

**The City of Lee's Summit**  
**Action Letter**  
**Planning Commission**

Thursday, November 4, 2021

5:00 PM

City Council Chambers and Videoconference

---

Notice is hereby given that the Planning Commission for the City of Lee's Summit will meet on Thursday, November 4, 2021, at 5:00 pm in the City Council Chambers at City Hall, 220 SE Green Street, Lee's Summit, Missouri, and via video conference as provided by Section 2-50 of the City of Lee's Summit Code of Ordinances, adopted by the City Council on June 15, 2021, Ordinance No. 9172.

Persons wishing to comment on any item of business on the agenda, including public testimony during a Public Hearing, via video conference may do so by sending a request prior to 5:00 p.m. on Wednesday, November 3, 2021, to the City Clerk at [clerk@cityofls.net](mailto:clerk@cityofls.net) to attend the meeting on the video conferencing platform. The City Clerk will provide instructions regarding how to attend by this method.

Call to Order

Roll Call

**Present:** 7 - Chairperson Donnie Funk  
Vice Chair Dana Arth  
Board Member Randy Benbrook  
Board Member Tanya Jana-Ford  
Board Member Jake Loveless  
Board Member Cynda Rader  
Board Member Terry Trafton

**Absent:** 2 - Board Member Mark Kitchens  
Board Member Matt Sanning

1. Approval of Agenda

Chairperson Funk announced that there were no changes to the agenda, and asked for a motion to approve. A motion was made by Board Member Trafton, seconded by Board Member Loveless, that this agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously.

Public Comments

There were no public comments at the meeting.

Approval of Consent Agenda

- A. [TMP-2091](#) An ordinance vacating a certain easement located at 2030 NW O'Brien Road in the City of Lee's Summit, Missouri.

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.

- B. [2021-4502](#) Appl. #PL2021-341 - PRELIMINARY PLAT - Colbern Road Investments, Lots 1 thru 4 and Tract A, 900 NE Colbern Rd; Engineering Solutions, LLC, applicant

Concerning Application PL2021-341, Commissioner Trafton stated that in his review of the documents in staff's letter, the action on this property was in 2007; and he had not seen a preliminary plat. He asked if it would be necessary to review this at tonight's meeting. Mr. Soto replied that staff did have a copy; adding that since plats were administrative approval items, a public hearing was not necessary. He added that in 2007 a preliminary plat had been included along with the preliminary development plan; and this application did not have one at present. The applicant wanted to subdivide and create the lots. A preliminary development plan would be included in a future application.

Mr. McGuire displayed the preliminary plat, as Commissioner Trafton was not able to see it. Mr. Soto stated that it basically did the groundwork for a future final or minor plat that would be brought to the Planning Commission and City Council. It established preliminary or prospective lot lines, easements and street layouts.

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

- C. [2021-4487](#) Approval of the October 21, 2021 Planning Commission Minutes

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

## Public Hearings

2. [2021-4505](#) Appl. #PL2021-289 - PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN - ReNourish Counseling Office, 102 SW 2nd St; ReNourish, 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. Matt Schlicht, of Engineering Solutions, gave his address as 50 SE 30th Street in Lee's Summit. He stated that the application pertained to an existing house at 102 SW 2nd Street. The applicant wanted to convert the house into a ReNourish counseling facility. The owners were present and could describe their project and business plans. The business would be a nutritional counseling center, with most of the services, about 70 percent, done online although some clients came to the facility in person. The building would be essentially a place for them to create an office for occasional meetings and administrative paperwork. Currently they were working out of an office at Bridge Space, and wanted to have a more permanent office base.

Mr. Schlicht displayed a map showing Market and 2nd Streets, with the proposed site indicated in yellow. Next door was a residence that had previously been converted into a photography studio and office. A strip commercial center was across the street, and a bank was located to the southeast. Two houses were directly across the street; one of which was still a residence and the other had been converted to an insurance office. The City community parking lot directly to the south was for Bridge Space. Properties to the south and southwest of this community parking were all transitional businesses, and a commercial/office use building was directly to the west, as well as a residence.

