

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

Thursday, December 2, 2021

5:00 PM

City Council Chambers and via Video Conference

---

Notice is hereby given that the Planning Commission for the City of Lee's Summit will meet on Thursday, December 2, 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, December 1, 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 Mark Kitchens  
Board Member Jake Loveless  
Board Member Terry Trafton

**Absent:** 2 - Board Member Cynda Rader  
Board Member Matt Sanning

Approval of Agenda

A motion was made by Board Member Trafton, seconded by Board Member Jana-Ford, that this agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously.

Public Comments

There were no public comments at the meeting.

Approval of Consent Agenda

[2021-4545](#) Minutes of the November 18, 2021, Planning Commission meeting

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

Public Hearings

[2021-4561](#) Public Hearing: Application #PL2021-380 - Rezoning from CP-2 to PI and Preliminary Development Plan and Application #PL2021-411 - Special Use Permit for a storage facility - Lot 1 Town Centre, 520 NE Town Centre Drive; WHD Management, LLC, applicant.

Chairperson Funk opened the hearing at 5:09 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 1-17 into the record. He stated that the subject property was Lot 1 in Town Centre. He displayed an aerial photo with a zoning map overlay, with the subject property indicated by a yellow star. It was at the southwest corner of a 38-acre property, with Town Centre Boulevard to the north and west, Town Centre Drive to the south and Independence Avenue on the east. It was near the northwest corner of I-470 and M-291 Highway. MoDOT's facility was to the immediate south of the property, as well as the Missouri Department of Natural Resources building. Some car dealerships were to the east, and Kia dealership was to the southwest on Colbern Road. The area marked "AZ" to the west is airport property, with some multi-family development between the airport and the subject property. Independence Avenue north of Colbern Road toward Strother Road went through what was basically an industrial corridor.

The recently adopted Ignite Comprehensive Plan included recommended land uses; and although some of it was currently zoned CP-2 for commercial use, the Comprehensive Plan recommended industrial uses that could serve as a transition from the commercial and State civic uses to the south and west. More heavy industrial uses were to the north.

A Project Information slide showed the uses for the 11.6 acres currently zoned CP-2. Two of the three lots designated as pad sites A and B, plus a regional detention and common area tract and a storage facility. The applicant would provide some detail as to what market the larger storage facility would serve. The property had a total of 24 buildings, 21 of which would be for storage laid out in an "L" shape on the northern and western sides of the acreage. The pad sites had direct access off Town Centre Drive, with proposed office/warehouse use north of the pads. Pad site A would be for indoor recreational facility including a batting cage for baseball training.

Both pad sites met and exceeded the number of parking spaces required by the UDO for planned industrial uses. The storage facility section had no designed striped parking spaces. This particular type of storage facility followed a business model that did not include any on site staff. That meant there was no office, and no customers would come to the site for business transactions. The facility would be accessible 24 hours a day, every day of the week. This was somewhat different from other types of storage businesses, as there were no gates and no security around the buildings. Customers for this business would have full access, and could load and unload directly in front of the units they were leasing.

The lack of any dedicated parking spaces would require approval of an alternate parking plan. The UDO had to alternatives for determining required parking. A default method would be to just follow the UDO's Table 8-1. The UDO for a mini-warehouse facility required a minimum of two parking spaces plus one for the maximum number of employees on any given shift. In this case, customers would not be coming to a central location. Section 8.530.A.2 stated that an alternate parking plan would be tailored "to the particular needs of the use". In this case, the business would not have any on-site staff or office and would allow loading and unloading in front of individual storage units.

Mr. Soto then displayed elevations for the proposed storage buildings. The off-white sections represented textured metal panels, with manufactured cultured stone bases featured along the back and sides of some of the buildings. The exterior walls between the buildings, shown on the parking plan as black bands, would not be visible from off the property. In view of that,

the applicant requested that stone veneers would not be used on this part of the exteriors.

Buildings on Pad site A, the location for the proposed baseball training facility, also had some textured metal panels, which would be varied in color to provide some visual interest. The west and east elevations had flat facades with little projections. The rear elevations would have boxed in downspouts. The south elevation would have a canopy feature over the main entrance, as would the door to the office warehouse.

On the displayed elevations for Pad site B, Mr. Soto pointed out one building with textured metal panel with smooth corrugated panels indicated in gray on all elevations. As part of the initial review, staff had commented to the applicant that the UDO had certain requirements about the extension of architectural elements to all sides of a building. This was to provide additional interest and break up large expanses of walls. The applicant had been informed of these requirements. The applicant had then re-submitted plan and chosen to move forward with these elevations.

The corrugated metal panel on the elevations was allowed in certain parts of the city, though not citywide. It was allowed on the Airport property, along Victoria Drive just east of Main Street, and the Century Drive/Broadway Drive area between Oldham Parkway and Bailey Road, a little east of Hamblen. The UDO did make allowance for these types of smooth-finish corrugated metal panels in those parts of town. They were not allowed in any other areas, even those with industrial zoning. The UDO required rough-textured metal panels in this area.

This application had three components; the preliminary development plan, the requested rezoning and a Special Use Permit. The SUP was specific to the storage facility component, which was an allowed use in PI zoning, subject to three conditions. The first condition, that "a mini-warehouse facility must be enclosed on all sides by a wall or earthen berm that shields the development from view", was not applicable as the storage facility would be on property with a proposed PI zoning. The condition applied only to non-industrial districts.

The second condition was for colors to be muted shades, and the application did include these, as the proposed colors for the buildings would be earth tones.

The third condition required a roof pitch of 1':3' with the proposed roof pitches having a ratio of 1.5':3'. These rather flat roofs did not comply with the UDO requirement. Mr. Soto added that the intent of the requirement was for areas closer to residential or commercial/office areas. This area was industrial in nature and close to properties with roof pitches that were similar. Consequently, the proposed roof pitches were not out of character for this part of town. The nearby MoDOT facility did have a few utility buildings along Town Centre Drive with pitched roofs; but the only other examples were the multi-family buildings to the west.

Special Use Permits were not granted for indefinite periods; and the applicant requested a term of 20 years. Recent renewals and approvals for storage facilities had been granted for terms of 20 to 30 years; usually to align with financing. In this case, the financing had been set up for 20 years.

A modification would be needed for the proposed roof pitch. Staff supported the request, as the proposed roof pitch was "typical for industrial buildings and is common to industrial areas throughout the City."

