



The City of Lee's Summit
Action Letter
Planning Commission

Tuesday, January 10, 2017

5:00 PM

City Council Chambers

City Hall

220 SE Green Street

Lee's Summit, MO 64063

CALL TO ORDER

ROLL CALL

Present: 6 - Board Member Jason Norbury
Board Member Colene Roberts
Board Member Fred DeMoro
Board Member Don Gustafson
Board Member Donnie Funk
Board Member J.Beto Lopez

Absent: 3 - Board Member Fred Delibero
Board Member Herman Watson
Board Member Brandon Rader

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA

[2017-0862](#) Application #PL2016-202 - VACATION OF EASEMENT - 1710 NE Ozark Dr.;
Trent & Christy Yager, applicant

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

[2016-0822](#) Minutes of the December 13, 2016, Planning Commission meeting

A motion was made by Board Member Roberts, seconded by Board Member Gustafson, that the Minutes was approved. The motion carried unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

[2016-0501](#) CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING - Appl. #PL2016-114 - PRELIMINARY
DEVELOPMENT PLAN - approximately 7.11 acres located at the southeast

corner of NW Blue Pkwy and NW Colbern Rd for the proposed Summit Village; Newmark Grubb Zimmer, applicant.

(NOTE: The applicant has requested this item be continued to a date certain of March 2, 2017.)

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. Michael VanBuskirk, with the law firm of Newmark Grubb Zimmer, gave his business address as 1220 Washington in Kansas City (MO). This project was 'Phase 1A' of the Summit Village development. The applicants were doing this project with and on behalf of Unity Village via Unity Reality. They had worked out some issues concerning financing and construction costs with staff over the past few months. The main building would be for the Summit Eye Clinic. Also present at the meeting, and available for questions, was Mr. Paul Osbourne, the project's civil engineer from Lutjen Associates, which was the applicant's partner on the Unity Village property.

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

Mr. Soto entered Exhibit (A), list of exhibits 1-16 into the record. He displayed a conceptual master plan, noting that the property was annexed to the City in 2011 and that the application tonight was for a preliminary development plan. The conceptual master plan was to provide an overview of how the property could be developed. Lot 1, directly southeast of the Colbern Road/Blue Parkway intersection and indicated in gray, showed how the first phase could be divided into two smaller phases. It was the site of the proposed eye care/surgery center building, about 18,500 square feet. This could be subdivided into a 6,500 square foot first phase and the remaining 12,000 square feet after that. Two 10,000 square foot spec buildings could go in north of this lot, with frontage along Colbern. However, the preliminary development plan in this application was only for the area shaded on the plan; and development outside it would require a separate application and hearings. The plan was consistent with the overall vision for the property. There was a gap between those two structures, and that was where the applicant wanted to use the fence required by the UDO. They wanted to use those existing structures to serve as buffers, supplementing that with some medium-impact buffer landscaping.

The application included one modification request. The Unity Villa Apartments, on Colbern Road, was adjacent to the Phase One lot on the east. This was potentially a commercial use adjacent to multi-family residential and would need a high-impact buffer. That would be a six-foot vinyl fence with masonry piers, with a 20-foot landscape buffer. The applicants were requesting a 10-foot buffer instead, with more trees and shrubs. It would essentially be medium-impact instead of high-impact landscaping. Along the development project's west property line was a two-story apartment building plus a long carport structure along the lower half of the frontage. Staff supported this modification request, as the existing structure plus the fencing and landscaping would meet the intent to provide a significant barrier between the uses. Staff recommended approval of the application subject to Recommendation Items 1 through 3.

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. As there were none, he then opened the hearing for questions for the applicant or staff.

Chairperson Norbury asked for some clarification as to where the buffer was in relation to other elements on the property. Marking the area on the displayed map, Mr. Soto stated that the ordinance required a buffer along that stretch. He marked the places where the fence would begin and end, and pointed out the locations of the buildings. Chairperson

Norbury noted the testimony that a carport was on the south end of the lot; and said that the north corner was his specific concern. He asked if the existing apartment building at that point had ground floor apartments, and Mr. Soto replied that it did. They were oriented so that one side faced the development and the entrances faced north and south; although these units did have a few windows facing the development.

