

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

Thursday, March 14, 2019

5:00 PM

City Council Chambers

City Hall

220 SE Green Street

Lee's Summit, MO 64063

---

Call to Order

Roll Call

**Present:** 7 - Board Member Carla Dial  
Board Member Don Gustafson  
Board Member Donnie Funk  
Board Member Jeff Sims  
Board Member Jake Loveless  
Board Member John Lovell  
Board Member Mark Kitchens

**Absent:** 2 - Board Member Jason Norbury  
Board Member Dana Arth

Approval of Agenda

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

Public Comments

**There were no public comments at the meeting.**

Approval of Consent Agenda

[2019-2610](#) Minutes of the February 28, 2019, Planning Commission meeting

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

Public Hearings

[2019-2636](#) Appl. #PL2019-005 - REZONING from CP-2 to AG - Summit Waves, 619 SW Jefferson St; City of Lee's Summit, applicant

**Vice Chairperson Funk opened the hearing at 5:05 p.m. and asked those wishing to speak, or provide testimony, to stand and be sworn in.**

**Mr. McGuire entered Exhibit (A), list of exhibits 1-12 into the record. He related that the City**

proposed to rezone this part of Harris Park from CP-2 to AG. The .78-acre property was at 619 SW Jefferson, and was the site of the former Buck's Barnyard gas station. The rezoning was part of the preparation for expansion of the Summit Waves pool. The 2005 Comprehensive Plan land use map identified this area as part of the Old Town master development plan. This plan proposed an increased emphasis on recreational and entertainment uses, with general goals of increasing a "sense of place and community" and providing "adequate facilities for indoor and outdoor entertainment and recreation" for all age groups. As the rezoning would be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, meeting the plan's objectives; and compatible with existing and planned surrounding uses, staff recommended approval of the rezoning.

Following Mr. McGuire's comments, Vice Chairperson Funk asked if there was anyone present wishing to give testimony, either in support for or opposition to the application. Seeing none, he then asked if the Commission had questions for the applicant or staff. There were no questions, and Vice Chairperson Funk closed the public hearing at 5:08 p.m. and asked for comments, or for a motion.

Mr. Sims made a motion to recommend approval of Application PL2019-005, rezoning from CP-2 to AG: Summit Waves, 619 SW Jefferson St.; City of Lee's Summit, applicant. Ms. Dial seconded.

Vice 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 Sims, seconded by Board Member Dial, that this application be recommended for approval to the City Council - Regular Session, due back on 4/2/2019. The motion carried unanimously.

[2019-2634](#)

Appl. #PL2019-017 - PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN and Appl. #PL2019-018 -#SPECIAL USE PERMIT for assisted living facility - Lee's Summit Senior Living Facility, generally located at the southeast corner of SE Ranson Rd and SE Oldham Pkwy; O'Reilly Development Co., applicant

Vice Chairperson Funk opened the hearing at 5:10 p.m. and asked those wishing to speak, or provide testimony, to stand and be sworn in.

Mr. Scott Auman of SWD Architects, gave his business address as 315 Nichols Road in Kansas City (MO). The preliminary development plan and SUP were for the Princeton-Lee's Summit Senior Living Community. O'Reilly Development had built other such communities elsewhere in Missouri including Blue Springs, Springfield, Nixa, Joplin, and St. Charles, with the most recent opening in Wentzville. The subject property was a 12-acre tract in the US 50 corridor. Mr. Auman displayed a slide showing the proposed community's independent living, assisted living and memory care center components. Independent living was a 3-story building with 91 resident units. The assisted living and memory care were both one story with 44 and 18 resident units; and both would be State licensed. Amenities for all three included community dining, salon and social gathering rooms. The independent and assisted living centers would include a theater, swimming pool and wellness center.

The three-story independent living center would be located along Oldham Parkway, and the assisted living and memory care centers on the property's south end, adjacent to a residential neighborhood; and the applicants proposed a landscape buffer consisting of fencing with landscaping on both sides. Another landscape buffer would be to the east along part of Princeton Avenue, an extension of the public street. Independent living residents would have carports available on the northeast corner.

