



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

Tuesday, September 13, 2016

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 Fred Delibero  
Board Member Jason Norbury  
Board Member Colene Roberts  
Board Member Fred DeMoro  
Board Member Donnie Funk  
Board Member J.Beto Lopez  
Board Member Brandon Rader

**Absent:** 2 - Board Member Frank White III  
Board Member Nate Larson

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

**A motion was made by Board Member Delibero, seconded by Board Member Roberts, that this was approved. The motion carried unanimously.**

APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA

**A motion was made by Board Member Delibero, seconded by Board Member Roberts, that this was approved. The motion carried unanimously.**

[TMP-0237](#) Appl. #PL2016-098 - FINAL PLAT - Napa Valley, 3rd Plat, Lots 116-146;  
MAR Investments, Inc, applicant

**ACTION: A motion was made by Board Member Delibero, seconded by Board Member Roberts, that this Ordinance be approved. The motion carried by a unanimous vote.**

[TMP-0240](#) Application #PL2016-136 - VACATION OF EASEMENT - 251 SW Greenwich  
Dr.; Cosentino's Food Stores, applicant

**ACTION: A motion was made by Board Member Delibero, seconded by Board Member Roberts, that this Ordinance be recommended for approval to the City Council - Regular**

Session The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

[2016-0519](#)

Minutes of the August 23, 2016, Planning Commission meeting

**ACTION:** A motion was made by Board Member Delibero, seconded by Board Member Roberts, that this Minutes be approved. The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

## PUBLIC HEARINGS

[2016-0548](#)

PUBLIC HEARING - Appl. #PL2016-135 - REZONING from AG and CP-2 to PMIX and PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN - Paragon Star, approximately 120 acres located at the northeast corner of NE View High Dr. and I-470; Paragon Star, LLC, applicant

Chairperson Norbury opened the hearing at 5:04 p.m. and asked those wishing to speak, or provide testimony, to stand and be sworn in.

Mr. Bill Brown of Spectrum Strategies LLC, stated that he was a member of Paragon Star's development team. He gave a brief overview of the project, adding that other members of the team were present and could answer questions. The application was for a rezoning for the property at View High Drive and I-470, and for approval of the preliminary development plan. Paragon had responded to an RFQ made by the City in 2012, for developing the 80 acres the City had owned at that corner. In December 2012, they and the City had then made a pre-development agreement, which also included the adjacent parcels owned by Flip Short, the developer. They had also worked with Jackson County, which owned about 20 acres at the site as well.

At present, Mr. Short, Paragon Star, Jackson County and the City of Lee's Summit owned the subject property. As part of the financing, they had created a community improvement district (CID) as well as a regional transportation development district and a tax increment financing plan (TIF). The CID had been established, and the City Council had passed the cooperative agreement last week. The applicants had gone before the circuit judge last Monday, and would go to the City Council with the TIF proposal on October 6th.

Mr. Brown displayed an aerial-view rendering of the proposed project, which would cover about 120 acres. The Magic Tree had been at the northeast corner for the past three years. The project would be for mixed use, including lighted, artificial turf sports fields and clubhouse, with a "village" adjacent that would include lodging, housing, office and retail space, dining and entertainment. The development would have two trails, with the trail head at this location. One of the trails would be the southernmost extension of the Little Blue Trace and the other would be part of the Rock Island Corridor trail, for which Jackson County planned to develop a major trail head

The next slide showed the boundaries for the redevelopment and project areas. What was outlined as Redevelopment Plan Area (RPA) 1 was the Paragon Star project; however, it was also part of a larger plan for development along View High and the I-470 corridor. As part of the TIF, it had also established redevelopment area 2, at the property's southeast corner; as well as RPA 3. This was the "Happy Valley" project that had been planned for the site of the abandoned limestone mine. They planned about 200 acres of land to be developed at this site. This was about total acres of space for development.

Mr. Brown stated that this development had an unusual public-private approach, noting that Mr. Short was a non-traditional developer. The displayed slide showed names of other team members who were known players in construction and development. A display of the site layout showed most of the acreage being devoted to the ten sports fields, as well as the locations of the village, trail head and parking. The blue lines indicated the trails were shared by the Rock Island and Little Blue Trace trails. The Little Blue Trace, indicated in red, continued through the project below the sports fields and

Planning Commission

Action Letter

September 13, 2016

---

village and terminate at the Longview Lake spillway.

