

LEE'S SUMMIT PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of Tuesday, October 10, 2017

The Tuesday, October 10, 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
Mr. Donnie Funk, Vice Chair	Present	Mr. Beto Lopez	Present
Ms. Colene Roberts	Present	Ms. Carla Dial	Present
Mr. Don Gustafson	Present	Mr. Jeffrey Semmes	Present
Ms. Dana Arth	Present		

Also present were Robert McKay, Director, Planning and Special Projects; Hector Soto, Planning Division Manager; Jennifer Thompson, Staff Planner; Shannon McGuire, Staff Planner; Kent Monter, Development Engineering Manager; Jim Eden, Assistant Fire Chief I, Fire Department; and Jeanne Nixon, Development Center Secretary.

1. APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA

- A. Application #PL2017-171 - SIGN APPLICATION -** Summit View Farms. 2900 and 2901 SW Arthur Drive; Lorax Design Group, applicant
- B. Application #PL2017-173 - FINAL PLAT -** Mill Creek of Summit Mill, 7th Plat, Tract U; Engineering Solutions, applicant
- C. Approval** of the Minutes of the September 26, 2017 Planning Commission

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

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. Funk, seconded by Ms. Roberts, the Planning Commission voted unanimously by voice vote to **APPROVE** the agenda as published.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Chairperson Norbury commented that this had been moved up on the agenda from the end of the meeting, per last meeting's bylaw change. There were no public comments.

2. **Continued Application #PL2017-167 - PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN - Village at View High, 2nd Plat, Lots 4-45 and Tracts B-E; Engineering Solutions LLC, applicant**

Chairperson Norbury opened the hearing at 5:03 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 business address as 50 SE 30th Street in Lee's Summit. He related that the overall concept for this 70-acre property had come before the Commission about two years ago. The concept had included commercial development, senior housing and apartments. Displaying a color rendering of the conceptual plan, he pointed out View High at the west, with Fred Arbanas' golf course a little further off. The Winterset Valley subdivision was to the east, north and south. When they had brought this forward the last time, they had no specific details about what the developer wanted to do with the senior element. They had subsequently held a number of meetings with the Winterset Valley residents, who had expressed a clear preference for development that 'looked residential', as opposed to large blocky apartment buildings.

The new plan had 39 single-family residential lots for seniors; with several options for single-level styles including ranch or reverse story-and-a-half. They wanted to be consistent with the style and price range of Winterset Valley. On the west side, abutting the apartment project, they proposed 16 two-story attached, or townhomes, intended to appeal to retired and 'empty nester' seniors as well as young professionals. All exterior maintenance would be provided. Amenities included a pool and community center in the north-central part of the property. Residents could meet for small get-togethers including card games and potluck meals. The pool would be designed for adult fitness use, meaning that it would be more shallow at 3 or 4 feet and somewhat warmer.

The part of Winterset Valley to the south was where most of the residents attending the neighborhood meetings. Most of the discussion had been about an effective buffer being installed. Mr. Schlicht displayed a cross section view of Village Park Drive, the main road at the southern part of the property. He remarked that Winterset included many tree 'corridors' and a many nature elements generally. This had the effect of separating the roadway from the homes; and that had influenced the design. They would have berming on both sides and create an attractive pedestrian walkway. It would separate the two developments in terms of noise as well as sight. Along with the Winterset Valley developers they had also designed an island feature at the Winterset entrance that would further distinguish it from the new development. Mr. Schlicht then pointed out the road running beside the future Winterset Valley phase, noting that some of the residents had objected to that access point going all the way out to View High. However, safety required access to that property and this approach would mitigate some of the impact. Some of them would be four- or six-plexes. They were two stories, with a typical first floor area of 1,200 to 1,400 square feet, with the second floor area ranging from 800 to 1,200 square feet. Prices would range in the \$200,000 and \$300,000 range.

Mr. Schlicht then displayed a color rendering of a typical design for a townhome in the project. Its architectural craftsman style was similar to that in Winterset Valley. The idea was for the developer to offer two or three floor plan variations, with the homeowner modifying the front facade as they wished. Another rendering showed an example of the single-family homes. It was a reverse one-and-a-half story that would especially fit well on lots where the grade

dropped from the south to northwest. These too were consistent with the styles used in Winterset. The only item concerning the neighbors that had not been resolved was how to provide a second access of water to this site. The applicants proposed a water line loop that would pass between two existing homes where an existing utility easement was located. They would prefer to go to the east and would continue to look for options in that direction. But at present the property to the east was not yet developed enough to make that connection.