A proposed first floor plan showed a mixture of choices. The independent living center had 14 studio units, 43 one-bedroom units and 34 two-bedroom units. Assisted living's 44 units including 27 studios, 13 one-bedroom and 4 two-bedroom units. Memory care had 18 studio

units. Displayed elevations showed the materials and design, with gables and sloped roofs; and materials to include fiber cement lap siding, vertical board and bat and shingle-style siding. Thin stone veneer and brick veneer would also be used.

The applicants had some concerns about staff's recommended term for the SUP. They were requesting 99 years, as this was a large investment they were making to the community, and felt that a shorter term meant a risk if the SUP was not renewed. They had been surprised that a time period was associated with an SUP for a senior living use.

Another slide displayed the roadwork and infrastructure improvements associated with the project. They were currently working with the City on a number of challenging aspects, including extension of off-site water lines to the east of Ranson Road. The line would extend from Princeton down to the Ranson/Oldham intersection. They were also considering some downstream improvements to an existing sanitary sewer system. Mr. Auman pointed out three sections of lines that they would need to improve in accordance with the impact the project would have on the system. He believed it would be minimal. The other items were the public street extension of Princeton Avenue to Oldham Parkway, and road improvements along Oldham.

Following Mr. Auman's presentation, Vice Chairperson Funk asked for staff comments.

Mr. Soto entered Exhibit (A), list of exhibits 1-19 into the record. He remarked that much of the information in his presentation had been presented by the applicant. Mr. Soto described the subject property as a tract about 12.25 acres, currently zoned CP-2, with the proposed development occupying about 10.5 acres. An additional Lot 2 on the east side of the Princeton Road extension was about one acre.

A buffer was required between the commercially-zoned subject property and the residential property to the south. Property to the east across the future road extension was undeveloped land zoned AG, though the Comprehensive Plan indicated the recommended future use as low to medium density residential. A high-impact buffer would be required; however, the eastern boundary also included a stand of mature trees. The applicant requested to retain this mature tree line in lieu of landscaping. Staff could re-evaluate the landscaping buffer needs after the subject property and property to the east were developed. Staff requested that the Commission recommend approval of a landscape buffer in the form of the mature tree line in lieu of landscaping as described in the UDO.

The applicant's second requested modification was to maximum building height, which was 40 feet in CP2 zoning. The proposed three-story independent living structure had a calculated building height of 41.6 feet. One of the UDO's conditions for this type of use was that, in order to retain residential character and better fit in with surrounding properties, the design of the structure had to include a pitched roof, as opposed to a flat roof that would have more of a commercial appearance. The applicant had provided that pitched roof, which necessarily added a little to the total height in order to be consistent with the overall size of the building. Staff also supported this modification.

Regarding the term of the SUP, past practice had been for new construction to have a time period of 20 to 40 years. Nothing in the ordinance specifically prescribed a maximum term, and in principle staff did not have a problem with a 99-year term. However, that was not what the City Council had grated at this point. If the SUP was not renewed in the future, that would indicate that some aspect of the use needed to be addressed. Staff typically did not consider this type of use to have a negative impact, and in this case the project's location might provide a transition between the highway and the residential uses to the south. Staff did not believe that this use would have a negative impact on surrounding properties.

Staff recommended approval of the preliminary development plan and rezoning, subject to

conditions 1 - 5. Mr. Soto added that item 5, an SUP term of 40 years, was based on past practice though the Commission did have the option to recommend amending it.

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

Noting the statement in the "Sanitary Sewer Analysis" paragraph of staff's letter that "a more detailed (house-by-house) analysis for potential sanitary sewer backups may be required during the final development plan process", Mr. Loveless asked for some more details about what the process would be if the improvements were performed by the applicant did not make the improvements before that point, and if funds were in escrow. Mr. Monter related that staff was aware of the sanitary sewer system being at capacity in some areas. From a development perspective, added improvements would add to that system. They were aware that there were solutions and had identified three segments of pipe that could be upsized. This would prevent negative impact to the existing system, and was what staff recommended. In the past, developers had been able to do a joint venture with the City via a CIP project and the developer would pay for improvements; however at present there was no project identified. Once the application was approved by City Council and there was a more detailed analysis, there was a choice of solutions. What the applicants were looking at so far was the impact of adding more flow to the system, including the flow increasing during a significant rain event. A 'house by house' analysis meant considering what impact this increased flow would have on flood-prone basements. So far this had not been done. When it was, staff would have a more information about possible impact on adjacent homes.