All three of the proposed land uses were consistent with the Ignite Comprehensive Plan, as well as being compatible with nearby developments, such as automobile dealers, office/warehouse uses and MoDOT. Independence Avenue's character between Colbern and Strother roads was primarily industrial; although some residential use was further west. The undeveloped part of the property had been zoned CP-2 for a little over 40 years. Mr. Soto again displayed the Aerial and Zoning map, stating that the rest of the property shown would

not be impacted by the requested use of the subject property. The property did have some dense tree growth as well as a topographical change; with a slope from east to west. The vegetation would provide an additional spatial and visual buffer from other industrial uses, particular for the multi-family development next to the airport property.

The application had six Conditions of Approval. The first allowed for a roof pitch of .5':1', equivalent to 1.5":3' ratio. Condition 2 required exterior building materials to comply with UDO Section 8.170.A and 8.170.B that listed approved materials. Corrugated metal panels would not be allowed as exterior building materials. Condition 3 required horizontal and vertical breaks and architectural details on all four sides of the buildings. The applicant would be able to provide additional details.

Next, Ms. Brianna O'Neal stated that she was present representing the multiple property owners. She did not provide an address. She was a designer, and had experience with architectural engineering. She provided some additional information about how the business would operate. Most of the business would be conducted over the phone or online. An offsite building manager in the Kansas City area would deal with property maintenance issues, as well providing customers with any assistance needed. A 24-hour video surveillance system would provide security, though the property would not be fenced. This approach had been successful with other locations; and this would be the first in the Kansas City metro area. Ms. O'Neal mentioned D-Bat, an indoor batting cage business, that catered to all ages but did host parties for children. It would provide a recreational venue for the property.

Following Ms. O'Neal's comments, Chairperson Funk asked if there was anyone present wishing to give testimony, either in support for or opposition to the application. He then opened the hearing for Commissioners' questions for the applicant or staff.

Commissioner Benbrook noted that the site included an existing drainage pond that would be built over. He asked if WHD Management had any communication with them. Ms. O'Neal answered that they would be providing an on-site detention area. She did not recall seeing a pond on the property, although she knew there was a pond to the south that had a walkway around it. Commissioner Benbrook explained that the underlay image showed a pond, probably for storm drainage. He added that after this kind of pond was there for awhile, the Army Corps of Engineers would take an interest in seeing if it could be classified as a wetland. Ms. O'Neal said the applicants had not had any communication with them to date but could check on it.

Commissioner Benbrook then asked if this would be phased construction, and Ms. O'Neal answered that it would be, since there were multiple property owners. The general time line would be for Pad Site A and the mega storage facility start construction next year, and have them completed by the end of 2022. The mega storage site would probably be broken up into phases, with the portion north of Pad Site B and the detention pond would be built after some of the units started to fill up. There was no tenant as yet for Pad Site B.

Commissioner Trafton asked Mr. Soto if the new drive accessing the property would be a private drive or City owned and a new right-of-way. Mr. Soto answered that it would be a private drive, similar to a shared private drive at a shopping center. Most likely it would have cross-access easements but would not be a public right-of-way.

Commissioner Jana-Ford remarked that she had not seen a storage business located so close to a multi-recreational facility or office use. She asked if there was a precedent. Ms. O'Neal could not recall any specific facility. Regarding D-Bat, this would be a metal building that resembled a storage unit. Some locations had corrugated metal panels and a slightly pitched roof. Commissioner Jana-Ford asked if it was correct that the sole intent for the indoor facility was for batting cages, and Ms. O'Neal answered that it was.

Commissioner Jana-Ford then asked whether Pad B had a prospective tenant; and if a new tenant might result in a new potential for redevelopment; or if Building B's use would just depend on the interests of potential tenants. In the latter case, it would create a new kind of redevelopment for the building and Ms. O'Neal answered that a new tenant might mean the building could have some changes, such as the number of doors and windows. If the building was re-used, it would still have a small office and overhead doors.

Commissioner Jana-Ford asked if the intent for the facade was to mimic and blend in with the storage units. Ms. O'Neal answered that originally it was intended to be separate altogether. In some cases, a prospective tenant might have a specific preference, such as color. However, blending in with the other buildings could be considered the default preference.

Commissioner Jana-Ford remarked that some of the elevations showed a type of alley between two units. She asked what was the purpose of the spaces between buildings 5, 6 and 7. Ms. O'Neal answered that the fire marshal had determined that the buildings needed to be less than 5,000 square feet. One of the markets the applicants wanted was RV and boat storage, and after a certain size, they were classified as a commercial vehicle. At that point having some kind of fire separation or fire sprinklers would be required. In order to have flexibility in the kinds of uses they could market; the applicants had decided to keep all the buildings less than 5,000 square feet.

Commissioner Trafton commented that Lee's Summit seemed to have a lot of storage businesses, and many had opened fairly recently. He asked if there was that much demand. Mr. Soto said that staff had not done any kind of study; but most of the recent growth was indoor, climate controlled facilities. One exception, Storage Mart south of M-150 was a hybrid, with exterior access. Commissioner Trafton asked the applicant what their research of the market indicated. He understood a need for storage of boats and RVs, as people often needed to store these off their own property. Ms. O'Neal answered that Lee's Summit had little storage for RVs or boats; and the storage units the applicants were proposing were generally larger than what the city currently had. The applicants had indicated that they would rent some units to contractors who needed to store machinery and materials off site temporarily.

Commissioner Trafton recalled that over the past year the Commission had approved a facility by the Senior center off Todd George, that included vehicle storage. Mr. Soto recalled a number of recent renewals, but he did not recall any new construction off Todd George. Mr. Elam explained that this had been a concept plan that had an appearance similar to a commercial storefront. Mr. Soto recalled that it had been termed a "concept garage."

Commissioner Kitchens asked what was the zoning in this area, and Mr. Soto answered that it was a combination of commercial CP-2, PI [Planned Industrial] to the north and municipal Airport zoning [AZ] to the west. A small area to the west, colored orange on the displayed map, was multi-family zoning. Commissioner Kitchens remarked to Ms. O'Neal that self-storage businesses he had seen in the past were all the same size, not a mixture of sizes. He then asked about signage for the facility. Ms. O'Neal answered that a monument sign would be at the main entry, plus a sign on the side of one of the buildings.

Commissioner Kitchens asked if this business would be marketed and advertised, or if it would rely on visibility in its location. Storage businesses usually included large and expensive items such as RVs. He also wanted to know if the units would have electricity. Ms. O'Neal answered that each unit would have at least one outlet. They should be able to accommodate an RV, trailer or boat.

