

The City of Lee's Summit

Action Letter

Planning Commission

Thursday, September 10, 2020

5:00 PM

Via Video Conference

Notice is hereby given that the Planning Commission of the City of Lee's Summit will meet in regular session on September 10, 2020, at 5:00 pm by video conference as provided by Section 610.015 of the Revised Statutes of the State of Missouri. Due to the ongoing Covid-19 pandemic, public attendance in a meeting room at City Hall is not being provided, and therefore the public is invited to attend the meeting by one of these methods:

- By viewing the meeting on the City website at www.WatchLS.net, and various cable providers (Spectrum channel 2, Google TV channel 143, AT&T U-Verse channel 99 and Comcast channel 7) for those whose cable providers carry the City of Lee's Summit meetings.
- By sending a request to the City Clerk at clerk@cityofls.net to attend the meeting on the Zoom platform. The City Clerk will provide instructions regarding how to attend by this method.

Persons wishing to comment on any item of business on the agenda may do so in writing prior to 5:00 p.m. on September 9, 2020, by one of the following methods:

- By sending an e-mail to clerk@cityofls.net,
- By leaving a voicemail at 816-969-1005 or
- By leaving written printed comments in the utility payments drop boxes located in the alley behind City Hall or inside the foyer at the north end of City Hall, both located at 220 SE Green Street, Lee's Summit, MO 64063.

Written comments submitted by these methods will be presented at the Planning Commission meeting. Persons wishing to speak at a public hearing on this agenda may do so by contacting the City Clerk prior to 5:00 p.m. on September 9, 2020, by e-mail at clerk@cityofls.net, and they will be provided with instructions regarding how to provide their live testimony via videoconference during the public hearing.

Call to Order

Roll Call

Present: 7 - Chairperson Donnie Funk
Vice Chair Carla Dial
Board Member Dana Arth
Board Member Jake Loveless
Board Member Matt Sanning
Board Member Terry Trafton
Tanya Jana-Ford

Absent: 2 - Board Member Mark Kitchens
Board Member John Lovell

Approval of Agenda

A motion was made by Board Member Loveless, seconded by Board Member Sanning, that the Agenda be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Chairperson Funk
Vice Chair Dial
Board Member Arth
Board Member Loveless
Board Member Sanning
Board Member Trafton
Jana-Ford

Absent: 2 - Board Member Kitchens
Board Member Lovell

Public Comments

There were no public comments at the meeting.

1. Approval of Consent Agenda

A motion was made by Vice Chair Dial, seconded by Board Member Trafton, that the Consent Agenda be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Chairperson Funk
Vice Chair Dial
Board Member Arth
Board Member Loveless
Board Member Sanning
Board Member Trafton
Jana-Ford

Absent: 2 - Board Member Kitchens
Board Member Lovell

A [2020-3656](#) Approval of the August 27, 2020 Planning Commission minutes.

A motion was made by Vice Chair Dial, seconded by Board Member Trafton, that these minutes be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Chairperson Funk
Vice Chair Dial
Board Member Arth
Board Member Loveless
Board Member Sanning
Board Member Trafton
Jana-Ford

Absent: 2 - Board Member Kitchens
Board Member Lovell

Public Hearings

2. **2020-3666** Public Hearing: Application #PL2020-084 - Special Use Permit for automotive repair - Herrington Automotive, 1500 and 1502 SW Market Street; Pat Herrington, applicant.

Chairperson Funk opened the hearing at 5:09 p.m. and asked that those wishing to speak, or provide testimony, to stand and be sworn in.

Ms. Patricia Johnson, with the law firm of Rouse Frets, gave her business address as 4510 Bellevue and stated that she was present on behalf of Herrington Automotive. Mr. Pat Herrington and Mr. Dan Herrington were also present at the meeting. Ms. Johnson used Power Point slides during her presentation. She called the Commissioners' attention to the red markers indicating the location of the business on the displayed aerial view. She clarified that it was a picture of the property before Herrington had acquired it and had made some improvements. It was located in the PI (Industrial Zoning) district. The displayed site plan showed two connected buildings and the location of the parking lot. Following slides showed buildings on the property at the time the applicant had bought it. These were followed by photographs of the property and its buildings after they had made improvements, including new asphalt. They had complied with the UDO requirements.

