



The City of Lee's Summit
Action Letter
Planning Commission

Tuesday, June 27, 2017

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 Carla Dial
Board Member Jason Norbury
Board Member Colene Roberts
Board Member Dana Arth
Board Member Don Gustafson
Board Member Donnie Funk
Board Member J.Beto Lopez
Board Member Herman Watson

Absent: 1 - Board Member Brandon Rader

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

A motion was made by Board Member Lopez, seconded by Board Member Gustafson, that the agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously.

APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA

[TMP-0554](#) Appl. #PL2017-100 - VACATION OF EASEMENT - Aldi, 600 SE Oldham Pkwy.; Kaw Valley Engineering, applicant

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

[TMP-0555](#) Appl. #PL2017-105 - VACATION OF EASEMENT - Two blanket water line easements generally located at the southeast corner of SE M-291 Hwy. & SE Bailey Rd.; The Grove at Lee's Summit, LLC, applicant

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

[TMP-0556](#) Appl. #PL2017-106 - VACATION OF EASEMENT - a storm drainage easement generally located at the southeast corner of SE M-291 Hwy. & SE Bailey Rd.; The Grove at Lee's Summit, LLC, applicant

Planning Commission

Action Letter

June 27, 2017

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

[2017-1319](#)

Minutes of the June 13, 2017, Planning Commission meeting

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

PUBLIC HEARINGS

[2017-1325](#)

PUBLIC HEARING - Appl. #PL2017-102 - SPECIAL USE PERMIT for swimming pool lights - 4140 NE Dick Howser Dr; Lakewood Property Owners Association, applicant

Chairperson Norbury opened the hearing at 5:03 p.m. and asked those wishing to speak, or provide testimony, to stand and be sworn in.

Mr. Mark Reed, general manager of the Lakewood Property Owners Association, gave his address as 651 NE St. Andrews Circle in Lee's Summit. He explained that the Special Use Permit application was for 20-foot light poles. They had been using 10-foot light poles on 5-foot bollards for the 30-year life of the previous pool. They had increased the deck space slightly, and added a zero entry feature. The latter had created a need to change to 20-foot poles. This would be LED lighting with a no illumination up to dark sky feature and essentially zero light emissions other than the directed projection onto the pool deck. The view of this facility would be little different than it had been, with better lighting that was five feet higher. The tennis court lighting would be changed at the same time. It formerly had the older tilted metal halide lighting.

Following Mr. Reed's presentation, Chairperson Norbury asked for staff comments.

Mr. Soto entered Exhibit (A), list of exhibits 1-15 into the record. He stated that the existing East Lake community pool in the Lakewood subdivision was being demolished and replaced. The new facility's configuration required a 20-foot tall light fixture. The UDO set the maximum height for subdivision pool lighting at 20 feet; however, any lighting over and above low-level bollard lights required a Special Use Permit. The lighting for this facility was consistent with other pools throughout the city. In 2012 the West Lake pool, which covered a bigger area, got an SUP for lighting with 30-foot poles. Staff recommended approval subject to Recommendation Item 1, which specified a ten-year term. The applicants had requested an indefinite period for the SUP; however, ten years was consistent with the SUPs for the West Lake pool and other subdivision pools throughout Lee's Summit.

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

Ms. Luanne Posey gave her address as 4040 NE Grant Street, which was on the south side of the proposed pool. She noted that tennis and basketball court lights were on a timer and stayed on until midnight or 1:00 a.m. People sometimes did use them at that hour; and that was often an annoyance to nearby neighbors, and she wanted to know what hours the pool lights would be used.

Mr. Dave Parady gave his address as 4028 NE Bittersweet. He stated that he also lived close to the pool, and the lights and noise from the basketball and tennis courts were often an annoyance late at night; although they were supposed to be turned off at 11:00

Planning Commission

Action Letter

June 27, 2017

p.m.

Mr. Reed stated that the LPOA intended to redo the circuitry in the new building. With the current system, it was possible for a user of the basketball or tennis courts to turn lights on after hours; and it would be in a locked room and no longer accessible. The lights at the pool would be for security as well as for pool users; so these would be on dusk to dawn.

