

The City of Lee's Summit
Action Letter
Planning Commission

Tuesday, August 14, 2018

5:00 PM

City Council Chambers

City Hall

220 SE Green Street

Lee's Summit, MO 64063

Call to Order

Roll Call

Present: 7 - Board Member Carla Dial
Board Member Jason Norbury
Board Member Colene Roberts
Board Member Don Gustafson
Board Member Donnie Funk
Board Member Jeff Sims
Board Member Jake Loveless

Absent: 2 - Board Member Dana Arth
Board Member Herman Watson

Approval of Agenda

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

Public Comments

Mr. Michael Klein gave his address as 148 NW Whitlock Drive. He stated that he had a question on the Woodside Ridge development off Pryor (agenda item 6). Chairperson Norbury clarified that this item was being continued to the next meeting on August 28. Mr. Klein could come back and attend that hearing, although he was still welcome to comment. Mr. Klein said that he was concerned about the safety of the road design. There were only two accesses for emergency responders, and one of them would require an ambulance or fire truck to turn left and go up to O'Brien or turn right and go through the middle of Sterling Hills. Shamrock, on the other hand, would provide a more direct route. He added that he lived in Sterling Hills; and in icy weather it was difficult for even City crews to make it up Cody Street.

1. Approval of Consent Agenda

- A. [2018-2206](#) Minutes of the July 24, 2018, Planning Commission meeting

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

Public Hearings

2. [2018-2177](#) Continued Public Hearing - Appl. #PL2018-081 - Preliminary Development Plan - Kessler View, generally located at the intersection of SW Kessler Drive and SW

Planning Commission

Action Letter

August 14, 2018

Fascination Drive; Inspired Homes, LLC applicant.

(Note: This item is to be CONTINUED to September 20, 2018 per the applicant's request.)

Chairperson Norbury opened the hearing at 5:08 p.m. and asked those wishing to speak, or provide testimony, to stand and be sworn in.

Chairperson Norbury noted that a number of people were present to give testimony. He stated that it would be necessary to keep track of time and asked that with the exception of the applicant, remarks be kept to three minutes.

Ms. Shannon Bustar of Olsson Associates, stated that Mr. Corey Walker, representing the commercial developer M3 Longview, was also present as was Mr. Nick Greer, representing the applicant Inspired Homes. The applicant had held a meeting with the neighbors on August 7th. Ms. Bustar gave a summary of the project's background. The subject property was currently zoned PMIX, which allowed for mixtures of commercial, office and residential uses. There were three relevant preliminary development plans already in place. The north side of Fascination Drive had a PDP dated 2006; Kessler Ridge to the south had a 2015 PDP and a 2016 PDP existed for the center commercial/residential section near the theater. A TIF plan for the subject property was approved in 2015.

The new PDP was intended to incorporate the area on the east side of Kessler Drive, which had not been under any development plan so far. The other areas included in the plan had been subject to the previous PDPs. In the previous plan, the traffic recommendations were very broad and somewhat confusing, with two shared parking models. Further, the developer wanted more square footage on the two large buildings on the north side of Fascination, which were now two stories. The more significant changes were to the area on the east side of Kessler Drive.

The applicants had considered some concepts for the new PDP. Demand for office uses had not been high, mostly due to location. The buildings would not front either Kessler or 3rd Street. There was, however, demand for the day care and the townhomes. Primrose School was a high-quality preschool and curriculum based child care facility with school readiness programs. Because the program involved more than day care, they preferred to be referred to as a school. The lot was 1.3 acres, with 45 parking spaces; more than the required number. Construction was projected to start in 2019, with the school opening in 2020.