Commissioner Kitchens remarked that there were many things about this plan that he liked, including the topiary and the fact that the plan did not include a car wash on the outside. He also liked the plan to have batting cages in Lee's Summit, as the previous ones had been taken over by the School District. He did want to know if the applicants had a plan for Pad Site B, and

Ms. O'Neal answered that they did not.

Regarding security, Commissioner Kitchens did not expect any major issues. He asked if there would be additional signs on the side facing I-470. Ms. O'Neal answered that the Pad Site A building would not have a monument sign. The applicants proposed two wall sides, with one on the side facing the highway. The only monument sign they were proposing was for the mega storage site. Pad B had no tenant as yet; and if it did have a monument sign in the future it would be on that tenant's lot. The business would have a wall sign, most likely on the building's facade.

Commissioner Loveless noted that he did not hear the applicant state whether or not they agreed with staff's Conditions of Approval. Ms. O'Neal replied that they did accept the Conditions of Approval, including the architectural materials and the facade variation.

Regarding the alternate parking plan, Commissioner Loveless, asked if the lack of striped spaces indicated enough space between the buildings to not need designated parking spaces. Mr. Soto answered that this was the main reason, as there was a lot of space between the buildings and very wide aisles. In a few locations, 'islands' could be designated, where a vehicle could be parked for a period of time if necessary, without impeding internal traffic circulation.

Commissioner Arth asked if the applicant had a Letter of Intent for the batting cages, and if this part of the development had a tenant. She also wanted to know if it was correct that there were no tenants for office space. Ms. O'Neal answered that D-Bat was a tenant, and they had over 100 locations around the US. She added that the Pad B building did not currently have a prospective tenant.

Regarding security, Chairperson Funk noted that it was not clear whether or not there would be RV or contractor storage; but no on-site personnel would monitor that. With no oversight, people could be working out of these units. Ms. O'Neal said the current plan was for buildings 1 through 3 would be for potential contractor use only. That would be the only aspect that could be called a commercial type use. The rest of the development would be for private storage only. Chairperson Funk still wanted to know who would monitor those buildings. He added that someone with a business like auto repair could rent a space and operate out of it. Ms. O'Neal said the business would have maintenance personnel, plus the 24-hour video surveillance. People who rented these units would have to sign some kind of contract or agreement, and that could include a stipulation about not using one of the units to operate a business.

Chairperson Funk asked if locations elsewhere had success with not having any kind of gate or in-person security on the site. Ms. O'Neal said that the current sites operated well without any issues, including having a fence.

Concerning materials, Chairperson Funk remarked that this resembled a large 'metal building farm.' He recalled a mention by staff of a treed lot, and asked if the applicant would be willing to have some screening should the lot be cleared. Ms. O'Neal answered that they were currently planting a significant number of trees and shrubs. They would provide substantial screening between the buildings and the property line when the plants were mature; though not meeting the City's specific screening requirements. The applicants had taken that into consideration. She added that with the slope and as small as that site was, she was not sure how it could be used; nor whether the applicants planned to put up any fences. The vegetation was also very dense.

Chairperson Funk said that the source of the concern was that this was a lot of metal buildings, and no one knew what would go in behind it on the other properties. Screening all the way around might be a good idea.

Commissioner Trafton asked if the D-Bat business was a local franchisee. Ms. O'Neal said that she had met the local representatives in person, but she did not know if they lived in the Lee's Summit area.

Mr. Vance Herrington gave his address as 15033 Chadwick Street in Overland Park. He was the franchisee for the new location. They already had one location in Lenexa that had been there for about five years, and it had been very successful. There were over 110 locations all over the US, with a few international locations. It was not just batting cages but was basically a baseball and softball academy that was open to the public and was not a team-oriented facility. The facility would have 15 batting cages, about five of which would have pitching machines. It was a swipe-card facility, so anyone could buy 75 pitches. Memberships and individual training were also available, and they rented out team areas for practice. A room was available for birthday parties. The age range was approximately 8 to 14. In scouting a location, they got a 'Buxton report' to get information about the area's demographics. The Lee's Summit areas got a high score.

Chairperson Funk asked about Item 2, "material compliance." He asked what they proposed to the City. Ms. O'Neal noted the language that "corrugated metal panels shall not be used as an exterior building material on any building." What the applicants were proposing would be textured to look like stucco. In order to comply with the requirement for horizontal and vertical breaks and architectural details, they would work with staff to upgrade the elevations to be in compliance with the UDO. They intended to add more canopies; but as these were prefabricated metal buildings, it would be difficult to change the facade. The applicants were trying to find more creative ways to create those breaks and add more interest that City staff was looking for.

Chairperson Funk asked if there were further questions for the applicant or staff. Hearing none, he closed the public hearing at 6:10 p.m. and asked for discussion among the Commission members, or for a motion.

Commissioner Benbrook stated that he had worked with metal buildings in the past, and he knew staff could help with the breaks. He was glad to hear the applicant was compliant with materials. He occasionally played softball and this would be a good place to warm up for the season. He did have some concerns about security considering the remote location. The applicant was voluntarily not putting a fence in and would have to get approval from the City if they did. However, the remote location might create some problems.

Commissioner Jana-Ford noted that development was occurring in the area, and did not think it should be assumed that this would all be industrial growth.

Commissioner Trafton believed that D-Bats was in a good location and would be popular. It was an especially welcome addition in view of so many local facilities being for teams.

Commissioner Kitchens also considered the batting cages a good addition, and shared the concerns about security. However, his main concern was over the land surrounding this property. Development would be happening there; but he did like the idea of the larger units. In terms of management, he would have preferred to have management on site. However, if a local management company would check on the facility regularly, that would discourage improper use. Development of adjacent land might run into a problem with some properties having a view of a storage facility.

Commissioner Arth liked the idea, especially of having three different types of use in one development. She did share Commissioner Benbrook's concerns about security, since an increase in thefts had occurred recently, even in residential areas. She especially liked the option of larger units, especially in view of Lee's Summit not having enough boat slips in the lake areas. She did think more consideration should be given to security but she did like the

project overall.

Chairperson Funk found the idea appealing; but did not support the application at present. He would recommend a continuance to allow the applicant to show some better architectural features. He also wanted a more detailed discussion of the screening. He thought that the security did not make much sense and might be a problem waiting to happen.