Mr. James Brown gave his address as 4028 NE Grant Street. He wanted to know what hours the pool would be open. Mr. Reed answered that East Lake was open until 9:00 p.m. on week nights and 10:00 p.m. on Fridays and Saturdays. The only use would be recreational swimming, with the West Lake pool used for competitive swim events.

Chairperson Norbury asked if there were further questions for the applicant or staff. Hearing none, he closed the public hearing at 5:14 p.m. and asked for discussion among the Commission members, or for a motion. He added that staff had provided wording for the motion in its report.

Ms. Roberts made a motion to recommend approval of Application PL2017-102, Special Use Permit for swimming pool lights: 4140 NE Dick Howser Dr; Lakewood Property Owners Association, applicant; subject to staff's letter of June 23, 2017, specifically Recommendation Item 1. Mr. Lopez 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 Roberts, seconded by Board Member Lopez, that this application be recommended for approval to the City Council - Regular Session, due back on 7/27/2017. The motion carried unanimously.

[2017-1116](#)

PUBLIC HEARING - Appl. #PL2017-121 - UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE (UDO) AMENDMENT #62 - Article 8 Accessory Uses and Structures, revision to the regulations for photo studios as in-home occupations; City of Lee's Summit Applicant- CEDC 5-10-17

Chairperson Norbury opened the hearing at 5:15 p.m. and asked those wishing to speak, or provide testimony, to stand and be sworn in.

Mr. McKay related that a few years ago the City had an application from the owner of a photographic studio that had multiple employees. The applicant had wanted to use it as a home occupation. Staff then did an analysis to determine the size of the property that might work out for a home occupation with multiple employees and people coming to the site. They had reached a conclusion that one acre would be a minimum size required. That ordinance amendment was subsequently approved. Now the City had a request from Ms. Jena Rowland, who had formerly had employees but was now looking to downsize her business and operate out of her home in a single-family residential neighborhood. The ordinance amendment was necessary in order for staff to provide that opportunity. In this situation, the owner did not have an acre of property; however, there were also fewer employees.

Tonight's application addressed the wording to be added to the "Home Occupation" section of the UDO [addition underlined], stating that "except as otherwise provided, no persons other than self or family members residing on the premises plus one additional person not residing on the premises shall be employed or involved in any business activity related to the home occupation on the premises." The "Prohibited Uses" section of the

UDO had previously specified one acre or more of property as an exception. Staff had changed the wording to read "a photographic studio with multiple employees in excess of the standard home occupation allowance", which basically allowed for a standard home occupation to allow for a photographic studio that could use the 25 percent of the home allowed for other home occupations.

Mr. McKay entered Exhibit (A), list of exhibits 1-8 into the record.

Following Mr. McKay's comments, Chairperson Norbury asked if there was anyone present wishing to give testimony, either in support for or opposition to the application. Seeing none, he then opened the hearing for questions for the applicant or staff.

Ms. Roberts asked why the amendment applied so specifically to photographic studios, noting that the traffic would not be much different for someone offering something like piano lessons. Mr. McKay answered that with piano lessons, the homeowner would see one client at a time whereas a photographic studio would often have clients in groups, especially family groups, graduation pictures and weddings. Photographers with this level of business often did have multiple employees at the studio, which was the reason for the required minimum one acre, which would satisfy parking requirements. Ms. Roberts remarked that a single-family home would be unlikely to have enough space for a wedding photographic session.

Chairperson Norbury asked if staff had ensured that this amendment was general enough to have some longevity, noting that tonight's amendment was for a specific business. He agreed with the reasoning; however multiple individualized tweaks to the UDO for specific businesses over time might have the effect of compromising the ordinance in terms of the broader picture. Mr. McKay acknowledged that at times, staff would prefer to bring in a number of amendments at one time. In this case, the business owner was looking to downsize and had a time frame to get that done.

Chairperson Norbury asked if there were further questions for the applicant or staff. Hearing none, he closed the public hearing at 5:20 p.m. and asked for discussion among the Commission members, or for a motion.