Mr. Brown added that the village would be brought to the Planning Commission later as a separate PDP. Tonight's application was for phase 1, comprised of the sports fields, clubhouse, trail head and the infrastructure. The estimated cost would be \$212 million with the overall cost being \$400 million.

The PDP showed details about the road structure. The I-470 exit would put drivers on View High, and the applicants planned to put in a roundabout where the road currently turned sharply to the left. The roundabout's south end would feed into the development's major parkway, which would pass through the village and on to the trail head and sports fields; and the north side would also access the sports fields. The transportation development district would provide about \$22-\$25 million to help finance the infrastructure.

The applicants had requested some UDO modifications. One was to the 3-inch caliper required for flowering or ornamental trees, and other was to allow 80-foot height for the soccer field lighting, with the UDO's maximum height being 70 feet. They were planning for ten fields, with two additional ones added in phase 2. Everything in phase 1 was in Lee's Summit, but the property used for phase 2 was in Kansas City. The applicants planned a 2,500-5,000 seat championship field adjacent to the clubhouse. Mr. Brown remarked that on any given night a very high percentage of the young people at Overland Park's venue were from eastern Jackson County. The sports complex would actually be owned and operated by the CID.

Concerning the landscaping, Mr. Brown stated that they planned about 800 new trees, in addition to the trail head for the two trails. The project would have the westernmost extension of the Katy Trail, which was annually used by an estimated 400,000-500,000 people. At present, a stretch between Windsor and Pleasant Hill was being developed; and after that it would be 17.7 miles to Arrowhead and Kaufmann stadiums. The major trails would likely be a reliable attraction to the site. The applicants were working with investors, but conforming with the TIF.

Concerning staff's report, the applicants disagreed with a few of their Recommendation Items. One was staff's request that Paragon Parkway and River Road be private streets (Recommendation Item 3). Mr. Brown noted that this recreational site with its sports fields and trails was likely to bring in significant numbers of people and they regarded these as public streets, not private ones. They were continuing to work with Lee's Summit, Kansas City and MoDOT in terms of what would happen with the intersection of View High and I-470. He understood from conversations with Mr. Park that the recommendations in the traffic impact report were not part of staff's recommendations. The extent of the improvements at the intersection was something that was an ongoing discussion.

Chairperson Norbury asked if it was correct that the only Recommendation Item in staff's report was Item 3, pertaining to Paragon Parkway and River Road being private streets. Mr. Brown replied that it was.

Chairperson Norbury then asked for staff comments.

Ms. Stanton entered Exhibit (A), list of exhibits 1-17 into the record. She remarked that Mr. Brown had given a good overview of the project in a regional context. This preliminary development plan was specifically for the ten sports fields, restrooms, concessions area and clubhouse. The applicants would bring in a development plan for the other elements. Staff recommended approval of the requested rezoning and PDP, subject to staff's September 9, 2016. In view of the number of people present, she

Planning Commission

Action Letter

September 13, 2016

---

reviewed the 9 Recommendation Items.

Staff supported that modification request for tree size in Item 1. The UDO required a 3-inch caliper and the applicants were requesting 1.5 inches for flowering or ornamental trees and 2 to 2.5 inches for deciduous trees. Staff also supported the requested modification in Item 2. The UDO required a maximum height of 70 feet for recreational lighting, and the applicants had requested a maximum height of 80 feet. Not all the lights on the sports field would be that height, and the photo metric plan would still have to be approved.

Item 3 specified that Paragon Parkway and River Road would be private streets. Item 4 required that a sound amplification system or any other noise caused by the operation “ be no more than 65 decibels at the property lines. Item 5 addressed signage. The project was allowed a total of 13 monument signs with overall sign areas of 90 square feet and structure areas of 138 square feet. They would be allowed an electronic digital LED board, as they had requested on the preliminary development plan.

Item 6 required the development in this part of the project to be as shown on the August 23, 2016 preliminary development plan. Item 7 continued that approval of this plan would be only for the 10 soccer fields, clubhouse and auxiliary restrooms/concession building. As the applicant had mentioned, the plan for the field house and mixed-use village would have to be approved via a separate application. Item 8 required a development agreement with the City that would, at minimum, address the road improvements recommended in the Transportation Impact Analysis dated September 9, 2016. No building permits would be issued until written proof is provided to the City that the development agreement has been recorded in the Jackson County recorder's office. Item 9 prohibited use of any of the fields until all required infrastructure has been constructed.