Commissioner Trafton made a motion to recommend approval of Application PL2021-380, Rezoning from CP-2 to PI and Preliminary Development Plan; and Application PL2021-411 Special Use Permit for storage facility: Lot 1 Town Centre, 520 NE Town Centre Dr; WHD Management, LLC, applicant. Commissioner 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 application be recommended for approval to the City Council - Regular Session, due back on 1/4/2022 The motion carried by the following vote:

**Aye:** 6 - Vice Chair Arth  
Board Member Benbrook  
Board Member Jana-Ford  
Board Member Kitchens  
Board Member Loveless  
Board Member Trafton

**Nay:** 1 - Chairperson Funk

**Absent:** 2 - Board Member Rader  
Board Member Sanning

[2021-4551](#) Public Hearing: Application #PL2021-382 - Rezoning from CP-2 to RP-4 and Preliminary Development Plan - Chapel Ridge Apartments, 721 NE Meadowview Drive; Patricia Jensen, applicant.

Chairperson Funk opened the hearing at 6:15 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. This application concerned properties in the south portion of Chapel Ridge Business Park. He displayed a map and pointed out the locations of I-470, Woods Chapel Road to the north and the Strother Road intersection. Ralph Powell Road ran to the east and Akin Boulevard behind that. He also pointed out a multi-family project just west of Akin. Mr. Andy Mackey, the developer, was present this evening as well as the architect's attorney, Ms. Patricia Jensen.

The applicant was requesting an approval recommendation for three items: to amend the 2005 Comprehensive Plan from Office to Residential Category 3; to rezone the property from CP-2 to RP-4 and approve the preliminary development plan; and to vacate various site utility easements. The project would have 276 residential units on about 12 acres; and Mr. Schlicht pointed out the three streets adjacent and within it: Custer Drive, Meadowview Drive and Akin Boulevard. Strother Road was directly to the south. Ralph Powell Road was built out, with commercial, medical office and general office uses. The development would also have a proposed clubhouse with a pool, in addition to a dog park and a fitness center.

The zoning map currently showed everything east of Akin as CP-2, with RP-4 zoning to the west, except for one piece to the north that had been rezoned RP-4 several months ago. Both these zoning designations were similar in terms of setbacks and densities. The proposed



rezoning would enable development of a residential project.

Mr. Schlicht showed two land use maps, one for the 2005 Comprehensive Plan and the other for the 2021 Ignite Comprehensive Plan. The 2005 plan showed most of this site as multi-family use; however, the Ignite Plan modified the plan to change it to office use. This change was primarily because the development directly east was zoned office and Akin provided a delineator. However, more uses in Akin's entire corridor were multi-family. The overall development still had 21 acres of commercial ground that had been there since the initial platting in July of 2002. Much of that acreage was either near Ralph Powell or only one lot removed. Strother Crossing, on the south side of Strother Road, was developed in 2015. Businesses nearby were a gas station and a dentist office; but about 9 acres remained on the south side that were zoned CP-2. About 30 acres of CP-2 zoned land would remain after the rezoning.

The site would have a proposed 444 parking spaces, well above the 414 spaces required. This would be a combination of surface parking and several parking garages located throughout the site. Some carports might be incorporated into the plan as a kind of middle tier between the garages and the surface parking. The 20,000 square foot office building to the west was a final development plan only, so it had not been brought to the Commission.

Three modifications were being requested. The maximum density in RP-4 zoning was 12 units per acre; and the plan well exceeded that with 23.1. Staff had provided a report listing of developments in Lee's Summit with densities that had been approved over the past few years. Minimum lot sizes in RP-4 were 3,500 square feet per unit, with a proposed 1,886 square feet. This larger figure was partly due to the increased density. The applicants requested a modification to the buffer, which had a requirement of an opaque screen fence with low-impact buffer landscaping to provide separation between the residential and commercial uses. In a situation where a commercial use was proposed near a residence, the owner had an opportunity to gain some additional screening. In this situation the east side was built out with commercial development, the residential tenants moving in were aware of the commercial activity. Increased plantings along the easterly border could provide natural screening that would be more beneficial to the overall development than a fence would. Maintenance of fences often created problems and issues; whereas natural screening would contribute to beautification of the overall area.

Mr. Schlicht displayed examples of development in this area, and mentioned that the development primarily existed on the back side of all the commercial development that was happening on Ralph Powell Road. The images included the back of a dentist office on the northeast corner of the site, a medical office in approximately the middle of the site; and a two-story building on the end of the cul-de-sac. He noted that the back side had more architectural elements than the other examples. Other examples were a law office with a drive along the back side; and some offices on the site's southeast corner. Two images showed a west view of the existing apartment facility.

Elevations proposed for the project showed sizes, number of units and rental rates for 1 bedroom, 2 bedroom and 2 bedroom plus 'den' units. Square footages ranged from 650 square feet to 1,145 square feet and rentals from \$1040 to \$1450. A total of ten buildings would be on the site with varying colors, materials and sizes. The various materials were listed that would provide an updated architectural style that matched current residential trends. Garages would have some stone or wainscoting to provide some visual interest.

Mr. Schlicht also displayed the proposed floor plans for one bedroom and 2 bedroom units. The option of two bedrooms plus a den would add some square footage and an additional room. He then displayed a drawing of the development's layout with the locations of the clubhouse, pool and dog park. The entire area had sidewalks and general walkability. A grocery store and restaurants were within walking distance. The clubhouse would include a fitness

facility and some work stations for home office work plus the outdoor pool.

A neighborhood meeting was held on October 28th, with two participants; one person from the northeast corner of the site where the dental office was located, and the other from the southeast corner where a law office was located. The law office was located one tier away from the rest of the facility. The 20,000 square foot building that staff was reviewing at present would probably start construction early in 2022, leaving one vacant parcel.

The discussion had focused on converting commercial uses into residential uses and whether or not this was appropriate. They had concerns about the values of their buildings changing, and noted that these lots had been a green space for 20 years. A second or third-tier office complex was not likely to happen in this area. The multi-family use that had been developed was progressing along Akin Boulevard, indicating that this site would fit well with that overall development. Mr. Schlicht pointed out that the buildings were laid out somewhat perpendicular to the developments closest to them. Most of them backed up either to parking or to green space, including the dog park.

Mr. Andy Mackey gave a brief history. About eight months ago, he was on his way to an appointment when he saw some vacant ground and had contacted the seller. He was aware based on the feedback he got that there was a lot of competition and high-end developments. Mr. Mackey listed some of his current projects including Skyline Homes in Riverside, Brighton Crossing apartments in Kansas City, Sunset Plaza in Raymore, and Madison Apartments pending in summer of next year. He mentioned a number of other projects in Blue Springs, Kansas City and Lee's Summit. Mr. Mackey then re-listed the applicant's request to the Planning Commission: amending the Comprehensive Plan from Office to Residential Category 3; rezoning the property CP-2 to RP-4 and approving the preliminary development plan; and vacating various site utility easements.