Ms. Roberts made a motion to recommend approval of Application PL2017-121, Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) Amendment #62: Article 8 Accessory Uses and Structures, revision to the regulations for photo studios as in-home occupations; City of Lee's Summit, applicant. Mr. Funk 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 Roberts, seconded by Board Member Funk, that this application be recommended for approval to the City Council - Regular Session, due back on 7/27/2017. The motion carried unanimously.

OTHER AGENDA ITEMS

[2017-1315](#)

Presentation of the Community for All Ages Program and Lessons and Reflections from a Recognition Program Recipient, City of Raymore, Missouri

Chairperson Norbury opened the hearing at 5:22 p.m.

Mr. McKay related that about a year ago Ms. Cathy Boyer-Shesol of the Mid-America Regional Council (MARC) had spoken to the City Council about the Community for All Ages program. She had received a positive response; and the Council had adopted a resolution

to go forward. They were now going through the first steps of that process. Ms. Boyer-Shesol was present at the meeting, as were Mr. Jim Cadoret, Community Development Director with the City of Raymore; and Mr. David Gress, Associate Planner with the City of Raymore. The city had gone through the process and achieved a Gold status.

Ms. Cathy Boyer-Shesol stated that this presentation was part of achieving the Bronze level, which was raising awareness of the ongoing and future shifts in demographics. This centered on the aging of the baby boom generation, which would impact communities across the country. Five years ago, MARC had developed tools and resources for communities to prepare for the significant increase in the elder adult population. Ms. Boyer-Shesol illustrated her remarks with a slide presentation.

The first baby boomers' 65th birthdays was in 2011; and for every day between then and 2030, 10,000 people would have their 65th birthday. The millennial generation would be even more numerous when they aged, as they outnumbered baby boomers by 8 million. Both generations shared certain preferences and priorities that would impact city planning. A slide contrasted percentages of people 65 and over in Missouri counties in 2010 and projected 2030. In 2010 only one county had 25% or greater; in two decades there would be over 30. Four counties in 2010 had percentages less than 10%; there would be none in 2030. Ms. Boyer-Shesol added that almost all the counties on the Kansas map would have over 25% in 2030.

The next few slides showed all the counties in the Kansas City metro area with increasing percentages; however, the projection indicated that metropolitan Kansas City's population trend was toward all age groups being represented relatively equally. The next few decades would be the first time in American history when the population had more people over 55 than under 15. A bar chart for 1990 showing numbers of people in specific age groups had a noticeable bulge in the middle (25-35 to 40-44) and a broad base for children about 10 or under. The 2030 projection showed a "stovepipe", with bars of roughly even widths, narrowing only in the oldest age groups. Another bar chart compared Lee's Summit's population and age breakdown between 2010 and projected 2020. It showed a sharp increase in ages 55 and up in the decade. These changes would impact all City functions, including emergency services, public safety, public works, parks and recreation, neighborhoods and housing.

Ms. Boyer-Shesol then summarized some of the myths involved. Members of the baby boom generation had different ideas about aging than did their parents, including an increased preference for remaining in their homes and neighborhoods. And they had a great deal in common with young people in terms of what they looked for in a community, such as walkability, transportation options, and low-maintenance housing. Moreover, planning for one age group was not a zero sum game. Communities for All Ages believed that cities which took into account the needs, abilities and interests of all age groups had the most long-term stability as they were places where "it's great to grow up and grow old."

The metro Kansas City area had 12 communities that had achieved one of the three levels of recognition. The program had three phases, and Lee's Summit was currently in the "awareness" phase, or "Bronze" level. That involved bringing presentations and discussions to variety of organizations in the community. The assessment phase ("Silver") required cities to go through the checklist, which typically resulted in robust discussions with residents, City staff and local government officials. Implementation was the final phase. The checklist cited essential topics: Public outdoor spaces and buildings; housing and commercial development; transportation and mobility; social inclusion, communication and participation; civil participation and employment; and community and health services.