Mr. Monter specified an addition to Recommendation Item 8. After “September 9, 2016” at the end of the first sentence, he asked to add “and water line improvements described in GBA's letter dated August 23, 2016.” This referred to the water line improvements off site. Mr. Monter explained that he had talked about this with the applicant. Chairperson Norbury asked staff to put this amended Recommendation Item in writing for the use of whichever Commissioner made a motion.

Mr. Monter asked for a change to Item 9 in the Code and Ordinance Requirement section. This required a “No Rise” certificate for streets crossing over the Little Blue River. He wanted to add in lieu of a “No Rise” certificate, the applicant may submit either a Promar or Lowmar to FEMA for evaluation. Staff had met with the applicant and discussed this, and it would not be read as part of the motion. It would be included in staff's letter when this application went to the City Council.

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

Ms. Linda Hartman gave her address as 9935 View High Drive. She stated that most of her concerns were about the mixed use element of the plan, and she would address these when the hearing for this part took place. She did also have concerns about traffic on View High Drive. Last week, she'd had a car in her front yard, upside down; and this was the second time this had happened on View High in just the last six months. Now, Paragon Star wanted to bring thousands of people into the area. She knew that not all these people would get to the complex via I-470. She anticipated seeing a lot more people detouring through the neighborhood driving recklessly or too fast, which was a common response to congested traffic. Kansas City might be involved in the project; but Lee's Summit would be bringing in all this traffic to her street and neighborhood.

Moreover, her property was 13 acres and the development would back up to it. The back of her property included a fire ring and picnic table and a lot of family gatherings happened there, including Christmas in some years. She did not want people wandering on her property, getting scratched on barbed wire or being bitten by snakes and then trying to sue her for their own carelessness. If the City was determined to move ahead with this property she wanted the plan to include a fence to protect her property.

Ms. Hartman added that there was nothing about this proposed development she liked but the concerns she had were valid. Traffic was already a serious problem and she was very concerned about the City bringing in large numbers of people, many of whom would be trespassing on her land. She did not want to see Lee's Summit become a city indistinguishable from others in the area, as was Overland Park, Lenexa and many others in the metro area with acres of concrete; but it did look as if that was the plan.

Mr. David Hartman said he also lived at 9935 View High Drive. He had a criticism of the method of presenting proposals like the one tonight. The printing on the notification he had received was so small as to be unreadable. Much of the information presented tonight was unreadable as well. He noted that the Little Blue River ran right through the middle of the property, which had previously been 120 acres of wetland; and they basically planned acres of concrete which would not absorb water. It was also at the bottom of some very steep hills so there was nowhere for water to go during heavy rains other than the soccer fields and neighbors' yards. The Commissioners' packets might have some information as to how the applicants planned to manage the stormwater but he had not seen any. The notification of the hearing sent out was the only information he had received about Paragon Star. No one had held any neighborhood meetings about the project or seemed interested in hearing their concerns.

The additional traffic was one of Mr. Hartman's main concerns. Most soccer games, at least for children and teenagers, began in the late afternoon around 4:00. During the rush hour around 4:00 and 5:00 p.m., traffic already backed up to US 71/49 and the applicants were proposing to add a lot of additional traffic. People would be exiting down one-lane ramps to an intersection with no controls; and again, the Commissioners might have some information about that situation but the neighbors did not. He wanted to know if MoDOT had approved any modifications such as traffic signals.

Mr. Hartman remarked that many people involved in this project would make money from it; however, the people living nearby would have their environment changed beyond recognition. In addition to the traffic, the applicants were proposing lighting on 70-foot and 80-towers and that was sure to have a negative impact on quality of life as well. He was opposed to the entire development.

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

Ms. Roberts requested that the applicant give a summary of the water management plan. Mr. Brad Burton, of GBA, gave his address as 9801 Renner Boulevard in Lenexa, KS. He related that they were designing the stormwater improvements in accordance with City standards. The property, crossed by the Little Blue River, was in a 100-year flood plain. As part of the development process, they planned to a conditional letter of map revision to FEMA for fine-tuning the limits of the flood plain. They would be raising the development above the flood plain's elevation and designing the storm sewer improvements on site to handle runoff from the development. Stormwater would drain through the fields into the sub-grade where rock and pipes would provide drainage. The water would be piped to the Little Blue River. Runoff from parking lots would be picked up in storm pipes and also drain into the river.

