

The City of Lee's Summit

Action Letter

Planning Commission

Tuesday, August 28, 2018

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 Jeff Sims
Board Member Jake Loveless

Absent: 1 - Board Member Herman Watson

Approval of Agenda

Chairperson Norbury announced that there were no changes to the agenda, and asked for a motion to approve. On the motion of Mr. Funk, seconded by Ms. Roberts, the Planning Commission voted unanimously by voice vote to APPROVE the agenda as published.

Public Comments

There were no public comments presented at this meeting.

1. Approval of Consent Agenda

A. [2018-2246](#) Approval of the August 14, 2018 Planning Commission Minutes

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

Public Hearings

2. [2018-2218](#) Continued Public Hearing - Appl. #PL2018-100 - Preliminary Development Plan - Reece Nichols, 222 SW Main St & 207 SW Market St; Engineering Solutions, LLC, applicant.

Chairperson Norbury opened the hearing at 5:07 p.m. and asked those wishing to speak, or provide testimony, to stand and be sworn in.

Mr. Matt Schlicht of Engineering Solutions gave his business address as 50 SE 30th Street in Lee's Summit. Also present at the meeting were Mr. Dusty Dahmer, the developer and Mr. Chad Dumas representing the tenant, Reece Nichols were also present. The location was the old City Hall site between Market and Main Streets on the east and west and 3rd and 2nd on the north and south. Mr. Dahmer had purchased the property in 2007, when the old City Hall was torn down. The Main Street public parking lot had remained. The City had looked at a number of development options for the property but none had been put in place to date. They proposed a two-story, 10,000 square foot office building. A third floor that would provide roof access might be added later. The project had two components in the Market Street side and the Main Street side, in that they wanted to build an on-site parking lot on Market Street, on the old City Hall site. It would have 52 on-site spaces plus six parallel parking spaces on Market and three restriped ones on Main.

Colored elevations showed primarily brick construction materials and EIFS, with four-sided architecture. Mr. Schlicht pointed out the side that would face Main Street. On a building floor plan, he pointed out the stairway on both stories, which could be extended to provide roof access. He then pointed out the Main Street side and entry area. The building would be in line with the adjacent buildings to the south. The historic building and museum to the north was set back a little further, but the new building would have the same character and style. An existing alley came off 3rd Street to access the back of the site, which had parking behind the building.

A proposed trash enclosure would be at the back of the alley, replacing some dumpsters currently on the site. They'd had exchanges with the neighbors about consolidating the trash containers.

The parking lot off Market Street could be accessed via the alley off Market. The alley up to the proposed parking lot entrance was owned by the City; but toward its end it became a private access, owned by the adjacent businesses. Mr. Schlicht pointed out the parallel parking on Market that would be added.

They were requesting three modifications. Being in the Downtown district its a little different and unique building area. The required 20-foot parking lot setback for parking lots was more difficult to adapt to the Downtown area, and they asked that this be reduced to 11 feet. They also requested a modification to the floor to area ratio (FAR), as this was two stories on the small lot on the Main street side. The modification request for landscaping was due to the UDO requirements being difficult to meet in the older Downtown district. They were asking to reduce or eliminate the minimum, although they would have landscaping on the site where it could be made to work.

A neighborhood meeting on August 21st was attended by about 11 people. Loss of the existing parking on Main Street was one of the concerns raised. People had been parking in the lot at 222 Main, which was owned by Mr. Dahmer, for a number of years. Reece Nichols wanted to control the parking spaces in the proposed on-site parking lot on Monday through Friday during business hours, before 5:00 p.m. Public use would be allowed after 5:00 p.m.

and on weekends. Another concern was over access from Market and who owned the property. The title work gave the date when Mr. Dahmer purchased the property from the City. The alley had been owned by the City, and the City was allowing public access through the alleyway. The mural on the existing Main Street building would be covered. Mr. Schlicht remarked that this was an unfortunate situation but things like that were going to happen during redevelopment. Concerning consolidating the dumpsters, some of the neighbors were in favor of it and some against. Mr. Schlicht then referred the Commissioners to the Historical Society's letter in the packets. The letter discussed some of their concerns, including losing the adjacent parking lot. After discussion, it appeared that Main Street's parking was largely taken up by Amtrak users. The proposed solution was to convert all the long-term parking on Main Street to two-hour parking, so Amtrak users would have to use the City lot on Market. A sidewalk would provide a connection between the Amtrak station and the public lot.

Staff did not support the on-site parking lot, partly because they considered that it was not the best use in this location. The applicant had a lease agreement with Reece Nichols, who wanted to build an office building in Downtown Lee's Summit, and wanted a parking lot for that facility. That tenant would not want to build and utilize that space with an adjacent parking lot. The applicant believed the on-site parking was a good use. He pointed out the strip near the Amtrak station where parking was basically unrestricted, as well as sidewalk they proposed, which would provide access to the public parking lot. Putting two-hour parking in place on that stretch of Main would address the parking problem in front of the Historical Society.

Staff had also referenced the 2016 Downtown Parking Study in the report, indicating an excess of parking on the west side of the railroad tracks. While this was true for the west side in general, the block where the subject property had a shortage. The block that included the subject property had only about half the spaces it needed. Including the other three blocks on the west side should make it work; however, the tenant wanted to invest in a 10,000 square foot building and bring a number of employees into the area. Additionally, clients would want to park at the facility and not have to walk to get to it. Mr. Schlicht added that they agreed with Recommendation Items 1 and 2, but not with Recommendation Item 3 as it called for removing the parking lot from the plan.

Mr. Chad Dumas stated that Reece Nichols had 250 agents and employees at their current office. They were among the top-performing real estate offices in the Kansas City metro area. They often partnered with businesses in Downtown Lee's Summit including Social Services and a number of bars and restaurants. He confirmed that the parking was an important part of the development for the company. Clients came and went for closings and for meetings, sometimes lengthy and sometimes lasting only a few minutes. He pointed out that in these circumstances clients often patronized local businesses, such as getting lunch or a drink after the appointment. However, this also indicated a need for some on-site parking, and the lot would be open to the public after business hours and on weekends.

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

Mr. McGuire entered Exhibit (A), list of exhibits 1-14 into the record. Tonight's application was for a two-story, 10,700 square foot commercial building. The building would be on Lot 2 of 222 SW Main Street, on the former City Hall lot next to the museum; and a surface parking lot on Lot 1 next to the parcel at 207 SW Market Street. The building would be a real estate office, and the developer intended to take possible future development of the rooftop into account, such as a rooftop deck. Any such development would require the owner to go through the City's approval process. The property was currently zoned CBD, as were surrounding properties to the north, south and east. The property to the west on SW Market was zoned PMIX. Mr. McGuire noted that this was a correction to staff's letter.