Staff's report had requested that the applicants provide a buffer on the west property line between the subject property and the apartment development. They did not believe this was necessary. At the time the apartments being developed, the concept plan showed a much more intense use and larger buildings. For that reason, the apartment developer was not required to put in any screening. The idea of the townhomes was that they would function as that screen, or transition, from single-family homes to apartments. Due to the quality and nature of this development, and the space in between, the applicants did not feel that this would be a benefit. The applicants had installed a storm sewer and sanitary sewer line on the west side for the first phase; and as a result they could not plant any large trees in that vicinity. For that reason, staff had suggested a low-impact screening of ornamentals and shrubs. Since this would be close to two-story townhomes, with two- and three-story apartment buildings on the other side, this level of screening would not be effective. Accordingly, the applicants were requesting a modification to allow omitting a buffer at that location.

Chairperson Norbury asked Mr. Schlicht if it was correct that the applicants were asking for a change to staff's Recommendation Item 1 to eliminate the screening requirement; and Mr. Schlicht replied that it was. Staff had addressed this on page 3 in the "Required/Proposed/Recommended" section. The applicants had proposed to have no buffer between the two properties. Mr. Schlicht added that both developers were aware of what type of development would be on the adjacent property. The applicants agreed with staff's other recommendations.

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

Ms. Thompson entered Exhibit (A), list of exhibits 1-19 into the record. She confirmed that the applicant had brought forward a preliminary development plan for a senior living residential development. The site was located at the northeast corner of View High Drive and 3rd Street, just west of the Winterset Valley subdivision. It was currently zoned PMIX, with adjacent properties to the north and east, and some to the south and east were zoned R-1. Other property to the south was zoned PMIX. The property was 13.78 acres and would be divided into 42 lots plus three common areas. Of the 42 lots, 39 of which would have single-family detached homes. The three townhomes, with a total of 16 units, would be on the remaining 3 acres. Density would be just under 4 units per acre (3.99) when the common areas were included. Excluding the common areas, the total density was just under 5 (4.94) units per acre. Specific building setbacks had been proposed.

Ms. Thompson displayed the previous conceptual plan and layout. It included a three-story building for memory care and a two-story assisted living facility. Tonight's plan did propose a development that would emphasize senior living. Ms. Thompson then displayed renderings of the townhomes, detached homes and community building. Staff considered the development compatible with adjacent land uses and appropriate for the site. Uses of the surrounding properties were existing and future residential, multi-family, and proposed mixed use. The design standards were comparable to the standards for RP-1 and RP-3 zoning districts.

Staff had 8 conditions of approval. A modification would be granted to the required medium-impact buffering requirement along the west property line, *“to allow a modified low impact screen”*, reducing the total number of trees and shrubs required, limiting tree types to smaller ornamental trees rather than evergreens or shade trees. Staff recommended granting this modification due to the 30-foot utility easement and the proposed infrastructure within the buffer area. Conditions 2, 3 and 4 were standard requirements for development approval. Conditions 5 and 6 established setbacks for all the lots. Condition 7 limited the number of dwelling units to 50 *“until such time as a second point of ingress to and egress from the subdivision”* was provided. Condition 8 confirmed that the development would be subject to the Village at View High development agreement.

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.

Mr. Dennis Sangroves gave his address as 158 Roosevelt Ridge. He pointed out that the water main had only an 11-foot easement, with only 15 feet between the two houses, one of which was his. That also included two electrical lines, cable lines and gas line. These all went through rock at that location. This made him concerned about putting a water line there. Water mains existed on the other side, on lots currently being sold; so there was no reason the water line could not go along the road. Mr. Sangroves pointed out his lot and the easement on the concept plan map. He also noted the discussions about berms at the neighborhood meeting and wanted to know what the plan looked like, adding that he had an interest in the screening being done as soon as possible. His house and those adjacent had an interest in an adequate berm due to the lots' height. He added that he was mostly pleased with the plan and wanted to ensure that the landscaping and screening part in particular were followed. After the street went in, it would be possible to do the berm and landscaping at the same time.