Mr. Monter confirmed to Mr. Loveless that the impact would be clearer when the project was a little further along in the process, and that the upsizing would have to be done before the City would issue certificates of occupancy. He added that this would also have to be after a final development plan was approved, and the applicant had done an initial water supply analysis. The water line currently came up on Princeton Drive, stopping at the intersection, and needed to be looped. This was in the PDP. However, this applicant had certain fire flow requirements, which were identified by the Fire Department. Assumptions were made via the model that staff did not believe to be accurate; which would mean that the fire flow requirements were not being met, which would be the reason for looping the water line.

Mr. Loveless commented to Mr. Park that there had been some discussion of a traffic signal at the intersection, and asked for some details about anticipated traffic impact. Mr. Park observed that a senior living facility would not be expected to generate heavy traffic. The traffic impact study that was done, due to existing conditions at the Ranson Road [Missouri RA]/Oldham Parkway intersection, which was State owned and managed. The study had indicated a traffic signal was warranted under current conditions; however, the decision was on a State level and the State was waiving the requirement on the basis of the development not generating heavy traffic. This would be revisited if or when further development happened.

Concerning the state of Missouri deciding that the intersection could currently do without a traffic signal, Mr. Kitchens noted that businesses in that area included Tractor Supply and Home Depot, and the parking of both emptied out near the eastbound portion of Oldham. It was not just a volume issue but also an unusual number of trucks with trailers. When left-hand turns were involved the backup could be as much as a half mile. Additionally, Ranson was a one-way in, one-way out access so there was no way to get around that intersection. If no signal went in, this was likely to cause considerable traffic congestion. He asked if the State would reconsider the decision if this situation produced traffic problems. Mr. Park replied that they were not denying that a traffic signal was needed and were working to get funding to put one in. This was likely to be within five years. The State had basically looked just at this development in terms of traffic generation. He emphasized that if this was a City-controlled intersection, the City would consider the infrastructure inadequate; and this would have to be mitigated before any new traffic was generated.

Vice Chairperson Funk asked if there was any member of the public present wishing to give remarks or having any questions for the applicant or staff. Seeing none, he asked Mr. Auman if the applicant agreed with staff's five Recommendation Items. Mr. Auman replied that they did.

Hearing no further questions, Vice Chairperson Funk closed the public hearing at 5:30 p.m. Mr. Loveless had a question, and Vice Chairperson Funk re-opened the hearing.

Regarding the buffer, Mr. Loveless asked Mr. Soto if all the trees were located on the subject property, and what sort of control the City would have. Mr. Soto stated that at least half the trees were on Lot 2, so they were under the developer's control. When a final development plan was drafted, the City could require the applicant to submit a tree preservation plan. Staff would have to keep working with the developer on site work as part of the continued inspection process. Mr. Loveless asked if this could be made part of the motion.

Regarding the applicant's request for a 99-year term for the SUP, Mr. Loveless noted that similar projects had been given a 40-year term. Projects of this size were often planned for three or four decades of use but not a century; so 40 years seemed a reasonable term. Vice Chairperson Funk commented that this was the term the Council supported most often.

Hearing no further discussion, Vice Chairperson Funk again closed the hearing, at 5:34 p.m. and called for a motion.

Mr. Sims made a motion to recommend approval of Application PL2019-017, Preliminary Development Plan and Application PL2019-018, Special Use Permit for assisted living facility: Lee's Summit Senior Living Facility, generally located at the southeast corner of SE Ranson Rd. and SE Oldham Pkwy.; O'Reilly Development Co., applicant; subject to staff's letter of March 8, 2019, specifically Recommendation Items 1 through 5. Ms. Dial seconded.

Vice Chairperson Funk asked if the City's recommendation for a 40-year SUP term should be part of the motion, and Mr. Sims answered that this was covered in staff's report as Recommendation Item 5.

Hearing no further discussion of the motion, Vice Chairperson Funk called for a vote.

A motion was made by Board Member Sims, seconded by Board Member Dial, that this application be recommended for approval to the City Council - Regular Session, due back on 4/2/2019. The motion carried unanimously.