Staff did not support the proposed parking lot on Lot 1, and recommended removing it from the preliminary development plan. From a land use and zoning perspective, a parking lot was an allowed use by right in CBD zoning; however, this proposed lot was an under-utilization of a commercially viable property. It was not the highest and best use for this property and could hinder its long term redevelopment. The City's Downtown Parking Study indicated sufficient public parking for anticipated demand, making an on-site lot unnecessary.

The property was in Lee's Summit's Downtown historical district, and the surrounding one- and two-story brick buildings were built between 1887 and 1950. Mr. McGuire displayed a color elevation of the proposed building, stating that its design was consistent Downtown's style and historical character. It conformed with the Downtown design requirements as set out in the UDO. Brick, glass and EIFS would be the primary materials.

The parking plan included six spaces on Lot 2, the 46-space lot on Lot 1, and the six parallel parking spaces on Market, with a total of 58 spaces. Based on four parking spaces per 1,000 square feet, only 43 spaces were required. Staff believed that enough public parking was available to serve the proposed development adequately, and the City's parking data supported staff's recommendation that the on-site parking lot be removed from the plan. Staff's report provided information showing that excess capacity also existed on the blocks immediately adjacent to the subject property. Adequate public parking existed within the required distance to the proposed development to support additional parking demand.

Staff supported the requested modification to the FAR (Recommendation Item 1), allowing a 1.12 ratio with 1.00 being the required maximum. This was a redevelopment in a Downtown block and conformed to the Downtown Master Plan's goal of encouraging multi-story buildings. It was not uncommon for Downtown buildings to exceed the FAR maximum, and the ratio with multi-story buildings in CBD ranged between 1.00 and 2.00.

In Recommendation Item 2, the modification would allow for no landscaping. The UDO called for *"1 street tree per 30 feet of street frontage plus 1 shrub per*

20 feet of street frontage; and 1 tree and 2 shrubs per 5,000 square feet of open yard area.” Mr. McGuire pointed out that these requirements were adopted to fit suburban style development with large setbacks and large open areas. They did not suit dense urban developments and traditional downtown environments, which often had small to nonexistent setbacks. Staff supported this request.

Recommendation Item 3 at present recommended that the proposed parking lot on Lot 1 not be approved. However, if the City Council did support and approve it, staff supported a modification to allow an 11-foot setback along Market Street. The wording of Recommendation Item was changed to read: *“A modification shall be granted to the 20' minimum parking lot setback from the right-of-way, to allow an 11' parking lot setback on Lot 1 from the SW Market Street right-of-way.”*

Following Mr. McGuire's comments, Chairperson Norbury asked if there was anyone present wishing to give testimony, either in support for or opposition to the application. He asked that those commenting keep their remarks to three minutes and to stay on topic.

Mr. John Wyznewsy gave his address as 4320 SE Furlong and stated that he was a Board member of the Historical Society. He mentioned that the Society was a tenant in a City owned building and had a 25-year lease. They mostly approved of the project and understood the importance of infill redevelopment Downtown. Parking was the main item of concern. Only the east side of Main Street had long-term parking, while the west side had a 2-hour limit. The museum docents worked in two-hour increments, so rather than park on Main they often used the parking lot to the south. They could park in the long-term City parking lot off Market. However, like some retail businesses the Museum depended in part on people being able to park in front or only a few doors down. Also, staff's parking parking evaluation did not take about 20 spaces in Mr. Dahmer's lot into account. What were now about 60 available parking spaces would be reduced by 20 if the vacant lot was no longer available. The Historical Society would like to see some creative solutions regarding limits on hours and types of parking on Main Street. They would also want to see the applicant address pedestrian circulation between buildings. Finally, they were not happy about plans to cover the mural. While it had no historical significance, people often visited the museum who had stopped to take pictures of the mural.

Mr. Bob Nedderville stated that he owned the two buildings next to the Dew Drop Inn. That area had a lot of off-street parking and the businesses in the two buildings he owned had seen an increase in traffic, with people from well outside Jackson County. The building at 18 SW 3rd now had a new occupant on the second floor and also had a general increase in activity. The project underway west of Market Street would also significantly increase traffic; and this all added up to an increase need for more parking. Mr. Nedderville added that the City had been given documents concerning the ownership of the portion of the alley from Market, and these dated to the 1880s. It had existed as a private alleyway for several decades.

Concerning the dumpsters, his two buildings shared a dumpster that was

emptied twice a week. Consolidating the dumpsters would put them about a block away. He did not like the idea of the parking lot emptying into the space behind the existing buildings.

Mr. Sean Verritasse stated that the alley that went back where the dumpsters would be moved was not shown on any County map as a platted alley. Technically the access that the applicants were planning to bring as much as half the traffic through was currently a dead-end alley whose use was almost all pedestrian. There were several different back doors that opened onto that alley, with people often using them as exits; and the applicants were bringing in over 50 parking spots. He believed that this warranted some attention in terms of safety, especially considering how fast he had seen people drive through alleyways. Mr. Verritasse did not have any specific objections to the building's design; however, Main Street already did not have enough space for people who wanted to bring in retail businesses and restaurants and office buildings did not tend to generate foot traffic and commercial activity.

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

Mr. Funk asked if it was correct that the building would have 220 employees. Mr. Dumas clarified that they had 250 real estate agents; however, there was never a time when they were all at the office at once. Events like sales meetings generally happened on Tuesday, and on those days it would be 50 or 60 people. The day of the meeting they had 55 cars in the parking lot. Many of these cars would be coming and going throughout the day, as agents tended to be in and out of the office regularly. Mr. Funk remarked that with even half the number he'd mentioned, it would be one person every 70 square feet and 153 cars. Mr. Dumas clarified that in this particular business many of the participants were not employees but independent contractors who did not necessarily work regular business hours. It was not likely that half that number would be there at any one time. Mr. Funk replied that in that case, the project did already have sufficient parking without the proposed parking lot. Mr. Dumas noted that when he had driven by today, about 30 cars were parked on the lot. He acknowledged that their owners would have to park them somewhere else after this development was completed. However, their clients did expect to be able to walk right in and walk right out, and he would prefer that agents use the long-term parking only and keep the two-hour spots for clients.

