

The City of Lee's Summit
Action Letter
Planning Commission

Thursday, February 14, 2019

5:00 PM

City Council Chambers

City Hall

220 SE Green Street

Lee's Summit, MO 64063

Call to Order

Roll Call

Present: 7 - Board Member Carla Dial
Board Member Jason Norbury
Board Member Dana Arth
Board Member Don Gustafson
Board Member Jake Loveless
Board Member John Lovell
Board Member Mark Kitchens

Absent: 2 - Board Member Donnie Funk
Board Member Jeff Sims

1 Approval of Agenda

A motion was made by Board Member Gustafson, seconded by Board Member Dial, that this agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously.

Public Comments

There were no public comments at the meeting.

Approval of Consent Agenda

- A** [2019-2567](#) Minutes of the January 24, 2019, Planning Commission meeting

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

Public Hearings

- 2** [2019-2570](#) Public Hearing: Application #PL2018-102 - Vacation of Right-of-Way for a portion of NE Douglas Street abutting 1410 NE Douglas Street; Oakview Capital Partners, 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. Soto entered Exhibit (A), list of exhibits 1-12 into the record. He displayed an aerial photo showing the location of the subject property in red. The rest of the zoning map showed the mixed zoning of CP-2 and PI to the east. Zoning to the north was CP-2, and PI to the west. The right-of-way to be vacated was a .38-acre portion of NE Douglas, extending along the length of the property. A preliminary development plan had been approved for the Oakview Storage phase II, located at the 1410 NE Douglas address, which had been approved by the Commission and City Council.. A displayed site plan showed the boundaries of the current right-of-way, which would become part of the property after vacating it shifted the property line a little to the east. The adjacent lots would gain a little additional area, which would accommodate parking lot and building setbacks when they were developed. Mr. Soto that the right-of-way was not necessary as it would not serve any public use. Staff recommended approval of the application.

Following Mr. Soto'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. There were no questions, and Chairperson Norbury closed the public hearing at 5:10 p.m. and asked for discussion among the Commission members, or for a motion.

Mr. Gustafson made a motion to recommend approval of Application PL2018-102, Vacation of Right-Of-Way: a portion of NE Douglas St abutting 1410 NE Douglas St; Oakview Capital Partners, LLC, applicant; subject to staff's letter dated February 8, 2019. Ms. Dial seconded.

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

A motion was made by Board Member Gustafson, seconded by Board Member Dial, that this application be recommended for approval to the City Council - Regular Session, due back on 3/5/2019. The motion carried unanimously.

- 3 [2019-2573](#) Public Hearing: Application #PL2018-121 and Application #2018-231 - Preliminary Development Plan and Special Use Permit for indoor climate controlled storage facility - Attic Storage of Lee's Summit, 920 NE Deerbrook Street; Strickland Construction Co., applicant.

Chairperson Norbury opened the hearing at 5:11 p.m. and asked those wishing to speak, or provide testimony, to stand and be sworn in.

Mr. Stan Hernley stated that he was the project's architect. He added that civil engineer Mr. Kevin Sterritt and Mr. Roger Strickland, representing the applicant, were also present. He stated that the subject property was at the intersection of Deerbrook Street and M-291, directly north of the Genesis Health Club. The site plan showed an undeveloped piece of property with an existing parking lot at the south end. It was built at the same time as the health club, and would be removed. Mr. Henley then displayed the proposed building's footprint, and described it as a three-story self storage facility. Because of the grades on the site, the building's southeast corner would be only two stories.

Access to the site would be via the common drive shared with the health club, whose parking was north of their building. It ran along the east side of the property and accessed it at the southeast corner. The plan showed parking on the south side of the building, with a total of 18 spaces on the site; two more than the UDO required. Customers renting space in the building would have three access points, with a loading/unloading bay in the southeast corner, with an overhead door on the east side. Customers would enter an assigned access code to park inside. The northeast corner had the same access arrangement; and at the southwest corner parking would be outside, with loading and unloading into regular swing doors. All storage units were indoors.

