions for the applicant or staff. Hearing none, he closed the public hearing at 5:19 p.m. and asked for discussion among the Commission members, or for a motion.

Mr. Lopez made a motion for approval of Application PL2017-093, Preliminary Development Plan, Pine Tree Plaza Renovations, 300 SW Blue Parkway, Pine Tree Plaza, LLC, applicant; subject to staff's letter of June 9, 2017 and recommendation for approval. Mr. Funk seconded.

Chairperson Norbury asked if the motion's wording needed to be amended. Ms. Yendes replied that the motion should recommend the application for approval, since it would go to the City Council. On Chairperson Norbury's request, Mr. Funk withdrew his second and Mr. Lopez amended his motion to "*recommend approval*" of the preliminary development plan. Mr. Funk then seconded the amended motion.

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

On the motion of Mr. Lopez, seconded by Mr. Funk, the Planning Commission members voted unanimously by voice vote to recommend **APPROVAL** of Application PL2017-093, Preliminary Development Plan, Pine Tree Plaza Renovations, 300 SW Blue Parkway, Pine Tree Plaza, LLC, applicant; subject to staff's letter of June 9, 2017.

(The foregoing is a digest of the secretary's notes of the public hearing. The transcript may be obtained.)

- |  |
|--|
| 6. <b>Application #PL2017-094 - REZONING</b> from AG to RP-4 and CP-2 and <b>PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN</b> - West Ridge at the Lake, approximately 23 acres located at the southwest corner of NE Bowlin Rd. and NE Jamestown ; Sallee Homes, applicant |
|--|

Chairperson Norbury opened the hearing at 5:20 p.m. and asked those wishing to speak, or provide testimony, to stand and be sworn in.

Mr. Greg Musil of the law firm of Douthitt Frets Rouse Gentile & Rhodes LLC, gave his business address as 5250 W. 116th Place in Leawood, Kansas and stated that he was present representing Sallee Homes. Also present were Mr. Randy Sallee and Mr. Tyler Sallee, who would build and own the apartment complex and two office buildings; and Mr. Dane Reddig, a civil engineer with Schlagel and Associates. Mr. Richard Heidenbright from BGO Architects in Dallas had done the design and could answer questions about the elevations and other specifics of the buildings. Mr. Wayne Kirkoff was present specifically concerning the landscape and buffering plan. A stormwater plan had been submitted, as well as a traffic study approved by the City and MoDOT; done by Mr. Jeff Wilke of TranSystems. The Sallees had hired an experienced management team. The development would have 297 apartment units in ten buildings plus a clubhouse, on about 20 acres. The two adjacent office buildings, on about three acres, would total 15,000 square feet. Mr. Musil gave a PowerPoint presentation of the site and plan.

The displayed location map showed the boundaries and the existing CP-2 structures to the west. These included a private school, a medical center, and office buildings. The Woods Chapel United Methodist Church and the future Monticello subdivision were to the south. On an elevated conceptual view of the proposed development, Mr. Musil pointed out the three-story apartment buildings, the CP-2 development to the west and the site of the Monticello subdivision. The next elevations showed side and end views of the apartment buildings, and Mr. Musil pointed out the metal over stucco roof, composite decking and significant amounts of brick on all portions of the buildings.

The clubhouse elevation placed the building at the north end, and the floor plan included two separate pools. The building included individual work rooms, meeting rooms and classrooms. The renderings for the office buildings showed a style similar to the apartments, with a similar blend of colors and materials. The following slide showed the landscape plan that was recently submitted. The landscaping was heavy along Jamestown Road and around the two office buildings.

Staff's report included eight Recommendation Items, and the applicant agreed with all but two. One was the mention in Recommendation Item 6 of installing elevators in the apartment buildings. These were three-story buildings and the International Building Code of 2012 suggested elevators in buildings of four stories or higher. The plan had ADA compliant accessible units on the first floors, and a feature as expensive as elevators was not necessary for the two upper stories; nor were they required by the UDO. They could cost as much as \$1 million for all ten buildings. Mr. Musil noted that the recommendation's wording had "*suggested*," not required.