Two neighborhood meetings had been held, one at Bridge Space. One person had attended, with general questions about what would happen; and it had been made clear that this would be another transitional use with little impact on neighbors. A second meeting had been scheduled via Zoom on October 27; however, no one had attended.

The proposal for parking was for a parking space with curb and gutter plus an ADA handicap space, with some retaining walls on both sides and some landscape screening on the west. Due to the size of the parking facility, the applicants were requesting a modification to the required 20-foot setback from the right-of-way. They proposed to develop the facility and add landscaping and screening. This approach was similar to what other users had done in this area.

Chairperson Funk announced that Commissioner Arth was now attending the meeting via Zoom. He then asked for staff comments.

Mr. McGuire entered Exhibit (A), list of exhibits 1-16 into the record. He confirmed that the site was located on the north side of SW 2nd Street, along the eastern edge of the Central Business District. Properties surrounding this development were all originally single-family homes, built between 1938 and 1950. The applicant proposed to refurbish the existing home as a nutritional counseling office. The purpose of this preliminary development plan was the requested modifications to the UDOs parking setback requirements. The proposed use was allowed by right in this zone; and the modification request was the reason for tonight's hearing.

The proposed development would retain the original single-family home that was built in 1921. As the use would retain this home's original residential character and appearance, the use would be compatible with the surrounding neighborhood. It would meet the intent and purpose of the TMZ zoning and would establish a buffer from the more intense CBD uses on adjoining properties. The requested modifications were primarily to the setbacks from the right-of-way and the east and west property lines.

The applicants proposed a 3.5 foot setback along the SW 2nd Street right-of-way, 11.5 feet from the residential use at the western property line, and 2.4 feet from the eastern property line. Like many other properties Downtown, site limitations prevented compliance with the required parking lot setbacks; and this was especially true of residential properties that were being converted to office or commercial uses. The proposed setbacks compared favorably to the adjacent property at 2100 SW 2nd Street. The parking lot extended up to both the SW 2nd Street right-of-way and the property line shared with the subject property. To mitigate any negative impacts to the western residential property line, staff had added a requirement for landscape screening.

The applicant had proposed to provide one ADA parking space on site, with the remaining required three spaces required being provided off-site in the public parking lot at 204 SW Market Street. The UDO allowed parking requirements waived in the Downtown area, as long as public parking was available within 500 feet.

Mr. McGuire summarized staff's three Conditions of Approval. One was for the requested modification to the setbacks; one required parking lot screening at the edge of the parking lot, running parallel to the western property line. The third condition required that the development "shall be in accordance with the preliminary development plan dated October 5, 2021. Staff's letter indicated that the application met the requirements of the UDO and the Design and Construction Manual.

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

Commissioner Benbrook noted that some dirt work was on the property's north side. He asked if this was part of a stormwater upgrade, and Mr. Schlicht replied that it was. Since the parking lot would create impervious surface, they planned to cut a flume that had some riprap going to the rear yard; and to install a rain garden in the back to provide some infiltration.

They also planned to keep the existing trees. Commissioner Benbrook asked if the applicant anticipated that would help with stormwater in the surrounding area, including adjoining properties. Mr. Schlicht answered that he did. This plan was similar to the one used for a project on Main and Orchard. Rain gardens in particular provided an opportunity to store stormwater long enough for it to soak into the ground.

Commissioner Benbrook then asked that the shrubs along the street looked to be a little shorter than the requirement. He asked if that would be for vehicle sight lines for drivers exiting the property. He also asked if the applicant was asking for shrubs to substitute for required street trees. Mr. McGuire explained that the UDO required vegetation per approved plans in the TNZ; so the UDO had no set requirements of that kind in that district. Mr. Schlicht stated that the required shrubs included a burning bush, which was initially plated in a two gallon container but could get as tall as seven feet. That particular species would be dense enough to provide visual screening.

