

The City of Lee's Summit

Action Letter

Planning Commission

Tuesday, May 23, 2017 5:00 PM City Council Chambers City Hall 220 SE Green Street Lee's Summit, MO 64063

CALL TO ORDER

ROLL CALL	This was approved.
	This was approved.
Present:	6 - Board Member Jason Norbury Board Member Colene Roberts Board Member Don Gustafson Board Member Donnie Funk Board Member J.Beto Lopez Board Member Herman Watson
Absent:	2 - Board Member Dana Arth Board Member Brandon Rader
APPROVAL OF AGENDA	
1 APPROVAL OF C	A motion was made by Board Member Roberts, seconded by Board Member Gustafson, that the agenda was approved. The motion carried unanimously. ONSENT AGENDA
	ACTION: A motion was made by Board Member Roberts, seconded by Board Member Gustafson, that this be approved the Consent Agenda.[EN_NR] The motion carried by a unanimous vote.
<u>2017-1234</u>	Appl. #PL2017-108 - SIGN APPLICATION - Monticello subdivision monument sign, 4837 NE Jamestown Dr; Silverstone Development, LLC, applicant
	A motion was made by Board Member Roberts, seconded by Board Member Gustafson, that this sign application was approved. The motion carried unanimously.
PUBLIC HEARINGS	
	CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING - Appl. #PL2017-075 - COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT - Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) 2018-2022; City of Lee's

Summit, 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. Michael Anderson entered Exhibit (A), list of exhibits 1-9 into the record, and gave a brief history of the CIP. It was essentially an overview of the projects the City expected to undertake for the next five years. The CIP was a flexible document and was updated every year. It being a 'financially constrained' list of projects kept the list relatively short. The City anticipated the revenues from the various funding sources and balanced them against the estimated project costs. While it was a planning document, it would become the City's capital budget once adopted by the City Council during the first year of the CIP; so it was a budget document as well. The Planning Commission adopted the CIP annually as an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan, via a public hearing. The City's charter also required it to be adopted by the Council; and the CIP would be presented at the City Council meeting of June 1st.

The total cost of the proposed CIP would be \$311,173,000, an increase from the current version, which was a little under \$304,000,000. Mr. Anderson explained that every year, some projects would be completed and others added; in this case the public safety bond for Fire Station #3 and radio upgrades. Parks and Recreation had continued receiving the .25 cent sales tax, and they had a number of projects.

Mr. Anderson then addressed the major funding sources. In 2007, the voters had approved a capital improvements sales tax, which was the funding for the Bailey Road, Hook Road, Chipman Road, Lee's Summit Road and Jefferson Street projects. This sales tax had been continued for another 15 years via the last election. However, the City would not collect the funds until the next fiscal year and they would prioritize all the projects in the meantime. The general obligation bonds had funded stormwater projects, the Downtown Cultural Arts Facilities project, Tudor Road, the M-291 interchange, Fire Station 3 and the radio system upgrades. Water and sewer tap fees funded improvements and rehab projects and the transportation sales tax had funded the Pavement Management program as well as various road, traffic signal and bridge projects and neighborhood safety programs.

The City had taken advantage of state and Federal grants as much as possible. The airport was a major recipient; and the Blackwell and M-291/US 50 interchanges. TIFFs and TDDs had funded the Blackwell/US 50 interchange and the Independence Avenue/Town Centre roundabout to be constructed next year.

The next side was a list of completed projects, which included curb replacement, improvements for various roads, a trail connector, a bridge replacement and water main rehabilitation. Some projects had been deleted and many were incorporated into new projects, such as the items pertaining to T-hangars for the airport. The airport's runway extension, safety area and perimeter fencing had been incorporated into the current paving contract. The Scherer Road and Heartwood improvements were no longer a standalone project, as Scherer Road from Jefferson to the west city limits was already being considered for the new CIP sales tax funding. Some of the water projects would be also incorporated into other goals. One project, 5th Terrace from Country Lane to Greenridge had been in the CIP last year and Public Works recommended that this project be removed.

