



The City of Lee's Summit
Action Letter
Planning Commission

Tuesday, November 8, 2016
5:00 PM
City Council Chambers
City Hall
220 SE Green Street
Lee's Summit, MO 64063

CALL TO ORDER

ROLL CALL

Present: 8 - Board Member Fred Delibero
Board Member Jason Norbury
Board Member Colene Roberts
Board Member Fred DeMoro
Board Member Don Gustafson
Board Member Donnie Funk
Board Member Herman Watson
Board Member Brandon Rader

Absent: 1 - Board Member J.Beto Lopez

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

Absent: 1 - Board Member Lopez

APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA

[2016-0706](#) Appl. #PL2016-172 - PRELIMINARY PLAT - Arborwalk North, Lots 1-204 and Tracts A-E; GRI Land Investment, LLC, applicant

A motion was made by Board Member Roberts, seconded by Board Member DeMoro, that this Preliminary Plat be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Board Member Norbury
Board Member Roberts
Board Member DeMoro
Board Member Gustafson
Board Member Funk
Board Member Watson
Board Member Rader

Absent: 1 - Board Member Lopez

Abstain: 1 - Board Member Delibero

Planning Commission

Action Letter

November 8, 2016

[2016-0712](#) Appl. #PL2016-182 - SIGN APPLICATION - The Goddard School, 1000 SW Longview Park Dr.; First Edge, LLC, applicant

A motion was made by Board Member Roberts, seconded by Board Member DeMoro, that this be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Board Member Roberts
Board Member DeMoro
Board Member Gustafson
Board Member Funk
Board Member Watson
Board Member Rader
Board Member Norbury

Absent: 1 - Board Member Lopez

Abstain: 1 - Board Member Delibero

[2016-0709](#) Appl. #PL2016-197 - SIGN APPLICATION - Dick's Sporting Goods, 720 NW Blue Pkwy; Midwest Sign Company, applicant

A motion was made by Board Member Roberts, seconded by Board Member DeMoro, that this be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Board Member Norbury
Board Member Roberts
Board Member DeMoro
Board Member Gustafson
Board Member Funk
Board Member Watson
Board Member Rader

Absent: 1 - Board Member Lopez

Abstain: 1 - Board Member Delibero

[2016-0695](#) Approval of the October 11, 2016 Planning Commission minutes

A motion was made by Board Member Roberts, seconded by Board Member DeMoro, that the Minutes be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Board Member Norbury
Board Member Roberts
Board Member DeMoro
Board Member Gustafson
Board Member Funk
Board Member Watson
Board Member Rader

Absent: 1 - Board Member Lopez

Abstain: 1 - Board Member Delibero

[2016-0696](#) Approval of the October 25, 2016 Planning Commission minutes

Planning Commission

Action Letter

November 8, 2016

A motion was made by Board Member Roberts, seconded by Board Member DeMoro, that the Minutes be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Board Member Norbury
Board Member Roberts
Board Member DeMoro
Board Member Gustafson
Board Member Funk
Board Member Watson
Board Member Rader

Absent: 1 - Board Member Lopez

Abstain: 1 - Board Member Delibero

PUBLIC HEARINGS

[2016-0415](#) Continued PUBLIC HEARING - Appl. #PL2016-114 - PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN - approximately 7.11 acres located at the southeast corner NW Blue Pkwy and NW Colbern Rd for the proposed Summit Village; Newmark Grubb Zimmer, applicant (continued to a date certain of January 10, 2017, at the applicant's request)

[2016-0713](#) PUBLIC HEARING - Appl. #PL2016-167 - PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN - New Longview Commercial Phase II, approximately 13 acres located at the southeast corner of SW Fascination Dr. and SW Longview Blvd.; Box Real Estate Development, applicant

Chairperson Norbury opened the hearing at 2:08 p.m. and asked those wishing to speak, or provide testimony, to stand and be sworn in.

Mr. Russ Pierson gave his address as 920 Ovation Drive in Lee's Summit, and stated that he was a New Longview resident as well as the commercial broker representing Mariner in the sale of the land. He had also become the commercial developer for this project. The project would be on a 13-acre infill site; and a displayed slide showed its central location in New Longview. Mr. Pierson gave a summary of the project's history, noting that the site was close to the Cerner campus. Mariner's previous plan, which had been for 8 acres, had located commercial development on the north side. They had considered that it did not feel like a congruous development; as there were two projects that were next to each other and were not integrated. They had wanted to increase both connectivity and walkability between the two parcels. The applicants had negotiated a "build to suit" agreement for the project's movie theatre; and the previous layout would not work for that part of the development.