Mr. Gustafson asked if the Downtown Parking Study assumed the future uses on each lot. Mr. Michael Park answered that it used more than one analysis scenario. They had collected data in October of 2016, and one of the scenarios was the parking supply and demand at that time. It assumed current uses for this block, and in terms of actual demand the utilization was about 55 percent during peak weekday hours, including all parking. However, another scenario was based on a long-term redevelopment and growth plan for Downtown. This showed redevelopment of this property, with no surface parking and the previously referenced parking shortage for this block. That would be compensated for with structured parking. A number of plans for Downtown had been brought forward over the last decade or so that had forecasted a high rate

of growth and development. A great deal depended on the forecasts of supply and demand for all the projected scenarios. Mr. Gustafson asked what uses were proposed or forecasted for this property. Mr. Park explained that land uses were often applied to blocks and to densities. The best information was the proposed three-story Market Street building, and some structured parking would have gone with that project, about 60 spaces in all.

Mr. Gustafson observed that Lot 1 was a good-sized lot, and asked what parking would be needed for office use, and if they would provide parking on site. Mr. Park replied that if Lot 1 was developed as staff recommended they would have to find available parking within 300 to 500 feet according to the UDO. If Lot 1 was developed without the parking lot, most of the supply would be taken by the office building on Lot 2. That would raise an issue as to whether the City would need to consider structured parking on the west side of Downtown. The long term approach for Downtown in general was to move away from surface lots and concentrate it instead in structured parking. That could be done via public funding or public-private partnerships. Mr. Park added that a number of unknown factors went with parking projections; however, policy trends across the U.S. were to reduce parking and have allowed parking quotas or maximums. Some Downtown areas were not adding parking at all. In this case, he agreed with staff's conclusion that there was a higher and better use for the lot. Mr. Gustafson remarked that reduction of public parking was dependent on availability of public transit, which Lee's Summit did not have.

Mr. Loveless asked if staff or the developer had a diagram of the existing spaces or this site. Mr. Schlicht displayed an aerial view of the public parking and pointed out the public lot to the north, stating that it had 43 spaces. He pointed out other locations of spaces on Market and 3rd Streets, as well as 14 spaces on the west side of Main across from the Amtrak station. He noted that tonight's testimony indicated a shortage parking spaces in that area, also acknowledging that the public lot was rarely full. He reminded that the applicants did plan to provide pedestrian access including the walking access from Main to Market. They did not intend for the narrow alley to be the main access point but rather for everything to come through Market Street. Regarding the relocated dumpsters, they were willing to take suggestions for a more accessible point. As far as he knew, the alley was owned by the City of Lee's Summit.

Mr. Loveless then asked if the developer had evaluated whether this project would be feasible without on-site parking, and if he had considered structured parking. Mr. Schlicht clarified that he did not want the parking lot to indicate to anyone that it was the end of this. The developer would continue to work with Engineering Solutions to figure it out. In 2007 they had brought a plan forward that utilized both lots. The developer did have a lease agreement with Reece Nichols to construct and build within a year. They were going to put the building together and that might be the project while the parking issues were resolved. That might be structured parking or the lot might be shifted. The 10,700 foot building would essentially go away if the developer did not have the parking lot on Lot 1.

Ms. Roberts remarked that until tonight's meeting she had never heard anyone

from the City say that they could be responsible for the parking, including covering costs at taxpayers' expense, and the applicant turn them down. She had formerly worked for the city of Kansas City but was now working at home so she did not leave Lee's Summit very often. She had discovered that Lee's Summit had everything she needed. She had gone to the Country Club Plaza a few times and it was a very popular place. People there did not necessarily see surface parking lots due to the abundance of structured parking that was hidden behind building design. People found them easily due to signage. If one parking deck was full, it was difficult to find one that wasn't. She certainly did not turn around and go home.

Mr. McGuire had mentioned that this was not a standard suburban development, and due to that the City could not expect landscaping. However, should making that distinction be consistent, no one could reasonably expect the parking that would be available at an office building in a suburban setting. The bottom line was that this zoning was CBD, which was not in any sense a suburban designation. People expected in that kind of setting that they would have to walk a block or two; and the setting produced by keeping to CBD standards was a pleasant one. She asked if the City needed to put up more signage to direct people to the parking facilities Downtown already had. Mr. Schlicht answered that this was a source of the constant head-butting with staff. Discussions and descriptions went to the Plaza and Kansas City and the CBD district in Lee's Summit was remote from that. However much anyone might love it, the Plaza's land value was so high that people had no other choice than structured parking. Ms. Roberts asked if the dollar value was the only value to place on it, and Mr. Schlicht answered that the City had a prospective tenant who, like it or not, had a use that he wanted a user to be able to come to his parking lot and the user had a lease that included it. While he understood where the City wanted Downtown to go, this property was west of the railroad tracks and was outside of what had been the development area.

Chairperson Norbury asked Mr. Schlicht if it was his opinion that the CBD and Downtown development in general stopped at the east side of the railroad tracks. Mr. Schlicht answered that it was not. There just had not been as much development on the west side of Downtown. Chairperson Norbury responded that this did not mean ignoring standards, and Mr. Schlicht stated that the CBD had fringe areas that were going to develop in a certain fashion. Less space was available on the east side, so it was not practical to construct a surface lot. More properties with surface parking lots were on the west side, and it was a stretch to compare Downtown Lee's Summit to the Plaza in Kansas City.

Ms. Roberts asked Mr. Park if he and staff would address the parking situation, since Downtown got more development and needed more parking. Mr. Park replied that the City had been addressing it, via partnerships with private developers and the sales tax initiative for a new parking garage. The Planning Commission, the city's elected officials and its citizens had established a vision for Downtown. The growth might get to a tipping point where Downtown would not need more parking, but it would have to increase at that point.

Ms. Roberts then related that the zoning standards in the CBD district were

somewhat different from the rest of town. Some things, such as mixed use within the same building, were allowed in CBD zoning but not elsewhere. She asked Mr. McGuire if it was fair to say that this kind of variation could be a priority, in the interest of Downtown providing both residential and commercial space on the same property. Mr. McGuire agreed that a good mix of commercial and residential was good for Downtown Lee's Summit.

Mr. Funk asked Mr. Park if the plan was to change the current front-in parking on Main Street to parallel parking. Mr. Park answered that it was not. Mr. Schlicht had been referring to the time-limited parking on one side of Main and unrestricted parking on the other side. The suggestion had been to have two-hour parking on the whole street, in order to get more turnover for the spaces near the Amtrak station. Mr. Funk observed that it would be a fairly simple matter if the City wanted to change the two-hour parking in front of the museum to unrestricted parking. Mr. Park answered that there would be more to it than changing signs, and he did not think that this was the request. It was to make all the parking on that part of the street two hours. Making the east side two hours, with unrestricted parking across the street, would just mean that Amtrak users would cross the street with nothing else changing. The change from unrestricted parking to two hours would be done by the City Council, after staff proposing an ordinance. He would be inclined to support these changes on the basis of what the Downtown Main Street organization proposed. Mr. Funk then asked if the alleys were directional in any way, and Mr. Park answered that they were not.