New projects for the airport included the south apron expansion and the east side terminal. Bridges, streets and signals did not have many changes other than two intersection signal projects. Ward Road from Tudor to Blue Parkway might be added to replace the 5th Terrace project being removed. Fire Station 3 would get a radio system upgrade as well as the fuel station being moved. Parks and Recreation would use the renewed half-cent sales tax to fund Arts In Parks and the Athletic Field House, as well as a number of projects with locations to be determined including neighborhood park renovations and upgrades. The sanitary sewer and water projects included a number of asset management plans as well as condition assessments and rehabilitations. Water main rehabs included Lakewood Way from Ridgewood to Bowlin and Sampson Road.

The deletion of the 5th Terrace project from Country Lane to Greenridge had been recommended by the Public Works Committee. This was influenced comments from people in the neighborhood who would be directly affected by removing the 5th Terrace bridge. The Commissioners' maps showed this as project 15. It was replaced by the completion of the four-lane section of Ward Road between Tudor and Blue Parkway. The section from Chipman to Tudor was already being done by the developer; and this stretch would also have a multi-use path and lighting. The proposed project would begin where the developer had left off, with the same amenities.

Mr. Anderson concluded that the action requested from the Planning Commission was to approve a resolution adopting the CIP as an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan. The Commission could have some public comment, and could recommend the CIP be adopted as presented or as proposed by the Public Works Committee. The Commission could also opt to postpone until the City Council met and made their decision. That would mean continuing it until the next Planning Commission meeting on June 13th.

Chairperson Norbury asked if there was anyone present who wanted to comment or had any questions about this application.

Mr. Ken Sessa gave his address as 1561 SE 5th Street in Lee's Summit. He had owned the property since 2003, and it was adjacent to 5th Terrace. The Public Works Committee had voted to stop work on the CIP's 5th Terrace project (#41632272), and substitute a widening of Ward Road. Mr. Sessa stated that as Lee's Summit's population continued to grow, demands on public services grew as well. Capital improvements had long life spans; so being realistic in making decisions was especially important. Good planning decisions included public vetting of economic development considerations, including getting the public involved and identifying whatever problems needed to be addressed. Any impact analysis should cover the full range of impacts, both positive and negative. This was a fully developed neighborhood with residents who had been there for a number of years and no undeveloped land; and the 5th Terrace bridge was in an established residential neighborhood with no potential for economic development or increasing the tax base. The City Council had recognized that previous planning efforts in this area did not reach the citizens who would be directly affected by this project, which was why it had sent this to the Public Works Committee for reconsideration. The residents had brought additional information to the meeting, City staff identified other capital projects that would have more positive impact. Since the Planning Commission would give a recommendation to the Council, Mr. Sussa urged the Commissioners to be consistent with the previous decisions of the Council and the Committee in considering the 5th Terrace project.

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

Chairperson Norbury asked if the motion would be to recommend drafting a resolution wording if the Commission's action would be to move the plan forward, approving that resolution under "other agenda items". Ms. Yendes replied that a resolution was already prepared that the Commission could choose to pass tonight. They would approve the CIP as presented. In the case of the 5th Terrace project, the Public Works Committee had recommended to the City Council that the Council direct the City Manager to terminate services under contract to design the 5th Terrace bridge, pay for the work done and complete the hydrology studies. The recommendation was also to remove it from the CIP via the decision regarding funding. The Council had not actually voted up or down to stop the project; and if the Commission wanted to wait until the final decision was made at the Council meeting, they would continue the application until the June 13th Planning Commission meeting. If the Council chose to not fund the project, the Commission would have the chance

Planning Commission Action Letter May 23, 2017

to substitute another project to be funded. Chairperson Norbury asked if the Commission also had the option to make a substitute tonight, since the CIP was also a planning document; and Ms. Yendes answered that it did. That would mean not funding the 5th Terrace bridge project; but the Council would make its own decision on which to fund.