The business included full service repair services, including major repairs. The existing buildings had all been improved as well as the parking and access. All repair work was done within these existing buildings. Hours of operation would be from 7:30 a.m. to 5:30 p.m., Monday through Friday. Services included minor repairs and maintenance as well as major mechanical work. They were requesting a 25-year term for the Special Use Permit, and had made a substantial \$1.2 million investment in the business and the property. She emphasized that the property would not be used for junked or wrecked cars, salvage or scrap. They would continue to operate in compliance with the International Fire Code.

The applicant agreed with staff's Conditions of Approval, and were ready to answer any questions.

Ms. Arth joined the meeting.

Following Ms. Johnson's presentation, Chairperson Funk asked for staff comments.

Mr. McGuire entered Exhibit (A), list of exhibits 1-14 into the record. He noted that the usual requirement for an applicant to host a neighborhood meeting was waived. Due to the current pandemic situation, applicants were encouraged to use alternative methods of communication in soliciting feedback from neighbors and answering any questions about the development.

The proposed development would be on about 3.5 acres. The platted and developed lots each had an existing building. The building at 1500 SW Market Street was about 3,100 square feet and the one at 1502 SW Market was about 5,800 square feet. Mr. McGuire confirmed that the applicant requested a 25-year term for the SUP. The surrounding area was mostly industrial use, with a small property directly to the north that was zoned CP-2. M-291 highway was directly to the east.

Automotive repair service use did require a Special Use Permit, and staff had specified four Conditions of Approval. All activities should be inside the buildings, and any outdoor storage should be in the back of the property and be screened. The use should not generate "noise, odors or fumes that could be detected outside the building. Overhead doors should remain closed, also for mitigation of noise. The applicant agreed that no part of the property would be used as a junkyard or for scrap or salvage.

Following Mr. McGuire's comments, Chairperson Funk asked there was any public testimony either in support for or opposition to the application. Hearing none, he then opened the hearing for questions for the applicant or staff. There were no questions, and Chairperson Funk then closed the public hearing at 5:17 p.m. and called for a motion.

Ms. Dial made a motion to recommend approval of Application PL2020-084, Special Use Permit for automotive repair: Herrington Automotive, 1500 and 1502 SW Market Street, Pat Herrington, applicant. Ms. Arth seconded.

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

A motion was made by Vice Chair Dial, seconded by Board Member Arth, that this Application be recommended for approval to the City Council - Regular Session, due back on 10/6/2020. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Chairperson Funk
Vice Chair Dial
Board Member Arth
Board Member Loveless
Board Member Sanning
Board Member Trafton
Jana-Ford

Absent: 2 - Board Member Kitchens
Board Member Lovell

- a **TMP-1685** An Ordinance approving a special use permit for automotive repair services-major repair in district PI (Planned Industrial) on land located at 1500 and 1502 SW Market St for a period of twenty five (25) years, all in accordance with Chapter 33, the Unified Development Ordinance, of the Code of Ordinances for the City of Lee's Summit, Missouri.

3. [2020-3672](#) Public Hearing: Application #PL2020-200 - Preliminary Development Plan - Oakview, Lots 2, 3 and 4, 1410, 1430 and 1440 NE Douglas St; Star Acquisitions & Development, LLC, applicant

Chairperson Funk opened the hearing at 5:19 p.m. and stated that the applicant had requested that this hearing be continued to a date certain of September 24, 2020. He then asked for a motion to continue.

Ms. Dial made a motion to continue Application PL2020-200 - Preliminary Development plan - Oakview, Lots 2,3,and 4, 1410, 1430 and 1440 NE Douglas Street; Star Acquisitions & Development, LLC Applicant to a date certain of September 24, 2020. Mr. Sanning seconded.

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

A motion was made by Vice Chair Dial, seconded by Board Member Sanning, that this application be continued to the Planning Commission, due back on 9/24/2020. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Chairperson Funk
Vice Chair Dial
Board Member Arth
Board Member Loveless
Board Member Sanning
Board Member Trafton
Jana-Ford

Absent: 2 - Board Member Kitchens
Board Member Lovell

- a [TMP-1691](#) An Ordinance approving a preliminary development plan located at 1410, 1430 and 1440 NE Douglas St in District CP-2, Oakview Lots 2-4, all in accordance

with the provisions of Chapter 33, the Unified Development Ordinance, of the Code of Ordinances for the City of Lee's Summit, Missouri.