The applicants had held a design workshop on June 29th. Mr. Pierson stated that the development team had attended, and displayed a slide listing the members. He had founded Box Real Estate Development for this project. Yarco was a developer specializing in multi-family projects. Master planning would be done by Confluence. Hollis & Miller Architects would design the commercial architecture and multi-family architecture would be done by Rosemann & Associates. Olsson Associates would be the engineering firm for the project. The group that had originally done the design work on New Longview had acquired the group that Mariner had hired to do design work in this case. Representatives from BMB Theatres also attended, as well as some restaurant owners and retail office users.

Among the discussions at the workshop was the definition of "New Urbanism" and "neo-traditionalist" design. Among the key items they discovered was a discernible

activity center, which could be a plaza, park space or intersection. The theatre might provide that function as well as serve as the commercial anchor and an activity center for both public and private events. Mr. Pierson then displayed diagrams of the layout and plan they had discussed, including the site plan that was a result. The orange items at the south end represented the project's multi-family structures, with medical and retail office buildings indicated in purple further north. The blue item at the far north end was the theatre and the red item at the northwest corner was an 8,000 square foot building that would probably house two restaurants. It would include a rooftop deck and a back patio that would access the activity center. Mr. Pierson added that some examples already existed in Kansas City. The purple building shown along Longview Boulevard was a three-story headquarters office building, with a two-story parking deck in the middle, for shared parking.

The theatre, surface parking around it, and the multi-family residential would be the initial phase. They were providing extra parking, and the parking garage in the center of the space would be available for a number of uses. However, this would be added last, so that they could have a better idea of how much parking was needed and size the building accordingly. They were requesting an alternative parking plan, emphasizing shared parking. Mr. Pierson had consulted the handbook on shared parking published by the Urban Land Institute and the Service Contract Industry Council. A color-coded slide showed fluctuations of traffic at the times of day when excess parking would be needed in the commercial area. The multi-family residential had some shared parking as well. Weekends, some evenings and days with festival events would also be peak times. The calculations were for the 13-acre site only; not parking in areas adjacent to it.

They would need 492 stalls in the first phase, if the needs were based on UDO requirements for various uses and the buildings separated into separate sites. This phase was intentionally over parked, as they planned 520. However, the numbers at full build out were 854 stalls, less than the UDO's requirement of a total 981. They would actually need only 787 based on a shared parking model, for a total savings of 20 percent. Mr. Pierson commented that shared parking and increased walkability were part of the new urbanism approach. The idea was concentrate the uses that had parking needs at different times of day; so that someone going to more than one destination might need to find a parking space only once. In many cases, people would be able to access amenities like entertainment and shopping from their home without having to drive. Mr. Pierson acknowledged that the numbers might increase in the event of an office user with heavy parking needs.

Mr. Pierson then displayed an elevation of the theatre building, which would have an Art Deco design concept, representing the period from the early to mid 1930s. The building would have seven screens, a restaurant and a bar. Mr. Henry Hoyt had been the architect for the original construction of the Longview Farm buildings in 1912, later becoming part of the firm of Hoyt, Price and Barnes. They had designed the municipal auditorium and the Power and Light building. The movie theatre was intended to look like it had been designed by Hoyt during the era, but using modern materials.

Elevations of the multi-family residential in Phase 1 showed four-story towers on the project's north side. The designs had been modified since this went through the City process a year ago. They were intended to reflect the look of some of Longview's historic buildings. The townhomes were a story and a half, also using the look and style of the older buildings, with two bedrooms upstairs and the master bedroom on the first floor. They included two-car garages. The next slide showed images of buildings in the future phases. These were conceptual, and still at the design stage; however, this could not be final until they had prospective users. The renderings did give a general idea of the early-mid 1900s, roughly 1930-1950. However, there would not be any attempt to create replicas or make the buildings look older than they were.