Commissioner Benbrook noted that in the existing conditions picture shown earlier by staff, the porch appeared to be between 18 inches and two feet off the grade. He asked if there was a plan to make the site ADA accessible. He did not see any room for a ramp. On the displayed diagram, Mr. Schlicht pointed out the existing sidewalk on 2nd Street; and showed where a second sidewalk would be installed along the west side. The plan was to redevelop the front porch to make it accessible from the front. The entry would be ADA accessible from the sidewalk to the front door.

Commissioner Benbrook then asked if there were any plans to upgrade the facade; and Mr. Schlicht replied that so far the plan was to keep the facade in its present form, other than any necessary patching and repairs.. Most of the changes would be to the interior to make it suitable for office and commercial use.

Commissioner Trafton noted that the photo showed a side entrance, with the front entrance being the main access. He asked if the applicant would make any connector to it. Mr. Schlicht answered that he did not know yet. The next step would be looking over the layout of the interior, to see what changes were needed. Later they would decide what to do with the side access, although the front would be the main entrance.

Chairperson Funk recalled that Mr. Schlicht had said the number of people of people coming to the facility on an average day would be minimal. Mr. Schlicht answered that most of the service to the clients was online. Chairperson Funk noted that the traffic impact study indicated traffic moving east and west on a hill; and Mr. Schlicht replied that this was a reason for including a turnaround, so that drivers could head out to 2nd Street rather than backing out.

Chairperson Funk asked if there were further questions for the applicant or staff. Hearing none, he closed the public hearing at 5:30 p.m. and asked for discussion among the Commission members, or for a motion.

Commissioner Trafton made a motion to recommend approval of Application PL2021-289, Preliminary Development Plan: ReNourish Counseling Office, 102 SW 2nd St; ReNourish, applicant. Board Member Jana-Ford 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 Trafton, seconded by Board Member Jana-Ford, that this application be recommended for approval to the City Council - Regular Session. The motion carried unanimously.

- a. [TMP-2094](#) An Ordinance approving a preliminary development plan located at 102 SW 2nd

Street, proposed ReNourish counseling office in district TNZ, in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 33, the Unified Development Ordinance, of the Code of Ordinances for the City of Lee's Summit, Missouri.

3. [2021-4498](#) Appl. #PL2021-346 - REZONING from AG to RLL - 2013 SW Sampson Rd; Nicholas P. Sallas and Carla E. Sallas, applicants

Chairperson Funk opened the hearing at 5:32 p.m. and asked those wishing to speak, or provide testimony, to stand and be sworn in.

Mr. Nicholas P. Sallas gave his address as 2013 SW Sampson Road in Lee's Summit. He stated that the subject property was currently zoned Agricultural;. He wanted to rezone it to Residential Large Lot (RLL) and built a ranch style house on it. At present, the setbacks were 50 feet to the north and west; and the lot was only 165 feet wide.

Chairperson Funk then asked for staff comments.

Mr. Soto entered Exhibit (A), list of exhibits 1-13 into the record. He displayed a zoning map that showed the approximately five acres on Sampson Road, about a half mile south of Scherer Road. It showed property still zoned AG, and some standard sized single-family lots at the map's north end. The yellow-green areas on the map indicated property currently zoned RLL. Of three parcels, one already had a home built on it and another was vacant. The third parcel, about a quarter mile south of Scherer, was also developed with a single-family home. Some PMIX property was at the SW corner of Scherer and Sampson. A closer view of the subject property showed some narrow five-acre lots; and some larger 10-acre lots to both the north and south. Some Preserve Inc. property was to the east, and some Army Corps of Engineers property was across Sampson Road to the west.

The applicants wanted to construct a single-family residence on the property. It currently had no sanitary sewer, with the closest location being at the Scherer-Sampson intersection about a half mile to the north. They were requesting Jackson County for approval of a septic system, which required a minimum three acre lot size. The applicants owned five acres, and have already started evaluating the prospective septic system.

A single-family residence was allowed under both the existing AG zoning and RLL zoning. The reason for tonight's hearing was the setback limitations imposed by the AG zoning. As the subject property was about 165 feet wide, the required minimum 50-foot setback would leave only about 65 feet in the middle for development. In comparison, the RLL zoning district would have a minimum side setback of only 10 feet. That would leave 145 feet in the middle of the lot.