Inspired Homes, the builder for Custer Ridge and Pergola Park, would build the townhomes. They would be on 3.9 acres, on both sides of Curry Drive, and would have a total 45 units. That was an average 11.5 units per acre below the threshold of 12 per acre. Ms. Bustar added that there was no specified density as this was PMIX zoning. Parking did have requirements, however; and the required two were provided per unit. An additional 43 shared off-street parking spaces would raise the average to almost 3 space per unit. Ms. Bustar pointed out the common green space area and the connection to the existing trail system. The units would have either two or three bedrooms, and the applicants

proposed a high-impact landscape buffer on the project's east side, between the townhomes and the single-family residences. Anticipated rents were between \$1,800 and \$2,000 month. As with the school, construction would start in 2019 and completion anticipated in 2020. The plan reflected the intent of the PMIX zoning in its flexibility; such as changing the previous office use when anticipated demand did not materialize. The residential development in general was intended to support the commercial development as well as make the site more appealing to potential commercial users. The zoning designation also called for high-quality building design.

Ms. Bustar then displayed elevations for the school, as well as a color photograph of another franchise, which used the same materials and colors. The construction used brick, vinyl shutters, steel awnings and stone. The style was consistent with the general aesthetics and style at New Longview. She then showed elevations for the townhomes, which had 40-year asphalt roofing, James Hardie fiber-cement board for lap siding, shingle siding and exterior trim and stone wainscoting that went all the way around each building. The fronts would also include stone accents and vinyl windows. These elevations also incorporated material and color variations on all sides to distinguish the units, as well as traditional design elements such as covered front porches, paned windows in doors and dormers on the front and back.

The applicant had held two neighborhood meetings. The first was on July 17th with neighbors adjacent to the property. The second was on August 7th, and the applicant had notified residents in Bridlewood, Winterset, New Longview and Kessler Ridge as well as the Longview Alliance via social media. The first meeting was a presentation followed by a discussion, and the 15 attendees had some concerns about multi-family development. The second meeting, with a little over 20 attending, was an open house format and most attendees were either positive or just curious. They'd made positive comments on the housing being maintenance-provided, the landscape buffering, and on the upscale nature of the development and buildings. A few people asked about getting some new restaurants in the area. They supported the daycare/school but did not seem very concerned about the Curry Road connection, which had been brought up in the previous Planning Commission meeting.

Buffering was another major subject at the last meeting. Working with staff, and following feedback from neighbors, they'd developed a high-intensity landscaping buffer that included a six-foot vinyl fence and heavy landscaping with trees and shrubs. The rendering on the displayed slide was estimated landscaping at the time of planting. A displayed side view, as seen from Curry Drive, showed the proportional distance from the townhomes to the single-family houses. Landscaping was also provided along the side. This rendering also showed the height of landscaping at planting time, and the dimmed background showed the heights at maturity.

Ms. Bustar acknowledged that the TIF was not the Commission's purview; however, when people saw some commercial development being taken out of the plan, the concerns were valid ones. She stated that the TIF would not be affected; since the TIF commercial square footage had actually increased.

Concerning whether the area needed another day care, Ms. Bustar again emphasized that as Primrose's approach was curriculum based and focused on school readiness, they would be a new product for the area. Parking had also been discussed at the first Commission meeting, and Ms. Bustar pointed out that while two parking spaces per townhome unit were required, the average was close to three. Concerning the density, this was an essential ingredient in an urban-style development, making the commercial development more viable and attractive to potential users.

Ms. Bustar also gave some details about the townhomes. These were upscale dwellings with maintenance provided and rents from \$1,800 to \$2,000. The buildings would have high-quality, four-sided architecture with materials and colors that were aesthetically pleasing; with plenty of landscape buffering. The applicants expected the townhomes to attract both young professionals attracted by the walkability and urban character, and elder "empty nesters" who would appreciate the provided maintenance.

Regarding the plan to connect Curry Road, Ms. Bustar explained that this was a City requirement. The maintenance would be provided by a professional property maintenance group. Trash collection would be on an individual basis, so no dumpsters would be needed. Concerning stormwater, half of the subject property drained to the north to existing off-site regional basins that had been designed to include the subject property after development. The southern half drained to the existing detention basin next to the trail, and this was also designed to accommodate the development.