Another conceptual image showed the restaurant building and open green space for events. The next view, looking west, showed the headquarters office building and parking deck. Mr. Pierson stated that they would call it a deck and not a garage; since it would be open on three sides and the access ramp was on grade. A view of the multi-family buildings and amenities center showed green space and a water feature in the center of the L-shaped space. The site had a sharp fall from the north and east; so they chose to use that fall and integrate it into the development. The edge of the theatre, which was the tallest side on the east with the parking garage with the tall side of multi-family, which branched into some retaining walls and faded around, allowed for a feeling of an upper and lower level and some views from the upper side. The tower components faced the main entrance off Longview.

Chairperson Norbury noted that staff's letter included five Recommendation Items, and asked Mr. Pierson if the applicants agreed. Mr. Pierson stated that they did. Chairperson Norbury then asked for staff comments.

Ms. Thompson entered Exhibit (A), list of exhibits 1-15 into the record. She stated that the applicant was seeking approval for New Longview Commercial Phase II. They proposed two phases, with Phase 1 consisting of a 172-unit, age-restricted development that was a combination of apartments and townhomes. The theatre, which would seat about 594 people, would also be part of this first phase. Phase 2 would consist of the medical office, office/retail and restaurant uses. The proposed building elevations for both phases provided creative design, using building materials that met or exceeded UDO requirements. They proposed a shared parking model, which staff supported. Staff and set out five Recommendation Items for approval. The first four conditions basically covered consistency with the preliminary development plan (Item 1), specific development standards (Item 2), required public improvements (Item 3), and adherence to the recommendations of the Transportation Impact Analysis (Item 4). Item 5 addressed the requirement of an agreement between the developer and the City regarding on-street parking, maintenance responsibilities and right-of-way details. Ms. Thompson noted that Recommendation Item 3 needed a specific date added for the Transportation Impact Analysis, as it currently specified only "2016". The date needed to be November 2, 2016.

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

Mr. Scott Coryell gave his address as 3168 SW Rockbridge Drive in Lee's Summit. He was speaking on behalf of the Longview Alliance. They had seen Yarco Development's site plan about a year ago. That version was very spread-out and had poor circulation for both traffic and pedestrians; and had not fit the site very well. What was being presented tonight was a significant improvement; and he commended the applicants on the job they had done, especially with vehicle and foot traffic circulation. It also provided much more visual interest. The Alliance did still have some concerns, mainly about the design quality and physical construction of some of the buildings. They understood that the developer would be willing to work with the Alliance, and wanted to be sure that this was the case. For example, one of the buildings included a turret and they were not sure that fit well into the neighborhood. They did like the continuation of a walkable, pedestrian-friendly neighborhood. The Alliance supported the project, and approval of tonight's application, as long as the applicant did continue to work with them.

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

Mr. Delibero asked Ms. Thompson how was the calculation done for the theatre having

140 parking spaces. That amounted to about one space for every four people. Ms. Thompson replied that it was actually done on the basis of one space for every four people in the 594-seat auditorium. It was part of the UDO's Article 12, which dealt with parking, and was based on an assumption that four people to a car would be the average, as well as not every screening being sold out.

Mr. Delibero noted that in a previous recent approval of the Residences At New Longview, questions had come up about how many apartments could be built at New Longview, according to the development agreement. That number had been somewhere in the 90s and tonight's proposal was for 172. Mr. Hughey replied that the previous TIF agreement did have a kind of carrot-and-stick approach, specifying a specific number of units in the context of the number of square feet built. An all-but-executed TIF contract amended those stipulations, with a quid pro quo approach based on actual projected square footage. Mr. Delibero replied that nevertheless, there had been a restriction in the original development agreement, not related to a TIF, and asked that this be looked at before the application went to the Council.

Another audience member wanted to make some comments, and was sworn in. Mr. Ronell Franklin gave his address as 2624 SW 10th Street in Lee's Summit. He asked for an approximate schedule for the project. Mr. Pierson replied that they wanted to have the theatre open by the release of Star Wars 8, projected for December 15 of next year. The pad would be installed in March, for November occupancy. Ground breaking for the multi-family residential would also happen in March; and they would put up the other buildings as soon as they could. The time frame for the rest was less certain in view of getting users. Mr. Franklin remarked that he was not clear on the location of the buildings in New Longview. Mr. Pierce displayed the site plan and pointed out the first roundabout at the northwest, as well as the roundabout's location relative to the existing CVS store and existing buildings on the design workshop plan. The theatre was in the north and central part of the development and indicated in blue. The theatre parking and multi-family residential were to the immediate south. The large rectangles indicated tower components. Displaying the color rendering of the south end looking north, he again pointed out the location of the CVS, the apartments, townhouses and amenity center.