[2019-2637](#) Appl. #PL2019-019 - PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN - Lakewood Business Park, Lot 35, 4101 NE Port Dr.; Sallee Development, applicant

Vice Chairperson Funk opened the hearing at 5:36 p.m. and asked those wishing to speak, or provide testimony, to stand and be sworn in.

Mr. Jeff Skidmore, of Schlagel and Associates, gave his address as 14920 W. 107th Street in Lenexa, KS. He stated that the presentation was essentially covered by staff's report, and they appreciated staff's assistance. He was willing to answer any questions from the Commission.

Vice Chairperson Funk then asked for staff comments.

Mr. McGuire entered Exhibit (A), list of exhibits 1-13 into the record. He described the proposed project as a one-story, 24,000 square foot building, at 4101 NE Port Drive. The lot was just north of the Lakewood Way water tower. The building would have 6,000 square feet of office space and 18,000 square feet of warehouse space. Current zoning was for PMIX (Planned Mixed Use), with surrounding properties to the north and west also zoned PMIX, and those to the south and east zoned AG. The subject property was on a grade, rising about 40

feet from west to east; and a steep rock embankment was on the northwest part. It was in the Lakewood Business Park, whose uses were office, warehouse and industrial.

Mr. McGuire displayed elevations showing the proposed building materials: brick, glass, architectural metal panels, embossed architectural panels and EIFS. The Comprehensive Plan land use map identified the area as business park use; and the proposed land use were in compliance with the plan. The smooth metal panels being proposed were conditional material. Mr. McGuire added that the quality of metal building material had increased over the years, and had become more commonly used for that reason. On each elevation, the percentage of conditional material was 30 percent or less; and this was consistent with other recently approved developments in Lee's Summit including churches and car dealerships. Staff recommended approval of the preliminary development plan, "inclusive of the use of architectural smooth metal panels as a conditional material as depicted on the building elevations".

Following Mr. McGuire's comments, Vice Chairperson Funk asked if the Commission had questions for the applicant or staff. Seeing none, he closed the public hearing at 5:38 p.m. and asked for discussion among the Commission members, or for a motion.

Mr. Gustafson made a motion to recommend approval of Application PL2019-019, Preliminary Development Plan: Lakewood Business Park, Lot 35, 4101 NE Port Dr.; Sallee Development, applicant; subject to staff's letter of March 8, 2019. Ms. Dial seconded.

Vice 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 Gustafson, seconded by Board Member Dial, that this application be recommended for approval to the City Council - Regular Session, due back on 4/2/2019. The motion carried by the following vote:

**Aye:** 6 - Board Member Dial  
Board Member Gustafson  
Board Member Funk  
Board Member Sims  
Board Member Loveless  
Board Member Kitchens

**Nay:** 1 - Board Member Lovell

**Absent:** 2 - Board Member Norbury  
Board Member Arth

[2019-2635](#) Appl. #PL2019-022 - PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN and Appl. #PL2019-021 - SPECIAL USE PERMIT for indoor climate-controlled storage facility - Extra Space Lee's Summit, 700 SE Oldham Ct.; Hernly Associates, Inc., applicant

Vice Chairperson Funk opened the hearing at 5:40 p.m. and asked those wishing to speak, or provide testimony, to stand and be sworn in.

Mr. Stan Hernley of Hernley Associates and the project's architect, gave his business address as 1100 Rhode Island Street in Lawrence, Kansas. Also present were Ms. Margaret McFarland, the property owner; and Mr. Daryl Liesey, the developer's representative, who had not yet arrived at the meeting. This application was a re-submittal of a project that both the Planning Commission and the City Council had heard twice.

Displaying an aerial map, Mr. Hernley pointed out the proposed location at the southeast corner of the of Hamblen Road and US-50 intersection, with the property indicated in red. A hotel, restaurant and an Aldi grocery store were immediately to the west, and a skating rink

was to the east. The applicant was proposing an indoor accessed, self-storage facility. Mr. Hernley pointed out the location of the building within the property. The site would be accessed from SE Oldham Road, using a shared drive. The access was directly across from the entrance to Aldi's.