The applicants had requested, and staff did not support, a modification to the high impact buffer requirement. A property line between two different zoning districts was required to have a six-foot opaque vinyl fence. Staff wanted this buffer down the entire west side, with one side RP-4 and the other CP-2. They also recommended it on the southern boundary, where the multi-family RP-4 was adjacent to future single-family homes. The applicants requested a modification, based on a wide, open area on the south end that included a water detention feature; which created a significant distance between the uses. One large triangular lot on the Monticello property was adjacent at the southwest corner, as well as a lot that was close to the property line on the east side.

The applicants had talked with Mr. Bella, the owner of the Monticello property; and he preferred heavy landscaping, which would provide residents with a better view, to an opaque fence. Their objection to this buffer on the west side was that it would not benefit many of the tenants on the second or third floors. For the lower levels, the preference was also for heavy landscaping. Mr. Musil displayed color renderings showing heavy juniper coverage with some hedges and evergreen and deciduous trees that could create a solid 6-foot visual buffer. One slide contrasted this look with that of a long vinyl fence. Mr. Musil complimented staff on their work and emphasized that they intended to work with the neighbor to the south, since this was a less intense use.

Following Mr. Musil's presentation, Chairperson Norbury asked for staff comments.

Ms. Thompson entered Exhibit (A), list of exhibits 1-17 into the record. She related that the applicant was asking to rezone 23 acres, located at the southwest corner of NE Bowlin Road

and NE Jamestown Drive. Of these, 20 acres would be rezoned to RP-4 for the apartments and the remaining three acres to CP-2 for office use. The Comprehensive Plan showed this area as a combination of commercial, office, retail and medium to high-density residential uses. Staff recommended approval of the rezoning and preliminary development plan, subject to eight Recommendation Items, which Ms. Thompson summarized.

Recommendation Item 1 was a requested modification to the maximum 12 units per acre to allow for 14.76 units per acre. Staff supported this modification, since the project would have significantly less impervious coverage than the maximum allowed for RP-4. It was also consistent with several recently approved apartment developments.

Recommendation Items 2, 3 and 4 concerned modification requests for various setbacks. The setbacks for front yards, rear yards and parking lots for RP-4 were a minimum 20 feet. The applicant requested a 10-foot front yard setback from Jamestown Drive for the clubhouse (Item 2) and a 15-foot rear setback for Building 7 (Item 3). This was for one corner of the building. A 15-foot parking lot setback was requested for the parking lot on Jamestown Drive near Building 9 (Item 4), also for only a corner of the lot. Staff supported these requests. As the clubhouse location fit into the overall style and design theme, it being close to the street seemed appropriate. Building 7 was close to the large open detention tract, providing some visual distance; and the parking lot corner being close to the street was due to topographic constraints.

Recommendation Item 5 was the requested modification to the high-impact buffer that Mr. Musil had described. Staff did not support this request. The UDO required a high-impact buffer between dissimilar uses, and here residential uses were adjacent to commercial ones. Staff recommended that the landscaping be installed on the north and east sides of the fencing. The apartment parking lots were already close to the CP-2 uses and to R-1 uses to the south. Staff believed that a substantial buffer was needed. Recommendation Item 6 was the one suggesting elevators for the buildings. While these were not required by the UDO, they could be an important amenity to an apartment development. Staff had discussed this with other apartment developers in pre-application meetings.

Item 7 required that development be in accordance with the preliminary development plan; and Item 8 required a development agreement with the City, that would address, "*at a minimum, the required off-site transportation improvements listed in the TIA, [Traffic Impact Analysis] dated June 7, 2017.* It would have to be recorded in the Jackson County Records' Office; and "*all public improvements shall be substantially complete prior to issuance of any occupancy permit within the development.*" Bowlin was to be improved to an urban standard including curb, gutter and sidewalks from the intersection of Lakewood Way to the relocated Jamestown Road intersection.