Mr. Gustafson asked if it was correct that this was consistent with the New Longview concept plan, and if that was included in the packets. Ms. Thompson replied that it was consistent. Page 3 of staff's letter included a paragraph about the conceptual plan, which had been approved by the City Council in 2002. The plan had served as a guide for many years, although some things had changed along the way. It had been updated and presented to the Council on July 9, 2015; and this update showed the subject property as having mixed use, similar to what was being proposed tonight. She did not think the actual plan was included in the packets. Chairperson Norbury remarked that a copy would be helpful for the newer Commission members.

Regarding Kessler, Mr. Gustafson noted that the street had been constructed but was apparently not open. Mr. Monter answered that it was very close to being done but had not yet been given a certificate of substantial completion by the City. That certificate was the benchmark for opening a new street to public use. Mr. Gustafson asked if on-street parking was allowed on a commercial connector street, and Mr. Park answered that usually it was not. However, this was a planned mixed-use district with traditional neighborhood design and parking had been integrated into the layout of some commercial streets. They had pre-planned to allow on-street parking; however, issues with parking were among the reasons for the street not being open as yet.

Mr. Gustafson observed that on-street parking was not generally factored into numbers of available parking spaces. Mr. Park was confident that the on-site shared parking model

the applicants proposed would meet the requirements. The angled parking along Fascination Drive was designed to be used by customers of the businesses there. Maintenance of parking areas was one of the reasons for the development agreement. Mr. Gustafson noted parallel parking spaces were along the inside of the curve on Kessler and was not sure that was good sight distance for parking, especially in peak traffic periods. Mr. Park acknowledged that this was an issue needing mitigation; and these spaces were being removed from the plan.

Noting the references to "age-restricted" housing, Mr. Gustafson asked how that impacted traffic projections and parking requirements. Ms. Thompson replied that the UDO did not distinguish age-restricted housing; however, Yarco did have other field market data that gave information on what they needed. Mr. Matt Coates was sworn in and stated that the residential element would be restricted to head-of-household age 55 and up. In similar developments elsewhere the parking requirements for properties occupied by seniors were less than for other age groups. Families with children generally wanted two parking spaces per unit, but for senior properties that was usually three parking spaces for every two units. This particular site was over parked, with more spaces than usual for senior occupants. They did not plan to ever convert the housing to another demographic but it would be technically possible to have enough parking if that did ever happen.

Ms. Roberts asked if all the residential uses would be age-restricted, and Mr. Coates answered that they would. Ms. Roberts then remarked that referring to the plan as New Urbanism was rather generous; especially in view of considerable single-level surface parking. That and the number of stand along, single-story buildings were not consistent with New Urbanism. The applicants had been referring to being over parked but also intended to put the parking deck in last. Her concern was that the deck would end up not being built and the project would have to rely on surface parking.

Mr. Gustafson observed that it was difficult to tell what the capacity was for the commercial drive on. The left turns in particular looked to be as high or higher than on Kessler where people turned onto 3rd Street; and the traffic study had shown a 4-way intersection with left turn lanes in both directions. He asked if an analysis was done for some kind of mitigation. Mr. Park answered that the study did include an analysis of all the existing and proposed intersections along 3rd Street and Longview Boulevard. It also took approved development in the area into account; and at the time this application was made, the 3rd and View High development had not been reviewed and approved and those traffic impacts were not considered. Both developments shared the same type of improvements along 3rd, including a traffic signal at the Kessler Drive intersection. They had also evaluated the intersection at View High and that did not warrant a traffic signal at any point. They would be required to install the Kessler traffic signal by full build out of this development. No other intersection of 3rd Street along that corridor would have a traffic signal, due to intersections being too closely spaced. If too many left turns became an issue, they would be managed via a median.