Mr. Gustafson asked Mr. Park if it was correct that the City was proposing parallel parking on Market, and Mr. Park replied that it was. Mr. Gustafson then noted that angled parking would provide more spaces, in a part of Downtown that he'd heard had a parking shortage. He asked if the City had considered doing that instead, and Mr. Park answered that neither the developer nor the applicant had proposed that. It would encroach into their developable property via setbacks and right-of-way. The parallel parking would be consistent with other parking along Market and 3rd Streets. After the project was done, it would be difficult and expensive to change the parallel parking to angled parking.

Regarding the alley, Mr. Gustafson remarked that it looked like a right-of-way continued up to the bank property. He asked about fire and other emergency access once the development was complete. Mr. Park stated that there was no alley that extended up to the bank. Emergency access had been reviewed and the review would continue as more plans came in. The alley would be vacated and access easements put in place. Staff had checked on there being sufficient space for turning movements of emergency vehicles.

Assistant Fire Chief Jim Eden stated that the Fire Department took a look at all sites before and during development, to ensure that fire protection was in place. He confirmed that the proposed building was sprinklered.

Mr. Sims asked if parking was currently allowed on the 20-foot platted alley that currently existed as a dead end. Mr. Park answered that it was not. Mr. Sims then noted that the alley had some existing utility poles and that would need to

be addressed if it was the entrance, and Mr. Park said that was correct. Mr. Sims then noted that the Market Street alley was only 16 feet wide, and asked if this would mean that two-way traffic on any parking lot entrance would not be possible. Mr. Park explained that two-way traffic would be allowed; and the entrance would need to be constructed accordingly. He added that parking in alleys was generally prohibited.

Chairperson Norbury noted that constructing buildings Downtown involved an additional set of design standards. The design had to fit with the surrounding buildings as well as Downtown architecture as a whole. He asked about the color of the proposed brick and where the color scheme had originated. Mr. Schlicht related that they'd had a couple of versions of the building's design. On the current colored elevations, he pointed out the front façade and brick line and the size, spacing and proportions of windows on both floors, stating that they were all consistent with Downtown's historic buildings. This was especially important since the buildings across Market were all one-story buildings. The intent was to continue Main Street's look across the railroad tracks. Chairperson Norbury asked about the keystone element on the second floor windows, remarking that he had not seen this on period buildings Downtown. Most of them had either an arched or contrasting brickwork. This had concrete fascia with a keystone element.

Mr. Dahmer stated that he had worked with staff to be in compliance with all design standards. It was only at the design stage at this point, and he offered to change the window detail. The tops and lower edges of the windows were supposed to line up with the neighboring buildings. The brick on the building to the south had been painted and he wanted to look of fresh brick. Chairperson Norbury then noted that the distance between this proposed building and the one to the north was so narrow, a little under five feet. Mr. Dahmer stated that this was the distance from the property line, plus the setback; not the building itself. Chairperson Norbury asked about the existing building to the south, and Mr. Schlicht confirmed that in that case the distance was about five feet. Mr. Dahmer confirmed for Chairperson Norbury that Downtown's sidewalks were also five feet. Chairperson Norbury remarked that while this was wide enough to walk through, it did not seem like a pedestrian-friendly space, especially when there would be so little light. Moreover, the building would obviously be empty at night so that space might not even be viewed as safe. He asked if anything could be done to either make this a pedestrian-friendly space or make it more clearly not one. Mr. Schlicht explained that the reason for that spacing was that the neighboring building was about 115 years old and they wanted to avoid anything that might cause any conflict including the buildings' foundations being too close together. They had not intended this to be a walkable space could block off that stretch if necessary. Mr. Dahmer added that the space also enabled them to have windows on all four sides.

Mr. Schlicht summarized that the neighbors had testified about a problem with parking, and reminded the Commission that the proposed surface parking lot would be a public lot after business hours and on weekends and holidays. That should contribute to addressing that particular problem. The surface parking lot would be not be a feature indefinitely, as the tenant had signed a ten-year lease.

After that it could be modified. Regarding the comments about mixed use and the intent for this area, a large residential development was nearby at the Summit Church, which was the reason this building would be able to go to a third floor. Some constructive things could happen down the road; but the developer could not put residential units in this facility in view of 100 residential units that might also be down the road. The City had an opportunity for a very nice-looking building on the site that would serve a good purpose, in addition to resolving parking issues for all the nearby property owners. There might be opportunities to do mixed use on this building once the scenario of the 100-unit development played out.

Ms. Roberts remarked that the colors in the elevations seemed rather odd in comparison to other buildings Downtown. She asked for some comparisons of massing, in particular the width as compared to neighboring buildings. Mr. Dahmer stated that it was the same depth as the building to the south. The width was 95 feet, and the adjacent building was 85 feet wide. Mr. Schlicht looked at the survey of the plat and corrected that the building on the corner was 97.5 feet wide. Both buildings were about the same in width and height, but only one was painted brick. Ms. Roberts still did not feel that it looked compatible with other Downtown buildings, and Mr. Schlicht pointed out several other buildings nearby of similar size. He noted that the brick color was about the same as the current City Hall building.

Mr. McGuire related that staff had requested the pilasters be continued all the way up on the ends, in order to break up. The idea was to be consistent with the historic buildings Downtown without putting up replicas.

Chairperson Norbury asked if there were further questions for the applicant or staff. Hearing none, he closed the public hearing at 6:25 p.m. Chairperson Norbury then announced a five-minute break.

(Mr. Loveless left the meeting during the break.)

The meeting reconvened at 6:30 p.m., and Chairperson Norbury re-opened the hearing.

Concerning the lease agreement, Ms. Arth asked the parking lot being removed would be a deal-breaker. Mr. Dumas replied that it would be.

Mr. Nedderville stated that the plan for the parking lot had gone through several versions. The one he had showed diagonal parking on Market but in another version it was parallel parking. Regarding material, he had heard EIFS mentioned, and this was not a very substantial material. Mr. Schlicht acknowledged that the parking plan had changed several times. Parking on Main would be diagonal, with parallel parking on Market. The front and back of the building would be brick and EIFS would be the material on the sides. Concerning the alley, he asserted that paperwork existed showing that it had been private property since the 1800s. He had provided these documents to the Planning and Legal departments.