Following Ms. Thompson's comments, Chairperson Norbury asked if there was anyone present wishing to give testimony, either in support for or opposition to the application. Seeing none, he then asked if the Commission had questions for the applicant or staff.

Mr. Gustafson asked if the existing Jamestown Road was being removed. Mr. Jeff Wilke gave his business address as 2400 Pershing Road in Kansas City, MO. He replied that Jamestown was currently on the original north-south alignment; and staff had requested it be re-aligned further to the west. Mr. Park added that it was in the developer's and City's interest to reconstruct the road in a location that best served the land use. The old alignment was to an

interim standard. Mr. Gustafson noted that the traffic study had mentioned “*improvement alternatives*”, and that the intersection was close to the interchange. He asked why the road had not originally been further east. Mr. Park explained that the actual location was not problematic, as most of the properties to the east of Jamestown were either public parkland or otherwise not developable and traffic was usually light. What needed attention was the intersection operations at I-470’s Bowlin Road and Lakewood Way exits. MoDOT owned and operated these and they had agreed that no traffic signal be required for this development. Staff did not consider a signal necessary for Jamestown and Bowlin at this point. At present, Bowlin/Lakewood Way was a diamond interchange and only one ramp had a traffic signal.

Mr. Funk noted that the City had been trying to develop more rental and multi-family housing in response to market demand and it seemed that this project hinged on the cost of elevators, not the cost of future commercial development. They might be appreciated by young families. Mr. Musil answered that whatever it hinged on, elevators had not been imposed on any other project, nor had there been a market response. Moreover, in this case installing elevators in ten buildings would be a significant expense and the complex would have only a few 3-bedroom apartments, which were what young families were typically looking for. Mr. Funk asked if that meant the applicants did not want to attract young families to Lee’s Summit and Mr. Musil responded that the applicant expected this development to attract a high percentage of young professionals and empty nesters. That did not mean that the owners would not welcome other tenants but this was the demographic they expected to take an interest.

Chairperson Norbury noted that high-impact screening was commonly used between contrasting uses, such as commercial development next to residential. On this development’s west side, a residential use would go in next to already existing commercial development. Typically the intent was to protect the less intensive from more intensive use. Ms. Thompson acknowledged that needs for high-impact screening did vary. She cited the example of the school and its playground backing up to a property line, which was adjacent to the apartments’ very large parking lot.

Chairperson Norbury noted that the Commission did have the purview to be flexible and require the fence in some sections but not others. The development’s southwest corner would be adjacent to commercial development, which was clearly a more intense use. He asked about precedents for a landscape buffer in lieu of a vinyl fence; adding that a common concern was that a fence needed to be maintained but trees and other landscaping could die. While it was true that a fence was not always the best look, the City could check on the condition of a fence but maintenance of living plants was more difficult to enforce. Ms. Thompson noted that the Village at View High (now the Meridian Apartments) had R-1 and AG districts on the north side and they got a modification to a high-impact buffer due to the presence of mature trees. They were required to submit a management plan. Tonight’s applicants had offered a minor maintenance plan.

Concerning the elevators, Chairperson Norbury was not sure what the purpose of Recommendation Item 6 was, as elevators were not a requirement. Ms. Thompson acknowledged that it was partially for discussion purposes.

Mr. Musil stated that the applicants would develop options and show details in the final plan for the landscaping buffers. He acknowledged that trees and other plants were difficult to monitor; however, both wood and vinyl fences did deteriorate and become eyesores. The applicants’



position was that greenery was more attractive, was more easily to fix and replace and lasted longer.