Chairperson Norbury remarked that he would prefer a fence for the whole length of the boundary line; but at any rate, the buffer was intended to separate two different uses. Buffering between two parking lots would not be much of an issue, and the carport would be equivalent to that. However, this situation would be an area where people lived directly adjacent to a commercial use; and he preferred that the fence be longer, preferably extending to the north property line. Mr. Soto suggested it go to a point parallel to the building's northernmost face, and Chairperson Norbury said that was a possibility.

Chairperson Norbury also had some questions concerning the architecture. He asked Mr. VanBuskirk what was the property to the north across Colbern, and Mr. VanBuskirk answered that it was main campus of Unity Village. Chairperson Norbury stated that this was a landmark piece of property in Lee's Summit, and included the tower and some very distinctive buildings. The campus had a unique style; and he was extremely disappointed to see so little reflection of that significance or style in the proposed architecture. Unity Village's architecture had some vertical elements in the tower, arches in the other buildings, and Mediterranean tile roofs as a consistent element. Everything he had seen on the elevations emphasized horizontal elements and had metal roofs. While he would not expect a 21st century office park to have the same early 20th century design as its neighbor, the designs could certainly do better in being consistent with the surroundings. Tonight's application was for the first building, which would tend to set a precedent for the rest of the development.

Mr. VanBuskirk stated that the architect, Mr. Guy Gronberg, was not able to be present; however, the applicants had made a conscious effort to not make anything in the development look like Unity Village. Unity's governing board had wanted the separation of this development from Unity Village to be clear. They intended to put private covenants and restrictions in place since this would be at the front door of the Unity campus. He added that Newmark Grubb Zimmer's other office parks had been done under covenants and restrictions but each architect had made their own decisions so these were not 'cookie cutter' architectural designs.

Ms. Roberts remarked that she did not think the designs should mimic Unity's look in the way that Hazelgrove Elementary school did. Mr. VanBuskirk noted that this building had actually been a Unity school that was donated to the school district. However, she was not entirely at ease with how stark the contrast was. The renderings she had seen suggested that these buildings would look downright unattractive compared with what was visible across the road. She did like them all being oriented toward the street, with parking behind, which ensured that people approaching via the roundabout would see the buildings first, not a parking lot; although the corner building in particular was not attractive visually. Mr. VanBuskirk suggested that she make the comparison to the medical office building immediately to the south. It looked very similar and was the prairie style of architecture. Due to the building's use, they did have some specific requirements especially concerning windows. The overall concept plan did emphasize the buildings being visible and noticeable from the street.

Ms. Roberts summarized that she would like to see something with a little less extreme contrast to what was visible on Colbern across the street; especially in view of this being a historically notable site. To go the such an opposite extreme in appearance, with such sharp edges, did not look to her to have a potential for being visually appealing and in that

setting had the potential to look cheap. She also had a general concern about the site having too much parking, although they were probably over the requirement by about 10 spaces. Mr. Soto answered that parking could be phased in as needed. It had to be planned for enough parking spaces at full build out. It could be scaled out in the initial phases.

Chairperson Norbury agreed that a few design elements used at Unity could help with a visual transition without any of the newer buildings looking like imitations. He wanted to see some alternate approaches, noting that the City Council might have some of the same questions and concerns. In terms of visual reaction, people at the intersection of Blue Parkway and Colbern were likely to look at the surroundings as a unit; and not likely to think in terms of architecture to the south. He respected the Unity board's desire to keep a clear distinction but that would not preclude some kind of visual transition. Ms. Roberts remarked that the New Longview development had taken that approach, making no effort to duplicate the Longview mansion. She was concerned that the contrast between the two properties could easily create an eyesore, and wanted to see something more complementary with the older architecture across the road. Mr. VanBuskirk replied that he would bring this input back to Mr. Gronberg, and consult with staff and the Unity board.

Concerning the parking, Mr. VanBuskirk explained that they had used 6 spaces per 1,000 square feet for the general office use. Concerning screening for the apartments, he added that the deannexation of the property had not included the apartments, so they were closely tied to Unity Village. The applicant had preferred screening with landscaping, since they would prefer their office tenants looking at the landscaping rather than at a vinyl fence. That was the reason for requesting the modification.