Concerning the impact of additional children on local schools, the PMIX zoning did allow for commercial, office and residential uses so this was not a major change from what the zoning projected for the school district. While this was a high-density project, densities had actually been reduced in some parts of New Longview.

Ms. Bustar concluded that the applicants had made some positive changes in the plan in response to questions and concerns, and they agreed with staff's Recommendation Items.

Following Ms. Bustar's presentation, Chairperson Norbury asked for staff comments.

Mr. Soto entered Exhibit (A), list of exhibits 1-26 into the record. He stated that Ms. Bustar had thoroughly covered the changes. He displayed a slide that contrasted the original townhome design with the updated one that provided more visual breaks and details. He stated that Ms. Bustar's presentation had been thorough and detailed; and there was no new information other than the changes described. He was available to answer any questions.

Chairperson Norbury opened the hearing for testimony and comments from the public. He asked participants to state their name and address. He would set a timer for the three minutes and if it went off, the speaker would not be expected to stop immediately but would need to make any last points and conclude their

testimony.

Ms. Kathy Arnwright gave her address as 3204 SW Rockbridge Drive and stated that she was present representing the Longview Alliance. She stated that New Longview's future was at a tipping point and its future was in the hands of the Commission, City Council and staff. New Longview's usual approach had been to attempt cooperative, measured persuasion done behind the scenes. Their priority was maintaining the unique quality and beauty of this area. That had been successful up to a point, but they had a critical issue with the developer and builder, namely the design of the townhomes. They did not have any issue with the school's design. Despite the changes shown in the illustrations, the townhomes were still essentially flat boxes. The City had originally asked for offsets and other features to break up the expanse. They appreciated the applicant meeting with the neighbors and hosted an open house showing elevations; however, 'this is what we're building' was the message. She acknowledged that everyone would benefit if the residential development attracted commercial users and vice versa; nevertheless, she still did not believe that the Planning Commission should recommend approval. The townhome designs were substandard and out of place in an upscale area; and this threatened neighbors' property values. She did not think that the buildings' design would attract the commercial investment that would make the development an attractive, walkable community. Low residential and commercial quality would not attract investment in the historic Longview barn and other historic structures. The City Council had previously decided that restoring this historic area was worthy of diverting millions of dollars in tax revenues; and low architectural standards would not serve that purpose.

Chairperson Norbury had remarked during the previous hearing that if the neighbors wanted to affect development of land in their neighborhood they should buy it; but this very large investment of public monies. They wished they could buy it outright and welcomed new ideas from investors. Ms. Arnwright believed that Chairperson Norbury was not suggesting that the rich developers should be the sole arbiters of land use. This was certainly not the case, as indicated by the existence of a Planning Commission and other City resources answerable to everyone. She urged the Commission to hold the applicant to a higher standard.

Ms. Rachel Doherty gave her address as 3192 SW Mowat. She related that she and a neighbor had gone online and looked at all the apartment complexes and townhomes in Lee's Summit., not including Kessler Ridge as that was not yet approved. The displayed map showed a large number of these on the west side of town, with the rest scattered across the rest of the area. The following slide listed these by name, giving numbers of units and rents. The west side had 2,300 units. The middle and east sides of Lee's Summit had around 2,000 apartments; the north side had just under 400 apartments and townhomes and south Lee's Summit had 392. The middle part of town was well suited for apartments due to its walkability and was a large area.