Most of the developed properties in this area had been developed before 2001. Standards before that year allowed for much less restrictive side yard setbacks. From 1954 to 1966, that was only five feet. From 1967 to the end of October 2001, the minimum setback was 15 feet. In November of 2001, the side yard setback in AG zoning increased to 50 feet, effectively removing flexibility in building a house on property with that zoning. The subject property was 165 feet wide and about 1,300 feet deep. These setback constraints were the reason for tonight's request for RLL zoning.

The RLL zoning district was consistent with the lower-intensity residential land use that was specified in the Ignite comprehensive plan. Existing zoning along Sampson between Scherer and Hook included three zoning districts: AG zoning, RDR (Rural Density Residential), and PMIX. The applicants wanted to develop their property with the setbacks similar to what was built before 2001. Regarding public infrastructure, the property would use a septic sewer system due to no public sewer being available. A water line ran along the opposite side of Sampson Road; and in view Sampson Road's existing condition, the traffic generated by a single

Planning Commission

Action Letter

November 4, 2021

---

additional residence would not make any improvements to the road necessary.

The application had two standard Conditions of Approval. At present, with the AG zoning the City was responsible for mowing the area between the edge of the street and the property line. With the zoning change to RLL, the applicants would be responsible for the right-of-way mowing. The second Condition required a minor plat to be approved and recorded before issuing a building permit. With these conditions, the application would be in compliance with both the UDO and the Design and Construction Manual.

Following Mr. Soto's report, Chairperson Funk asked if there was any member of the public present who wanted to comment. Seeing none, he then asked if the Commissioners had questions for the applicant or staff.

Commissioner Trafton noted that according to the plan, Sampson Road would eventually become a larger street, especially if PMIX zoned development happened. He asked what the easement for the street was. Mr. Soto answered that under AG zoning, the minimum setback was 100 feet from the property line. With RLL zoning, it could be as close as 30 feet. He did not know the exact location on the lot where the applicants wanted to locate the house. Mr. Sallas stated that the house would be lined up with the house to the north, about 150 feet back from the street. He added then when he and his wife first looked at the lot, they had asked when the street would be widened.

Commissioner Trafton remarked that in that case, the easement would technically be 30 feet; and Mr. Soto confirmed that this would be the minimum setback. Commissioner Trafton asked what changes would be made to Sampson Road, and whether it would be widened to three lanes. Mr. Soto said that at minimum, it would be a three-lane road. If it was four lanes, the overall width of the right-of-way would be about 100 feet. The house would need to be at least 80 feet from the center of the road.

Commissioner Trafton asked Mr. Sallas if it was correct that his intent to not build within 10 feet of the property line, and Mr. Sallas confirmed that it was. Commissioner Trafton remarked that Mr. and Mrs. Sallas had met with the neighbor to the south, and the neighbor had asked about the placement of the house. He wanted to be sure he had understood clearly.

Chairperson Funk noted the red line outlining the Sallases' property in the packets; and asked how far off the driveway to the north their property line was. Mr. Sallas replied that it was right on their property line. The adjacent neighbor had previously moved her driveway, resulting in it being partly on his property. He had talked with her son, and was told that this was probably when the gravel was put in.

Chairperson Funk asked if there were further questions for the applicant or staff. Hearing none, he closed the public hearing at 5:45 p.m. and asked for discussion among the Commission members, or for a motion.

Commissioner Trafton said he appreciated the Sallases' efforts to build in this area, commenting that they would be neighbors to the south of his home.

Commissioner Trafton made a motion to recommend approval of Application. PL2021-346, Rezoning from AG to RLL: 2013 SW Sampson Rd; Nicholas P. Sallas and Carla E. Sallas, applicants. Vice Chair Arth 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 Trafton, seconded by Vice Chair Arth, that this

Planning Commission

Action Letter

November 4, 2021

---

application be recommended for approval to the City Council - Regular Session. The motion carried unanimously.