Mr. DeMoro asked if the applicant had held meetings with the apartment tenants, and Mr. VanBuskirk replied that they had not, since the residents were not citizens of Lee's Summit. There had been a number of meetings during the deannexation process, and the majority of the tenants had not wanted to be a part of Lee's Summit. No one had wanted the matter to come to a public vote, so the apartments were parceled out. They were sensitive to the opinions of the apartment residents, especially since many of them were Unity Village employees.

Chairperson Norbury asked if there were further questions for the applicant or staff. Hearing none, he closed the public hearing at 5:30 p.m. and asked for discussion among the Commission members, or for a motion.

Mr. DeMoro remarked that Mr. VanBuskirk was giving a workable approach to the concerns about design in offering to pass the Commission's input on to the architect and to the board of Unity Village.

Mr. DeMoro made a motion to recommend approval of continued Application PL2016-114, Preliminary Development Plan: approximately 7.11 acres located at the southeast corner of NW Blue Pkwy. and NW Colbern Rd. for the proposed Summit Village; Newmark Grubb Zimmer, applicant; subject to staff's letter of January 6, 2017, specifically Recommendation Items 1 through 3. Mr. Lopez seconded.

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

On the motion of Mr. DeMoro, seconded by Mr. Lopez, the Planning Commission members voted by roll call vote of three "yes" (Mr. DeMoro, Mr. Lopez, Mr. Gustafson) and three "no" (Chairperson Norbury, Ms. Roberts, Mr. Funk) to recommend APPROVAL of continued Application PL2016-114, Preliminary Development Plan: approximately 7.11

Planning Commission

Action Letter

January 10, 2017

acres located at the southeast corner of NW Blue Pkwy. and NW Colbern Rd. for the proposed Summit Village; Newmark Grubb Zimmer, applicant; subject to staff's letter of January 6, 2017, specifically Recommendation Items 1 through 3.

Ms. Heanue confirmed that since the vote was tied, the matter would go to the City Council. She added that the Legal Department had confirmed the title of the applicant in the motion, since the agenda had given something different.

Chairperson Norbury stated for the record that he had not been expressing disapproval of the project's concept in requesting the changes.

(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 DeMoro, seconded by Board Member Lopez, that this Public Hearing - Sworn was recommended for approval to the City Council - Regular Session, due back on 2/2/2017 The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 3 - Board Member DeMoro
Board Member Gustafson
Board Member Lopez

Nay: 3 - Board Member Norbury
Board Member Roberts
Board Member Funk

Absent: 3 - Board Member Delibero
Board Member Watson
Board Member Rader

[2016-0805](#) CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING - Appl. #PL2016-184 - SPECIAL USE PERMIT renewal for outdoor storage of temporary storage containers - Walmart, 1000 NE Sam Walton Lane; Walmart Real Estate Business Trust, applicant.

Chairperson Norbury opened the hearing at 5:33 p.m. and asked those wishing to speak, or provide testimony, to stand and be sworn in.

Ms. Callie Butts stated that she was a co-manager at the Walmart retail store at 1000 NE Sam Walton Lane in Lee's Summit. They were requesting renewal of the ten-year Special Use Permit that allowed the use of the temporary storage containers during the entire month of December. They also wanted to expand the time period for holiday season storage to 12 weeks: from October 1st through December 31st. The containers were used for overflow inventory for holiday sales.

Chairperson Norbury noted that staff's letter included four Recommendation Items and asked Ms. Butts if the applicant agreed with these, and Ms. Butts answered that they did.

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

Mr. Soto entered Exhibit (A), list of exhibits 1-15 into the record. He stated that the requested SUP renewal would be the second one, as it had been originally approved in October of 1996. The proposed location of the storage containers, along the west (back) side of the store, were shown on the displayed site plan in yellow. A solid masonry fence spanned the entire Independence Avenue frontage, from Tudor Road to the back driveway, on that side. That part of the property also sat below the roadway. The containers were only used during the holiday period, from the first of October through

the end of the year. Temporary storage containers needed for projects like remodeling were allowed by the ordinance. The request was for an additional ten years, and up to 25 containers.

Staff had not received any complaints from nearby property owners including any complaints about noise, trash or debris. A residential neighborhood existed directly to the west of the store's back lot. Staff recommended approval of the Special Use Permit renewal, subject to Recommendation Items 1 through 4.