Displaying the landscape plan, Mr. Hernley stated that along the east property line was an existing landscape buffer between the subject property and some residences to the east. It included vinyl fencing with brick pilasters and had mature evergreen trees. The buffer was being maintained, and could be brought up to City standards. A six-foot privacy fence also ran along the east property line. An existing tree line and an easement ran along the north side, and the tree line would stay in place. Additional new trees and landscaping would be installed along the west side.

Mr. Hernley pointed out the exterior lighting on a displayed photometric plan, commenting that the light was zero footcandles at the property line. He then displayed a south elevation of the facade facing the health club. It illustrated the transition from three to two stories on the property's upward slope. Materials were a combination of masonry and stucco finished panel. The stone masonry and brick were manufactured Canyon Stone products; and the second-story material showed in tan on the elevation was an insulated metal panel with a stucco finish. Mr. Hernley added that they had brought samples for anyone who wanted to see them. An east elevation showed the same configuration, with the loading bay on the north end. Mr. Hernley also showed elevations of the north facade facing the park and west side facing M-291. Another east facade elevation showed the existing fence and landscaping. Much of the landscaping had been installed in 2007 and so was already mature and fairly dense. A view from a little further away showed the sight lines between the building and a nearby residence, with the fence between. Only part of the top of the building would be seen. The next elevation showed the building's southwest corner as seen from M-291.

Mr. Hernley then addressed staff's Recommendation Item 2, which stipulated that "the pilaster located on the northeast corner of the building shall incorporate more architectural detail, adding depth and interest as it wraps around towards the interior of the building." The next rendering showed this added detail. The applicants were complying with Recommendation Item 3's stipulation that the windows on the second and third stories be opaque.

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

Ms. Thompson entered Exhibit (A), list of exhibits 1-19 into the record. She described the property as a vacant, platted lot approximately 2.54 acres, located east of M-291 and north of Deerbrook Street. The property sloped south to north, with the north end dropping down to a ravine. It was zoned CP-2, with CP-2 zoning to both north and south, CP-2 and CP-1 across M-291, and R-1 (Deerbrook) to the east. The Genesis Health Club was immediately south, with some City owned vacant land to the north. Ms. Thompson displayed photos of some of these surrounding properties. A view north showed the top of the ravine and treed area; south was the fitness club and its parking lot; east showed the fencing, high-impact buffer and location of the subdivision; and west toward M-291.

The building would be a three-story, climate-controlled storage business, approximately 101,400 square feet. It would have 583 individual storage spaces. The elevations showed gray and red-brown color and materials with the look of brownstone and stucco. Ms. Thompson displayed a color elevation of the entire building as viewed looking southeast from M-291, followed by other elevations viewed from the fitness center and the single-family residences.

Ms. Thompson then reviewed staff's analysis of the preliminary development plan. The CP-2 zoning district allowed an indoor climate-controlled storage facility with a Special Use Permit. This use typically generated little traffic, and was at the end of a dead-end street with access from a shared driveway. It was located on M-291 highway, a major corridor with commercial uses. A high impact buffer was already established along the east property line, between the facility and single-family residences, which reduced the impact on the surrounding neighborhood. If the landscaping was lacking anything required by the UDO, it could be added.. This site was not likely to be suitable for retail or restaurant use, given the access. In 2006

Planning Commission

Action Letter

February 14, 2019

plans were drawn up for an office building, but it was never built. The building currently proposed was designed to have an office appearance, with four-sided architectural and quality materials.

In December 2018, the City Council had approved a UDO amendment allowing this kind of use in the CP-2 and AZ zoning as a special use. Conditions were that all activities be inside the structure, which had to be four-sided architecture. No outside storage was to be allowed, and standards such as building placement, height, size, setbacks, signage and landscaping would be determined by the standards of the Planned Office (PO) zoning district. The applicants were complying with these conditions.

Staff recommended approval of the application with five Recommendation Items. Item would allow a modification to floor/area ratio, with a .92 FAR as opposed to the maximum .55 allowed in CP-2 zoning. Item 2, the northwest corner pilaster would incorporate "more architectural detail, adding depth and interest as it wraps around towards the interior of building". The second and third story glass windows would be opaque (Item 3). In Items 4 and 5 the development would be "in accordance with the preliminary development plan date stamped January 22, 2019" and the SUP would be granted for a 25-year term.