Chairperson Norbury then re-closed the public hearing, at 6:35 p.m.; and asked for discussion among the Commission members.

Ms. Dial stated that while she supported the idea of less surface parking Downtown; however, as a suburbanite she drove everywhere she went. She liked to park close to her destination enough to drive past restaurants if there was no parking available. She and her husband often

avoided Downtown due to parking. She understood that walking was necessary for developing a Downtown area but Lee's Summit was essentially a suburb where people did not walk. She was still uncertain about this aspect of plan.

Ms. Arth remarked that bringing in an office building with that many agents and clients would very likely mean more business for nearby stores and restaurants. She owned a business close to Downtown and knew that her customers liked to have parking close by. Personally she did not mind walking in mild weather but close parking was good for business. Downtown was visited by people from smaller communities who were used to having plenty of accessible parking and she did not think she could support staff's Recommendation Item that would take away the surface parking lot.

Mr. Funk remarked that he appreciated Mr. Dahmer's plan to put in a building that generally fit in with the area buildings' style. However, he lived, worked and had an office in Downtown Lee's Summit and the office had zero parking spaces but nevertheless worked. There was a parking lot across the street that he passed regularly. Mr. Funk asserted that there was a much better use for the land other than a surface lot. Moreover, this was an opportunity for the City to take a close look at parking plans. He did have concerns about the parking lot entrances allowing two-way traffic, and this was a safety concern.

Mr. Sims stated that he supported this development plan including the surface parking lot. He was afraid that the City would not act on a parking facility if that if this building went up without its parking lot and new development came in later.

Mr. Gustafson agreed with Mr. Funk that the City did need to look at the parking. Lee's Summit was not the Country Club Plaza though he knew some people would like it to be. It could potentially be something like the Plaza but the Plaza had plenty of parking structures. He was concerned that City staff was not looking far enough into the future and did not have any idea where the parking should be. He wondered how many more businesses the City would turn down because they wanted parking.

Chairperson Norbury asserted that everyone, the developer, the landowner, the City and others, had fallen short of evaluating an appropriate development for Downtown. First, the prospective tenant had come forward and stated that they wanted to be part of Downtown; while at the same time demanding to be allowed to do something that was out of character for this part of Lee's Summit, namely an expanse of surface parking in a densely populated urban environment. That did not amount to being part of Downtown. While he appreciated Ms. Dial's concerns, this part of Lee's Summit was different from the suburban areas of town. It was a small area and an urban, dense environment surrounded by sea upon sea upon sea of parking lots and subdivisions. Downtown was the tiny heart of the city that was different in a structural, zoning and attitude sense. People needed to accept that reality. It did mean that some businesses would not want to come Downtown. This area would not, for example get the Texas Roadhouse restaurant that had just opened on US 50; and Downtown was better for it due to the number of parking spaces that a Texas Roadhouse would want. Parking restrictions were simply part of the deal for any developer who wanted to do a project Downtown. This was the only place in the entire city that did not have acres and acres of parking lots and he did not like the idea of opening Downtown to the Parking Lot Sea option.

Chairperson Norbury pointed out that Lee's Summit had passed a bond issue involving \$8 million for the development of an additional parking structure for Downtown Lee's Summit. One of the prospective locations was Market Street on land currently owned by the City; which had also purchased land at Main and 4th Streets. But despite the need, the City Council had put this off to an undetermined date. In general the City and Council had not met their responsibility to stay on top of the parking demands and requirements in this part of town. Lee's Summit's Downtown was a feature in all marketing promoting the city. It was a jewel in the heart of the city; yet even signage that would make public parking easy to find was not a

priority. The parking deck near City Hall was usually only half full except during festivals and special events; yet anything in the Central Business District, including the subject property, was only a five minutes' walk away. Small business owners were urged to have cooperative parking agreements, and Chairperson Norbury commended Mr. McGuire and staff for working around that minimum and working with the applicant.

Chairperson Norbury stated that it would be helpful to have a street level elevation in applications involving Downtown and its design standards. An idea of surroundings would make it easier to see massing and scaling as well as spotting potential issues. It had been requested but he had not seen it, and being able to get an idea of a proposed project in its surroundings and environment would be especially helpful in this case.

Chairperson Norbury then noted that tonight the Commission had heard from business owners, the landowners, neighbors and other Commissioners but Downtown Lee's Summit Main Street had been absent and this was very disappointing. He had no way of knowing what the group had heard or what their opinion was, other than one of Main Street's committees being involved during the design process. He hoped that Main Street would correct this before the City Council hearing. For tonight, he agreed with staff that a surface parking lot was not an appropriate use. Evaluation of the street parking situation would also be helpful.

Ms. Roberts stated that she also could not support the parking lot on Lot 1. It was unnecessary for Downtown; and if a business had to have surface parking this was not a good location for it. Architecturally, the building looked to her too much like the CVS pharmacy on 3rd Street, and not quite like a Downtown building. It might fit a little better with Downtown if the use was mixed, such as offices on one floor and retail or residences on another. As it was, the building might look like a missing tooth after business hours, when much of Downtown was active.

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

Mr. Funk made a motion to recommend approval of continued Application PL2018-100, Preliminary Development Plan: Reece Nichols, 222 SW Main St. and 207 SW Market St.; Engineering Solutions, LLC, applicant; subject to staff's letter of August 24, 2018, specifically Recommendation Items 1 through 3. Ms. Roberts seconded.

Chairperson Norbury asked Ms. Nixon for a roll call vote. He specified that a "yes" vote would recommend for approval the application as presented by staff including removing the parking lot from the plan. A "no" vote would be a recommendation of denial, so overriding it would require a super-majority vote. As there was no more discussion of the motion, he called for a vote.

A motion was made by Board Member Funk, seconded by Board Member Roberts, that this application be recommended for approval subject to staff's letter dated August 24, 2018, recommendation items 1-3, to the City Council - Regular Session, due back on 9/20/2018. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 4 - Board Member Dial
Board Member Norbury
Board Member Gustafson
Board Member Funk

Nay: 3 - Board Member Roberts
Board Member Arth
Board Member Sims

Absent: 2 - Board Member Watson
Board Member Loveless

3. [2018-2220](#) Continued Public Hearing - Appl. #PL2018-103 - Preliminary Development Plan -

Woodside Ridge, 300 NW Pryor Road; Clayton Properties Group, LLC, applicant.

Chairperson Norbury opened the hearing at 6:55 p.m. and asked those wishing to speak, or provide testimony, to stand and be sworn in.