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. Seeing none, he then asked if the Commission had questions for the applicant or staff.

Ms. Roberts asked if anyone else had an SUP for storage containers. Mr. Soto replied that Walmart was the only one at present. They had not needed them during the holiday season that just ended; but had in recent years. He confirmed for Ms. Roberts that no one had complained about the containers being a nuisance or eyesore.

Mr. DeMoro asked if the containers had merchandise in them when they were delivered and set up. Ms. Butts answered that they were not. The merchandise was transferred from the store to the containers. While the store might use all 25, the containers were only ordered as needed. They were kept locked and only members of management had keys. Mr. DeMoro then asked if the containers arrived in good condition and if store management had the right of refusal if they were not. Ms. Butts answered that they did, and could require the company leasing them to pick them back up.

Chairperson Norbury noted that this application was continued from the December 13, 2016 meeting, at which the applicant had not shown up. Ms. Butts answered that she was new to this store and had not been aware of the previous meeting. Mr. Soto related that there had been a misunderstanding on the part of the store manager, who had thought they would need to be present for the City Council hearing but not for the Planning Commission.

Mr. Gustafson asked about the setbacks in the back of the Walmart lot. He also wanted to know if it was a paved area and if it had parking. Mr. Soto answered that it was paved, and no parking was available on that part of the lot, as it was a loading dock area. The setback would apply only to a permanent structure, not for a temporary use. Mr. Gustafson then asked if the containers were needed because of a shortage of storage space in the store, or because the building was too small; and Ms. Butts answered that they were not. The freight overflow peaked sharply on high-volume days like Black Friday. It was a common practice at every Walmart.

Mr. Funk asked if the temporary storage would have any impact on fire lanes, and Fire Chief Eden answered that it would not. Fire lanes were maintained any time they brought stock on site; and they had to have access to their shipping containers not only for stocking shelves but also adequate circulation for fire access.

Chairperson Norbury asked if there were further questions for the applicant or staff. Hearing none, he closed the public hearing at 5:43 p.m. and asked for discussion among the Commission members.

Ms. Roberts noted that these storage methods had been used since October of 1996 and so Walmart had 20 years to come up with a better solution. She did not like the idea of 30 years of storage containers. Chairperson Norbury pointed out that they were actually building a solution on M-150. He added that he drove by on Independence Avenue every day and really could not see the containers. Moreover, there had been no complaints and

Planning Commission

Action Letter

January 10, 2017

one of the near neighbors was a senior living center. Mr. Lopez said that he worked nearby as well, and he did not think the containers would be a problem.

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

Mr. DeMoro made a motion to recommend approval of continued Application PL2016-184, Special Use Permit renewal for outdoor storage of temporary storage containers: Walmart, 1000 NE Sam Walton Lane; Walmart Real Estate Business Trust, applicant; subject to staff's letter of January 6, 2017, specifically Recommendation Items 1 through 4. Mr. Funk seconded.

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

On the motion of Mr. DeMoro seconded by Mr. Funk, the Planning Commission members voted by roll call vote of four "yes" (Chairperson Norbury, Mr. DeMoro, Mr. Lopez, Mr. Funk) and two "no" (Ms. Roberts, Mr. Gustafson) to recommend APPROVAL of continued Application PL2016-184, Special Use Permit renewal for outdoor storage of temporary storage containers: Walmart, 1000 NE Sam Walton Lane; Walmart Real Estate Business Trust, applicant; subject to staff's letter of January 6, 2017, specifically Recommendation Items 1 through 4.

(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 DeMoro, seconded by Board Member Funk, that this Public Hearing - Sworn was recommended for approval to the City Council - Regular Session, due back on 2/2/2017 The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 4 - Board Member Norbury
Board Member DeMoro
Board Member Funk
Board Member Lopez

Nay: 2 - Board Member Roberts
Board Member Gustafson

Absent: 3 - Board Member Delibero
Board Member Watson
Board Member Rader

[2017-0871](#)

Appl. #PL2016-206 - REZONING from R-1 & CP-2 to PMIX and CONCEPTUAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN - West Pryor Village, approximately 70 acres generally bounded by I-470 on the north, NW Pryor Rd on the east and NW Lowenstein Dr on the southwest; City of Lee's Summit, applicant (continued to a date certain of January 24, 2017, at the applicant's request)

A motion was made by Board Member Roberts, seconded by Board Member Gustafson, that this Public Hearing - Sworn was continued to the Planning Commission, due back on 1/24/2017 The motion carried unanimously.