Mr. Sangroves also noted that the plan showed sidewalks on both sides of the street. He had discussed this with near neighbors and most of them did not think sidewalks would be needed on their side. The street was not likely to get so much traffic that five-foot sidewalks would be needed on both sides.

Chairperson Norbury then asked if the Commission had questions for the applicant or staff.

Mr. Funk noted that the presentation had included references to the plan as a senior living development but also mentioned young professionals as likely buyers. Mr. Schlicht stated that it would be designed and positioned for seniors but could appeal to young professionals as well. It would basically be an adult neighborhood rather than one geared toward families with children. The designs of the community center and a pool geared as much to workouts as recreational swimming were examples.

Chairperson Norbury had a similar buffer question come up with the apartments just south of Bowlin Road. They would be next to a commercial use and the developer did not want to put in a buffer. He did not recall what decision the Commission had made; but did recall a discussion about whether the less intensive user should have to put up a buffer if they did not want one. Mr. Soto answered that the plan went forward with an improvised landscaping design to be worked out between the applicant and staff. They were to put in a screen of staggered evergreen trees instead of a solid screen with evergreens. Chairperson Norbury then asked

staff if the UDO required sidewalks on both sides, and Ms. Thompson answered that they were for collector streets.

Ms. Roberts asked if it was correct that they were requiring landscaping on the rest of the site. Ms. Thompson answered that much of this PMIX was a standard single-family development, and these did not require landscaping. The buffer was something they were offering to Winterset Valley and would be used on the west between dissimilar uses. Ms. Roberts noted that the City had required a certain amount of landscaping in other development plan. It obviously had benefits other than serving as a screen; and reducing the amount on a specific part of the site did not make any sense. Ms. Thompson acknowledged that it was a reduction; however, it did include 51 trees and 64 shrubs. Ms. Roberts emphasized that the vegetation provided environmental benefits on its own, regardless of screening potential. She did not see any point in removing it.

Mr. Gustafson asked what the back side of the apartments in the development to the west looked like; and specifically if they had any visual interest features such as balconies. He was in favor of retaining the landscaping, especially for the first 5 or 6 lots since they backed up to a driveway leading to the apartments' parking lot. Mr. Schlicht related that the front side or one of these apartments included a lower-level garage and the back would have patios or balconies. Regarding the screening, Mr. Schlicht clarified that the applicants were not trying to remove any landscaping. They had in fact gone well above the City's requirements for landscaping.

In addition to the berm and shrubbery, Village Park Drive had plenty of street trees on both sides. The issue was not about landscaping itself but about landscaping buffers were not required for the PMIX; and staff was directing the applicants to install 115 plants in very specific locations. While the applicants were doing plenty of landscaping, they did not want to be required to put 115 plants along the west side of the property. Their plans did include doing some kind of screening; but the applicants wanted the developer to decide on the details. It might be an aesthetic factor in selling the nearby homes. In the case of the buffer, City staff had decided that the two uses were dissimilar. Six connected townhomes were sitting next to an apartment building of two or three stories and while there was more density on the other side it was still multi-family development.

Mr. Gustafson noted that a cross-section of the elevations' horizontal dimensions was shown on the lower right corner of the concept plan and this showed the berms. He asked Ms. Thompson if the berm would have a required height. Ms. Thompson answered that staff did specify heights when a berm was required; but technically that did not apply to this one. Mr. Schlicht said it would be 4 to 6 feet tall, with the plan specifying a minimum height of 3 feet. It would be four to 6 feet high when possible but depending on the grade it would be as little as 3 feet.

Ms. Arth asked how wide the space was between the townhomes and the neighboring apartments. Ms. Thompson replied that it was 30 feet, and Mr. Schlicht added that at some points it was a total of 60 feet.

Noting that the additional screening was a response to a request from the neighbors, Ms. Roberts asked if the Commission could do that. Mr. Schlicht remarked that the responsibility for screening should have been on the apartment developer, as this was the more intense use. He repeated that removing the requirement would not result in no landscaping at that location and this was not the only part of the property where they intended to install vegetation. Mr. Soto

added that at the time the conceptual plan was proposed, the senior housing development was more of a care facility, with three-story buildings similar equivalent in intensity of use to the apartments. This was the kind of situation where a landscaping buffer would not be required. As it was a conceptual plan at the time, staff could not be certain what would end up on the property. The preliminary development plan clearly showed a use that was less intense, somewhere between single-family and multi-family residential in this context. That was the point where staff would look at the UDO and see what was required. The disparity of uses required a medium-impact buffer. Taking the existing sanitary sewer and stormwater lines into consideration, staff's recommendation was to provide the quantity equivalent of a low-impact buffer. Staff had chosen the number on the basis of the prescribed ratios cited in the UDO for a low-impact buffer. Since larger trees would interfere with the buried infrastructure, they had recommended smaller ornamental trees.