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 opened the hearing for Commissioners' questions for the applicant or staff.

Referring to the shared drive on the aerial map, Mr. Loveless remarked that it was a fairly common practice to park cars inside shared drives, and in fact the aerial map showed two cars in parked in this one. He wanted to be sure that the drive was wide enough to allow for parked cars. Mr. Kevin Sterritt replied that it was a standard 28-foot width, and was striped and marked for "No Parking" on both sides. At present, people did park further down on the undeveloped property. Mr. Loveless asked how this would be managed, perhaps via a development agreement with the health club. Parking was currently an issue in that lot, and he was concerned about managing traffic for the two businesses. Mr. Park answered that since this was a private drive, the best approach would be to mark it as a fire lane, which would make a no parking rule enforceable. It could be added to the conditions of approval.

Mr. Gustafson asked Ms. Thompson if the applicants had submitted a signage plan. She answered that they had not but they would have to to comply with the standards of the PO zoning district including signage. Mr. Gustafson then asked if signage would be approved with the rezoning and PDP, and Ms. Thompson said that if they were not asking for any modifications they could submit it to staff separately.

Chairperson Norbury remarked that a request for modification to an FAR in applications was becoming quite common. He suggested that this was something to be considered when looking at UDO amendments. He then noted to Mr. Hernley that while there had been no testimony from the public so far, staff had received one letter of opposition from a neighbor who lived within 185 feet. Concerning lighting, he noted that there were two existing fixtures on the north side that would be kept, and the plan showed other fixtures being added. Mr. Hernley confirmed that these were on the side of the building and pointed downward. Chairperson Norbury asked how high they would be, and Ms. Thompson replied since the development was next to residential zoning, the UDO required that the fixtures could be no more than 15 feet. Chairperson Norbury noted that they should be at or below the fence line level. Mr. Hernley added that they intended to include security devices on the lights, such as motion sensors especially on the building's east side.

Chairperson Norbury confirmed with Mr. Hernley that the doors on the east elevation were overhead type, essentially the same design as household garage doors. He then noted that

Planning Commission

Action Letter

February 14, 2019

the letter of opposition from a Deerbrook resident had mentioned noise as a potential complaint, and asked if that could be applied to the overhead doors. Mr. Henley stated that the doors would make about as much noise as a garage door on a residence.

Chairperson Norbury asked if there were further questions for the applicant or staff. Hearing none, he closed the public hearing at 5:35 p.m. and asked for discussion among the Commission members, or for a motion.

Mr. Gustafson made a motion to recommend approval of Application PL2018-121 and Application PL2018-231, Preliminary Development Plan and Special Use Permit for indoor climate controlled storage facility: Attic Storage of Lee's Summit, 920 NE Deerbrook St.; Strickland Construction Co., applicant; subject to staff's letter of February 8, 2019, specifically Recommendation Items 1 through 5. Ms. Dial seconded.

Ms. Yendes noted the discussion about adding making the private driveway a fire lane as condition 6. The motion was amended to include the added condition of approval.

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

On the motion of Mr. Gustafson, seconded by Ms. Dial, the Planning Commission members voted unanimously by voice vote to recommend APPROVAL of Application PL2018-121 and Application PL2018-231, Preliminary Development Plan and Special Use Permit for indoor climate controlled storage facility: Attic Storage of Lee's Summit, 920 NE Deerbrook St.; Strickland Construction Co., applicant; subject to staff's letter of February 8, 2019, specifically Recommendation Items 1 through 5, with item 6 added as stated.

- 4 [2019-2572](#) Public Hearing: Application #PL2018-233 - Vacation of Right-Of-Way - a portion of NW Lowenstein Drive, located west of NW Pryor Road; Drake Development, LLC, applicant.

Mr. Lovell stated that he would recuse himself from this hearing, due to his involvement with the project.

Chairperson Norbury opened the hearing at 5:37 p.m. and asked those wishing to speak, or provide testimony, to stand and be sworn in.