Ms. Doherty's main concern about the proposed townhomes was the density, specifically traffic since she had small children and the proposed school meant

more children in the neighborhood during business hours. She emphasized that the opposition was not a matter of wanting the people there and additionally, they had preferred more commercial development. The mentions of crime during the previous meeting were based on an increase in crime in the area; specifically theft; and a higher density would mean more people and a possibly worse problem. Regarding schools, every school in the district was already at 85 percent capacity. The increase in traffic would also mean more money budgeted for traffic signals, and if there was shared parking at the school that would include the hours when parents were dropping off and picking up children. She also was not confident that the rents mentioned would not be lowered at some point. Ms. Doherty then stated that she had contacted some commercial businesses and told them about the development; and they had said they were interested and asked for more information. Consequently, she was skeptical of a claim that commercial users would be hard to find and wanted to know what businesses the applicant had contacted.

Ms. Liz Stickley stated that she was the owner of Winterset Montessori and gave her business address as 812 SW Forest Park Lane. Her school was similar to the proposed Primrose school and the Montessori had been there since Winterset was built. It was always at full capacity. Like Primrose, it had a school preparedness program and was definitely focused on early childhood education. That included infants, above the six-weeks acceptance age, and toddlers; and of course their teaching was appropriate to the various ages. Her school was licensed for 166 children, and it reached that number every year.

The Goddard School was the first upscale competition her school had, and her school's loss was about 28 percent over the last two years. The Lakewood Montessori school was licensed for about 200 students and their loss was 30 percent. A few small daycare facilities had gone out of business. In short, the upscale child care and preschool facilities had now grown beyond the demand. There was no Certificate Of Need program for child daycare like there was for adult senior care; so owners depended on the City leaders to figure out what was best for the community. The current school owners had major investments made in good faith for the city to help them expand and prosper. A new 10,000 square foot facility, by State regulations, would accommodate about 200 children; and the numbers indicated that there was no need for it. For that reason, she requested that the Commission reconsider approval of the child day care component.

Mr. Justin Biers gave his address as 3032 SW Saddlewood Place in Bridlewood. He agreed with Ms. Doherty's testimony in particular. He read a statement: *"Lee's Summit's booming corridor will feature walkability, high-end retail, and a true work/play lifestyle desired by millennials and empty nesters alike."* This statement was consistent with what the Commission and the public had heard from the applicant and further, it was referring to an 312-unit apartment complex currently under construction across the street. Combined with the 206 at New Longview, which currently had plenty of vacancies, that meant about 500 apartment units in about a square mile space. It did not make sense to add another 45 and expect them to be filled. This was not likely, but the situation was likely to force lower rents.

Mr. Ryan Triebel gave his address as 1121 SW Sunflower Drive, in the Meadows At Winterset subdivision. He stated that he and his wife and children had moved to Lee's Summit about a year ago from Prairie Village on the Kansas side. They had searched for a house for about two years and they had settled on the Longview area as a very special place with unique neighborhoods. The homes sold for high prices, kept their value over time and most were well-maintained; in addition to the convenience of nearby businesses and the historic restoration. They'd then heard about this project from the Longview Alliance on social media; and had been surprised that this was even being considered. They were looking forward to their two children attending Longview Farm elementary school, with the setting being a special experience. He wanted to know what school the children in the townhomes would be attending, as he was concerned about the school being filled. The tenants were likely to live there for a few years and move out, but his family's home was a permanent one. In conclusion, Longview was a special and unique area but there was nothing special about the proposed townhomes. He had not heard of anyone in favor of them other than the people who would make a profit.

Ms. Veena Dontharaju stated that she was the owner of the Goddard School. She agreed with Stickley's comments about this area already having enough daycare and early childhood education facilities and programs in that part of town. The Goddard School had been open for about two years, and they also offered high quality child care and early education programs. Her school was not full and she had consulted with owners of other schools including Our Lady of Presentation, which had been operating in this area for awhile; and this and other church-sponsored schools were also not full. Ms. Dontharaju added that she was always on the lookout for early childhood teachers; and another new school would mean more competition for good teachers. That would not be a good situation for any schools in Lee's Summit. She urged the Commission to evaluate the school in particular in the context of Lee's Summit based schools in general.