Mr. Schlicht stated that this was a point of disagreement with staff. The reason for the buffer now was that staff was now addressing the development as a whole as a low-impact single-family development. That included the two acres and 16 townhomes, with a density about 6.5 units per acre, abutting the apartment development next door, whose density was about 12 units per acre. It would be different if single-family homes were on that portion; but one reason for putting townhomes in that location was that they were part of a transition from single-family homes to apartments.

Ms. Roberts noted that nevertheless, architecturally speaking, what was previously planned was dramatically different. The plan had previously featured much larger buildings. Mr. Schlicht pointed out that they had held neighborhood meetings even before the original approval; and much of the discussion had centered around the height of the buildings. The applicants had made it clear that what was presented was a concept only, and that the development would be residential and single-family. While the conceptual plan had been flawed, the apartment residents had been clear about how the adjacent property would be developed. He did not believe that the change had been very dramatic, as these were still large buildings.

Chairperson Norbury asked if there were further questions for the applicant or staff. Hearing none, he closed the public hearing at 5:50 p.m. and asked for discussion among the Commission members.

Ms. Arth commented that Mr. Schlicht had made a good point about whether the shrubbery and trees would do anything to screen the townhomes from the apartments, due to their height.

Chairperson Norbury remarked that tonight's hearing illustrated one of the limitations of PMIX zoning. A large area would be rezoned PMIX, with a concept plan backing it up, but the concept plan subsequently changed. In this case, the transition had included two adjacent uses that had gone from approximately equal in intensity to slightly unequal. A result was that it was not clear which owner on which side of the property line had responsibility. He did see a benefit to having a landscaping plan.

Ms. Roberts noted if these two had come in as separate plans, the City would require some kind of transition in between. She did not see any reason why this could not be done now, regardless of who could or should have done it at the beginning.

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

Ms. Roberts made a motion to recommend approval of Application PL2017-167, Preliminary Development Plan: Village at View High, 2nd Plat, Lots 4-45 and Tracts B-E; Engineering Solutions LLC, applicant; subject to staff's letter of October 6, 2017, specifically Recommendation Items 1 through 8. Ms. Dial seconded.

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

On the motion of Ms. Roberts, seconded by Ms. Dial, the Planning Commission members voted unanimously by voice vote to recommend **APPROVAL** of Application PL2017-167, Preliminary Development Plan: Village at View High, 2nd Plat, Lots 4-45 and Tracts B-E; Engineering Solutions LLC, applicant; subject to staff's letter of October 6, 2017, specifically Recommendation Items 1 through 8.

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

<p>3. Application #PL2017-174 - REZONING from CP-2 to RP-3 and PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN - Siena at Longview Lot 291; Tract U; Engineering Solutions LLC, applicant</p>
--

Chairperson Norbury opened the hearing at 5:52 p.m. and asked those wishing to speak, or provide testimony, to stand and be sworn in.

Mr. Schlicht noted that the Commission was considering but rezoning and a preliminary development plan for this project. The Siena development had been there for a long time, in multiple phases on Sampson and Scherer on the southwest end of Lee's Summit. It had started as a mixed-use project but had evolved into a senior living one. One large lot, number 291, was platted in the last phase and for some reason it had been zoned commercial, along with some City-owned property to the south. The rezoning request was to correct this oversight and make the lot's zoning match the rest of the development. Accordingly, the applicants was doing some reworking on three existing platted lots next to Lot 291. They would then be divided into 12 lots, with homes that were consistent architectural style and character with the existing neighborhood. The applicants had held a neighborhood meeting attended by 20 residents who had been very positive. They had requested two modifications, and staff supported both.