[2017-0872](#)

Continued PUBLIC HEARING - Appl. #PL2016-209 - REZONING from R-1 & CP-2 to PMIX and PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN - Pryor Lakes,

approximately 32 acres located at the northwest corner of NW Chipman Rd and NW Pryor Rd; Christie Development Association, LLC, applicant (continued to a date certain of February 28, 2017, at the applicant's request)

A motion was made by Board Member DeMoro, seconded by Board Member Lopez, that this Public Hearing - Sworn was continued to the Planning Commission, due back on 2/14/2017. The motion carried unanimously.

[2017-0848](#)

Appl. #PL2016-214 - COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT -

Thoroughfare Master Plan 2015-2040; City of Lee's Summit, applicant

Chairperson Norbury opened the hearing at 5:50 p.m. and asked those wishing to speak, or provide testimony, to stand and be sworn in.

Mr. Park entered Exhibit (A), list of exhibits 1-9 into the record. He stated that the Commission would also have the opportunity to approve a resolution approving the Thoroughfare Master Plan, for the years 2015-2040. This master plan was incorporated into Lee's Summit's Comprehensive Plan. This particular authority was the purview of the Planning Commission. Mr. Park gave a presentation about what the thoroughfare plan was, and the process that had developed it.

Background: This kind of citywide plan was prepared, or updated, every ten years. The last thoroughfare plan was in 2006, and in 1995 before that. Versions before 1995 were done with Comprehensive Plans, dating to the 1960s, on the concept that it needed to be a living document. Tonight's plan, unlike the last two, was done by staff rather than consultants. The Planning Commission had the authority to adopt it as part of the Comprehensive Plan, and it specifically addressed roadways. Other, related transportation plans included the Bicycle Transportation, Sidewalk and ADA Transition and Greenway plans.

Purpose: It would establish a vision of a thoroughfare network at the ultimate build-out of Lee's Summit. This would go past the various plan horizons in the plan. It had a wide scope, and so it applied to corridors and gaps but to smaller scale situations such as intersections or site-specific improvements. Identifying thoroughfare conditions and improvement needs included rights of way and future lanes. The City would use the information in assessing development applications and CIP planning. This use would include looking at traffic impact studies and determining whether a corridor needed to be widened. City staff used the document as a reference for arterial, collector and local street classifications, including those used in design, and for prioritizing future thoroughfare projects. The information was also coordinated with future land use.

Benefits: A definite plan set an expectation for future thoroughfare networks, which would be useful to both residents and developers. Someone considering moving to Lee's Summit could take a realistic look at what roads they would be using. The infrastructure "backbone" could be a basis for planning related features such as trails; as well as infrastructure items like utilities. It was a guide to consider land use and connectivity in development; and was useful in considering locations for fire stations and schools. It was also a summary of potential thoroughfare projects. Mr. Park gave an example from last year in prioritizing a \$20 fund balance for road improvements; since it gave them a clear look at where the needs and the gaps were.

Application: The 2006 Thoroughfare Master Plan had been followed, the next year, by the transportation sales tax issue. The update being considered tonight would be used for the next transportation sales tax, and the City Council would soon consider a 2018

ballot issue on this for April.

Approach: It would be used in scenarios for existing conditions (2015) and for near-term (2025) and long-term (2040) development. Concerning the PRI property, both at the north and southwest parts of town, this version looked at it with PRI north, and with PRI left out altogether; since the owners did not intend to develop either part over the next few decades. Staff estimated that when they did, the north part was more likely to be the first. The 2006 plan had looked at the picture without PRI, with PRI north and PRI south. Lee's Summit's 2040 outlook and horizon also fit in with the Mid-America Regional Council's "Transportation Outlook 2040", the regional transportation plan.