4. [2020-3498](#) Continued Appl. #PL2019-330 - REZONING from AG to R-1 and PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN - Woodland Oaks, Lots 1-42 & Tracts A-C, 2501 and 2601 NE Colbern Rd; Engineering Solutions, LLC, applicant

Chairperson Funk opened the hearing at 5:20 p.m. and asked that those wishing to speak, or provide testimony, to stand and be sworn in.

Mr. Matt Schlicht of Engineering Solutions gave his address as 50 SE 30th Street in Lee's Summit. He stated that the project was 20 acres, essentially north of Woodland Shores, at the southwest corner of Colbern and Blackwell. It consisted of 42 single-family residential lots that were similar in size and character to those in Woodland Shores. Construction would start at Blackwell and proceed west, with a few estate-size lots on Colbern. One of the two roads going through the development would connect with Woodland Shores and the other with Blackwell. The applicant had held a neighborhood meeting and one of the original concerns was that the original plan showed access to the development only through Woodland Shores. They had then added an access through Blackwell.

Another concern was that this was a right-in-right-out access, and the neighbors had requested a median on Blackwell. However, according to staff's report the right-in-right-out access was sufficient. Woodland Shores had a full access directly to the south. Some other questions at the meeting concerned the traffic access, the movement, demand and load that might occur in entering Woodland Shores. Lashbrook Drive, which exited on the north side of Woodland Shores, would provide a connection into the subdivision and through the east-west main connector that went out to Blackwell. There were some general concerns about how much traffic the development would send onto Lashbrook, and if Lashbrook would be able to handle that additional traffic. The applicant believed that it was well within the road's capacity to handle an additional 42 lots. Additionally, it was likely that some of the Woodland Shores residents at the north end would use the right-in-right-out intersection. The roads in the development would all be standard size residential roads: 28 feet wide on a 50-foot right-of-way.

Some neighbors had asked about the density of the proposed development, which would be similar to that of Woodland Shores, since these were all residential single-family lots. Other questions involved lot costs and construction time and duration. An earlier neighborhood meeting had been held with the previous developer, whose plan had been a little different. The current plan provided increased green space, and some lots had been re-oriented to make them more rectangular and more similar in general to the Woodland Shores lots.

The developer accepted all of staff's recommendations, other than Condition of Approval #9. The existing sewer capacity in the Woodland Shores development had two segments that could be a potential problem. The Condition made the developer responsible for increasing the sizes of the lines in order to increase the capacity downstream. While this was a typical procedure in most developments where the downstream system was not adequate, the developer was responsible for it. In this situation, the two segments were located under an existing roadway and in the side yard between two existing houses. The landscaping, streets and driveways were already in place, making this a difficult project with an estimated cost of about \$200,000. When Woodland Shores had been designed, the sewer line came up to the subject property's south property line. During construction, one of the segments the developer was asked to replace was set at a slope that consequently reduced the line's capacity although the design appeared to have worked earlier. The developer's position was that the system as designed would have worked. It should have been replaced during construction, before the houses were in place and could have been done at a more reasonable cost. Consequently, the developer was requesting some help from the City.

Chairperson Funk clarified that the references to the sanitary sewer were in Condition of Approval 10, not 9 in the revised staff report.

Following Mr. Schlict's presentation, Chairperson Funk asked for staff comments.

Ms. Nelson entered Exhibit (A), list of exhibits 1-17 into the record. She described the project as 20 undeveloped acres at the intersection of Colbern and Blackwell roads. The City had annexed this area in 1963 and it had been zoned AG since then. The applicant was requesting that this be changed to R-1, and it now had 42 lots plus two common area tracts. The density would be 2.3 units per acre, with 4 units per acre being the maximum density under the UDO. The lot size, design and building materials of the homes were all compatible with Woodland Shores. That material would be composition roofing, stucco, veneer stone and smart term. When the proposal first came through in 2019, only one access point through Woodland Shores was shown. Many of the residents were concerned about the amount of traffic generated as well as the number of houses, so a second access off Blackwell was added.

The applicant requested a modification concerning cul-de-sacs. These were not desirable compared with an interconnected street system; however, at times considerations like topography could create problems with connecting streets. Staff supported this modification.

Regarding the sanitary sewer, Mr. Kent Monter stated that staff had the area downstream modeled by HDR. They had concluded that some of the pipes needed to be resized. Two that were 8 inches in diameter should be increased to 10 inches. The model of the development showed some surcharging in the system during any 50-year storm event. Additionally, some infiltration would occur through manholes or pipe joints; and that could bring surcharge levels up to a point that would impact some of the houses. Staff always did an analysis with any proposed subdivision; and a developer would be required to make sure that it had adequate infrastructure.