Mr. Hernley reviewed the changes that had been made. The drive had originally gone all the way around the building, which had been much longer north to south in its previous version. They were proposing to put the parking area in the spaces directly to the north and south of the building. The wide northwest corner would be reserved for customers to turn around, as well as access and turn around space for the Fire Department if needed. Displaying a closer view, Mr. Hernley pointed out the total 37 parking spaces currently on the site. He related that when the previous projects were reviewed, concerns were raised about traffic on the site. They were providing spaces in excess of what they needed, including possible overflow parking from the grocery store especially on Saturdays.

The main building had undergone major changes. About one-fourth of the floor area was now a basement. On a floor plan of the building's internal configuration, Mr. Hernley pointed out the drive-through bay on the left. Some units would be accessed from this bay, but it was enclosed; with the rest of the units accessed through hallways. The facility's main office would be at the southwest corner, and two elevators would be available, close to the drive-through bay.

The applicant had put together a comparative chart showing changes from the previous application. The major items, highlighted in yellow, including the 30,500 square foot basement, which reduced the building's visible mass by a little over 20 percent. Parking was changed from 7 spaces in the previous plan to 37 spaces. Architecturally, the building was similar to the one in the previous submittal, designed to look similar to an office building. Second and third story windows shown in the displayed rendering would be opaque glass, with only the office on the first story, in front of the elevator landing and the sides of the drive-through bay having clear glass.

The rendering also showed the entrance drive and the parking at the front of the building. Mr. Hernley pointed out the location of the trash enclosure on the other side of the lot from the hotel. A northwest view showed the hotel and proposed building as seen from the highway. The building's height had not changed and the materials were a combination of brick, fiber cement panel and metal architectural panels. The latter were less than 30 percent of each elevation's facade.

The applicant had a traffic study done. "Table 1" showed an average of 183 weekday development trips in an out; a peak hour maximum of about 10 vehicles. The study had included intersections around the site, with about 50 percent of the traffic going north on Hamblen Road. The highlighted portion on the last two tables showed the level of service and delay for various directions and turns. At the point of entrance, across from Aldi's, Table 4 showed existing peak hour delay times.

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

Mr. Soto entered Exhibit (A), list of exhibits 1-19 into the record. He displayed a zoning map showing the subject property as zoned CS (Commercial Services). Property to the east, a skating rink and future car dealership, was also zoned CS. The Home Depot store to the south was in PMIX zoning, and properties to the north (across US 50) and west were CP-2 zoning. Other commercial zoning existed further south along Century Drive/Hamblen Road and Broadway. Materials proposed for the building included an architectural wave metal panel, which was a conditional material. A colored rendering showed this material primarily on the upper two-thirds of the building. This had become more popular in the past few years, especially on car dealerships; and the City Council had approved its use on some industrial

sites. Incorporation into modern architectural designs had also improved. Staff recommended allowing this conditional material, in Recommendation Item 1.

The floor area ratio (FAR), a metric used to measure density and regulate bulk in building was the only real modification requested. The ratio was essentially the gross square footage of a building relative to the square footage of the lot. A displayed slide showed the different ways to configure a building and satisfy FAR requirements. A one-story building that covered the entire area would have a FAR of 1.00, but so would a two-story building that covered half the area or a four-story building on a quarter of it. The chart showed how the buildings themselves could be configured differently. The CS zoning district in particular had a maximum FAR of .65, and the applicant was requesting an FAR of 1.01. In the previous application it was 0.98. Staff's Recommendation Item 2 allowed a modification for the 1.01 FAR. From a square footage perspective this building was slightly larger; however, they were going below grade with the lowest building story.

Mr. Soto remarked that FAR could be somewhat misleading without any kind of context and in this case, the visual impact of the building's mass was much less since part of it was out of sight. The building's height was the same as before, 35 feet. The CS zoning district did allow for buildings of five stories or 75 feet. This building would be 40 feet shorter above grade than the zoning district's maximum. For an idea of the visual impact, the nearby Home Depot building height was 40 feet, and the adjacent hotel was 30 feet. When this was all taken into account, the proposed building would be compatible with nearby existing structures.