Mr. John Erpelding of Olsson Associates described the Woodside Ridge project as a single-family subdivision. The 112 acres were located between Chipman to the north and 3rd Street to the south. It was currently owned by John Knox Village, with the Sterling Hills community to the south and west, John Knox Village to the north and east and Forests of Brookridge to the west. The John Knox Village Care Center was directly adjacent to the property at the northeast end. A plan for about 28 acres undeveloped acres on Pryor's west side would be brought to the Commission at the September 11th meeting. It would include the fire station at the southeast corner.

The applicants proposed 206 single-family residences in two phases. The first would include 146 lots on the north end, as well as 44 villa lots, in the \$300,000 price range.. These were about 50 feet wide and 110 feet deep, with maintenance-provided residences. That would include snow removal and mowing services. The first phase would also include 32 lots at the southeast. These were Summit Homes' "Lifestyle" series, with homes in the \$400,000 range. Another 70 homes in the "Signature" series, in the same price range, were in the center. The second phase would add another 60 Signature series lots.

The property was currently zoned RP-3, with a small PMIX parcel at the northeast corner. They did not plan to rezone, and allowed to bring in an R-1 product. The applicants had worked with staff and provided a number of studies required for this kind of project. One was a storm drain study that indicated a number of dry detention basins to handle the site's stormwater runoff. He pointed the locations of the basins plus a pond at the northeast that would remain as a neighborhood amenity. They had also submitted a sanitary capacity analysis which confirmed that the existing downstream sewer lines could handle the increase from the development. The traffic study that they'd submitted showed a need for a southbound right turn lane on Pryor Road at O'Brien. That part of O'Brien currently stubbed before reaching the property, so it would need to be improved and widened to accommodate an eastbound left-turn lane on Pryor.

The applicants were requesting a number of modifications, all of which staff supported. The first four were for the maximum block length of 700 feet, which was the length from one intersecting street to the next. This property had terrain changes and steep slopes, and was not as well suited for shorter blocks as a flatter area. The requested lengths were 1,270 feet on Ashurst between Pryor and Kaylea (Recommendation Item 1); 1,228 feet for O'Brien between Ambersham Drive and Patch Court (Item 2); on Ambersham Road between Whitlock and Killarney Lane (Item 3) and 1,010 feet for Killarney Lane between Ambersham Road and Cody Drive (Item 4). Mr. Erpelding pointed out the roads and intersections. There were a number of constraints, as they had connections that had to fit plus the steep topography near the pond.

Recommendation Item 5 was for a modification to the required landscape buffering between RP-3 and R-1 zoning, as the development would be single-family homes similar to nearby neighborhoods. Recommendation Item 6 was a modification for the 20-foot rear yard setback for villa lots 34, 35, 36, 43 and 44 along the north end. The connections points at Ashurst at Pryor did not allow enough depth in these lots for 20-foot setbacks. John Knox Village planned to grant a an easement on their property along that end for a 25-foot landscape buffer. That would make the rear yards visually deeper than they currently were.

The applicants had held a neighborhood meeting at the Gamber Center on August 6th, notifying everyone within 185 feet of the property. About 50 people had attended, and had asked questions about traffic, street connections, stormwater runoff, home values and preserving existing trees. They planned to break ground late this year and start constructing streets and utilities in the spring. Mr. Erpelding stated that the applicants agreed with all 9 of staff's Recommendation Items.

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

Mr. McGuire entered Exhibit (A), list of exhibits 1-15 into the record. He confirmed that this would be a two-phase development comprised of 206 single-family lots and 10 common area tracts. The property was in five parcels plus one platted lot. These parcels were undeveloped and unplatted and were zoned RP-3. The remaining lot, at the northeast corner, was zoned PMIX, with an existing home on the lot that was used as an information center for John Knox Village. Surrounding zoning was RP-3 to the north, R-1 to the south, PMIX to the east across NW Pryor and R-1 to the west. The overall density would be 1.84 units per acre, with 10 per acre the maximum in RP-3. Excluding the common area, it was 3.67 units per acre. Amenities provided included walking paths and a community pool on Tract C. Developing this pool site would require a preliminary development plan on a separate application.

Mr. McGuire confirmed that although this type of residential development was typically in R-1 zoning, the applicant had chosen to not rezone as single-family residential was an allowed use by right in both PMIX and RP-3. All development on this site was tied to the approved plan and any deviation from the approved plan of single-family homes would require approval of a new preliminary development plan.

Regarding the modifications to the block length, which ranged in length from 1,010 feet to 1,270, with 700 feet the allowed maximum. This was due to the topography, steep slopes, and locations of ridge lines and existing streets. Staff supported these requests. Regarding the modification to the required landscape buffer in Item 5, the UDO required properties zoned RP-3 to provide a low-impact buffer for R-1 development. The proposed single-family homes would be adjacent to similar development, so the buffer would not be necessary. The applicant had agreed to preserve all of the existing vegetation as was feasible. Staff considered this reasonable and supported the modification. The

applicant had agreed install the required medium-impact buffer on Tract C to screen the pool, as well as comply with buffering requirements for screening the pool, as well as screening lots 74-76 from the fire station.

The applicant had proposed 10-foot rear yard setbacks for lots 34-36, 33 and 34, had had offered a 25-foot off-site landscaping easement to visually extend the lots. The constraints of the streets to both north and south made 20-foot rear yards impractical. Staff believed this met the spirit of the UDO and supported the modification.

Recommendation Items 7, 8 and 9 were standard language requiring development in accordance with the preliminary development plan, development standard in the PMIX part were to follow RP-3 standards and the development would be "*subject to the recommended road improvements outlined in the Transportation Impact Analysis*". Staff recommended approval, subject to Recommendation Items 1 through 9.

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

Mr. Michael Klein gave his address as 148 NW Whitlock Drive in the Sterling Hills subdivision. He had not seen anything on the site plan for emergency access to the property. It would require going out to Pryor to O'Brien or through Sterling Hills and up a very steep hill on Cody. This was especially difficult in winter road conditions. He asked why this could not be redesigned to connect Shamrock with Ambersham and Killarney. That would be easier access for emergency vehicles in particular.

Ms. Cecily Vadsy gave her address as 416 High Cliff Drive. Their lot was at the bottom of Ashurst at the double cul-de-sac. She was concerned about the plan to eventually open it to through traffic. Almost the entire neighborhood consisted of cul-de-sac streets, 21 in all; and consequently the neighborhood had no sidewalks and people were used to walking on the streets, and through traffic would create a safety hazard. There were 10 children, all under the age of 8 years, just on her street. The traffic and safety situation could be compounded by the number of cul-de-sac streets, as it would be easy for someone outside the neighborhood to get lost. She and her neighbors preferred the connection be made with Mulberry, the street that continued through by St. Luke's East adjacent to Cambridge Heights. Drivers continuing up Mulberry to the neighborhood would see a Do Not Enter sign that had significantly cut down traffic.