Following Mr. Mackey's presentation, Chairperson Funk asked for staff comments. He added that Commissioner Loveless was no longer connected online.

\*Commissioner Loveless left the meeting @ 6:23 p.m.

Mr. Soto entered Exhibit (A), list of exhibits 1-16 into the record. He stated that Mr. Schlicht and Mr. Mackey had given most of the relevant information about the proposed project. The elevations that he displayed showed a mix of materials including a composition roof. There were some metal panel and wood accents that would add some warmth to the building's appearance. The requested modifications pertained to both density and lot size, with the maximum 12 dwelling units per acre being increased to 23.1, and the minimum 3,500 square foot lot size decreased to 1,887.6 square feet. It was fairly consistent with other recent projects. Over the past 12 years, developments that had been on the very low end would now have about 16 units per acre. On the higher end more recently, some developments, like the Streets of West Pryor, had 38 or 39 units per acre.

There was some topographical change that would support a request to add more landscaping for a natural buffer, rather than using an opaque fence with fewer landscaping materials. The fence requirement was six feet for a high-impact buffer; but there were areas in this development where there was some topographical change between this development and the existing office and commercial sites to the east that was more than a net six feet. Since the commercial sites were at a higher elevation, a six-foot fence would not be very effective.

Regarding the difference between the original 2005 and the current Ignite Comprehensive Plan, Akin Boulevard was a divide between the existing multi-family land use and the commercial land use to the east. Portions of this subdivision had been platted for commercial purposes since 2002. A preliminary development plan had been submitted for the Chapel Ridge golf course in 2005; and it was approved for the Chapel Ridge mixed use development. Over the past 16 years, the demand along the corridor west of Ralph Powell Road was for

multi-family development.

The next aerial view showed the Fairways apartment development. In past years the City had received applications for the rezoning from existing commercial uses to residential zoning for townhomes. Tonight's application would mirror the type of development for the apartments to the west on the other side of Akin Boulevard.

Staff had eight Conditions of Approval for this application. The first three were modifications concerning density, minimum lot size and the high impact landscape buffer mentioned earlier. Staff recommended approval subject to Conditions of Approval 1 through 8.

Following Mr. Soto's comments, Chairperson Funk asked if there were any comments or questions from the public concerning this application.

Mr. Jim Young pointed out the building that he owned on the Aerial and Zoning map. He was a resident of Lakewood and had owned the building for 11 years. He pointed out another part of the map that was actually a dentist's office, not vacant land. The dentist had attended the neighborhood meeting in October. He added that the office use for some of these spaces was for people working there. For example, the building he owned as occupied by 12 attorneys who paid him rent. Most of these offices were in the back. The proposed development would completely envelop his office, via a series of three-story apartment buildings.

When he had bought the building, Mr. Young had relied on a general office zoning, and it was basically his retirement plan. People who bought land that was zoned a certain way did depend on it having some degree of permanence; and changing it might be a positive move for a developer but negative to him. He had foreseen looking out the back of his building and seeing one-story masonry buildings with tile roofs. That was the character of all the buildings currently there with office uses. He had basically paid for a road behind him to be used by whoever moved in. He expected that ongoing development all around him to be one-story masonry buildings with tile roofs. Until the two lots on the map were sold, he would be looking at three-story apartment buildings. He believed that there were competing interests. He had the impression that the goal was to 'shoehorn' as many units possible into the smallest space possible; and that blocked any effort to have any buffer between the apartments and the commercial buildings that were built under the previous commercial zoning.

In terms of density, one-story masonry buildings with tile roofs with green space nearby represented 'horizontal' density, with taller three-story buildings having 'vertical' density.

Mr. Mike Atcheson gave his address as 4835 NW Canyon Road in Lee's Summit. He had worked as a developer since the late 1990s. He pointed out Mr. Young's building on the map, as well as the vacant commercial lot behind it. Next door was the 20,000 square foot site for the office building that was planned for next year. The ground along that west side dropped dramatically, and a detention pond was at the bottom of the drop-off.

When the property was zoned 20 years ago, the market was much different and more office use development had been anticipated. The PMIX zoning designation did not exist at that time. The only success with office product had been along Ralph Powell Road, with direct access and high visibility. This property would be difficult to develop and he did not think it would ever get office use.

Chairperson Funk then asked if the Commission had questions for the applicant or staff. He was not sure what 'competing interests' meant. Mr. Bushek said he assumed that the speaker was representing his interests in opposition rather than in favor, specifically his opposition to the application.

Mr. Schlicht offered to answer questions, and Chairperson Funk asked for some detail about

the elevation change on the property. Mr. Schlicht said that the grade this pad site was about 14 feet below the finished floor of Mr. Young's building. That was a fairly significant drop from east to west. Regarding the references to one-story buildings with tile roofs, he commented that this was CP-2 zoning district, which allowed three-story buildings about 40 feet tall. The difference between CP-2 and RP-4 zoning was minimal as far as the impact of the ground was concerned. The change in use in the change of zoning would be minimal. The building currently being designed was 20,000 square feet, with a parapet roof. From an orientation standpoint, the attempt was to keep all the buildings from running perpendicular to the property line and avoid the visual loss.

Chairperson Funk opened the hearing for questions from the Commissioners. Commissioner Benbrook asked how many garages were being proposed. Mr. Schlicht replied that they currently proposed 40 garage spaces, spaced out through the site. About 10 percent of the parking would be in garages; and they would add carports. Other developments in town had included too many or too few garages, and including carports would be a good middle option. Commissioner Benbrook asked if these would include an additional rental fee. Mr. Schlicht answered that a fee would be assessed for a carport or a garage; but an assigned parking space would be included with no additional fee.

Looking at the total number for parking, Commissioner Benbrook noted that 10 percent of parking being in garages would total about 40. If carports were added, that would mean the development would be under-parked. He explained that typically parking counts in terms of numbers did not have an additional rental fee. However, the proposal here was 10 percent of parking in garages or carports. Since the minimum parking requirement was 414 and the plan was for 440. If 40 was subtracted for garages, the development would be under-parked unless people were paying more.

Mr. Mackey recalled the Mayor once saying that the Donovan apartments were probably the best in the city, but the Meridian had the best parking. He had remembered that, and wanted to have multiple parking options. They were willing to make modifications in order to ensure that all parking requirements were met. Commissioner Benbrook asked if other developments had a surplus or shortage of garages and carports. Mr. Mackey answered a balance had to be maintained. Going to 30 percent on parking and everyone having a parking space would mean that no one would be willing to pay for parking. Taking away a little bit of parking was a kind of market study situation. He added that he could look at the numbers for Echelon and Meridian to see where any gaps were. In general, parking was at a premium in Lee's Summit, and the Meridian charged as much as \$150.