Mr. Wayne Kirkoff of WIK Urban Design 11437 Flint in Overland Park, Kansas. He related that when the applicants first submitted the plan, they were not specific about what plants would be used. They were proposing a hedge of seagreen juniper, which was hardy and very fast-growing; and grew to about six feet. Other juniper types would be used in places where more height was needed. The seagreen juniper hedges would provide a thick landscape barrier which would be difficult to walk through.

Chairperson Norbury asked staff if it could work for the recommendation to give a reference point for a landscaping-only high-impact buffer. Mr. Soto answered that staff could work with that.

Chairperson Norbury asked if there were further questions for the applicant or staff. Hearing none, he closed the public hearing at 6:02 p.m. and asked for discussion among the Commission members.

Mr. Lopez agreed with this approach, noting that the problem might have been not enough communication or information. Mr. Funk agreed that providing a standard via the recommendation was a good idea. He stated that as the City was pushing multi-family developments and these were for young families, elevators should be discussed in the future. Chairperson Norbury noted that the City could require applicants to include the expense of elevators in multi-family housing.

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

Mr. Funk made a motion to recommend approval of Application #PL2017-094: Rezoning from AG to RP-4 and CP-2 and Preliminary Development Plan: West Ridge at the Lake, approximately 23 acres located at the southwest corner of NE Bowlin Rd. and NE Jamestown ; Sallee Homes, applicant; subject to staff's letter of June 9, 2017, specifically Recommendation Items 1 through 8, amending Recommendation 5 to read "*A high-impact buffer screen with plantings six feet in height, and without a fence, shall be provided along the south and west property lines with low-impact landscape screening on the north and east sides of the fencing.*" [amendments underlined] Mr. Lopez seconded.

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

On the motion of Mr. Funk, seconded by Mr. Lopez, the Planning Commission members voted unanimously by voice vote to recommend **APPROVAL** of Application #PL2017-094: Rezoning from AG to RP-4 and CP-2 and Preliminary Development Plan: West Ridge at the Lake, approximately 23 acres located at the southwest corner of NE Bowlin Rd. and NE Jamestown ; Sallee Homes, applicant; subject to staff's letter of June 9, 2017, specifically Recommendation Items 1 through 8, with Recommendation 5 amended as noted.

(The foregoing is a digest of the secretary's notes of the public hearing. The transcript may be obtained.)

7. **Application #PL2017-095 - PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN** - Bloom Living, approximately 2.5 acres located at the southwest corner of SE Shenandoah Dr. and SE Battery Dr.; Complete, LLC, applicant

Chairperson Norbury opened the hearing at 6:10 p.m. and asked those wishing to speak, or provide testimony, to stand and be sworn in.

Mr. Austin Chamberlain of Complete, LLC, gave his address as 8666 W. 96th Street in Overland Park, Kansas. He related that this was the second Bloom Living senior development in Kansas City. It was an independent living facility, with assistants for residents who needed it being licensed elsewhere. The minimum age was 60, and tenants had a choice of services such as delivery of meals, medication reminders, housekeeping and laundry. Complete, LLC would be the developer and part owner; with another owner-operator and financial partner, Midwest Health, in Topeka. They owned about 50 communities in the Midwest.

Mr. Chamberlain displayed a rendering of the entrance of the three-story, 95-unit building. The development would back up to Shenandoah and Battery Drives and covered a little under 3.5 acres including the water detention area in back. The site plan showed the main entrance off Battery Drive, with a roundabout for dropoffs, with parking and carports nearby. A second access was off Shenandoah. A side elevation showed different use of textures, with stucco, concrete lap siding, some shingle siding, and stone; and architectural features for visual interest such as trusses at the top. Another view showed an interior common area with windows looking straight out to the back. Mr. Chamberlain explained that the patio would have a fire pit and face the detention area, which would be designed as another green space with a trail. The common space would be used for a wide variety of purposes, including dining, exercising and meetings. The common kitchen was for use of the residents.

The next slides showed samples of the living units, including studio and one-bedroom. Displayed lists showed basic amenities and additional services that could be purchased.