Ms. Nelson continued that staff had received some feedback. They had received eight emails in 2019, and all of them raised concerns over having only one access, as well as the number of houses. Some of them had wanted this area to be a park or green space. More recently, comments from Zoom had focused on the amount of traffic and the potential for people making U-turns off Blackwell.

Staff considered the development compatible with existing and planned surrounding land uses. It also met an objective in the Comprehensive Plan to provide "a diverse housing type that meets an identified need in the market." Additionally they concluded that it met the UDO and Design and Construction Manual requirements. The requirements were for a 10 percent maximum allowance for cul-de-sac lots, and staff was requesting that 79 percent be allowed. The style and materials for the houses were required to be consistent with the building elevations.

Following Ms. Nelson's comments, Chairperson Funk asked there was any testimony either in support for or opposition to the application.

Dr. David Kuhlmann gave his address as 1733 NE Woodland Shores Lane. He noted that his own street, Woodland Shores Lane, could also feed into the subdivision in addition to Lashbrook. Woodland Shores Lane had a large hill, and while most of the traffic heading to Langsford would be moving along south along Lashbrook. However most of the traffic entering the subdivision would be going along Woodland Shores and not Langsford. One problem he saw with the current design was safety for children walking across the street to the bus stop as this was a 'blind' hill with limited visibility. That plus the increased traffic load would certainly be a concern for any parents.

Dr. Kuhlmann considered it troubling that the Traffic division in Lee's Summit was claiming that there was no traffic risk. The existing homes in the area were sold, some with patios, on the basis that this would be an agricultural environment; and there was really no good access to that land in particular. He appreciated the addition of a right-in-right-out access; however, people would likely be making U-turns on Blackwell where the speed limit was 45 mph. The proposed luxury houses would be a good fit in the subdivision as far as appearances were concerned, but the potential for risks from traffic was definitely present. He had spoken with the Fire chief about the three cul-de-sacs, but the only response he had received was that the design 'met code.' He did not make a commitment to this being a safe place to get fire trucks in and out in an emergency. Dr. Kuhlmann added that the City allowing an increase in of cul-de-sac from 11 percent to 79 percent was not reassuring.

Dr. Jeff Meisenheimer gave his address as 1737 NE Woodland Shores Lane. He had attended the meeting on Thursday. Like Dr. Kuhlmann, he appreciated the right-in-right-out access but did not think that addressed all the problems. He asked why they could not put in a left-in-left-out access in that location. Mr. Schlicht remarked that Blackwell was a four-lane divided road and safety dictated limiting the number of full access points. Under these circumstances, right-in-right-out was the best alternative.

Dr. Meisenheimer asked why, if a left-in-left-out was detrimental because of the traffic flow off Blackwell, it would not be detrimental to Lashbrook or Woodland Shores Lane. He pointed out that being the larger street, Blackwell would be better suited to handle more traffic. The easiest solution would be to put in a left turn only access as long as a right turn one.

Mr. Park acknowledged that full access could be accommodated and still comply with the City's code, but pointed out that the policy was to limit access on arterial roads. In this case the code requirements were in place due to Blackwell's higher traffic speeds and volume. It would be necessary to construct a left-turn lane within the median and to close the existing median opening.

Dr. Meisenheimer then asked if Lee's Summit had another subdivision with one of its main traffic patterns going through a separate subdivision. Mr. Park replied that there were several of these. Dr. Meisenheimer remarked that whatever traffic studies might report, there were variable factors such as where the homeowners would work and where they went shopping. He added that on that stretch of Blackwell most residents would be likely to turn left in exiting, not right; partly because there were more businesses in that direction that might be a driver's destination. Also, a blind spot at that exit would make turning more hazardous, especially when a turn on that corner would be more than a right-angle, 90 degree turn. This would not be beneficial to all concerned. He added that he did not have an issue with the subdivision itself, although he had talked with an appraiser who had expected as much as a \$10,000 decrease in the value of the houses.

Dr. Kuhlmann stated that he had talked with Mr. Michael Park, and had learned that Lee's Summit had never had a subdivision with more than 40 houses that had only one dedicated access point, with a second involving going through another subdivision. 50:31

Chairperson Funk then asked if the Commissioners had questions for the applicant or staff.