Ms. Dorothy Peters gave her address as 3040 SW Gentry Court. She remarked that while there was a trend toward rentals, she and her neighbors owned their homes. According to the Realtor.com website, high rental concentration tended to bring down homes values, with the average being 13.4 percent. She also questioned whether there was a need for the townhomes in view of the number of existing apartments, and had the same concerns about density creating too much traffic. She asked if on-street parking would be allowed on both sides of Curry, observing that some residential driveways accessed that street; and if these rentals could be subleased. She also wanted to know if residents would be allowed to park large items such as boats or trailers on driveways. She also asked how trash would be picked up at the townhomes, since it was not clear what 'individual' pickup was and if one trash hauler would be doing it. Ms. Peters also suggested that speed bumps on Curry might be a good way to reduce traffic hazards once it was a through street. Speed bumps might also serve to re-route some traffic to the major streets, with fewer cars going through a residential area. She added that many older people looking to rent might prefer a maintenance-provided villa to a townhome with rents as high as \$2,000

a month.

_____ gave her address as 730 Drury. She did not think that the figures given for rent were supported by any contract. Further, the developers were apparently not providing much in the way of amenities if they wanted to attract tenants who could pay that kind of rent. The New Longview apartments, as a contrasting example, offered a swimming pool, Wi-Fi and 24-hour fitness. She did not think they would be competitive in attracting young professionals.

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

Mr. Funk asked for details about the provided maintenance, including whether this would include trash collection. Mr. Nick Greer replied that the maintenance did not include trash, which would be individual service. No dumpster would be on site and residents were subject to standard HOA rules, including trash being stored inside. No outside storage of large items such as boats or trailers would be allowed. Mr. Funk noted a mention of a professional management group and asked for the name and some details about the group's experience. Mr. Greer answered that it was a management company within their group that had several properties in the metro area under their management. Mr. Corey Walker added that it was called Alpine Management and managed about 400 units in Kansas City.

Chairperson Norbury asked if any of the townhomes could be subleased. Mr. Greer stated that he did not know at this point, as they had not developed the lease as yet. Chairperson Norbury then asked Mr. Michael Park about parking that would be allowed on Curry. Mr. Park replied that there would be designated head-in parking on Curry. It was not parallel parking.

Chairperson Norbury observed that he'd thought outdoor storage of large items like boats and trailers was prohibited in all residential zoning. Mr. Ryan Elam confirmed that regulations addressing trailers were already in Chapter 16 of the Property Maintenance Code.

Ms. Dial observed to Mr. Walker that he'd had a cordial and successful working relationship with the Longview Alliance in the past and why this was not the case at present. Mr. Walker responded that they still did have a cordial relationship and he had been conferring with them for the past month or so. They did have disagreements concerning the final product type in the current application.

Chairperson Norbury that one thing that concerned him about this application was not so much the choice of use as an impression that the design standards for the proposed buildings were based on what they could get by with. He acknowledged that the first drawings the Commission had seen were theoretical and had evolved and improved at this point. The boxy look had improved somewhat but he did think the aesthetics were still lacking and asked if they could be improved. He did not like the feeling he was getting that the application met the minimum standard but not much beyond.

Ms. Bustar acknowledged that this was a fair point. She pointed out that as this was a new development and a new product, it was difficult to develop details so early on. It was part of a natural progression and not an intent to do the bare minimum. This plan had changed along the way, with the contrast between the first elevations and the current ones being an example. She disagreed that the units still had a boxy look pointing out that the porches on the front were all recessed and a projection slightly in front of the building line plus a porch roof overhang. They had also tried to address the visual concerns with the material and color changes and variations and had specifically identified quality materials such as Hardie board. Staff had agreed that the elevations had added considerable visual interest.

Mr. Scott Coryell gave his address as 3168 SW Rock Bridge Drive. He stated that he was an architect and when someone talked about 'high quality' and 'good design' it did not apply to box-shaped buildings with facades added. He considered that to be equivalent to creating a stage set. He did not see the reason for not include a small offset of two or three feet for the individual units, which would not be very expensive. He remarked that in many jurisdictions in the metro area, this design would not be acceptable and shared Chairperson Norbury's impression that it was the bare minimum.