Ms. Thompson entered Exhibit (A), list of exhibits 1-12 into the record. She pointed out the location of the street and right-of-way on the displayed map. The vacation would be to accommodate the pending Streets of West Pryor development, which had been approved by the Commission and the City Council. A temporary easement was needed for the existing utilities during relocation. The zoning map showed PMIX to the north and south, including Lowenstein Park, CP-2 with Summit Woods shopping center across Pryor Road to the east, and Lowenstein Park, a single-family subdivision and some AG zoning was to the west. A displayed exhibit showed details of existing Lowenstein Drive and the right-of-way.

Ms. Thompson explained that staff's process for vacating was to send a request to the City's Public Works and Water Utilities department and to the utility companies. For this application AT&T, Spire and KCP&L had all objected and the developer had been working with these entities to expedite moving the existing utilities in the right-of-way. The agreement was that these three entities would each waive their objection upon the establishment of a temporary utility easement. Staff's one Recommendation Item stated that the vacation of right-of-way "shall not take effect until such time as a temporary utility easement covering the existing AT&T, Spire and KCP&L infrastructure is dedicated."

Following staff's presentation, 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. As there were no questions,

Chairperson Norbury closed the public hearing at 5:40 p.m. and asked for discussion among the Commission members, or for a motion.

Mr. Gustafson had a question for Ms. Thompson, and Chairperson Norbury re-opened the hearing. Mr. Gustafson asked if staff's letter included the agreement with the utility companies, and Ms. Thompson answered that it did, as Recommendation Item 1, and Chairperson Norbury re-closed the public hearing.

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

Mr. Gustafson made a motion to recommend approval of Application #PL2018-233, Vacation Of Right-Of-Way: a portion of NW Lowenstein Dr. located west of NW Pryor Rd.; Drake Development, LLC, applicant; subject to staff's letter of February 8, 2019, specifically Recommendation Item 1. Mr. Loveless seconded.

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

On the motion of Mr. Gustafson, seconded by Mr. Loveless, the Planning Commission members voted unanimously by voice vote to recommend APPROVAL of Application #PL2018-233, Vacation Of Right-Of-Way: a portion of NW Lowenstein Dr. located west of NW Pryor Rd.; Drake Development, LLC, applicant; subject to staff's letter of February 8, 2019, specifically Recommendation Item 1.

- 5 2019-2574 Appl. #PL2018-234 - PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN - DTLS Apartments, 114 SE Douglas St; Cityscapes Properties, LLC, applicant

Chairperson Norbury opened the hearing at 5:42 p.m. and asked those wishing to speak, or provide testimony, to stand and be sworn in.

(Mr. Lovell returned to the meeting, at 5:42 p.m.)

Mr. Jim Thomas stated that he was a partner with the residential part of Cityscape Properties. He introduced Cityscape associate Mr. Ryan Adams, stating that other staff members were present and could answer questions. Cityscape projects in the Kansas City metro area included Prairiefire, Greenwood Reserve and projects in Quality Hill, Crossroads and the Village At View High just north of New Longview. They specialized in high-end multi-family communities, as well as urban type properties; and had been looking for a long time for a suitable project in Lee's Summit.

Cityscape had recently worked out a purchase agreement for the former building of the Lee's Summit United Methodist Church at 114 Douglas. It would be a market rate luxury multi-family rental community with 276 units and a parking garage. The development was intended to attract empty-nesters, people who worked at home, and others who wanted to live in a walkable urban setting. The applicants had discussed the project with Downtown Main Street and some local business owners. Displaying an aerial view of the plan, Mr. Thomas noted that the Baptist church was to the north, and indicated the area on the plan that the other church owned. Many people had expressed concerns about what would be done with the 1922 chapel that was the oldest section of the church; and that portion would be retained as the leasing office. Mr. Thomas added that due to the grades near the train tracks to the west, pedestrian traffic would best be kept near the Farmer's Market at the east, so this was a good place for the front entrance. Mr. Thomas then displayed a color elevation of the project facing Douglas.