Mr. Cadoret stated that Raymore had been involved in this program for about 18 months. He acknowledged that the communities of Raytown and Mission had also been helpful in providing input about the process. It had paid great dividends for Raymore, and Mr. Cadoret compared this to being a tree city or a walk-friendly community. It was in the community's interest to welcome all age groups; and Mr. Cadoret commented that the Raymore had particularly wanted to appeal to younger residents and provide incentives for them to settle in the community. Over that 18 months he had attended many of Ms. Boyer-Shesol's presentations; and at the same time, the City Manager had become interested in the program. Mr. Cadoret had worked with City staff throughout the process during the assessment phase.

The Bronze level was basically about raising awareness of the program and its goals by City staff, planning commissions, elected officials and the community at large. Raymore's Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council had attended a presentation in a joint session. Officials from Raytown in particular had shared what the program had meant to their city. Part of the process was determining where the City currently was in terms of meeting the needs of all residents. The second, assessment, phase identified what goals the City was not meeting and what it still needed to work on. Mr. Cadoret displayed a slide with a list of requirements for Bronze level, including a community meeting, education via a dedicated website page, and a resolution approved by the City Council. Raymore sent notices out to residents via their newsletter and mass emails.

The second Silver level was all about an assessment of the community. Raymore had picked a group of residents to act as a task force. They had an extensive checklist and worked with City staff on acquiring the necessary data. At the same time they had done a community outreach program, at the same time that the City was going through a strategic planning process. During this time hundreds of citizens had attended community meetings; and this had been valuable in identifying areas that needed attention. Many people, for example, had problems finding out about city events and sometimes had trouble getting to them, indicating a need for improved communication and transportation. Others noted that there were not sufficient affordable housing options for their adult children to live in the community. Unlike Lee's Summit Raymore did not have a senior community center as a central clearinghouse for senior programs; and the process had helped identify what needed to be done for the community to be attractive to all age groups. The task force for the project had gone through the six items of the checklist that the Commissioners had in their packets. Mr. Cadoret emphasized that this assessment process was not a matter of 'grading' a city but to identify what the city was doing well and correctly and what needed to be added, expanded or improved. Excelsior Springs had done a resident survey; and he wished Raymore had also done that. Doing a statistical survey of your residents, asking specific questions and finding out what residents thought about specific issues was very valuable. The task force had also lacked a young adult representative, and so even after the assessment the City had not involved a major age group.

Implementation was the last step for Gold level recognition. The assessment process had identified those things they were doing well and others they needed to work on, such as transportation and programming for seniors. Social isolation was a problem that had been noticed in the assessment; and an example was a need to ensure that residents secluded in their homes could get to community events. Part of the implementation process was producing a plan for meeting all the needs the previous phase had identified. In Raymore they chose the option of creating a new document. Another option was to work specific issues or goals into an existing plan, such as a comprehensive plan. Raymore had adopted a very specific Community for All Ages master plan that was also a component of the City's comprehensive plan. That approach allowed the plan to cover all identified aspects including housing, transportation, social services and social inclusion. Mr. David Gress, the

city planner, had become involved at the beginning of this process.

Mr. David Gress gave an overview of projects underway in Raymore as a result of the work on Community for All Ages. He first reviewed the plan's goals and objectives.

Parks, Outdoor Spaces, and Public Facilities: The City was working on two new parks: Hawk Ridge, a regional park for surrounding communities as well as Raymore residents; and T.B. Hanna Station Park, a neighborhood-sized park in the original city of Raymore. Both were currently in the design stage; and they were regularly going back to the plan to confirm that the parks and trail designs met the needs and abilities of all citizens. The Centerview Community Building had opened only last week. Previously the City had lacked space for programs geared to older residents, although parks had ballfields and other features that attracted younger people. Centerview was intended to be a community gathering place, a setting for public gatherings and for classes and other events.

Regarding housing, Raymore was a fast-growing community, and the need for more housing was an opportunity to have options for all age groups. In the annual review of Raymore's Unified Development Code, City staff had proposed an amendment allowing accessory dwellings in most residential districts. At present, these were allowed only in three large-lot districts, and would give families more options to include dwellings for older family members or younger single ones. The City was also working with non-profit groups in Cass County on issues of affordable housing and accessible services. A proposed Universal Design Ordinance would allow more options for people who wanted to live in Raymore.