Regarding replacing the bridge, Ms. Roberts stated that this neighborhood included an elementary school and park nearby. Improving pedestrian access to the bridge could improve the neighborhood, which would mean that schoolchildren could get around the neighborhood on foot safely. Mr. Park explained that due to the funding source, this project was a matter of all or nothing. The pedestrian and bicycle access would come with the bridge and road, and the City would not be able to fund a project for a non-motorized access bridge.

Mr. Funk asked if money had already been spent on the 5th Terrace project. Mr. Anderson replied that they had already gone through the preliminary design stage and some of the hydraulic studies, which the City intended to have completed.

Chairperson Norbury summarized that the Commission could choose to approve the plan as is, subject to the City Council's decisions; make a recommended change, or continue the application until the next meeting, which would be after the plan had gone back to the Council.

Chairperson Norbury asked if there were further questions for the applicant or staff. Hearing none, he closed the public hearing at 5:25 p.m. and asked for discussion among the Commission members.

Ms. Roberts was uncertain about what recommendation to make concerning the 5th Terrace bridge. Chairperson Norbury stated that since the plan still had to go back to the Council, continuing it would make the most sense. He concurred with Ms. Roberts' concern about non-motorized connectivity.

Ms. Roberts remarked that normally she would support making connections in a neighborhood that had a gap. That gap had been there for decades so it was difficult to argue for connectivity at this point; but on the other hand, not providing at least pedestrian and bicycle access in a neighborhood near an elementary school seemed a missed opportunity that she was not altogether in favor of passing on.

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

A motion was made by Board Member Lopez, seconded by Board Member Funk, that this public hearing was continued. to the Planning Commission, due back on 6/13/2017 The motion carried unanimously.

OTHER AGENDA ITEMS

```
2017-1206RESOLUTION NO. 2017-02 - A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION<br/>OF THE CITY OF LEE'S SUMMIT, MISSOURI, ADOPTING THE CAPITAL<br/>IMPROVEMENT PLAN 2018-2022 AS AN AMENDMENT TO THE CITY OF LEE'S<br/>SUMMIT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, AS AMENDED, AND APPROVING THE<br/>LOCATION, EXTENT AND CHARACTER OF ALL PUBLIC IMPROVEMENT<br/>DESCRIBED IN THE CITY OF LEE'S SUMMIT CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN<br/>2018-2022.
```

Ms. Yendes suggested that the Planning Commission also continue this item to the next meeting. Chairperson Norbury called for a motion.

Mr. Lopez made a motion to continue Resolution No. 2017-02: A Resolution Of The Planning

Commission Of The City OfLee's Summit, Missouri, Adopting The Capital ImprovementPlan 2018-2022 As An Amendment To The City Of Lee's Summit Comprehensive Plan, AsAmended, And Approving The Location, Extent And Character Of All Public ImprovementDescribed InThe City Of Lee's Summit Capital Improvement Plan 2018-2022, ComprehensivePlan Amendment:Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) 2018-2022; City of Lee's Summit,applicant; to a date certain of June 13, 2017.Ms. Roberts 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 Lopez, seconded by Board Member Roberts, that this Resolution was continued. to the Planning Commission, due back on 6/13/2017 The motion carried unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMENTS ROUNDTABLE

Chairperson Norbury stated that as Commissioner Fred DeMoro was now on the City Council, the Commission now had few than the required number of Commissioners. Ms. Dana Arth was appointed as a new Planning Commission member. Mr. DeMoro had also been the Commission's secretary, so the Commission needed to choose a replacement. He asked for a nomination. Ms. Roberts nominated Mr. Funk, who was Assistant Secretary; and Mr. Lopez seconded. The Commission then voted unanimously by voice vote to appoint Mr. Donnie Funk as Assistant Secretary.

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".