Following Mr. Chamberlain's presentation, Chairperson Norbury asked for staff comments.

Ms. Stanton entered Exhibit (A), list of exhibits 1-15 into the record. She referred the Commission to the "Code and Ordinance Requirements" section of staff's report, having to do with fire access and ensuring that the curvature would be ironed out in the final plan. Staff recommended approval of the preliminary development plan, subject to the two Recommendation Items. Item 1 granted a modification to the UDO's minimum allowed plant size to allow for 2-inch caliper and "*evergreens with a minimum height of 6 feet*" on the landscape plan. Item 2 references the Traffic Impact Analysis statement that "*the proposed driveway onto SE Shenandoah shall be subject to the recommendations of the City Traffic Engineer.*" This recommendation included three options.

Following Ms. Stanton's comments, Chairperson Norbury asked if there was anyone present wishing to give testimony, either in support for or opposition to the application. Seeing none, he then for questions for the applicant or staff.

Chairperson Norbury remarked that stormwater issues had come up previously in applications involving this area between Blue Parkway and Shenandoah. He asked if the stormwater plan met the requirements and there would be no increase in flow to nearby residential property. Mr. Monter answered that the applicants had submitted their preliminary stormwater report, and the report indicated no increase in the peak flow. Chairperson Norbury continued that he had noticed references to future office buildings on some of the drawings, and asked for confirmation that this application was for the main building only. Ms. Stanton answered that it was, adding that staff had asked the applicants to update the conceptual plan for that area. The original plan had shown five one-story office buildings. What was currently shown met ordinance standards for parking and square footage. She added that a condition requiring a modification for open yard trees had not been needed, and the wording in "Minimum Open Yard, Trees" in the report had been that the modification was not supported by staff. They had since discovered a typographical error in the table, and the applicants actually had the number of trees they needed.

Chairperson Norbury observed that there were three options for the TIA, and asked if a determination had been made. Mr. Park replied that staff had tried to keep the options flexible, since some review had not been completed. If the developer could not move the driveway further west, staff could agree to a right-in-right out option. Keeping the options available would allow the applicants flexibility with the final design.

Chairperson Norbury asked if there were further questions for the applicant or staff. Hearing none, he closed the public hearing at 6:23 p.m. and asked for discussion among the Commission members, or for a motion.

Mr. Lopez made a motion to recommend approval of Application PL2017-095, Preliminary Development Plan: Bloom Living, approximately 2.5 acres located at the southwest corner of SE Shenandoah Dr. and SE Battery Dr.; Complete, LLC, applicant; subject to staff's letter of June 9, 2017, specifically Recommendation Items 1 and 2. Mr. Funk seconded.

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

On the motion of Mr. Lopez, seconded by Mr. Funk, the Planning Commission members voted unanimously by voice vote to recommend **APPROVAL** of Application PL2017-095, Preliminary Development Plan: Bloom Living, approximately 2.5 acres located at the southwest corner of SE Shenandoah Dr. and SE Battery Dr.; Complete, LLC, applicant; subject to staff's letter of June 9, 2017, specifically Recommendation Items 1 and 2.

(The foregoing is a digest of the secretary's notes of the public hearing. The transcript may be obtained.)

<p>8. <b>Application #PL2017-096 - SPECIAL USE PERMIT</b> for a senior independent living facility - Bloom Living, approximately 2.5 acres located at the southwest corner of SE Shenandoah Dr. and SE Battery Dr.; Complete, LLC, applicant</p>
--

Chairperson Norbury opened the hearing at 6:24 p.m. and asked those wishing to speak, or provide testimony, to stand and be sworn in.

Mr. Austin Chamberlain of Complete, LLC, gave his address as 8666 W. 96th Street in Overland Park, Kansas. He stated that the applicants had held a neighborhood meeting last week. About 10 people had attended, and there had not been any opposition to the project.