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

Mr. McGuire entered Exhibit (A), list of exhibits 1-17 into the record. He related that the

applicant proposed to redeveloped the former Lee's Summit United Methodist Church, an area of 3.734 acres. He noted that the 36-stall parking lot across Douglas was included in the project as well as the 114 SE Douglas address. The original brick church was built in 1922, with several subsequent additions over the decades. The 276 units would consist of 162 one-bedroom apartments, 98 two-bedroom apartments and 16 studio units. The proposed floor/area ratio was 2.03, considerably higher than the maximum 1.0 for the CBD. Impervious coverage was 76.3 percent, a little lower than the maximum 80 percent. Open area was 23.7 percent. The original church building, re-purposed as the leasing office with areas for residents' amenities, would be attached to the new development.

Proposed exterior materials included brick, horizontal fiber cement lap siding, and smooth fiber cement panels. The development would have two open courtyards and an internal courtyard with a pool and entertainment area. The landscape package proposed by the applicant exceeded the UDO minimum and included street trees and shrubs.

Mr. McGuire then addressed the three requested modifications, The first was for the proposed floor area ratio of 2.03, twice the minimum FAR of 1.00. This was a redevelopment of a Downtown block, and the increased FAR was consistent with the Downtown Master Plan's goal of encouraging more multi-story buildings. A high floor area ratio was not uncommon in this older part of town, with multi-story buildings in the CBD typically having a FAR between 1.00 and 2.00.

The second modification would be to parking stall dimensions. The applicant had provided a study done by the National Parking Association, indicating that average car widths had decreased over the past five decades, from 17 feet one inch to six feet two inches. The NPA used an 85 percentile vehicle in the largest-smallest range as an average. The applicant requested that instead of the required nine feet wide and 19 feet deep, they provide 77 stalls eight feet wide and 18 feet deep, and 365 stalls at 8.5 feet wide and 18 feet deep. Staff found this reasonable and supported the request.

The third modification would be to building materials. The requirement was for two-story street facing facades to be brick. The applicants asked for the brick facade to be one story in limited areas, in order to create a more varied facade and avoid large expanses of one material. The brick facade was a full four stories in some places and one story in others. This variety helped reinforce the look of the base, middle and top. Staff supported this request as being reasonable.

In 2017, the City had done a housing study to evaluate market demand in the near future. This study had found demand in Lee's Summit for apartments to be strong. It indicated that by 2027, this would be an additional 2,319 units. The study broke this down into about 1,050-1,400 one-bedroom units, 700-1050 two-bedroom units and 115-230 three-bedroom units. Increasing housing stock and specifically was also a key component identified in the Old Town Master Development Plan of 2004. The plan had recognized a mix of housing stock as supportable in the Downtown area including rental housing with high rents. One of the plan's objectives was also to encourage more density within the Downtown core with a wide range of new housing opportunities. This was expected to generate more active urban center and stimulate demand for more retail goods and services.

Parking would be provided via a combination of structured and surface parking including some on street and parallel parking, and shared parking arrangements. The UDO's Article 8 provided for waiving requirements for additional parking Downtown, if public parking was available within 300 feet of residential use. It had to have enough capacity for the required number of spaces and could not be on the opposite side of the railroad tracks. The most recent Downtown parking study illustrated an excess of about 155 spaces. For the purposes of this application, this was in addition to available spaces in the City Hall parking garage and the public lot used by the Farmers Market. Based on this information, adequate parking existed within

the required 300 feet to support the additional demand. Regarding the shared public parking, Mr. McGuire noted that peak demand for that public parking and peak demand hours for the residential area were opposite of the demand for public parking during the day, as peak residential parking was at night. Staff recommended approval of the preliminary development plan subject to the three requested modifications that staff supported.

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.

Mr. Donnie Rogers, executive director of Downtown Lee's Summit Main Street, gave his business address as 13 SE Third Street. He stated that its board of directors regarded additional housing Downtown as both important and necessary for Downtown's continued economic growth. Both the 2004 Old Town Master Development Plan and the 2015 Master Plan task force had considered additional housing and subsequent increased density Downtown as essential for supporting Downtown's business community. A 2014 study was done for the national Main Street center that focused specifically on the benefit of upper floor housing in downtown environments similar to Lee's Summit's. A resident of a unit that would rent from \$800 to \$1,200 a month would average \$18,000 annually in the community. The study broke this spending down into specific categories, including food eaten away from home, womens' apparel, furniture and drinks. Additionally, downtown residents might often choose to walk short distances, which would generate less traffic. Theoretically the proposed 276 units in this application represented collective buying power of \$5 million. At present, Downtown restaurant and retail sales came to \$42 million annually.