Mr. Doug Frahg gave his address as 2208 NW Ashurst Drive. He related that at least three school buses went through and children walked, on the street, to two or three stops. There was little street lighting, another factor in early morning in the winter. Further, many of the streets wound around, especially High Cliff. At present, an exit on Pryor was right only; and people in the proposed new subdivision who did not want to make a right turn out of Ashurst might go through his neighborhood, in which sidewalks had not been required when it

was built, and not much traffic anticipated.. It was a one way in, one way out subdivision. Additionally Ashurst, currently a dead-end street, had a yellow fire gate at the end. The idea had been that emergency vehicles could go through John Knox Village and access the neighborhood at Ashurst. The right turn in and out would make that impossible. It looked like fire trucks or ambulances would now have to come up Pryor, cut through the Care Center and back onto Pryor.

Mr. Steve Barber gave his address as 2204 NW Ashurst Drive. He added that some of the residents on Ashurst had been there for 20 years. It had been a good place to live; and while he did not expect that to change, he shared Mr. Frahg's concerns about emergency access. The plan did show an open space on Ashurst behind the Care Center that might be used. The neighbors also wanted to know if a full intersection would be possible. While there was a 660-foot separation requirement, all the residents had driven on Chipman Road and knew how abundant traffic lights were between McDonald's and Pryor Road. Additionally, Chipman was reduced from four lanes to two, though it had been intended as having four lanes.

Concerning the increase of traffic into the adjacent subdivision from Ashurst, Mr. Park explained that it was a stub street planned for future expansion as the land developed, so he did anticipate more use on that extension of Ashurst by existing residents and people from Brook Ridge. Residents of the proposed villas would be less likely to use it. No changes were proposed along Pryor Road at the existing intersection where the two connection points were. This was confirmed in the Traffic Impact study. Chairperson Norbury asked for an estimate of what the peak east-west traffic volume would be. Mr. Park estimated that it would be 24 entering vehicles in both morning and afternoon, entering Ashurst from Pryor Road. Regarding interaction between neighborhoods, 4 to 2 total trips would come from Brook Ridge, through Ashurst and out to Pryor in the morning with 4 to 12 returning in the afternoon.

Chairperson Norbury then asked if the Commission had questions for the applicant or staff. He asked Mr. Park to respond to the concerns about traffic and traffic patterns.

Mr. Park believed that what had been done on Mulberry had been an unsuccessful effort to manage traffic. At one point, staff members had seen over 100 violations in just a few hours. It was put in as a response to a large commercial development, in order to discourage the traffic it generated from cutting through the neighborhood.

Chief Eden first addressed the concern about access to Cody. He stated that while it would be necessary to go out to Pryor and back down, the changes would actually improve access to Mr. Klein's neighborhood in Sterling Hills as there would now be two points of entry. Regarding the access road on Ashurst, when that development went in, more than 50 lots had a single point of access which was far too many. That was why the emergency access existed, and John Knox Village had allowed access to that point. It provided an alternative for emergency vehicles should Chipman Road be blocked. That would be lost if the

street were completed. He added that legally, emergency vehicles could go through oppositional traffic with warning via lights and siren. It was normal practice to go up to the next intersection, make a U turn and come back down for a right turn into a street.

Ms. Roberts noted that the RP-3 zoning meant "Planned Residential Mixed Use", and asked for a definition of that phrase. Mr. McGuire answered that this district allowed single-family dwellings, duplexes and apartments. It did not include commercial mixed use. Ms. Roberts asked why this property had been given this zoning designation. Mr. McGuire replied that the rezoning to RP-3 had happened in 1976, with details in the "Background" section of staff's letter.

Ms. Roberts noted that these different designations were in the Comprehensive Plan. She assumed that on occasions the City would take a look at areas that were undeveloped and how they were zoned, and what was left as developable land. Taking this property back to R-1 in its usage if not its zoning designation, would effectively diminish that amount of land available for denser residential use. Mr. McGuire responded that low-density residential was the long-range plan for this part of town and that would be RP-3 and below. Ms. Roberts remarked that it was strange to zone a property RP-3 if the preferred use would be really be R-1. She emphasized that reducing RP-3 uses, including substituting R-1 uses, would result in lesser acreage in Lee's Summit for RP-3 development. Mr. McGuire acknowledged that it would. Ms. Roberts continued that the City of Lee's Summit had a housing study done that showed a severe need for multi-family housing. This was a prime piece of real estate that was zoned for that kind of use; yet the Commission was hearing a plan to use it for single-family homes. Mr. McGuire clarified that the RP-3 zoning would not allow for apartments; that would be RP-4 zoning. Mr. Soto clarified that the study's focus was apartment use, so it did not include other forms of multi-family housing such as duplexes and townhomes.

Ms. Roberts observed that this particular piece of real estate was in an unusually good location, with its access to restaurants and shopping as well as major roads like I-470, even with geography as an issue. In view of that, she did not understand why staff would approve dialing back the density. Mr. McGuire replied that he had reviewed the application based on what was allowed in that zoning district, which was single-family use. It was allowed by right. Ms. Roberts wanted to see highest and best use factored in, regardless of what might be allowed. She asked if staff considered this the highest and best use of this real estate that was in such a central location. She wanted some consideration of development meeting the RP-3 definition.

Mr. Soto confirmed that RP-3 did allow single-family residential by right, and that was the proposal that staff had received. The density was slightly higher at the north end with the villa lots, and decreased toward the south end. Staff evaluated the application on the basis of what was permitted by right in the UDO. Ms. Roberts took issue with the idea that property not zoned R-1 should be treated as such on the basis of it being allowed. She emphasized that the property was designated RP-3 for a reason. Mr. Soto answered that the RP-3 designation had been granted in 1976 as a rezoning from AG. It was tied to a

request from John Knox Village for a specific use, as described in the "Background" section of staff's report. However, John Knox village had not followed through with the project.

Ms. Roberts considered that if anything, the zoning suited the property as well or better now than 42 years ago. It was adjacent to PMIX, had major roads and a major commercial retail area nearby and should have more density than single-family lots. Mr. Soto pointed out other residential development nearby including Sterling Hills and Winterset. He acknowledged that the arterial Pryor Road separated it from John Knox Village. From a compatibility perspective, the proposed development was consistent with what was nearby. Ms. Roberts replied that nevertheless, the usual transition was a stepped process, where more dense development was used as a buffer for less dense development. In this case, if John Knox Village was considered a more dense development, this one should be somewhere between that and the R-1 zoned residential properties further out. Mr. Soto answered that he would consider a major arterial road like Pryor the buffer in this case.