Commissioner Benbrook then asked if the facades the applicant had shown would definitely be included in the final plan or if they might be modified somewhat. Mr. Mackey noted that at present, Hardi produced a metal product that looked like board and batten. However, he would have to use a wood product if that was not available. He assured that this would be as high end as anything on the market. Commissioner Benbrook asked what specifically 'high end' might mean. Mr. Mackey said that much depended on what materials were available at present. I liked the geometric roofs the Echelon had done; but some of the materials used for those would not be available for another 6 to 9 months. That was one reason for the higher roof pitch he had chosen.

Regarding stormwater, Commissioner Benbrook said he assumed that the direction was from a lot of pervious material to a lot of impervious material; and asked if the current stormwater systems were dealing with the increase. Mr. Schlicht answered that the stormwater when into two different detention basin areas. Both were designed for commercial development, with a higher impervious area than what was proposed for this application. Both would be able to handle the volume of stormwater. The rezoning would reduce the load somewhat.

Commissioner Jana-Ford asked if surface parking would be assigned. Mr. Schlicht answered

that in these facilities, garage and carport spaces were all claimed very quickly. That made it likely that the parking demand would drive how many carports were put up. Spaces were not assigned; but were rather consolidated into locations based on where people were living. That meant that in higher density areas there was more available surface parking. Commissioner Jana-Ford asked if carports were definitely included, potential items, and Mr. Mackey answered that he definitely planned to add these. Commissioner Jana-Ford asked some spaces would be lost, should carports be added at a later point. Mr. Mackey answered that they would not. Carport pylons took up 4 to 6 inches, and the span could be up to 48 feet. He added that these would be part of the plan and not be added later.

Commissioner Jana-Ford asked if it was correct that the office would be one-story or one and a half stories. Mr. Schlicht answered that it was a normal commercial building with a parapet. Commissioner Jana-Ford asked if the land sloped down from the east side on to the new development, and Mr. Schlicht responded that it was.

Commissioner Jana-Ford then remarked that this sounded like it sloped in two directions: east to west and north to south. Mr. Schlicht explained that a ridge existed on the property, and pointed out where most of the ground drained to the basin to the north and west. Most of the site drained from east to west; but the ridge formed a break; but everything went from Ralph Powell down to Akin. The new building would use the existing roadway that was already built. However, on the back side of the building the slope down to the apartment project was ten feet of grade change. An 8-foot retaining wall on the south side essentially helped hold the upper level building up. The height difference between the office and the new building would be between one and one and a half stories depending on the slope.

Referring to the sector off the page as the 'island' for discussion purposes, Commissioner Jana-Ford noted that this portion did not have immediate access to the clubhouse. She asked how tenants would access it. Mr. Schlicht remarked that this was a very elongated property, and they were trying to work out where the walking paths and sidewalks would be to make this a connected community. There would be a walkable route from the south to the north side. This was primarily a business park area where most activity would be in the daytime; but the residential community to the south and west included some senior and assisted living housing. Crossing the public street at the south end should be safe.

Noting the reference to a detention basin at the south part, Commissioner Trafton asked if there would be drainage to that area from the apartment buildings. Mr. Schlicht pointed out the existing detention basin's location on the south end of the map, explaining that it was part of a previous plat and was already constructed and in a platted tract. It was on common ground and was maintained by the HOA. It was part of the Chapel Ridge business park.

Commissioner Trafton commented that the change of topography even for the law office was about 8 feet from the front to the back. A building on the vacant lot parallel to the law office would sit about 20 feet lower. Mr. Schlicht commented that a building could be as tall as 40 feet in a CP-2 zoning district. The change from the law office to the building pad would be as much as a story and a half. Commissioner Trafton remarked that there could be a one-story to three-story building between the back of the law office and the apartment building.

Concerning the apartment building south of Meadowbrook, Commissioner Trafton noted that it was actually closer to the law office in terms of sightlines due to the drop off. Mr. Schlicht pointed out the lot in the south part of the property that sloped from 9 or 10 to 13 feet. It would need a retaining wall when a building was constructed. Commissioner Trafton asked how high the apartment buildings would be, and Mr. Schlicht said they were three stories with a pitched roof. He did not think they were any higher than 40 feet at the rooftops. The space was actually an indoor stairwell access, with hallways leading off to the units.

Chairperson Funk asked if what he was seeing on the map was an open breezeway between

two buildings. Mr. Mackey pointed out the space between apartment buildings that Chairperson Funk was looking at, and Chairperson Funk commented that he always asked about elevators when he saw a breezeway on what was described as high-end apartments.

Chairperson Funk asked Mr. Schlicht about access points from the commercial development. Mr. Schlicht pointed out the two access points on Akin and another two on the south side.

Commissioner Jana-Ford asked if it would be possible to move the proposed dog park to a more central location in the development. Mr. Mackey stated that the plan had previously included two dog parks. They had deleted one based on comments from staff; and the other would be located in a green space near the detention pond. It would be fenced and pet trash bags provided. Some faux grass spots might be provided during the winter.

Mr. Soto reported that the overall maximum height for the buildings was shown at 47'8". Heights up to 50 feet were allowed in the RP-4 district.

Chairperson Funk asked if there were further questions for the applicant or staff. Hearing none, he closed the public hearing at 7:20 p.m. and asked for discussion among the Commission members.

Commissioner Benbrook thanked staff for assembling all the documents. Concerning the screening, eliminating a stark white vinyl fence might be the best approach for natural screening. He liked the facades, but at this preliminary stage they looked a little flat. He liked the overall concept and felt that the location would work.

Commissioner Kitchens also approved of the plan and concept.

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

Commissioner Trafton made a motion to recommend approval of Application PL2021-382, Rezoning from CP-2 to RP-4 and Preliminary Development Plan: Chapel Ridge Apartments, 721 NE Meadowview Drive, Patricia Jensen, applicant. Commissioner 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, due back on 1/4/2022. The motion carried unanimously.

[BILL NO.](#)  
[22-01](#)

An Ordinance approving a rezoning from CP-2 (Planned Community Commercial) to District RP-4 (Planned Apartment Residential) and Preliminary Development Plan for Chapel Ridge Apartments, located at 721 NE Meadowview Drive, 781 NE Meadowview Drive, 821 NE Custer Drive, 3301 NE Akin Boulevard and 3430 NE Ralph Powell 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.