Following Mr. Chamberlain's comments, Chairperson Norbury asked for staff comments.

Ms. Stanton entered Exhibit (A), list of exhibits 1-15 into the record. She stated that the one Recommendation Item for a term of 30 years was consistent with previous similar uses. These had varied between 50 years (for a hospital) to 20.

Chairperson Norbury asked if there was anyone present wishing to give testimony, either in support for or opposition to the application. Seeing none, he asked the Commission had questions for the applicant or staff. As there were none, Chairperson Norbury closed the public hearing at 6:27 p.m. and asked for discussion among the Commission members, or for a motion.

Mr. Funk made a motion to recommend approval of Application PL2017-096, Special Use Permit for a senior independent living facility: Bloom Living, approximately 2.5 acres located at the southwest corner of SE Shenandoah Dr. and SE Battery Dr.; Complete, LLC, applicant; subject to staff's letter of June 9, 2017, specifically Recommendation Item 1. Mr. Lopez seconded.

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

On the motion of Mr. Funk, seconded by Mr. Lopez, the Planning Commission members voted unanimously by voice vote to recommend **APPROVAL** of Application PL2017-096, Special Use Permit for a senior independent living facility: Bloom Living, approximately 2.5 acres located at the southwest corner of SE Shenandoah Dr. and SE Battery Dr.; Complete, LLC, applicant; subject to staff's letter of June 9, 2017, specifically Recommendation Item 1.

(The foregoing is a digest of the secretary's notes of the public hearing. The transcript may be obtained.)

<p>9. <b>Application #PL2017-097 - PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN</b> - Coleman Equipment, 4101 NE Lakewood Way; Coleman Equipment, applicant</p>
---

Chairperson Norbury opened the hearing at 6:28 p.m. and asked those wishing to speak, or provide testimony, to stand and be sworn in.

Mr. Kevin Tubbesing of The Land Source, a land brokerage and consulting firm, gave his address as He introduced Mr. Lonny Shanks with Tevis Architects and Mr. Dan Foster, civil engineer with Schlagel and Associates. Mr. John and Mr. Bruce Coleman, owners of Coleman Equipment, were also present. The 12-acre site was located off Woods Chapel Road northeast of Lakewood. It was a very challenging site to develop. A 30-foot grade went across the property and it had unrecorded City easements for public utilities. This property was also within an industrial park; but because of the better aesthetic value of property to the south the City had rezoned the area to PMIX. That zoning district was more expensive to develop than industrial

zoned property. The development would generate 21 jobs as well as provide needed services. The Colemans would not be using the entire 12.8 acre lot, so there would be four additional commercial lots for future development.

Following Mr. Tubbesing's comments, Chairperson Norbury asked for staff comments.

Mr. Shannon McGuire entered Exhibit (A), list of exhibits 1-16 into the record. He related that the application was for a preliminary development plan for the 12-acre lot at 101 NE Lakewood Way. It had been platted into two lots, plus a common tract. Lot 1 was 6.7 acres and would be the site of the proposed business. The remaining property would be developed at a later date. The building, about 14,000 square feet, would be accessed by a private street on the lot. Of the 14,000 square feet, 6,600 would be a dealership area with 5,500 square feet to be the shop area. Outdoor displays would be on the building's west side, and the applicant had requested a modification to the requirement that vehicle parking areas and drives be paved. They had also asked for a modification to the requirement to screen all rooftop equipment with parapet walls. Staff recommended approval of the application, including the two requested modifications, in Recommendation Items 1 and 2. Instead of paving they proposed "*decorative mulch placed over gravel filled reinforced modular cellular grid system for the equipment display area*" (Item 1). Instead of parapet walls, staff recommended allowing "*the proposed Envisor Screening System in lieu of parapet walls for screening around the periphery of the rooftop mechanical equipment*" (Item 2).

Following Mr. McGuire's comments, Chairperson Norbury asked if there was anyone present wishing to give testimony, either in support for or opposition to the application. Seeing none, he then asked if the Commission had questions for the applicant or staff.