Mr. Burton emphasized that they were meeting best practice standards for storm drains and best management practice for water quality. Ms. Roberts asked if 'water quality' meant that some filtering would happen. Mr. Burton replied that it would, but they had not completed the design. It would be in the final plan. He added that since the property was in a watershed, detaining the water on site would be a detriment, as the peak runoff on the site would happen at the same time as the peak from the rest of the watershed. Ms. Roberts said she was more concerned with getting better infiltration on the site and that this sounded like a lot of piping. Mr. Burton acknowledged that it was; however, the fields themselves allowed for infiltration because the water had to get down through the fields. There would be more impervious area, which did mean more runoff and that could be managed via vegetated swales as well as piping.

Ms. Roberts asked what kind of material would be used in parking lots. Mr. Burton answered that they would be asphalt and would have raised islands, and Ms. Roberts remarked that the water would just run across the asphalt while picking up pollutants from vehicles along the way, and then carry those pollutants into the Little Blue.

Mr. Aaron Ross of BNIM Landscape Architects stated that most of the parking was on the south side of the site. The water flowed to the south, so they had enough room to use a series of bio-swailes on the way to the river. The pipes that Mr. Burton had mentioned also directed water through these vegetated swales. He also did not want a lot of delay in moving stormwater out; however, the goal was to provide as much infiltration as possible. He pointed out on the displayed map where the red trail went through the southern part of the property and stated that this was the area where they planned many of the swales. The design team had a lot of experience with this kind of system, and much of the vegetation would be native grasses. This would re-introduce an element of the prairie system that had been there previously. Most of the runoff from the property was from the parking lots and fields, but they intended to use similar strategies on all the property. Mr. Ross acknowledged that this property had functioned as wetland and pasture previously and it would be necessary to compensate for the changes. Ms. Roberts commented that parking lots were a significant source of water pollutants, and Mr. Ross agreed, and said the runoff from the parking lots would be a separate system for that reason.

Ms. Roberts was in favor of this kind of infiltration; however, she added that this kind of development was sure to produce a lot of litter. They would have to factor in this getting caught in the grasses, regularly. Mr. Ross said that one proactive measure was to have a 15- to 20-foot wide, consistently mowed strip around the parking lot. Much of the litter would end up there and could easily be picked up. Ms. Roberts remarked that a barrier such as shrubbery might be more useful.

Finally, Ms. Roberts said she did have an issue with dropping the caliper of the trees. This was an area where a tree canopy was needed to catch as much stormwater as possible. Chairperson Norbury asked staff or the applicant to clarify why the modification was asked for and why it was granted.

Mr. Aaron believed that this was partially due to the number of trees they were going to plant. He added that although he would personally like to plant much larger trees, these had a lower survival rate. Mr. Soto confirmed that staff had heard from other landscape architects and other design professionals that smaller trees were more adaptable and had a higher survival rate. Chairperson Norbury commented that the City would need to discuss a change to the ordinance to reflect that; and Mr. Soto answered that staff was considering taking a look at the landscaping article of the UDO to see what changes were needed.

Mr. Funk asked how far along the applicants were with the permitting from the Corps of

Engineers. Mr. Burton replied that they had completed the application and received comments back. The Corps had a public notice period; and the applicants had submitted an alternative analysis. They expected a response, and approval, within the next 30 days. Mr. Funk remarked that a couple of bridges were in play as well as the runoff issue. Mr. Burton answered that currently they were concentrating on the permit pertaining to impacts on the wetlands. The bridges did not impact wetlands, but they did affect the Little Blue River and that would be included in the letter to FEMA. They would be two separate approvals.

Mr. DeMoro asked what the assumption of Corps of Engineers approval was based on, if they had just recently submitted the request. Mr. Burton said that they had been in this process for about a year, and were at the final step, based on their communications with the Corps. Mr. DeMoro then asked what was the "No Rise" certificate that Mr. Monter had mentioned. Mr. Burton related that a floodway was established when development started in or around a flood plain. It was permitted to raise the flood elevation, up to a foot. And any change beyond that would have an impact beyond the property. Anything within that was known as a "no rise" situation. There were areas on the property where the applicants would be changing the flood elevation, so a conditional letter of map revision would be done beforehand. A final letter of map revision, to update the map, would be submitted after the work was done.

Chairperson Norbury noted that the mixed use area bordered the Hartmans' property. He asked what the buffer requirements for this use was, and if this was provided for in the application. Mr. Soto said that a CP-2 use next to a residential use would need a high-impact buffer, with a specified amount of trees and shrubs in addition to a six-foot vinyl or masonry fence. He did not know the exact location of the Hartmans' property relative to the village. Mr. Burton pointed it out at the northwest corner of the property. Mr. Soto noted that for this location, it looked like a substantial buffer would be there with the existing vegetation. However, he did not know what the exactly boundaries were as yet; and this would be provided with the separate PDP the applicants would be bringing in. They would look at buffering more closely at that stage.