[2021-4550](#)

Appl. #PL2021-384 - COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT - change from Office land use designation to Residential 3 land use designation, approximately 12 acres generally located along NE Akin Blvd between NE Meadowview Dr and NE Morgan Dr; Patricia Jensen, applicant

Chairperson Funk announced a break at 7:20 p.m. The meeting reconvened at 7:26 p.m.

Chairperson Funk opened the hearing at 7:26 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 stated that this was the Comprehensive Plan amendment changing the designation from Office use to Residential Category 3, to allow for RP-4 use.

Chairperson Funk asked for staff comments.

Mr. Soto entered Exhibit (A), list of exhibits 1-8 into the record. He stated that staff's testimony in the previous hearing, applying to rezoning and a preliminary development plan, applied for this application. He noted one change needed to the Resolution. Approval of the Comprehensive Plan amendment would be subject to approval of the associated rezoning and preliminary development plan at the City Council stage. Staff had made an addition to the Resolution to add Section 4. It would state that "this Resolution shall become effective upon approval of the ordinance that rezones the property and approves the preliminary development plan pursuant to Application PL2021-382." If the application for rezoning and the preliminary development plan was not approved by the City Council, this amendment would not go into effect.

Chairperson Funk stated that for this application, the Commission was not recommending approval but rather approving the Comprehensive Plan amendment.

As no members of the public were present at this point, Chairperson Funk then asked if the Commission had questions about the amendment. Hearing none, he closed the public hearing at 7:35 p.m. and asked for any comments or discussion among the Commission members, or for a motion.

Commissioner Arth made a motion to approve Application PL2021-384, Comprehensive Plan Amendment change from Office land use designation to Residential 3 land use designation, approximately 12 acres generally located along NE Akin Blvd between NE Meadowview Dr and NE Morgan Dr; Patricia Jensen, applicant. Commissioner Kitchens seconded.

Chairperson Funk stated that one of the Commission's agendas showed Mr. Mackey as the applicant and the other showed Ms. Jensen as the applicant. Mr. Bushek stated that the agenda he was looking at showed Patricia Jensen as the applicant.

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

A motion was made by Vice Chair Arth, seconded by Board Member Kitchens, that this application be approved. The motion carried unanimously.

## Other Agenda Items

[2021-4553](#) RESOLUTION NO. 2021-05 - Resolution of the Planning Commission of the City of Lee's Summit, Missouri, amending the Lee's Summit Ignite Comprehensive Plan with a change from Office land use designation to Residential 3 land use designation, approximately 12 acres generally located along NE Akin Blvd between NE Meadowview Dr and NE Morgan Dr.

Chairperson Funk asked Mr. Bushek if the Commission needed to vote on this item, and Mr. Bushek explained that the motion made on the last agenda item would be treated as authorization to execute the Resolution.

A motion was made by Vice Chair Arth, seconded by Board Member Kitchens, that this

resolution be approved. The motion carried unanimously.

[2021-4552](#)

Public Hearing: Application #PL2021-385 - Vacation of Easement - 721 NE Meadowview Drive, 781 NE Meadowview Drive, 821 NE Custer Drive, 3301 NE Akin Boulevard and 3430 NE Ralph Powell Road; Patricia Jensen, applicant.

There were no questions or comments from the Commissioners or from City staff.

Chairperson Funk called for a motion on this application.

Commissioner Arth made a motion to recommend approval of Application PL2021-385, Vacation of Easement: 721 NE Meadowview Dr, 781 NE Meadowview Dr, 821 NE Custer Dr, 3301 NE Akin Blvd and 3430 NE Ralph Powell Rd; Patricia Jensen, applicant. Commissioner Kitchens seconded.

Chairperson Funk then called for a vote.

A motion was made by Vice Chair Arth, seconded by Board Member Kitchens, that this application be recommended for approval to the City Council - Regular Session, due back on 1/4/2022. The motion carried unanimously.

[2021-4562](#)

Appl. #PL2021-422 - SIGN APPLICATION - Lee's Summit High School, 400 SE Blue Pkwy; Gould Evans, applicant

Commissioner Trafton stated that this was quite a big sign. He asked to see some visuals.

Mr. John Wilkins stated that he was employed by Gould Evans. He displayed an aerial map showing the locations of Lee's Summit High School, US 50 highway and M-291 Highway. He pointed out the location of a large concrete tiger head on a corner along US 50. Gould Evans was the architectural firm that was renovating and adding on to the school.

This application involved two areas. Area 1 was over by the entrance, and Area 2 was the location the application was referencing. Some pen mounted aluminum signage reading "Lee's Summit High School" was attached to the front wall by the main entrance. The upper-case letters on the sign were 14 inches high, and the lower-case letters were 10 inches.

At the other area, facing US 50, was a zinc metal panel that formed the exterior and complemented some existing black metal panel. On the displayed diagram, Mr. Wilkins pointed out a perforated metal scrim that wrapped around a corner of the building. It was similar to an element used at Kauffman Stadium. The perforations created the image that he displayed of a new sign. He had worked with the high school and the School District to create a sign that would be visible from US 50. The proposed sign had an abstract image of a tiger head, with the high school name complemented by abstract tiger stripes.

The proposed sign extended the scrim, which was 24 feet tall and the facade that faced the highway was 139 feet long. The sign's appearance would change throughout the day depending on how the sun hit it. It was becoming popular in schools and athletic venues in general.

Commissioner Jana-Ford remarked the scrim seemed to extend past the building's facade, and asked what the purpose was. Mr. Wilkins said that this new elevation extended over to create an entry element, keeping all the pieces of the facade visually cohesive. Commissioner Jana-Ford asked if it would stand out very tall from the building, and Mr. Wilkins pointed out the locations of the building's exterior wall, which currently had a one-story addition that the School District was tearing down. He also pointed out the facade of the original gymnasium, which resulted in the scrim being offset. As the sidewalk was about 6 feet wide, it was approximately 8 feet out from the wall.



Commissioner Trafton commented that it looked somewhat like a billboard; and said he knew what the applicant was trying to do; but he was concerned about it being several feet off the building, and asked what was the reason for it. Mr. Wilkins answered that had to do with the light and how it worked with the perforated screen. If the screen was directly attached to a masonry wall, it would not look the same.