Ms. Sherry Frasier gave her address as 3041 SW Gentry Court. The back of her property was adjacent to the proposed landscaping buffer. She had seen a design with a vinyl fence with the landscaping on the east side. It would, apparently, be on her property, so she wanted to know who would be responsible for its maintenance and she had concerns about this being overlooked. She agreed with earlier testimony about so few amenities being offered with the townhomes, and doubts about being able to attract people who could pay as much as \$2,000 a month rent. She also agreed that two or three bedrooms with a one-car garage and no basement did look like the bare minimum was being offered. She also expected parking to be a challenge and wished that, in general, there was more variety with the townhomes. She also agreed that speed bumps on Curry would discourage speeding and make that part safer.

Chairperson Norbury asked Mr. Soto for some clarification. Mr. Soto stated that the landscaping material would not be planted on neighbor' property. Chairperson Norbury asked for a description of materials in a high-impact buffer. Mr. Soto related that the buffer had to be at least 20 feet wide. A high-impact buffer was required to have a 6-foot fence centered on landscaping within that area. The different levels of buffers all specified a percentage of shade trees, evergreen trees, ornamental trees, and shrubs. It was based on the square footage, and the City had prescribed ratios. If an qualified landscape architect submitted an alternative plan that would work better on a specific site, staff was willing to consider it.

Chairperson Norbury then asked what was the procedure for getting speed bumps added to a stretch of road. Mr. Park answered that this would be part of the Neighborhood Traffic Safety program. They were the entity that neighbors would apply to for speed bumps on a specific street. Other necessary steps

would be neighborhood consent via a petition and study to confirm that there was a need. They could not be installed based on just a fear of traffic congestion or perceived traffic speeds and volumes.

Ms. Doherty reported that she had just looked up Alpine Property Management on Google and their reviews were an average 2.8, which was not very positive. She added that she'd previously looked into Longview Elementary's capacity and it was only two additional students away from being full. Cedar Creek Elementary had just added a kindergarten teacher and Pleasant Lea was 70 students away from capacity; Summit Lakes was 143 away from capacity and Lee's Summit West was 198.

Ms. Peters was not sure who the architect was. She asked if it was a local architect who had previously dealt with the Longview Alliance and worked with them. She also wanted to know who would maintain the landscaping in the buffer. Mr. Greer replied that the property management company would do the maintenance. The architect would be Mr. Carlos Baldibos, who was based in Overland Park, Kansas.

Ms. Roberts asked for clarification about the townhomes parking. Ms. Bustar answered that for the 45 units there were 43 off-street parking spaces. The average overall was about 2.95.

Mr. Sims asked if it was correct the parking figures for the townhomes did not include the parking at the school. Ms. Bustar answered that it was.

Chairperson Norbury asked if there were further questions for the applicant or staff. Hearing none, he closed the public hearing at 6:12 p.m. and asked for discussion among the Commission members.

Ms. Dial first stated that the whole New Longview concept, specifically the historic preservation aspect, was very important to her. She commented that she was not appointed to the Commission to rubber-stamp plans for staff and developers but was appointed as a citizen to provide oversight. She stated for the record that the City needed to think long and hard about PMIX projects. The designation did not mean 'do whatever you want', and a project's conforming to the UDO and zoning requirements did not necessarily mean it was a good idea for the city overall. She had seen some PMIX conceptual plans in applications, with several more pending; and they seemed to have devolved back to standard suburban development. This was not the best approach for Lee's Summit in general; or for New Longview in particular. It was designed as an urban development with a walkable neighborhood and it was common knowledge that the goal was preservation of the historic Longview Farm structures. It had to be done with money from a TIF, and commercial development was essential for doing that. In this kind of mixed approach, replacing commercial development with residential affected revenue. Ms. Dial questioned a claim of being able to find a commercial tenant on one block but not another. She also questioned whether the additional commercial square footage in second stories could generate as much revenue as that on a ground floor.