The UDO required a Special Use Permit for an indoor climate-controlled facility in CS zoning; and listed four conditions: (1) All activities would be carried on inside the structure; (2) The building had to have four-sided architecture; (3) No outside storage of any kind was allowed and (4) PO (Planned Office District) requirements for building placement, minimum lot size, height, setbacks, landscaping and signage would be met. The applicant would comply with all four. One portion on the west side of the building had overhead doors for access to a freight elevator; however, it did not affect neighboring properties in terms of noise or visual impact. Staff recommended a term of 25 years for the SUP. Staff recommended approval of the application, subject to conditions 1 through 5.

Vice Chairperson Funk then if the Commission had questions for the applicant or staff.

Mr. Lovell asked if the changes in tonight's application addressed the problems and issues in the previous application. Mr. Soto one of the concerns expressed at the City Council meeting was the traffic impact of this type of use on surrounding properties. The applicant had commissioned and provided a traffic impact study in order to address these concerns. The study indicated negligible additional impact on the surrounding streets. The applicant had also done considerable work on the architectural side, working with staff. Tonight's product had come a long way from what the Commission had previously seen, especially in the building's office-like appearance on a major corridor.

Mr. Sims asked Mr. Park if he agreed with the results of the traffic impact study, and if he had any concerns about the impact on surrounding roads. Mr. Park answered that he had reviewed the traffic study they submitted, and it was consistent with his original opinion: that this particular type of land use generated very little traffic and would likely generate less than the surrounding uses did.

Mr. Loveless observed that the FAR was comparable to other recent projects the Commission had seen with similar zoning. Mr. Soto added that with many such indoor facilities, the proportion of square footage would be comparable to this project.

Vice Chairperson Funk asked if the applicant was in agreement with staff's five conditions of approval, and Mr. Hernley answered that they were.



Planning Commission

Action Letter - Draft

March 14, 2019

---

Mr. Kitchens asked if there was a lighting plan. Mr. Hernley answered that it had been included in the larger package of drawings. It would include building-mounted lights that would be shielded for zero light spillage at the property line. Mr. Kitchens observed that while buildings with a lot of glass and metal might be attractive, when they were on an east-west traffic corridor the reflection could cause a dangerous glare for drivers.

Vice Chairperson Funk asked if there were further questions for the applicant or staff. Hearing none, he closed the public hearing at 5:10 p.m. and asked for discussion among the Commission members.

Mr. Lovell commented that this was a very good use for the location, and commended the applicant on all the work it took to get to this point. Mr. Kitchens agreed, adding that this lot in particular had been an issue in the past and he was glad to see it developed.

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

Mr. Gustafson made a motion to recommend approval of Application PL2019-022, Preliminary Development Plan and Application PL2019-021, Special Use Permit for indoor climate-controlled storage facility: Extra Space Lee's Summit, 700 SE Oldham Ct.; Hernley Associates, Inc., applicant; subject to staff's letter of March 8, 2019, specifically Recommendation Items 1 through 5. Mr. Sims seconded.

Vice 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 Gustafson, seconded by Board Member Sims, that this application be recommended for approval to the City Council - Regular Session, due back on 4/2/2019. The motion carried unanimously.

#### Other Agenda Items

There were no other agenda items at the meeting.

#### Roundtable

Mr. Soto stated that he had sent out the sample revised format for staff's letter. Depending on feedback, they intended to start using it at the March 28 meeting.

Vice Chairperson Funk asked Mr. Elam what might be coming back to the Commission from the CEDC meeting, in regards to the "Envision" area. Mr. Elam reported that over the last month, the City got inquiries over some properties located in the Envision LS area. This was around the M-291 south interchange including the old Adessa property, the CalMar property and Pinetree Plaza. Some changes to existing buildings in that area had been proposed as well as some requests pertaining to uses currently on the prohibited list. However, the current Envision LS ordinance required any exterior change to a building to go through the development plan process. This was brought to the CEDC last night, to see if they wanted to retain, revise or replace the requirement. That would essentially be a UDO amendment. Over the next few weeks, staff would be looking closely at the current Envision LS language as well as the process including a clarification of prohibited uses and the appeal process. This would be brought back to the CEDC in April and possibly to the Planning Commission as a possible UDO amendment.

#### Adjournment

There being no further business, Vice Chairperson Funk adjourned the meeting at 6:15 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"