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

Mr. McGuire entered Exhibit (A), list of exhibits 1-15 into the record. He stated that the application was to rezone the subject property, about 2.7 acres located just south of the intersection of SW 16th and SW Corinth Drive from CP-2 (Planned Community Commercial) to RP-3 (Planned Residential Mixed Use). The 12 lots had a density of 4.31 units per acre, with 10 units per acre the maximum density allowed in that zoning district. The applicants requested modifications to the high-impact buffer requirement along the south property line, and to the required 25-foot front setback for lots with front-facing garages. Staff supported both these requests. Mr. McGuire displayed elevations of the prospective houses on the lots, and confirmed Mr. Schlicht's statement that the architectural styles, lot sizes and price ranges were

consistent with the Siena At Longview homes. The proposed rezoning and associated preliminary development plan would create 12 new lots that would comprise Siena's final development phase. The 2005 Comprehensive Plan had showed the area as retail use, do the proposed residential use was a deviation but nevertheless consistent with the preliminary and final site plans previously approved for this subdivision (September 21, 2000). Staff supported the rezoning. Properties to the north and west were zoned RP-3 and were part of Siena at Longview. The property to the south would remain CP-2, and was undeveloped land owned by the City originally acquired for the now abandoned SW Scherer Parkway project. The City had no plans for that property at present. The land to the east was undeveloped PRI property and was zoned R-1.

Mr. McGuire then addressed the requested modifications. The applicants proposed a 22-foot front yard setback for Lots 217, 218, 224 and 320 through 328; less than the required 20 feet for buildings but 25 feet for buildings including front-facing garages. The proposed 22-foot setback matched those for other homes in the subdivision and consistent with previously approved site plans. Regarding the high-impact landscape screen, the UDO did require this for residential development adjacent to CP-2 zoning, consisting of a 20-foot buffer yard, a 6-foot masonry wall or opaque vinyl fence with low-impact landscaping on both sides. In this case, the lots were adjacent to the City-owned property, a large area of green space that was not likely to be developed in the near future. It was also consistent with the previously approved preliminary and final site plans. These modifications were specified in Recommendation Items 1 and 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.

Noting staff's support of the modification request for screening, Ms. Roberts asked if, should someone put in a dentist's office or day care center some time in the future, they would be required to provide screening. Mr. McGuire answered that they would; adding that the City had no interest in selling this property for commercial development. Mr. Soto confirmed that it was the second developer who would be responsible.

Chairperson Norbury asked Mr. Soto to clarify the acronym "PRI", since the Commission had some new members. Mr. Soto answered that the name was "Property Reserve Inc.", the real estate holding company for the Latter Day Saints Church [LDS], the owner. Chairperson Norbury added that this was a significant land holding.

Mr. Funk asked what was the reason for the requested setback modification. Mr. McGuire answered that 22-foot setbacks had previously been approved in 2000; so the purpose was to make these lots consistent with the others. Since it was in the process of rezoning, the PDP was required; and that plan had to re-establish the modification,

Chairperson Norbury asked if there were further questions for the applicant or staff. Hearing none, he closed the public hearing at 6:05 p.m. and asked for discussion among the Commission members, or for a motion.

Mr. Funk made a motion to recommend approval of Application PL2017-174, Rezoning from CP-2 to RP-3 and Preliminary Development Plan: Siena at Longview Lot 291; Tract U;

Engineering Solutions LLC, applicant; subject to staff's letter of October 6, 2017. 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 PL2017-174, Rezoning from CP-2 to RP-3 and Preliminary Development Plan: Siena at Longview Lot 291; Tract U; Engineering Solutions LLC, applicant; subject to staff's letter of October 6, 2017.

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

4. Application #PL2017-177 - UDO Amendment #63 Article 5 Zoning Districts and Article 6 Overlay Districts - M-150 Corridor Overlay District Zoning and Development Standards; City of Lee's Summit, applicant

Chairperson Norbury opened the hearing at 6:07 p.m. and asked those wishing to speak, or provide testimony, to stand and be sworn in.

Mr. McKay entered Exhibit (A), list of exhibits 1-9 into the record. He displayed a series of slides and then summarized the major amendments. The original plan had included four new zoning districts, but none of these had been used. It also had a menu-driven point system that turned out to be difficult for developers to meet. When the City did the original M-150 Overlay District, they began with a survey that established the look of the corridor they wanted. Many property owners voted on the series of photographs the City had.