Chairperson Norbury recalled seeing a bar chart addressing traffic numbers, and noted that none of the numbers seemed to include residential parking although that was included in the shared parking plan. He asked if some overflow into residential parking might occur at peak times, especially in view of these being built first. Mr. Pierson explained that they had originally included the multi-family parking in their analysis. However, the graph Chairperson Norbury referred to was just for timing of excess spots and a stacking analysis just for the commercial side; and they had considered the multi-family parking separately. The commercial parcels included both surface and covered deck parking side parking; and the residential side included some underground reserve parking. The townhomes had their own garages and guest parking. Street parking was available along Longview Boulevard. They had evaluated parking for the

residential and commercial side on a stand-alone basis.

Chairperson Norbury noted that the deck was planned to be put in last. He asked if the first phase would be mostly surface parking until that happened. Mr. Pierson summarized that the deck would be built at the point when the development would start to need it. They believed that considering the shared parking model and the site's walkability, they would still be over parked. They did not want to put in the parking deck unless or until there was a definite need for it; and preferred to have that much more green space if possible.

Concerning the apartments' architecture, Chairperson Norbury asked about the buildings' scale compared with those across Longview Boulevard, especially in view of their being three or four stories. Mr. Edward English, of Rosemann and Associates Architects, was sworn in and stated that their buildings had flat roofs and the others had pitched roofs. This would result in there being equal height from a visual standpoint. Chairperson Norbury noted that both the townhomes and the apartments across the road had pitched roofs, and asked why the architects had chosen flat roofs. Mr. English answered that the apartments were adjacent to and would in a sense become part of the commercial piece. Flat roofs would be more consistent with commercial architecture, and flat roofs would make it possible to put the mechanical and HVAC elements on the rooftops and keep them off the ground.

Mr. Delibero asked if they planned a parapet wall to screen the rooftops' mechanical units. Mr. English answered that they planned for parapet walls of about 3 or 4 feet, adding that the units would be residential sized. The total height would be about 45 feet tall. Mr. Delibero then asked Mr. Coates for some numbers showing how much the site was over parked, and Mr. Coates answered that it was about 13 spaces. That was based on the number of spaces per unit, which was higher than usual for age-restricted housing. Mr. Delibero asked why a developer would put extra capital into excess parking and increased impervious coverage. Mr. Coates answered that this was in response to meetings with staff. It might turn out that they would eliminate spaces here and there over the next few months. Mr. Delibero also wanted to know if these apartment spaces were being used just for those units and not included in the parking requirements for the whole project. Mr. Pierson replied that the commercial did not spill over into the residential; and street parking had to be factored in. Some residents might park in commercial spaces but the reverse was not likely to happen. Without the apartments, the commercial parking would still meet UDO requirements.

Chairperson Norbury asked if there were further questions for the applicant or staff. Hearing none, he closed the public hearing at 5:55 p.m. and asked for discussion among the Commission members, or for a motion.

Mr. Delibero made a motion to recommend approval of Application PL2016-167, Preliminary Development Plan: New Longview Commercial Phase II, approximately 13 acres located at the southeast corner of SW Fascination Drive and SW Longview Boulevard; Box Real Estate Development, applicant; subject to staff's letter of November 4, 2016, specifically Recommendation Items 1 through 3, adding the words "November 2" after "dated" and before "2016" in the first sentence of Recommendation Item 3. Chairperson Norbury corrected that there were 5 Recommendation Items, and Mr. Delibero corrected the motion to include Recommendation Items 1 through 5. Mr. Gustafson seconded.

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

On the motion of Mr. Delibero, seconded by Mr. DeMoro, the Planning Commission

Planning Commission

Action Letter

November 8, 2016

members voted unanimously by voice vote to recommend APPROVAL of Application PL2016-167, Preliminary Development Plan: New Longview Commercial Phase II, approximately 13 acres located at the southeast corner of SW Fascination Drive and SW Longview Boulevard; Box Real Estate Development, applicant; subject to staff's letter of November 4, 2016, specifically Recommendation Items 1 through 5 with Recommendation Item 3 amended as stated.

(The foregoing is a digest of the secretary's notes of the public hearing. The transcript may be obtained.)

A motion was made by Board Member Delibero, seconded by Board Member DeMoro, that this Public Hearing - Sworn was recommended for approval to the City Council - Regular Session, due back on 11/17/2016 The motion carried unanimously.

OTHER AGENDA ITEMS

PUBLIC COMMENTS

ROUNDTABLE

ADJOURNMENT

For your convenience, Planning Commission agendas, as well as videos of Planning Commission meetings, may be viewed on the City's Internet site at "www.cityofls.net".