Mr. Sanning asked Mr. Park if there was a maximum number of houses before the Commission made a different recommendation if it was not compliant. He wanted to know if there being fewer than 50 lots and houses would be a factor in the Blackwell access. Mr. Park answered that it would not be with the current application. However, but the previous revision of this plan in 2019 that only one access, which was where the number of lots came into play. A development with more than 50 lots would be required to have a second access point.

Mr. Loveless asked Chief Eden if the Fire Department had concerns about the present design,

including the modification for cul-de-sacs, raised any concerns about emergency access. Chief Eden replied that they had no issues as far as access to the subdivision was concerned. The cul-de-sacs were in compliance with the City's Design and Construction Manual.

Concerning Condition 10, Mr. Loveless then asked Mr. Monter if the City was typically responsible for upgrading and upsizing the sewer lines. Mr. Monter replied that when a new development application came in, staff would check to see if adequate infrastructure was in place, whether related to water or sanitary sewer lines. Based on the current conditions, and if the capacity was exceeded, the applicant or developer was responsible to make whatever improvements were necessary. If not done, a new development could create a surcharge system that could in the future back up into residents' homes.

Mr. Loveless asked Mr. Schlicht if this development would have the same Home Owners Association [HOA] as Woodland Shores. Mr. Schlicht was not sure if the developer had brought this up with Woodland Shores' HOA. He added that this application was for a separate subdivision. Mr. Loveless asked what the cost would be for the additional left turn lane that had been mentioned, and Mr. Schlicht estimated that a turn lane would be about \$100,000. Woodland Shores was about 200 lots, and this project would add 42 to the overall total. That subdivision already had two access points plus a number of access roads. The existing road network was already sufficiently interconnected that it would not make sense to spend a large amount of money on full access for a limited amount of traffic.

Mr. Trafton also had concerns about the turn lane. If he was buying a home in this subdivision, he would want a left turn lane rather than exit through another neighborhood. He understood that there would be additional cost involved, especially since it would include cutting through a median and putting in additional asphalt. He noted that the median already had an opening about 135 feet away from where the additional one would be. He wanted to hear from some residents who would support having a left-turn lane; and asked if the cost involved was based on past history of adding a turn lane to an existing street. Mr. Schlicht replied that the quoted cost looked realistic. However, a median for a U-turn existed on Blackwell about 135 feet south and a little further on, a U-turn could be done at Legacy Park. This was not unusual for subdivisions in Lee's Summit.

Mr. Park explained to Mr. Trafton that part of a left-turn lane would cross over into the existing access. The way that the area had developed, Legacy Park would not have another driveway where the median opening currently was. It had happened to be there just because it was a natural spot for it but after development happened, it had little use other than a place for cars to turn around.

Ms. Dial noted that Mr. Schlicht had mentioned that the original design for Woodland Shores' sanitary sewer would have worked, and asked for an explanation. Mr. Schlicht explained that the original slope of that line was about .6 percent but ended up as .2, which resulted in about a capacity reduction of about 42 percent. Ms. Dial asked why the City had allowed it to be built differently than was planned. Mr. Park said he had not been the inspector at that time. At the time the subdivision went in, the City was not doing TV camera inspections, and he did not have enough information as to why it was allowed. Ms. Dial remarked that her concern was that this new developer would have additional cost that if that part had been developed as originally planned. They might have saved enough funds to pay for a left turn lane, and potentially taking Lots 1 and 2

Ms. Ford asked if any planning studies had been done to connect the outlet directly to the existing opening, and potentially making Lots 1 and 2 parallel with Lot 42. Mr. Park answered that there were not. The existing median cut was outside the south property line, so they would not be able to get far enough south. The entrance had to stay north of the property's south boundary.

Chairperson Funk asked if there was a way to determine if the sewer system would have the capacity for this new development, should it be constructed correctly. Mr. Schlicht answered that it could, if the design slopes and elements such as infiltration could be factored in. Chairperson Funk remarked that it appeared they were asking the developer to fix a problem that he was not responsible for. Mr. Schlicht remarked that this was asking for an interpretation of the original design and how correct it was. It most likely could be done.

Mr. Loveless noted that amenities were not mentioned, and Mr. Schlicht confirmed that they were not being added for this size project. He added that the neighborhood itself did provide some amenities, such as Legacy Park being nearby. That made a swimming pool, workout facility, walking trails and other recreation available. The plan did include landscaping and green space around the perimeter.