Commissioner Trafton appreciated the reference to Kauffman Stadium as an example of where else this approach to signage was used. He asked if other schools used this approach, and Mr. Wilkins mentioned Salina High School. It had been used more over the last several years, as a way to create patterns in metal. Commissioner Trafton if at certain times of day, it might create a glare near the highway. Mr. Wilkins did not believe this would happen. It was not a shiny, reflective finish but was more similar to the matte kind of finish that working with zinc sometimes produced. What the Commission was seeing that was solid was a metal panel with no perforation. The artwork or message was created via perforations in a metal panel. He acknowledged that natural light in various times of day or weather conditions would influence the appearance.

Commissioner Trafton asked if students had been involved in the process, and Mr. Wilkins answered that they had been early on they had worked with the students in the total design, over a 7 month period; and the school principal had vetted the project with community members, students and teachers. They had brought some mock-up panels out to the site.

Commissioner Trafton asked who at Gould Evans was credited with the design of this sign, and Mr. Wilkins said a 15 member team headed by lead project designer Kelly Driers and lead project architect Steve Vukovich had worked on some of the technical details.

Chairperson Funk asked if the sign was lit at night, and Mr. Wilkins said that it was not, and would not be back lit. Chairperson Funk replied that in that case, it would work with only a specific amount of light and taxpayers in the community would pay money for a sign that they would only be able to see in certain shades of light or certain kinds of weather. A highway went by it, and it was not even lit. He did not think it made a lot of sense.

Commissioner Benbrook noted the reference to a zinc panel, which would tend to have a gray hue. It looked to him like the dominant color in the design was bronze. Mr. Wilkins answered that a dark gray type of zinc was available, along with several other colors and shades. It was not similar to a silver color. He confirmed for Commissioner Benbrook that the same material would wrap around the facade toward the west. Commissioner Benbrook asked if the perforations would vary in size at all, and Mr. Wilkins said he was not sure about that detail, but generally they were all the same. It was possible for smaller perforations to be used for more detail. Commissioner Benbrook asked what measures would be taken to prevent rust, and whether they would be galvanized or painted. Mr. Wilkins answered that it was all galvanized steel.

Concerning the reference to the sign not being back lit, Commissioner Trafton remarked that the sign could not be seen at night if it was not lit. He asked if it would be lit at night from the ground in front. Mr. Wilkins answered that the site itself would have some general lighting, so it would not be pitch black. He added that it could be seen during the day, cloudy or sunny; but the appearance would change. A strong glow at night was not part of its purpose. Commissioner Trafton then asked about the cost of the sign, and Mr. Wilkins answered that it was less than one percent of the total project. The total cost was about \$400,000 and it was part of a project whose total cost was \$66 million.

Commissioner Arth stated that having adequate light at night was appealing.

Commissioner Kitchens disagreed with the idea of a big blob sign that was black or dark gray

and could not be seen in the early morning hours or at night. He did not think this was the proper signage for right there off US 50.

Concerning the front scrim off US 50, Commissioner Jana-Ford noted that the panels were 24 feet tall and there were three sections of 8 feet. She assumed that each of those 8-foot elements would have a horizontal band of structure behind it. She asked if there was any study or information as to what that would look like. It sounded like the horizontal band would break up and hinder the graphics on the front. Mr. Wilkins said the staff and project architect had done extensive studies and the firm had used perforated panels on a number of projects and had taken that into account.

Commissioner Jana-Ford then noted that Sign 1 was not connected on the south end. It appeared to be free-floating off the face of the wall. The rendering showed a ceiling element of some kind, but it did not close off the space. She asked if this was an access for repair, cleaning and maintenance, or what would be happening in that space. Essentially there was no connection to the building on the south end of the sign. Mr. Wilkins re-displayed the diagram, and pointed out the scrim piece that extended out to create the portal for access. It would theoretically be possible to walk between the sign and the building.

Commissioner Jana-Ford asked if there was any concern about trash and other debris building up in that space. Mr. Wilkins stated that his firm had over 100 meetings with the School District, including weekly meetings. Commissioner Jana-Ford noted that a gust of wind going through could create a kind of wind tunnel, and she wanted to know what the tieback was to the existing facade would be. She saw only one anchor point to the building. Mr. Wilkins acknowledged that trash could be blown back behind the sign, but he did not think it created a wind tunnel. He had not done any modeling for that kind of situation; however, the structure included a perforated skin and some large openings.

As there were no other questions or comments, Chairperson Funk called for a motion.

Commissioner Arth made a motion to recommend denial of Application PL2021-422, Sign Application: Lee's Summit High School, 400 SE Blue Pkwy; Gould Evans, applicant. Commissioner Kitchens seconded.

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

**A motion was made by Vice Chair Arth, seconded by Board Member Kitchens, that this application be denied. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 4 - Chairperson Funk  
Vice Chair Arth  
Board Member Jana-Ford  
Board Member Kitchens

**Nay:** 2 - Board Member Benbrook  
Board Member Trafton

**Absent:** 3 - Board Member Loveless  
Board Member Rader  
Board Member Sanning

## Roundtable

Mr. Monter recalled a question at the last Planning Commission meeting about the status of Third Street heading east toward Downtown from the highway. It was currently in the Livable Streets plan to be upgraded in the spring of 2023. It would remain a three-lane street, with a turn lane in the middle. There would be a focus on sidewalks or trails on both sides of the street. Some questions had come up on it becoming four lanes, but it would remain three

lanes west from Jefferson Street.

Commissioner Trafton asked if he knew what was going on with Chipman Road between Pryor and View High. Some conversations with the County had taken place about the bridge and what bridge would be replaced. At this point, it was only one lane over the bridge. Mr. Monter said he attended a monthly CIP meeting, and he was looking at a design schedule for Chipman from View High to Bent Tree. The design was about 75 percent complete; and they were currently in utility coordination and right-of-way acquisition. Construction was to start in May of 2022. Commissioner Trafton asked if they were soliciting any public comment about that project, and Mr. Monter answered that since the design was 75 percent complete, this would have been done previously.

Mr. Monter stated when Commissioners had questions about changes in elevations, staff could access the information and answer questions.

Mr. Soto confirmed for Chairperson Funk that the last applicant previously brought in a preliminary development plan for approvals of the use of metal panels and screens. However, the plan had not addressed the use of a structure to support signage. The applicant did have the option of revising the application and bringing it back. They could also appeal tonight's decision to the Board of Zoning Adjustments. Commissioner Benbrook asked what was the distinction between a building screen and a sign. In the case of tonight's hearing, it looked to him more like a building screen and a sign. Mr. Soto said he would regard it as an architectural wall or panel; however, with any kind of an image or text it would be a sign.

## Adjournment

There being no further business Chairperson Funk adjourned the meeting at 8:13 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](https://lsmo.legistar.com)"