## gouldevans

December 10, 2021

To: Lee's Summit Planning Commission Cc: Kyle Gorrell, Mike Weisenborn

Re: Request to rescind previous decision regarding LSHS Signage Application (#PL2021-422)

Planning Commissioners,

In the Planning Commission meeting dated Dec. 2, the decision to reject Sign Application #PL2021-422 was rendered in part due to the PowerPoint presentation being limited in details to address the Planning Commission's questions regarding project detailing, and in part due to incorrect information provided by the architect.

To this last point, we would like to clarify answers to the following questions raised in the meeting:

- What is the finish of the structure supporting the scrim? Will it rust? In the
  meeting it was noted that the steel structure is galvanized steel. The primary
  structure is actually epoxy/urethane-coated, while secondary structural elements
  are stainless steel. Both finishes are expected to weather well and are not prone to
  corrosion or rust.
- Is the sign illuminated? In the meeting, it was stated that the sign was not illuminated. The sign is in fact backlit, allowing the graphic to be seen at night. Linear down lights are attached behind the screen per the attached detail and illuminates the wall behind. There is no direct light shining outward towards the parking lots or roads It should be noted that a scale mock-up of a portion of the scrim is to be built prior to construction to review detailing, color, graphic legibility and back-lighting. Additionally, should our request to rescind the previous decision be granted, a rendering of the scrim and graphic at night will be shared directly with the Planning Commission or at an upcoming Planning Commission meeting.

- Will the area behind the scrim at the main entrance create wind turbulence that could collect trash? In the meeting it was shared that we have not had a wind consultant specifically address this issue. However, we have since reached out to a nationally recognized wind consultant to better understand any unforeseen conditions that would be of concern to the School District, Planning Commission, and/or users. Though preliminary discussions do not suggest that the design will present issues with wind turbulence, we are happy to follow up with a more detailed report upon conclusion of this study (approximately 1 week).
- Is there horizontal sub-framing that will be seen through the perforated screen and impact the image? The primary horizontal structural steel member is offset from the perforated screen. There is vertical sub framing (inverse stainless steel channels) that the perforated panels attach to directly and are attached to the primary horizontal tubes. This allows the lighting to graze the back of the perforated screen without creating a shadow effect and impacting the image.
- What is the area of the sign in comparison to the area of the south elevation of the school? The total area of the south building elevation upon completion of the project will be 7,731sf (10,933sf if including south façade of existing A Building recessed). The area of the south-facing graphic scrim is 3,336sf. The area defined by a rectangle that bounds the entirety of text and tiger head graphic is 2,343sf. Again, should our request to rescind the previous decision be granted, a complete south elevation of the school, illustrating the full context of the south scrim and graphic, will be shared directly with the Planning Commission or at an upcoming Planning Commission meeting.

Additionally, it was not made clear in the Dec. 2 meeting that the building elements proposed, and associated materiality, was presented at the Nov. 12, 2020 Planning Commission meeting with a motion carried to approve (#PL2020-304). The PowerPoint presented at that Planning Commission meeting did illustrate the use of a large scrim with graphic at the south entry to the school, however a specific graphic image had not been finalized at that time, and therefore it was noted that graphics and signage would be addressed at a later hearing. Given this previous approval, it was our intent to use the Dec. 2 meeting to focus on the scale and content of the chosen graphic as a follow up to the specific request at the 2020 Planning Commission meeting.

Accordingly, we are requesting your consideration to rescind the previous decision with the clarifications and corrections noted above. We would greatly appreciate the

opportunity to re-present this information to the Planning Commission and we look forward to your response.

Sincerely,

John Wilkins, Principal Gould Evans