An open house was held on September 25th, with about 20 property owners along M-150 attending. They were provided with information about the proposed amendments. Of the three or four applications, the last had been especially difficult in terms of getting the minimum number of points. The City Council had addressed this with the first application, and had later suggested taking a new look at the guidelines. Staff had agreed on the approach of not making it easier for development to come in but rather to make it easier for the process to occur for all parties involved. They had subsequently worked to simplify the basic development process. While the City did not want to create a barrier but at the same time they wanted to preserve the design standards originally set for this corridor including sustainability requirements.

The amendment would retain the design standards cited by the "visual preference" survey. It resized the area by removing land designated for single-family and duplex residential land use as the City already had significant controls in place for these. The focus was on office, retail and multi-family developments. Since the original four zoning districts for the overlay had not been used, they were removed. Mr. McKay added that some planned districts in place and they met or exceeded requirements.

The Community and Economic Development Committee had requested adding definitions to the legend on the Framework Plan map. Color-coded legends were now on both sides of the map with paragraphs identifying them. This map showed the properties that would be included in the remainder of the M-150 Corridor. Light yellow areas filled in a few gaps but were not subject to

the proposed amendments. They identified the mixed-use activity center, retail, commercial/office, residential mixed density, planned mixed use and open space use including golf courses, parks and nature preserve areas. The next map showed the new defined area subject to the overlay district. Mr. McKay summarized and commented on some of the other amendments.

Sidewalks: Sidewalks were specified on both sides of all streets. The Community For All Ages group had given a presentation to the City Council, which had then adopted a resolution for the City to follow its recommendations. Lee's Summit would receive the group's Bronze award * next January. Sidewalks on both sides of streets provided maximum connectivity for pedestrians.

Residential Design Standards for single-family and two-family developments were removed.

ADA compliance: A requirement was added for ADA compliant elevators for multi-family developments three stories and above. These had to be one out of every three buildings at a minimum. Mr. McKay added that these apartments might attract both seniors and young professionals, and most of them did not want to walk up three flights of stairs especially while moving in. It would be too restrictive to simply confine older residents' choices to a first floor.

Universal Design: This was something the City would be considering in the future. It was not part of this amendment. It was based on making the designs of multi-family, commercial and retail buildings be interchangeable in terms of ADA requirements. This idea would be discussed at a future work session.

Added requirements: Areas identified as 'activity centers' would have to provide multi-story vertical mixed uses. On the displayed Framework Plan, Mr. McKay pointed out the two starred areas at three major intersections. In landscaping, only native plants and plant materials would be used. That had been discussed by the Planning Commission and staff had provided a native plan chart for developers to use.

Point system: Both the "Menu of Sustainability Options" and the minimum points requirement had been removed. Although new mandatory minimum development requirements were added. Stormwater best management practices were a major element and included source control, source filtration and regional retention and treatment. Both the Mid-America Regional Council [MARC] and the City's Public Works department had manuals best management practices. Erosion control was essential from beginning to end of a project. Mr. McKay cited the Raintree Lake community in the area, emphasizing that it was important to preserve existing lakes from siltation. LED lighting was also along the new requirements.

Other minimum requirements: Locally sourced construction materials were to be a priority whenever possible; and, this was possible with most construction materials. Other requirements included solar ready buildings, durable materials, construction or demolition debris and waste management, waste containment on site and a construction staging area. Mr. McKay cited HyVee east's new addition as an example of containment on site and using a staging area. They had a separate fenced area for all the materials they were using.

Applicants would be required to provide a minimum of 3 of environmental requirements: solar, wind or geothermal renewable energy system; energy-efficient materials either new or recycled; materials produced from renewable resources, "green" roofs, or materials, designs meeting requirements for U.S. Green Building Council's certification. Also included in the choices were recycling systems for greywater; an electric vehicle recharging station, xeriscape or water-

conserving landscaping materials, drip irrigation, shared parking and shade structures including covered parking or shaded walkways. Mr. McKay observed that recycled materials and those produced from renewable materials were becoming more common; “green” roofs were still not common but these, if done right, were efficient and did not leak. Shared parking had become quite common. Regardless of which three options were chosen, none of them were prohibitively expensive.

Intended outcomes: Removing the point system and menus would likely make compliance with the standards more practical; although the amendment maintained the sustainable development provisions. It could provide a consistent message for potential developers in the M-150 Corridor while ensuring that green standards would be included in each development. Compliance could improve water quality and stormwater management. The deletions in Article 5 included not only the zoning districts specific to the corridor but all tables relating to them as well.