Concerning the townhomes, Lee's Summit definitely did need more apartments and other rental options, although there was no reason for them to be clustered in the southeast corner of town. There were a large number of units that were not all full. Regarding density, Ms. Dial observed that the concept 'we need density to support the commercial' was referenced every time. Many properties originally intended for commercial development were switched to residential because of difficulty finding a tenant. She did like the idea of commercial development in two stories along Kessler, and was in favor of other combinations, such as retail on the first story, office on the second and a residence on the third floor. However, she did hope the City Council would take a close look at whether the additional square footage would provide the same amount of dollars that were being taken away by substituting the townhomes for the previous office uses.

Ms. Dial emphasized the importance of looking at the New Longview district as a whole. Looking at it block by block by individual block was eroding the concept. She wanted the Commission to emphasize the question of whether a development fitted the entire project, not just the immediate environment.

Finally, Ms. Dial asked if the City was in a hurry to have this project go forward immediately with no other options, and what precedent this might set for future PMIX projects. The subjects of neighborhood development, walkability, historic preservation and highest and best land use often came up in Planning Commission meetings and she asked the other Commissioners to keep this in mind in voting.

Mr. Funk remarked that the area being unique had come up in testimony. But Lee's Summit also had a beautiful Downtown, parks and lakes. The Longview area was a major one for historic preservation and he wanted the developer to do a little more to incorporate some of the design ideas to mitigate the boxy look. Regarding the school, the Commission had heard testimony from two people with roots in the community that had businesses and he believed this was the best use for that property as well.

Chairperson Norbury thanked the members of the community who had come to the meeting. He also commended them on the quality and clarity of their comments. He advised them to attend the City Council meeting, mentioning that there would be more clarity concerning questions about the TIF.

Chairperson Norbury noted that a number of people commenting had brought up density, and acknowledged that revealed a demand, expected to increase, for multi-family housing. At the same time, the current generation of young adults wanted different housing options. In theory, this kind of mixed use project did have density and prices that were consistent with surrounding neighborhoods. They did not tend to attract families with children so he doubted it would generate much demand on schools. He added that Lee's Summit was growing, so the number of children would increase in the future. But in the long view, he believed that more residents were the answer; one reason for multi-family to be clustered on the southeast side was that there was still some available land.

Chairperson Norbury had the same concerns as before about quality of design, and the

Planning Commission

Action Letter

August 14, 2018

Commission did have some history of pushing back on applications that did not meet an architectural standard. He recalled an application in particular where a proposed office development looked too obviously generic. The Commission had also sometimes demanded that an applicant make changes and improvements. In terms of tonight's application, the product the Commission had seen needed more architectural interest, in a style that reflected or was consistent with the style of Longview as a whole.

Chairperson Norbury then stated that he understood the concerns that the Goddard and Winterset Montessori owners had about the pool of potential customers being diluted. He observed that demand in real estate, especially residential, did not respond to market trends immediately. Moving itself took time, effort and expense. He added that while Lee's Summit did now have a lot of apartments available, a high percentage of them were priced at \$1,000 a month and more and were out of reach for people of median income. The city had plenty of multi-family units but not enough of them were affordable for many renters.

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

A motion was made by Commissioner Roberts, seconded by Commissioner Funk, that this application be recommended for approval to the City Council – Regular Session. The motion failed unanimously. Since the motion failed to obtain a majority vote, the application is forwarded to City Council- Regular Session with a failure to recommend.