- a. [TMP-2090](#) An Ordinance approving a rezoning from district AG to district RLL for approximately 4.93 acres located at 2013 SW Sampson Road 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. [2021-4506](#) Appl. #PL2021-367 - PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN - The Villas of Chapel Ridge and The Townhomes of Chapel Ridge revised architectural elevations, 4008 NE Independence Ave and 4060 NE Ralph Powell Rd; Engineering Solutions, LLC, applicant

Chairperson Funk opened the hearing at 5:46 p.m. and asked those wishing to speak, or provide testimony, to stand and be sworn in.

Mr. Matt Schlicht, of Engineering Solutions, gave his address as 50 SE 30th Street in Lee's Summit. He was present tonight on behalf of the developer and builder of The Villas of Chapel Ridge and The Townhomes of Chapel Ridge. The application was basically a request for modifications to update the architectural style. In 2019, he had brought in a preliminary development plan for the overall Chapel Ridge development, specifically this particular corner. At that time he had reworked some of the townhomes and estate lots, as well as increasing the amount of green space. Mr. Schlicht noted that at that time, Lakewood still had wood shake shingle roofs; and discussions were going on that eventually resulted in tile roofs being used. Similarly, stucco had a good reputation at that time and was added. Essentially builders were then restricted to stucco and tile roofs. At present, development plans were being modified to add some flexibility about materials.

The project site was the northwest corner of Woods Chapel Road and M-291. Businesses on that commercial corner were QuikTrip, Burger King, Commerce Bank and Tiff N Jay's restaurant. The former golf course was behind and to the south of this corner. It had been converted into townhomes, estate lots, and villas. This happened in 2006, when the only approved materials were stucco and tile roofs. In that year 23 estate lots had been platted; and in the years since then only seven had been developed, for an average of only about 1.1 lots per year. Two lots had been added in 2002, when the next phase of townhomes was done in the northwest corner of the property. In 2006, the townhomes occupied eight lots, and until two years ago only three of those lots had buildings on them.

Last year, 11 more lots were starting construction of townhomes. The eight lots previously platted were now completely built and the units sold; so some progress had been made. The villas were on the west side of the pond on the property. Of these, 42 lots were platted in 2006; and at present 14 lots were still undeveloped or currently under construction.

A neighborhood meeting was held via Zoom last week, with five or six people participating. One of the requests was to allow some alternatives to tile roofs, such as composite asphalt shingles or standing seam metal roofs. This was similar to what was used in Lee's Summit generally and Lakewood in particular. One participant had preferred that tile roofs be retained throughout the entire development, in order to remain consistent with what was already there. Having some trail connections through the development were also discussed; but no lot or network changes would be allowed although some ways to improve pedestrian access might be considered with the next phase.

Another participant had questions about the townhomes. These would have maintenance provided including exterior elements such as roofs, lawn maintenance and snow removal. Questions were raised about whether dues would be changed by modifying or adding materials; but the answer was that they would not. Currently, the HOA in the townhome

section had a significant monthly cost for repairing the tile roofs on the first three townhomes. These had constant problems with leaks and roof materials shifting.

A resident of the subdivision to the west who attended the meeting had commented that he wanted to keep the tile roofs, as they were more visually attractive than the asphalt shingle roofs that were used throughout his neighborhood. Another subdivision in south Lee's Summit which had tile roofs and stucco materials on all four sides. This was the villas at Stoney Creek, that were developed in the late 1990s and early 2000s, and they had also sold very slowly until a new developer took over.

One participant had said the tile roof material was a better quality product, and was told that there were differences with the asphalt shingles with styles and levels. These were the 'designer' level, which was equivalent to tile. Another participant believed that this was being done only to increase the developer's profit; however, roof selection was a small part of the sale price and cost of construction.

Some residents who lived in existing phases of the subdivision preferred that the existing phase of the villas in Phase 1 and the estate lots use tile, in order to stay consistent with current product. The developer agreed to keep tile roofs for the villas in the first phase. For the second phase, the roofs would be designer asphalt shingles and tile, with standing seam metal roofs as accents. In the estate section, tile roofs would stay consistent with the remaining estate lots. In both phases, architectural elements would also include Hardi-board lap siding, Hardi-board shake shingles and cedar beams and accents. None of these were acceptable under the current preliminary development plan; and the applicant was requesting modifications in the form of accent elements that would make the houses more attractive.