Ms. Roberts recalled during the discussion of the townhomes at Longview that people had brought up concerns about schools if more children were brought into an already overcrowded school district. Single-family homes, especially of this size, typically would be bought by people with children. That was less true of smaller homes. Multi-family housing typically had 66 percent, or two-thirds, fewer children per unit than single-family homes. Consequently, it was likely that this development would bring a disproportionate number of children into the school district. Mr. Soto noted that the school district regularly got staff's the project list, which showed all upcoming projects and hearings. He had not heard anything from them in response to any of the lists; however, they were informed of upcoming projects.

Mr. Funk asked if the City had intended for the main cul-de-sac streets to eventually become through streets, and Mr. McGuire replied that they had.

Mr. Gustafson asked if RP-3 zoning would allow any home business uses that R-1 zoning would not. Mr. Elam answered that what was allowed or prohibited was the same in both districts.

Chairperson Norbury asked what use was designated for this property on the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Elam related that this area was originally owned, and zoned, by John Knox Village. The Comprehensive Plan indicated it as "Mixed Use/John Knox". Mr. Soto recalled that staff had received a direction from the City Council that in terms of recommended land uses, they should be consistent with the existing zoning in cases of property where zoning was already in place.

Chairperson Norbury asked if there were further questions for the applicant or staff. Hearing none, he closed the public hearing at 7:35 p.m. and asked for discussion among the Commission members.

Chairperson Norbury noted that several months ago, the Commission had attended a joint information and discussion session with the planning

commissions in Independence and Blue Springs. Several members of the development community, both commercial and residential, had also attended. A representative from Summit Homes had brought up the difficulty in creating affordable “starter” housing. The average price of an already-existing home in the metro area was \$175,000 and the average for a new home was \$350,000. These prices and the 100% ‘markup’ from used to new was troubling. He knew that home builders did not build their products at a loss and they did not want to build products that did not sell. Overall, Lee’s Summit did not seem to be able to provide any stock of affordable housing. Some single-family homes had prices that would eliminate a high percentage of first time buyers, generally people in their 20s and 30s, as potential buyers. Many young families could not buy new homes in Lee’s Summit, or no homes at all in some cases but it seemed that every proposed project involving multi-family housing always had difficulties. It was getting more difficult to approve half-million-dollar residences when a gap existed that had to be filled sooner or later. Lee’s Summit could not continue this trend, as so much of it depended on the business of older buyers. The City could address this situation in a number of ways, including via the zoning codes and support for multi-family developments like apartments. The trend for discouraging multi-family development, whatever the cause, would result in major problems for Lee’s Summit in a few decades.

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

Mr. Funk made a motion to recommend approval of continued Application PL2018-103, Preliminary Development Plan: Woodside Ridge, 300 NW Pryor Rd.; Clayton Properties Group, LLC, applicant; subject to staff’s letter of August 24, 2018, specifically Recommendation Items 1 through 9. Mr. Gustafson 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 Funk, seconded by Board Member Gustafson, that this application be recommended for approval subject to staff’s letter, dated August 24, 2018, recommendation items 1-9, to the City Council - Regular Session, due back on 9/6/2018. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Board Member Dial
Board Member Arth
Board Member Gustafson
Board Member Funk
Board Member Sims

Nay: 2 - Board Member Norbury
Board Member Roberts

Absent: 2 - Board Member Watson
Board Member Loveless

4. [2018-2249](#) Appl. #PL2018-108 - PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN - Douglas Corners, 150 NE Tudor Rd; HG Consult, Inc., applicant (continued to a date certain of September 11, 2018, to allow for proper notification)

Chairperson Norbury opened the hearing at 7:43 p.m. and stated that Application PL2018-108

Planning Commission

Action Letter

August 28, 2018

was requested to be continued to a date certain of September 11, 2018, to allow for proper notification. He asked for a motion to continue.

Mr. Funk made a motion to continue Application PL2018-108 to a date certain of September 11, 2018. Mr. Gustafson 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 Funk, seconded by Board Member Gustafson, that this application be continued to the Planning Commission, due back on 9/11/2018. The motion carried unanimously.

5. [2018-2250](#) Appl. #PL2018-135 - REZONING from RP-3 to PMIX and PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN - West Village, 300 NW Pryor Rd; City of Lee's Summit, applicant (continued to a date certain of September 11, 2018, to allow for proper notification)

Chairperson Norbury opened the hearing at 7:45 p.m. and stated that Application PL2018-135 was requested to be continued to a date certain of September 11, 2018, to allow for proper notification. He asked for a motion to continue.

Ms. Dial made a motion to continue Application PL2018-135 to a date certain of September 11, 2018. 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 Dial, seconded by Board Member Roberts, that this application be continued to the Planning Commission, due back on 9/11/2018. The motion carried unanimously.

Other Agenda Items

6. [2018-2221](#) Approval of amended Planning Commission bylaws

Chairperson Norbury noted that the Planning Commission meetings would be moved from the second and fourth Tuesdays to second and fourth Thursdays. He asked for a motion to approve the change. The first meeting under the new schedule would be Thursday, October 11.

Ms. Roberts made a motion to approve the amended Planning Commission bylaws, and Mr. Gustafson 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 Gustafson, that the proposed amendment to the Planning Commission bylaws be approved. The motion carried unanimously.

Roundtable

Mr. McKay stated that it was not true that the City was not doing anything to get affordable housing. They were proposing a new zoning district for small lots, which would go through the CEDC and then to the Planning Commission. The district would be geared for 'cottage home' type development. A problem was that since Lee's Summit had seen so much growth, and expensive homes were built, land prices had risen. An infill development program in the Downtown neighborhoods had been shot down by residents. It might take someone with the

Planning Commission

Action Letter

August 28, 2018

funds to buy up a block or several acres, with a 4,000 square foot lot being about one-tenth of an acre. Other regional groups, such as MARC, were also looking at the affordable housing issue.

Mr. Elam announced that housing affordability would be a discussion subject at the next CEDC meeting on September 12.

Ms. Roberts reported that the Human Relations Commission had also taken up the issue of affordable housing. She encouraged other Commissioners and staff to attend a meeting.

Adjournment

There being no further business, Chairperson Norbury adjourned the meeting at 7:50 p.m.

For your convenience, Planning Commission agendas, as well as videos of Planning Commission meetings, may be viewed on the City's Legislative Information Center website at "lsmo.legistar.com"