3. [2018-2217](#) Appl. #PL2018-098 - REZONING from R-1 and PMIX to PMIX and PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN - Streets of West Pryor, approximately 72 acres located at the northwest corner of NW Pryor Rd and NW Lowenstein Rd; Drake Development, LLC, applicant (continued to a date certain of September 25, 2018, at the applicant's request)

Chairperson Norbury opened the hearing at 6:44 p.m. and stated that Application PL2018-098 was requested to be continued to a date certain of September 25, 2018 at the applicant's request. He asked for a motion to continue.

Mr. Funk made a motion to continue Application PL2018-098 to a date certain of September 25, 2018. Ms. Roberts seconded.

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

A motion was made by Board Member Funk, seconded by Board Member Roberts, that this application be continued to the Planning Commission, due back on 9/25/2018. The motion carried unanimously.

4. [2018-2218](#) CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING - Appl. #PL2018-100 - PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN - Reece Nichols, 222 SW Main St & 207 SW Market St; Engineering Solutions, LLC, applicant

Chairperson Norbury opened the hearing at 6:47 p.m. and stated that Application PL2018-100 was requested to be continued to a date certain of August 28, 2018 to allow for proper notification. He asked for a motion to continue.

Mr. Funk made a motion to continue Application PL2018-100 to a date certain of August 28, 2018. Ms. Roberts seconded.

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

for a vote.

A motion was made by Board Member Funk, seconded by Board Member Roberts, that this application be continued to the Planning Commission, due back on 8/28/2018. The motion carried unanimously.

5. [2018-2219](#) Appl. #PL2018-101 - REZONING from PI to PMIX and PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN - Woodland Glen; Schlagel & Associates, applicant (continued to a date certain of September 11, 2018, at staff's request)

Chairperson Norbury opened the hearing at 6:48 p.m. and stated that Application PL2018-101 was requested to be continued to a date certain of September 11, 2018 to allow for proper notification. He asked for a motion to continue.

Mr. Funk made a motion to continue Application PL2018-101 to a date certain of September 11, 2018. Ms. Roberts seconded.

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

A motion was made by Board Member Gustafson, seconded by Board Member Roberts, that this application be continued to the Planning Commission, due back on 9/11/2018. The motion carried unanimously.

6. [2018-2220](#) CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING - Appl. #PL2018-103 - PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN - Woodside Ridge, 300 NW Pryor Rd; Clayton Properties Group, LLC, applicant

Chairperson Norbury opened the hearing at 6:49 p.m. and stated that Application PL2018-103 was requested to be continued to a date certain of August 28, 2018 to allow for proper notification. He asked for a motion to continue.

Mr. Funk made a motion to continue Application PL2018-103 to a date certain of August 28, 2018. Ms. Roberts seconded.

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

A motion was made by Board Member Funk, seconded by Board Member Roberts, that this application be continued to the Planning Commission, due back on 8/28/2018. The motion carried unanimously.

Other Agenda Items

7. [2018-2221](#) Approval of amended Planning Commission bylaws

Mr. Soto stated that the only substantive change was the meeting day being changed to the second and fourth Thursday of each month. He acknowledged that this change would impact other meetings, both those open to the public and internal staff meetings of various departments. It had been determined that Thursday would be the day least disruptive. The City Council's move would be from Thursday to Tuesday. Chairperson Norbury stated that the Commission had discussed this via email, and while they did not advocate any time change Thursday was the best option. He noted to Ms. Yendes that the Commission had to amend its bylaws in order to change the meeting day, and asked what would happen if they did not do that. Ms. Yendes believed it would be more of a scheduling issue, involving available meeting rooms and staff.

Planning Commission

Action Letter

August 14, 2018

Mr. Soto clarified that the only thing to be done tonight was for staff to officially present the change. The Commission would not take action on any amendment until the following meeting. Mr. Gustafson asked when they would now get the packets, and Mr. Soto answered that this day would not change, so the Commission would have extra preparation time.

Roundtable

Chairperson Norbury said he was pleased when the Commission was willing to at least discuss controversies.

Adjournment

There being no further business, Chairperson Norbury adjourned the meeting at 6:53 pm.

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"