Additionally, Downtown Lee's Summit now had a 'walk score' of 77, meaning that most errands and business here could be done on foot. In contrast, the city of Lee's Summit overall had a walk score of 21, which indicated the opposite. This project was close to enough amenities to attract people who wanted to cut down on everyday automobile use.

Mr. Rogers then thanked the applicant for listening to the community, emphasizing that keeping the original church structure had been important to many people in Lee's Summit. Re-using and re-purposing the site would also be an economic benefit for Downtown. He also was in favor of granting the requested modifications. The mix of materials would help with the visual transition between Downtown's commercial and residential areas.

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

Mr. Kitchens noted the train tracks nearby, and asked if anyone had factored in noise as a potential issue with some potential tenants, such as retired people. Mr. Thomas referred to Cityscape's most recent project, Crossroads West Side. This was very close to railroad tracks and an overpass that could be seen from I-35. While no developer could promise soundproof dwellings, they were doing some noise abatement including slightly thicker walls on the west and southwest sides, with as few apartments as possible on that side. At present noise had not proven to be a problem at Crossroads.

Ms. Arth asked Mr. Thomas if it was the company's policy to do background checks on applicants. Mr. Thomas acknowledged that this was a 'delicate' area, partly due to provisions of the Fair Housing Act. They did all checks that were allowed under the law. He emphasized that they did not discriminate but did all screening that was legally allowed.

Mr. Loveless asked for some details about rent rates, amenities, and finishes offered to tenants, including . elevators and parking. Mr. Thomas summarized that the units would have upscale elements such as high-end appliances, granite countertops and tile surrounds. The development would have elevators and carpeted hallways. The parking garage would be for residents only. Mr. Thomas recommended revisiting the parking ratio of 1.67 parking spaces per unit, saying that it was antiquated and created unnecessary impervious surface. The plan

included enough parking for the residents with some extra parking, such as the Farmers Market parking lot. Most residents would park in the garage, with a nominal charge included in the rent.

Mr. Loveless noted that about 20 percent of the parking would be off site, and if that would be within 300 feet. Mr. Park stated that the percentage of parking that was from the shared public supply was not required to meet any of their resident parking requirements. He acknowledged that there was a difference between what Lee's Summit's UDO required and necessities that applicants often found in the market. Staff was confident that there was plenty of available vacancy in the public supply to meet the visitor need. Typically those visitors would be as likely to be generally visiting, and so might or might not necessarily be visitors of people living in the apartments.

Referring to the UDO allowing a requirement for additional parking to be waived if public parking was available within 300 feet of residential uses [Article 8], Chairperson Norbury remarked that he did not have a high opinion of this provision. When the Stanley building was renovated, it was 308 feet from a parking garage and they had to get several parking agreements with other Downtown businesses. He asked staff to consider this when the next UDO amendment was being looked at. Chairperson had looked at the landscaping and streetscape plans, and asked if the applicant was familiar with the streetscape improvements done about ten years ago, and if they had thought to reflect that in the plans in the interest of consistency, on Douglas and Second Street. Referring to the some of the brick work on the sidewalk near Douglas and Second, he said that the sidewalks had a 'subdivision' look although they were likely to get more use than sidewalks in a subdivision. He was not sure a full streetscape was warranted, as in this case it would not go anywhere in the sense of not matching up with anything. He did want to see some kind of accent that would be typical of the Downtown setting. Mr. Thomas pointed out that at the front of the original sanctuary, the southern door was actually the operable one. That would provide some means for ADA compliant access. That corner of the old structure might be a good setting.