Mr. McKay asked the Commission if they wanted to hear any details about the presentation or the redlined copy they had.

Ms. Roberts said she understood getting rid of the point system and made the process less confusing, as well as taking some of the items and making them requirements with options for choice. She was concerned about the fact that so many deletions meant that a lot of options were not even present as possible choices, with the result that the City had made a choice to no longer encourage a number of possibly constructive approaches. She cited bicycle facilities, park and ride, limiting the amount of turf grass and composting as examples; and was in favor of including these in some context to make it clear that what the City would like to see.

Mr. McKay answered that the amendment did include alternate equivalents, so applicants had the opportunity to request something in lieu of what was listed. Ms. Roberts doubted that the passive approach of not even making these a suggestion and assuming that developers would choose these options on their own was very practical. Mr. McKay pointed out that facilities for parking bicycles were now a requirement and not an option; and Ms. Roberts said that nevertheless, the items on the original list pertaining to bicycles involved more than parking, and bicycles were part of the Livable Streets program. She asked if the deleted items could be at least posted on a web page as additional options. Mr. McKay answered that this should not be difficult to do.

Chairperson Norbury noted that these could be divided into main sets of requirements. One was familiar requirements such as heights of buildings and distance from a street. He acknowledged that some of these requirements would increase the cost of development in that area and his concern was that a lot of this was just good ideas, and not specifically for the M-150 corridor. The idea was to develop this corridor in a way that would make it attractive to people but it was possible that the requirement could drive development elsewhere, with cheaper construction costs. He was concerned that these requirements in one part of town rather than everywhere could backfire.

Mr. McKay answered that staff's intent was for the amendment to lift many of the restrictions and their impacts from the overlay district. Not many of the things listed as requirements were very expensive to do. It was essentially a common sense approach. It could eventually be city-wide; a possibility that had been discussed from the beginning. However, this corridor included most of the green property that could be on a major street network and this was where the City

could set an example. At least one developer had asked for information and staff had not heard any negative reaction. He also pointed out that ignoring practical considerations, such as native and drought-resistant plants for landscaping, had resulted in real costs to developers and the City in the past. He believed that the amendment struck a good balance between being sustainable and costs being kept manageable.

Chairperson Norbury asked if there was anyone present wishing to give testimony, either in support for or opposition to the application and amendment. There were none, and he then asked if the Commissioners had any further questions. There were none.

Mr. McKay reported that the CEDC had reviewed the amendment and believed it was headed in the right direction for what the City wanted to see long-term in this corridor.

Chairperson Norbury asked if there were further questions for the applicant or staff. Hearing none, he closed the public hearing at 6:35 p.m. and asked for discussion among the Commission members. Hearing none, he called for a motion.

Mr. Lopez made a motion to recommend approval of Application PL2017-177, UDO Amendment #63: Article 5 Zoning Districts and Article 6 Overlay Districts: M-150 Corridor Overlay District Zoning and Development Standards; City of Lee's Summit, applicant. Mr. Sims 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. Sims, the Planning Commission members voted unanimously by voice vote to recommend **APPROVAL** of Application PL2017-177, UDO Amendment #63: Article 5 Zoning Districts and Article 6 Overlay Districts: M-150 Corridor Overlay District Zoning and Development Standards; City of Lee's Summit, applicant.

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

ROUNDTABLE

Mr. McKay stated that the joint session with the City Council would take place on Thursday, October 12t. In addition to a series of PowerPoint presentations and a review of statutory requirements, they would be taking a look at the Thoroughfare Master Plan, the Capital Improvements Program and the development application process. The session would start at 5:45 p.m. and dinner would be available shortly after 5:00. Mr. McKay encouraged all the Commissioners to attend and have some discussions with the City Council. It would be beneficial to have these a couple of times each year. The meeting had a positive response from the Council.

Referring to Mr. Sangroves' question concerning the View High project about the water line, Mr. Monter explained that staff got the final development plans, final plats and engineering plans, they did take a closer look. He had confirmed with Mr. Schlicht that the water main had 15-foot-wide easement, not 11 feet. Staff did not usually want to take water lines outside plan boundaries onto undeveloped property.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Chairperson Norbury adjourned the meeting at 6:40 p.m.

PC 101017