Chairperson Norbury confirmed with Mr. Tubbesing that this application was only for the Coleman Equipment building, and not for the rest of the property.

Chairperson Norbury asked if there were further questions for the applicant or staff. Hearing none, he closed the public hearing at 6:36 p.m. and asked for discussion among the Commission members, or for a motion.

Mr. Lopez made a motion to recommend approval of Application PL2017-097, Preliminary Development Plan: Coleman Equipment, 4101 NE Lakewood Way; Coleman Equipment, applicant; subject to staff's letter of June 9, 2017, specifically Recommendation Items 1 and 2. Mr. Gustafson seconded.

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

On the motion of Mr. Lopez, seconded by Mr. Gustafson, the Planning Commission members voted unanimously by voice vote to recommend **APPROVAL** of Application #PL2017-097, Preliminary Development Plan: Coleman Equipment, 4101 NE Lakewood Way; Coleman Equipment, applicant; subject to staff's letter of June 9, 2017, specifically Recommendation Items 1 and 2.

(The foregoing is a digest of the secretary's notes of the public hearing. The transcript may be obtained.)

## OTHER AGENDA ITEMS

10. **RESOLUTION NO. 2017-02** - A Resolution Of The Planning Commission Of The City Of Lee's Summit, Missouri, Adopting The Capital Improvement Plan 2018-2022 As An Amendment To The City Of Lee's Summit Comprehensive Plan, As Amended, And Approving The Location, Extent And Character Of All Public Improvement Described In The City Of Lee's Summit Capital Improvement Plan, 2018-2022.

Chairperson Norbury opened the hearing at 6:37 p.m., and asked if there was any discussion of the resolution. Hearing none, he called for a motion, noting that this motion would be for approval and not recommendation for approval..

Mr. Funk made a motion to adopt Resolution No. 2017-02: A Resolution Of The Planning Commission Of The City Of Lee's Summit, Missouri, Adopting The Capital Improvement Plan 2018-2022 As An Amendment To The City Of Lee's Summit Comprehensive Plan, As Amended, And Approving The Location, Extent And Character Of All Public Improvements Described In The City Of Lee's Summit Capital Improvement Plan, 2018-2022. Mr. Lopez seconded.

Chairperson Norbury asked if there was any discussion of the motion. Ms. Yendes asked that the phrase "adopted by the City Council" be included in the motion. Mr. Funk withdrew his original motion and Mr. Lopez withdrew his second. Mr. Funk then amended his motion and moved to adopt Resolution No. 2017-02: A Resolution Of The Planning Commission Of The City Of Lee's Summit, Missouri, Adopting The Capital Improvement Plan 2018-2022 As An Amendment To The City Of Lee's Summit Comprehensive Plan, As Amended in Exhibit A, And Approving The Location, Extent And Character Of All Public Improvements Described In The City Of Lee's Summit Capital Improvement Plan, 2018-2022 Mr. Lopez seconded

On the motion of Mr. Funk, seconded by Mr. Lopez, the Planning Commission members voted unanimously by voice vote to recommend **APPROVAL** of Resolution No. 2017-02: A Resolution Of The Planning Commission Of The City Of Lee's Summit, Missouri, Adopting The Capital Improvement Plan 2018-2022 As An Amendment To The City Of Lee's Summit Comprehensive Plan, As Amended in Exhibit A, And Approving The Location, Extent And Character Of All Public Improvements Described In The City Of Lee's Summit Capital Improvement Plan, 2018-2022.

## PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no public comments at the meeting.

## ROUNDTABLE

Mr. Soto noted that the second Planning Commission meeting in June was for election of officers. This would be on the agenda for the June 27 meeting, as well as appointments of liaisons to the Historic Preservation Commission and the CEDC.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, Chairperson Norbury adjourned the meeting at 6:46 p.m.

PC 061317