Ms. Roberts wanted to know how they had arrived at the number of parking spaces, noting that there were more than the comparisons cited. Mr. Ross answered that they had looked at examples across the country in addition to Overland Park and other regional examples. They had found that 100 spaces per field was considered optimal. They had wanted to be competitive but 90 spaces would be rather low, so we're proposing to have between 90 and 100. Those spaces had included use of the clubhouse and other features on the site, as they wanted to avoid having any parking spaces that would be empty most of the time. Ms. Roberts asked where people would park who came to access the trail head. Mr. Ross estimated that it would be to the east, close to the trail head. He agreed that they could park elsewhere on the site, as the village would have its own parking.

Mr. Funk asked if the developers had any commitments, such as teams that were interested. He noted that Lee's Summit already had a soccer facility at Legacy Park. Mr. Brown responded that at Legacy, one soccer club had total control of the fields via an agreement with Parks and Recreation. Because they were not artificial turf fields, no one could practice on them, the teams that were part of Sporting Lee's Summit; so the fields were used for games only. Consequently, this facility would not be competing with Legacy. Teams wanted access to the durable playing service, in addition to not being vulnerable to inclement weather that could cancel a practice or game. So far Missouri had very few soccer fields. They did have an anchor soccer club, KC Select, which had over 100 teams and over 1,000 young players. He anticipated them being the major user of the fields. They had been talking with other groups, but it was a competitive situation so he did not want to state details as yet.

Chairperson Norbury asked for some direction from staff on crafting a motion. Mr. Park remarked that they had gone through various scenarios with public and private streets; and they had not come to a resolution as well. Normally staff regarded streets that served a development as private. However, if the village turned out to be quite separate from the soccer complex the streets should all be public. Their concern from a public works perspective was that the streets were essentially excluded from the city's transportation network, since part of it was in Kansas City. The City of Lee's Summit had dealt with that before, as View High was within its corporate limits but by contract was maintained by Kansas City. The initial idea of the Recommendation's wording was to make the streets private until the use of the development made it clear whether they should stay that way. The Commission could also choose to take out that particular Recommendation and let it be determined at the later stages.

Chairperson Norbury asked if this would be subject to the TDD or the TIF, or if it would impact the infrastructure generally; and Mr. Park acknowledged that several things related to the transportation network that were still not clear. When they were resolved, it might be more clear whether these streets should be public or private.

Chairperson Norbury then asked for a response to Ms. Hartman's concerns about traffic. He mentioned that after it turned to the west, it became part of Kansas City. Mr. Park remarked that only a short segment of View High was in Lee's Summit. By an executed agreement, it was controlled and maintained by the City of Kansas City. This multi-part agreement had happened when the interchange at View High and I-470 was completed. Mr. Park agreed that there would be traffic issues; and dealing with them would have to be a coordinated effort among Lee's Summit, Kansas City and MoDOT. Whatever Kansas City and MoDOT were going to require were conditions of approval for this development; and these entities had full authority to waive those conditions. Right now they were discussing a totally new, 4-lane or 6-lane diverging diamond interchange as a condition of development. The applicant was working with MoDOT to clarify what type of interchange would be necessary. They had looked at using a standard diamond or adding signals but neither looked like a good solution. Roundabouts had also been considered but that might not be a good long-term option either and the investment in transportation infrastructure needed to last. Mr. Park added that Kansas City had cited other off-site improvements and these were mentioned in his report. There were suggestions such as a traffic signal at Chipman and View High.

Chairperson Norbury added that all of this was in process, and the Commission was the first to hold a hearing on this development. It would certainly be impacted by the decisions of its Kansas City counterparts as well. Mr. Park stated that MoDOT had reviewed the traffic impact study and were considering what improvements were needed and when. In addition to the decisions of the Commission and City Council, this plan would have to be looked at by the City of Kansas City and MoDOT as well.

Chairperson Norbury added that the Commission had put a high premium on applicants having meetings with nearby residents who would be affected. They would have to include anyone within 185 feet of the subject property. He asked how many meetings had taken place, noting that this would not be a large number of people as the surrounding area was large lots.