Chairperson Norbury noted that the CIP recently approved via the bond issue had included some improvements slated for Douglas Street from Second Street to Chipman. He asked Mr. Park if the apartment project would be at the same time and how they would be coordinated. Mr. Park answered that staff was coordinating the proposed development and the Douglas Street improvements. The improvements between Second Street and Chipman were not within the current five-year CIP, though they were funded for the next five-year period. Basically the City was reconstructing the perimeter of this block and everything in its boundaries; but this project for Douglas was not a matter of widening it and adding lanes. The private project complemented what the City was trying to do.

Chairperson Norbury remarked to Mr. Thomas that the proposed lighting package did look like a good fit for what was currently used Downtown.

Mr. Lovell commented that the pool shown on the plans was one of the amenities offered, as was Downtown itself for infill development. He asked what other features would be offered that would be considered amenities. Mr. Thomas remarked that people working from home was becoming more common and many made a good income. The original part had a large domed sanctuary with an upper terrace or balcony level, and this might be used for co-working and fitness areas and even bike storage. Some amenities might be intended for dog owners. Mr. Thomas generally called it a 'hospitality' focus.

Mr. Lovell noted that tenants headed to or from the Downtown commercial area would be crossing Second Street. It would be best to route them through Douglas. He asked if the City had any plans for something like a crosswalk or bridge for pedestrians. Mr. Park replied that both corners of the development were intersections controlled with traffic signals. He added that the City planned to reconstruct the grade at the Main Street intersection, bringing it to

street level. That should help with pedestrian access at that corner. As main entrances were on Douglas it was likely that most pedestrians from the apartments would be crossing there. He added that Douglas and Second had been a busy corner for pedestrians for some time and it had not been a problem. Mr. Lovell asked if staff had studies for pedestrian traffic to go by as well as studies for vehicle traffic, and Mr. Park answered that much of it was on a complaint basis. Staff had not heard complaints about difficulties crossing at the signaled intersections. If they did, they would re-evaluate the timing of the signals to give pedestrians more time to cross.

Regarding the train tracks, Mr. Lovell said he'd heard that if the crossing went the full length, trains would not have to activate their signals going through. Mr. McGuire confirmed that if the crossings were fully controlled, the trains could go through without using horns. Train operators did have the option of using horns whenever they saw fit. Mr. Lovell asked if the City had considered doing this, and Mr. Park answered that this could not be done on an isolated basis. It had to be done at all of the Lee's Summit at-grade crossings, and would cost a couple of million dollars. A less expensive option would be an automated horn device at each crossing; however, this would not prohibit operators using warning horns when going through town. Downtown Main Street had also looked into creating a 'quiet zone' but to date the cost was prohibitive. The crossings included Second, Third and Fourth Streets, Maple to the north and Hamblen to the south.

Mr. Lovell noted the mixture of materials in the facade and asked for some details about how to arrive at standards for design. Mr. McGuire responded that the trick with this kind of development was to complement and work creatively with the existing structure or structures, the church building in this case. Some design elements from the original structure had to be carried over into the new design to preserve the architectural character. When the applicants had resubmitted the design there was more brick and more cobbling at the top. He commented that this particular project had taken two stories of brick, a Downtown characteristic. Mr. Lovell remarked that the City had not been as flexible with other projects as in this case, and he wanted to make sure this was set up for long term. He wanted to see some consistency in terms of how flexible the City was on this site versus other Downtown projects. He asked if staff researched other urban core apartment developments. Mr. McGuire answered that during the review process, he and other staff had multiple discussions both internally and with external partners and business owners Downtown. He added that one of the City's new project managers was an architect, and he had not heard any complaints about this particular project.

Chairperson Norbury asked if there were further questions for the applicant or staff. Hearing none, he closed the public hearing at 6:25 p.m. and asked for discussion among the Commission members.

Ms. Arth complemented Mr. Thomas on his enthusiasm for this project. Commission members had seen other apartment projects he had done in the metro area. She liked the location with its proximity to the Downtown business area, and liked the preservation of the church building including the varied heights.

Chairperson Norbury said he was pleased with this project and had wanted to see redevelopment there for some time. He appreciated the work the applicant had put in to respond to the public's concern about preserving this historic property. He agreed that it exposed some things concerning ordinances that the City needed to revisit, including parking and floor/area ratio. He would vote in favor of approval for this project.