As a community at some distance from the urban core of the metro area, transportation options had been limited to date. OATS was available in Raymore but was too limited to meet the community's overall needs. They might partner with KCATA but also were also looking to establish a Dial a Ride service. They were also looking for ways to include all age groups in community activities. The Communications Department already reached out to residents via the website, social media, emailings and monthly newsletter but was always looking for improvements in these. The CFAA task force, which had been helpful in the assessment phase, was to stay involved in helping the City stay on track in implementation. The task force had recommended a permanent advisory committee. Partnering with non-profits also included developing community health services that served a wide range of ages. Project Community Connect was a proposed annual event for screenings, checkups and other information. The City was looking into possible partnerships with neighboring communities and various organizations as well as non-profit groups. Implementing the plan had to include keeping people involved, maintaining communication including sharing the program with other communities, and monitoring and adjusting the plan via annual reviews and updates.

Chairperson Norbury remarked that the City of Lee's Summit had recently a commissioned a study on multi-family housing that had been presented to the CEDC a few weeks ago. It had addressed population aging issues and growth in the senior population as well as market demands in general.

Ms. Roberts remarked that walkability had to be part of a community for all ages. Without it, many people had to rely on public transportation, which was extremely expensive and limited freedom of movement since it relied on schedules and routes. Lee's Summit could not make the entire city walkable, so it was more practical to increase density in specific areas where destinations were necessarily not very far apart. That meant an overall shift in thinking about density. She asked if Raymore had identified areas with potential for increased walkability. Mr. Ray Thomas stated that the new community center, located near City Hall, had been a key component of the capital

Planning Commission

Action Letter

June 27, 2017

improvement program and studies about walkability, including sidewalks and a trail network. He agreed that walkability was critical, as well as services such as short-distance shuttles for people who needed that alternative.

In conclusion, Ms. Boyer-Shesol mentioned that a Communities for All Ages coalition of eastern Jackson County had been established about four years ago. This offered considerable support and resources that were available to Lee's Summit.

[2017-1326](#)

Election of Officers

Chairperson Norbury stated that the Commission had four officer positions. He was Chair, Ms. Roberts was Vice Chair, Mr. Funk was Secretary, and the position of Assistant Secretary was currently unfilled. Ms. Dial volunteered for the position. Chairperson Norbury then asked for nominations.

Mr. Gustafson nominated Chairperson Norbury for another term as Chairperson and Mr. Funk seconded. The Planning Commission members voted unanimously by voice vote to re-appoint Mr. Norbury as Chairperson.

Ms. Roberts nominated Mr. Funk for Vice Chair and Mr. Lopez seconded. The Planning Commission members voted unanimously by voice vote to appoint Mr. Funk as Vice Chair.

Chairperson Norbury stated that it was the Secretary's job to sign off on documents. Mr. Funk nominated Mr. Lopez for Secretary. Mr. Funk withdrew his nomination. Mr. Gustafson nominated Ms. Arth for Secretary, and Ms. Lopez seconded. The Planning Commission members voted unanimously by voice vote to re-appoint Ms. Arth as Secretary.

Ms. Roberts nominated Ms. Dial for Assistant Secretary and Mr. Lopez seconded. The Planning Commission members voted unanimously by voice vote to appoint Ms. Dial as Assistant Secretary.

Chairperson Norbury announced that there were two liaison positions, one to the CEDC and one to the Historic Preservation Commission. He asked that Commission members contact him about serving.

PUBLIC COMMENTS
ROUNDTABLE

Chairperson Norbury stated that Mr. McKay wanted the Commission to hold a basic planning commission seminar, due to the recent turnover. Mr. McKay noted that July would be a good time since the schedule was light, adding that this consisted of a Power Point presentation with some basic information and a question and answer session.

Mr. McKay stated that it was time for a joint session with the City Council, to discuss the direction the city was going and for general discussion. September 14th was the proposed date.

Mr. Soto mentioned that staff would give a presentation and bring an updated report on the multi-family housing assessment study at the July 11th meeting.

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".