Mr. Sanning asked if, while the subdivision was being constructed, construction equipment be turning right in and out or whether they would be going through the existing subdivision. Mr. Park we will restrict all construction traffic to Blackwell, so they would come in from Colbern and make a right turn into the site. Traffic would go back to Colbern on leaving the site, and no construction traffic would be allowed to go through Woodland Shores.

Chairperson Funk asked if there were further questions for the applicant or staff. Hearing none, he closed the public hearing at 6:17 p.m. and asked for discussion among the Commission members, or for a motion.

Ms. Dial said she wanted to see some monetary benefit to the developer. If the original design of the sewer system would have saved the subdivision the \$200,000 cost, there should be an agreement for some cost sharing. Although the Planning Commission did not have that authority, it was something that could be suggested. Lacking that, she would like to see the City making some kind of contribution, with the objective of using the money for the left-turn lane. Mr. Sanning agreed, noting that this seemed to be one of the major public concerns. He recalled that while the Blackwell interchange was being done, he had seen many vehicles drive through since it was the only thoroughfare. He also noted that U-turns on Blackwell were especially difficult while sports events were going on.

Mr. Trafton acknowledged that the Commission did not have the authority to ask the City to help with the infrastructure issues, but a left-turn lane onto Blackwell would be in everyone's interest.

Chairperson Funk said the Commission would need to determine if they wanted to send this matter back for more discussion with Development Services. They also needed to determine if they were in agreement to recommend approval based on the traffic conditions and issues about the sewer system.

Mr. Loveless noted that they were adding capacity to the sewer system, and did not think that it was fair to require the current residents to be responsible for those improvements.

Chairperson Funk asked Mr. Bushek for some procedural advice; specifically if this should be sent back to staff or forward to the City Council. Mr. Bushek answered that there were three options: a recommendation to move the application forward, a recommendation of approval with additional conditions addressing the sewer and access issues, or continuing the application to let staff work with the developer.

Ms. Dial preferred the third option, which would provide an opportunity to discuss some cost sharing. She was in favor of the left-turn lane though it would entail additional cost.

Mr. Sanning noted that the sewer system was apparently not sufficient and asked if there was any precedent of cost sharing between the former developer and the current HOA. Mr.

Bushek said that staff could address this issue; but he could not recall any precedent of that kind.

Mr. Monter did not recall any cost sharing other than upsizing, and he would not want any confusion between the two. When a development was required to put in an 8 inch sewer pipe but the long-term plan mandated a 10 inch pipe, then an upsizing agreement would essentially have the City pay the difference in the cost of the two sizes.

Ms. Ford said she would favor the third option of continuance.

Chairperson Funk stated that he agreed with the idea of continuing the application to allow for more discussion. He did not consider it the developer's responsibility to benefit another development, and this application met the design standards. He asked for a motion to continue, and asked if they had to continue it to a date certain. Mr. Bushek said it would not have to be a date certain. That was usually to provide adequate notice, though it would be better in terms of procedure to cite a specific date.

Ms. Dial made a motion to continue Application PL2019-330, Rezoning from AG to R-1 and Preliminary Development Plan: Woodland Oaks, Lots 1-42 & Tracts A-C, 2501 and 2601 NE Colbern Rd; Engineering Solutions, LLC, applicant to a date certain of September 24, 2020. Mr. Trafton seconded.

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

A motion was made by Vice Chair Dial, seconded by Board Member Trafton, that this Application be continued to the Planning Commission, due back on 9/24/2020. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Chairperson Funk
Vice Chair Dial
Board Member Arth
Board Member Loveless
Board Member Sanning
Board Member Trafton
Jana-Ford

Absent: 2 - Board Member Kitchens
Board Member Lovell

- a [TMP-1668](#) An Ordinance approving a rezoning from Agricultural (AG) to District R-1 and preliminary development plan for approximately 20 acres located at 2501 and 2601 NE Colbern Rd, proposed Woodland Oaks, Lots 1-42 and Tracts A-C, in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 33, the Unified Development Ordinance of Lee's Summit Code of Ordinances, for the City of Lee's Summit, Missouri.

Roundtable

Chairperson Funk welcomed the Commission's new member, Ms. Ford. She had also been present at the joint meeting on Tuesday. The September 24th meeting would be a "hybrid" one, with some members physically present and others not. He would make a list available to Ms. Beck.

Adjournment

There being no further business, Chairperson Funk adjourned the meeting at 6:30 p.m.

Planning Commission

Action Letter

September 10, 2020

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"](https://lsmo.legistar.com)