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

Mr. Gustafson made a motion to recommend approval of Application PL2018-234, Preliminary Development Plan: DTLS Apartments, 114 SE Douglas St.; Cityscape Properties, LLC applicant;

Planning Commission

Action Letter

February 14, 2019

subject to staff's letter of February 8, 2019, specifically Recommendation Items 1 through 3.
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 Mr. Gustafson seconded by Ms. Dial, the Planning Commission members voted unanimously by voice vote to recommend APPROVAL of Application PL2018-234, Preliminary Development Plan: DTLS Apartments, 114 SE Douglas St.; Cityscape Properties, LLC applicant; subject to staff's letter of February 8, 2019, specifically Recommendation Items 1 through 5.

Chairperson Norbury announced a five-minute break at 6:30 p.m. The meeting reconvened at 6:35 p.m.

(Mr. Gustafson left the meeting, at 6:30 p.m.)

Other Agenda Items

- 6 [TMP-1109](#) Appl. #PL2018-099 - FINAL PLAT - Oakview, Lots 1-5; Oakview Capital Partners, LLC, applicant

Mr. Soto stated that normally this and the next final plat application would be on the consent agenda. In this case, two vacation of right-of-way items were associated with them, they were on 'other agenda items' for the sake of consistency. This application was to approve the plat of the five Oakview lots for future industrial and commercial development. They were 7.5 acres located at the northwest corner of Douglas and Victoria. Staff recommended approval of the final plat.

Chairperson Norbury asked for any questions or comments. Hearing none, he called for a motion.

Ms. Dial made a motion to recommend approval of Application PL2018-099, Final Plat: Oakview, Lots 1-5, Oakview Capital Partners, LLC, applicant. Ms. Arth seconded.

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

On the motion of Ms. Dial, seconded by Ms. Arth, the Planning Commission members voted unanimously by voice vote to Recommend APPROVAL of Application PL2018-099, Final Plat: Oakview, Lots 1-5, Oakview Capital Partners, LLC, applicant.

- 7 [BILL NO. 19-44](#) An Ordinance accepting final plat entitled "Streets of West Pryor Lots 1 thru 14, Tracts A, B, C, & D", as a subdivision to the City of Lee's Summit, Missouri.

Mr. Soto stated that this final plat application was for the northwest corner of Pryor and Chipman. It consisted of 14 lots and four tracts. Staff recommended approval of the applicant.

Mr. Lovell announced that he would have to abstain from voting on this application.

Chairperson Norbury asked if there any questions or discussion. Hearing none, he called for a motion.

Ms. Dial made a motion to recommend approval of Application PL2018-232, Final Plat: Streets of West Pryor, Lots 1-14, Tracts A, B, C and D; Drake Development LLC, applicant. Ms. Arth

Planning Commission

Action Letter

February 14, 2019

seconded.

Chairperson Norbury asked if there was any discussion of the motion. Ms. Yendes pointed out that while the motions indicated approval and not recommending approval, an ordinance would be read at the City Council..

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

On the motion of Ms. Dial, seconded by Ms. Arth, the Planning Commission members voted by voice vote (Mr. Lovell abstaining) to Recommend APPROVAL of Application PL2018-232, Final Plat: Streets of West Pryor, Lots 1-14, Tracts A, B, C and D; Drake Development LLC, applicant.

Roundtable

Chairperson Norbury reported that he had met with the Mayor and some of the Planning and other City staff regarding the comments and recommendations from the joint meeting with the City Council last November. Some changes to procedures were in the works.

Mr. Elam announced that "Lee's Summit Ignite", the citizens' strategic planning project, had started and some information was on the social media the City was using as well as its website. The first phase involved a lot of community feedback. Initial involvement opportunities would be February 27 from 11:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. at the John Knox Village Pavilion and February 28 at the Lee's Summit High School cafeteria from 6:30 to 8:30 p.m. People could also participate online at lignite.net.

Adjournment

There being no further business, Chairperson Norbury adjourned the meeting at 6:45 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"