Mr. Schlicht then displayed an elevation of the current townhome design, which showed the stone and stucco front and tile roof. This design had worked well, but he did not think it had much character. An elevation of a proposed villa also showed the stone and stucco materials and use. It also showed cedar beams above the front door; although these were not technically allowed. Next, some displayed photos showed examples of single-family homes and townhomes. They showed what the developer and builder had done for variety, such as peaks and stone siding, while staying within standards of what was currently acceptable. A displayed rendering of what the developer was proposing, with a board and batten look, some standing seam roof options and an example of a designer composite asphalt shingle roof. The next image showed Hardi-board shake shingles and some stone accents. They reflected an effort to update styles by adding to the available materials. Other examples of some homes being built in the area showed a mixture of materials with cedar elements and accent pieces added.

Regarding roofing materials, tile roofs were standard at present. It was technically a concrete manufactured material that had been coated. Lakewood had allowed luxury designer shingles, actually an asphalt shingle roof. "Stoneworth" was a 50-year tile product; and "Certain Teed" was asphalt shingles. Both, as well as "Golden Pledge", had a 50-year warranty. Mr. Schlicht displayed an aerial map of the Lakewood area with shingles or wood roofs indicated in yellow. The remainder of were tile. He had also made price comparisons based on Zillow; and concluded that the type of roof, whether asphalt shingle or tile, was not directly associated with the home's value. A tile roof cost about \$400 a square and designer shingles about \$300 a square. A typical villa home would have about 40 squares, for an approximate \$4,000 cost difference in total cost. For townhomes it would be 25 squares, for a cost difference of about \$2,500.

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

Mr. Soto entered Exhibit (A), list of exhibits 1-15 into the record. He displayed a color coded map showing the two planned zoning areas. He stated that a reason for tonight's hearing was



Planning Commission

Action Letter

November 4, 2021

---

the language in Section 5 of Ordinance 60-106, that approved the Chapel Ridge mixed use development, stating that "That development shall be in accordance with the preliminary development plan dated September 19, 2005 appended hereto and made a part thereof. The development standards shall be as shown on the preliminary development plan" He then displayed the villa elevations provided in 2005. All four sets of elevations were variations of a theme and all had stucco, stone and brick facades as materials to be used in the villa section. All had tile roofs. The displayed elevations for the townhomes did allow for Hardi-board composite and composition roofs; but both had limited lists of materials. The Hardi-board mentioned would not be used for the villas.

Part of what was being proposed as part of the amendment was to adopt updated design guidelines to expand the number and variety of materials to be used on exterior siding. All three options, tile, composition and standing seam metal, could be used on the villas in the townhome section. Smart siding could be allowed along the front; but it was limited to board and batten or lap siding. Other types of smart siding could be used on the rear of the building. It did exclude vinyl and metal siding.

The three Conditions of Approval had been amended slightly, due to the requests of residents to maintain tile roofs in the existing phase. Condition 3 required "tile roofs on the remaining undeveloped lots within the first phase of the villas area originally platted as "The Villas of Chapel Ridge, 1st Plat, Lots 1042 and Tracts A-1 & B1". Condition 3 also included the language "added by the applicant at the request of existing area homeowners." Future phases could conform to the proposed standard of tile, composition or accent standing seam.

As there were no members of the public present to comment, Chairperson Funk then asked for any questions from Commissioners for the applicant or staff.

Commissioner Rader stated that she lived in Lakewood, and knew that rules about roofing were strict. She understood that an effort was being made to update and upgrade in the interest of increasing sales.

Commissioner Benbrook said he assumed that increasing the number of materials reflected the modern Craftsman aesthetic. Mr. Schlicht agreed that this might be a factor but it was likely more market-driven. A number of developments on the north side of town were selling well; and with this application there had been a sense of something missing. In response, some architectural elements were being added.