Land use and development projections: These were provided by Planning staff. Overall, staff had considered regional growth, consulted with the Mid-America Regional Council (MARC) and looked at neighboring communities. Development and land use plans in the region could have an impact on Lee's Summit's road network so some regional involvement was essential. Trip assignments would be calibrated based on real traffic data, referencing standard industry sources, such as the Institute Of Transportation Engineers, for trip generation rates of a variety of land uses including schools and retail uses. Essentially staff looked at many of the same elements as the Commission did with applications, only on a city-wide basis.

Mr. Park then displayed a color coded plan showing the information that went into the plan. Existing land use was the basis of the 2015 baseline. The next part of the plan was the land use forecast prepared by the Planning Department. Planning had provided a land use plan for the 2015 version, and that might not exactly match what was currently adopted as the future land use map. Similarly, the Thoroughfare Plan might not match exactly what was in the comprehensive plan, which was comprised of many different 'pieces', in the form of articles. This did not supersede the land use plan but was only used to develop projections. Information the Planning staff provided included land use types and square footages for these types. The next slide compared the 2006 Thoroughfare Master Plan with the new land use data used for the updated. In terms of 2006 projected square footages, they matched up fairly well. The base line year of 2015 was highlighted on both charts.

All roads had a functional classification in the master plan, from interstate highways down to residential collector, local, and thoroughfares in city and county parks. They ranged from high mobility/limited access to very low mobility and access all along the length, and were color coded. Capital road improvements often changed the number of lanes on a road and sometimes speed limits; and these were among the updates. Such changes could impact the number of trips and levels of congestion and delay. Existing traffic counts were then compared to the model volumes for those roads, and to determine the actual volumes with those shown on the model. The map showing projections had drawn on forecasted land use included numbers for 2025 and 2040. These projections would be used in projecting traffic volumes.

Assessment: Staff used these projections, as well as policies, such as the level-of-service policy; and system information, such as a road's condition, to assess capacity, safety, economic development and livability. An assessment of capacity included level of service of a scale of A through F; which would reflect delay and congestion. Policy had established a LOS level of C on urban roads and especially at intersection. Staff had determined which specific areas, such as Colbern Road between Douglas and Blue Parkway, where that goal was not attained and which needed attention.

Evaluation: For both the 2025 and 2040 planning horizons, the evaluation included what capacity improvements were needed, and expected changes to the model that would result from any improvements. Exhibits showed existing numbers of lanes, future land

use and 2025 model traffic conditions.

Analysis: The updated Thoroughfare Master Plan would provide an easy to read diagram of levels of traffic conditions, from uncongested to over capacity. The information would help identify which roadways were most in need of improvements for that 10-25 year period. Most of the noticeably congested roads were on the state highway system. Most of the congested municipal roads were near interchanges; however, many municipal roads would be nearing congestion by 2025, due to people looking for local roads as alternatives as the highways grew more crowded. This would increase by 2040, especially the I-470 corridor from the north city limit down to Colbern. By 2040 this might approach a state of critical failure; and would push traffic over to local roads, particularly Woods Chapel and Todd George Parkway south of Woods Chapel. Mr. Park summarized that while Lee's Summit might not have municipal roads in critical need of improvements, that would happen if the state did not take action in respect to the state highway system.

Mr. DeMoro asked what the process might be to get the state to do that. He noted that northbound I-470 was gridlocked at Friday afternoon rush hour. Mr. Park observed that the state went through the same kind of model making and transportation planning process that he was presenting. It was a matter of finding funds and prioritizing. There were a number of highways that needed improvements; and they were going through the steps to be eligible for more Federal funding. Sometimes the City had to contribute, such as with US 50 and M-291 interchange. He added that using local tax dollars that were really reserved for improving local roads was a difficult decision. MoDOT was planning to widen I-435 from the state line to Blue River Road.

Mr. Park continued that safety was one of the assessment areas. Staff looked at roadway conditions and according to the unimproved road policy determined which were too narrow and should be improved. Scherer Road between M-291 and Sampson Road was a good example of an unimproved or interim road that should be improved for safety.

"Livability" involved closing gaps by expanding transportation access to neighborhoods and businesses. Expanding transportation access would encourage economic activity. The City Council had targeted economic development in certain "market target areas", and this might influence the priorities of transportation improvements. The assessment also mentioned the Livable Streets policy and LS360 Goals. Staff had also heard from the public about what they wanted to see. Economic development could also be related to the safety aspect, such as with unimproved roadways. These could also be unsuitable for development due to limited traffic capacity.