Ms. Christine Bushyhead of Bushyhead LLC stated that she was counsel for the development at 315 SE Main in Lee's Summit. She reported that 19 letters were sent out. Only 7 of these went to owners who were not the City, the county or the developer. Regarding the private/public street issue, he then stated that the applicants would agree to the item reading "both Paragon Parkway and River Road may be private streets, to be determined during the Final Development Plan." She added that Kansas City had looked at View High's alignment in that area. There were three different



possible alignments, and Kansas City's wording actually referred to an "expressway".. The westernmost alignment that was on the books and had been for a long time actually went through the Hartmans' property. Consequently, they considered the plan to be the one which would have the least impact on the neighbors, in view of what the City of Kansas City was intending in that part of town.

Mr. DeMoro asked if Lee's Summit had any infrastructure in that area, such as water lines and sanitary sewers, and if the development would use Kansas City's sewers and water lines. Mr. Burton replied that it would be in the Little Blue Valley sewer district, and would certainly be in a location to use Kansas City water as well. That was their initial plan; however, Lee's Summit had wanted to provide the water as well. That was among the ongoing discussions, and the cost would be about \$1.2 million to run a new water line from Chipman Road to View High, already had a right-of-way issue. The water would go under I-470 to the subject property. In any event, tapping into Kansas City water would be less expensive.

Chairperson Norbury asked about the height of the lights, noting that this was a concern the neighbors had raised. He had not seen a photometric plan that would give information such as light output. The neighbors did need to know about the UDO's requirements for lighting.

Mr. Bob Bushyhead, of LAND3 Studio, LLC, gave his address as 317 SE Main in Lee's Summit. They were field consultants for the project. The sports complex had been located partly to keep the impacts as far from neighboring residents as possible. Further, outdoor lighting design now included technology for preventing light overspill; and they intended to use them. The exception for pole height they had requested would pertain to one or two fields in the core of the complex. It was also part of an effort to concentrate the lighting on as few poles as possible. The lights would be directed inward and would be 50 or 60 footcandles. They intended to provide more exhibits as the plan developed.

Chairperson Norbury asked what would be the potential spill effect for the Hartmans' location. Mr. Bushyhead replied that he did not have that information but again, as the plan went forward they would have more information and design including photometric sheets and details about impacts.

Chairperson Norbury asked if there were further questions for the applicant or staff.

Ms. Hartman said she had not heard anyone address the Deron Cherry soccer complex that would be going up in Grandview. She said she would have thought this would be a factor in terms of competition. Mr. Burton said they had been asked about that several times; and they did not see that as a competitive project and were not sure it would ever happen. It was one thing to put in fields, but another to get enough commercial development to generate tax money that would pay for the construction work. Their intent was to bring the best project forward and to do this in Lee's Summit. Mr. Burton cited the site's traffic, visibility and the linkages of trails as well as the mixed-use village as strong points. It would be easily accessible for employees at Cerner nearby. View High had an expected half billion dollars in projected development. It could be a major center for people on that western gateway to Lee's Summit.

Ms. Bushyhead added that they were aware from the beginning that they had to look at Lee's Summit's Comprehensive Plan. This particular part was identified as having recreational as well as commercial use. They had come forward as a result of an RFP process initiated by the City of Lee's Summit. It owned a 76-acre parcel within the PDP boundaries.

Planning Commission

Action Letter

September 13, 2016

---

Hearing no further comments or questions, Chairperson Norbury closed the public hearing at 6:25 p.m. and asked for discussion among the Commission members.

Ms. Roberts said that having been a public works person, she was not in favor of removing or changing Recommendation Item 3. She added that this was an environmentally sensitive area; and was pleased that BNIM was part of the project as she knew they could do green infrastructure well.

Mr. Delibero commented that Recommendation Item 3 was best left to the final development plan, and could be addressed at that point. Making a decision at this stage might be premature.

Mr. DeMoro wanted to know how the road names became an issue and how the Commission had approached this in other applications. Chairperson Norbury responded that this varied case to case. This development being involved with as many different parties and authorities as this one would have input from more than once source. What they needed to decide ton

**ACTION:** A motion was made by Board Member Delibero, seconded by Board Member DeMoro, that this Public Hearing - Sworn be recommended for approval to the City Council - Regular Session, due back by 10/6/2016 The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

OTHER AGENDA ITEMS

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

ROUNDTABLE:

ADJOURNMENT

For your convenience, Planning Commission agendas, as well as videos of the Planning Commission, may be viewed on the City's Internet site at "[www.cityofls.net](http://www.cityofls.net)".