Regarding Condition 3, Commissioner Benbrook remarked that other products that imitated tile roofs and were just as durable. He suggested that these be considered. Mr. Schlicht agreed, but agreed with Commissioner Rader's observation about the Lakewood HOA having strict rules. The designer asphalt shingles were on their list of allowed materials.

Commissioner Jana-Ford stated that she also lived in Lakewood and was familiar with the roofing situation. She asked if it was correct that this area was under the Lakewood HOA. Mr. Schlicht answered that it was part of the HOA; however, a sub-HOA pertained to the townhome section, since exterior maintenance was provided. Commissioner Jana-Ford noted that Lakewood had a number of different neighborhoods. Her neighborhood, for example, could not use architectural shingles. She asked if this development was allowed to have a mix. Mr. Schlicht stated that the buildings in the yellow area on the map all used either designer composite shingles or had wood roofs. The applicants had sent out a letter to the Lakewood Property Owners Association about the materials, and the reply was that they were staying neutral.

Regarding the references to 'designer' shingles, Commissioner Jana-Ford asked if this meant architectural shingles. On the displayed slide, Mr. Schlicht pointed out the tabbed grooves on each side of some of the shingles, which added another layer. They had a little more character,

Planning Commission

Action Letter

November 4, 2021

---

such as depth; and allowed for a variations such as an alternate row of shingles with no grooves and more than one color. He added that this was a 50-year product.

Commissioner Loveless noted that one of the comments from neighbors was that this was an inferior product and might lead to additional expenses for the HOA members. Mr. Schlicht responded that the data he currently had was specifically for the townhomes; but he also had a letter from the HOA president on the townhome side stating that they were repairing and working on leaks and other problems with the tile roofs of three existing townhomes, on a monthly basis. He added that the other five townhomes had been built in last 24 months. These occasional issues were one reason for the Lakewood HOA had started allowing some alternatives.

Commissioner Loveless noted the second change to the material list on the exterior elevations, and asked Mr. Schlicht for comparisons on the cementitious siding product versus stucco, adding that the material list was very long and was not exclusive to Hardi-board. Mr. Schlicht responded that the approach was to go through a wide variety of quality products and did allow the LPsmart siding. This was already being used in the estate section. They were also using Hardi-board and brick veneer. The wood panels or wood shakes would be for accents and not an entire wall. He confirmed that the stucco use would be on all four sides. Four sided architecture was already being used in the villa section as well as the estate section. They were not expecting any significant savings in terms of maintenance.

Chairperson Funk asked if there were further questions for the applicant or staff. Hearing none, he closed the public hearing at 6:17 p.m. and asked for discussion among the Commission members.

Commissioner Jana-Ford noted that maintenance was an issue with tile roofs. She was the second owner of her home, and the tile roofs did create problems with leaks. They were definitely not maintenance-free.

Commissioner Trafton commended Mr. Schlicht on the details in his presentation, as well as all the information that staff had included in the packets.

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

Commissioner Trafton made a motion to recommend approval of Application PL2021-367, Preliminary Development Plan: The Villas of Chapel Ridge and The Townhomes of Chapel Ridge revised architectural elevations, 4008 NE Independence Ave and 4060 NE Ralph Powell Rd; Engineering Solutions, LLC, applicant. Board Member Jana-Ford 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 Trafton, seconded by Board Member Jana-Ford, that this application be recommended for approval to the City Council - Regular Session. The motion carried unanimously.

a. [TMP-2095](#)

An Ordinance approving a preliminary development plan requesting the revision of a certain Section #5 from approval Ordinance No. 6106 for the Chapel Ridge Mixed Use Development architectural elevations in districts RP-1 and RP-3, all in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 33, the Unified Development Ordinance, of the Code of Ordinances for the city of Lee's Summit, Missouri.

Roundtable

There were no Roundtable items at the meeting.

**Planning Commission**

**Action Letter**

**November 4, 2021**

---

**Adjournment**

**There being no further business, Chairperson Funk adjourned the meeting at 6:18 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](http://lsmo.legistar.com)"