Concerning prioritizing in general, Mr. Park stated that projects with the best combination of the elements of safety, economic development, capacity and livability should be at the top. The chart for the plan's project ranked each project in terms of these four elements. The result was the list of recommended projects for 10 and 25 years out. They were summarized in the Thoroughfare Master Plan as a resource document. The last map showed a summary of the long-term vision of the city in terms of roadways. The City was proposing a resolution to adopt this plan into Lee's Summit's Comprehensive Plan. The City would implement it considering capital projects and development projects; and the thoroughfare plan was likely to influence other plans, such as utility and land use.

Chairperson Norbury asked if there were any comments from the public concerning the Thoroughfare Master Plan. Seeing none, he then asked if the Commission had any questions.

Mr. Gustafson asked if the plan included requiring right-of-way dedications for developments and if there were any changes for rights-of-way. Mr. Park answered that it did, adding that because they were updating the 2006 plan, there were not many changes

to the functional classifications such as arterial and collector streets. Staff had used the plan in implementing a number of projects, and had corrected some technical errors in the plan. One difference was that the 2006 plan had not shown many of the residential collector network, although the arterial street network was essentially the same. Staff had identified the residential collectors during 2008 and 2009; and the new plan would adopt those changes. They had already used the residential collectors in snow route planning and access management in some developments. Arterials offered less access, since their major purpose was mobility. Right-of-way limits for collectors were all standardized at 60 feet for residential streets and a little wider for commercial streets. For arterials, right-of-way width was 100 to 120 feet.

Mr. Gustafson asked if the City had adopted street standards with cross sections, and Mr. Park answered that there were typical sections. These were usually referenced in the design and construction manual, and it was on a case-by-case basis as staff looked at projects. For a major roadway, there was a public engagement process and what the City and public wanted for the road, such as sidewalks and trails. Sidewalk widths were addressed in the UDO, and bike lanes and their widths were in the transportation plan. Concerning features such as bike routes and greenways, Mr. Park emphasized that a variety of plans, such as the Greenway Master Plan, addressed a variety of transportation modes in Lee's Summit.

Mr. Gustafson noted that some cities had provisions such as requiring bike lanes on collector streets, with specifics about rights-of-way. He remarked that this information seemed to be scattered around. Mr. Park noted that the Comprehensive Plan tied all these elements together including plans for water and sewer management, the trail system and the highway network. Other plans might be incorporated into the master plan in the future. Mr. Gustafson asked if there was a specific transit plan, and Mr. Park answered that it was not part of the Comprehensive Plan but the City did have transit studies that were guides to future transit policies. Several plans existed for commuter rail, the most recent from Jackson County and the KCATA in partnership with the Mid-America Regional Council. Both were part of the Rock Island Initiative; and they involved Lee's Summit. It was reflected in the current land use plan. Lee's Summit would be working with the Jackson County Rail Authority at whatever point rights-of-way were needed.

Chairperson Norbury asked what time frame this would have, and Mr. Park answered that realistically it might be full build-out or the 2040 limit of the Thoroughfare Master Plan. Other considerations might come into play such as autonomous vehicles or radical changes in the work culture. However, this study took a conservative approach, as it was difficult to make specific projections that far out.

Ms. Roberts thanked Mr. Park for acknowledging changing technology and culture in his projections, and staff for tackling this daunting task that had been done by consultants in the past.

Mr. Gustafson asked if the plan could be amended at any time. Mr. Park answered that these were usually done during the periodic updates; however, these plans were living documents and they did make changes as needed.

Chairperson Norbury confirmed with Ms. Heanue that the Commission would need to vote to approve the resolution but not the application. He closed the public hearing at 6:27 p.m.

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

OTHER AGENDA ITEMS

[2017-0868](#)

RESOLUTION NO. 2017-01 - A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF LEE'S SUMMIT, MISSOURI, ADOPTING THE THOROUGHFARE MASTER PLAN 2015-2040 AS AN AMENDMENT TO THE CITY OF LEE'S SUMMIT'S COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

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

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".