



## The City of Lee's Summit

### Action Letter

### Planning Commission

Thursday, December 17, 2020

6:00 PM

Via Video Conference

\*\*\*JOINT MEETING WITH CITY COUNCIL\*\*\*

---

Notice is hereby given that the Planning Commission for the City of Lee's Summit will meet in on December 17, 2020 at 6:00 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](http://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](mailto: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 Wednesday, December 16, 2020, by one of the following methods:

- By sending an e-mail to [clerk@cityofls.net](mailto: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.

In the event that the meeting cannot be broadcast via [www.WatchLS.net](http://www.WatchLS.net) and the cable channels noted above, this agenda will be amended to include directions for the public to attend via the Zoom software platform at [www.Zoom.com](http://www.Zoom.com); such amendment will include a specific link to attend the Planning Commission meeting.

**1. Call to Order**

**2. Roll Call**

**Present:** 16 - Chairperson Donnie Funk  
Board Member Dana Arth  
Board Member Tanya Jana-Ford  
Board Member Mark Kitchens  
Board Member Jake Loveless  
Board Member Matt Sanning  
Board Member Terry Trafton  
Mayor Bill Baird  
Councilmember Trish Carlyle  
Councilmember Fred DeMoro  
Councilmember Phyllis Edson  
Councilmember Andrew Felker  
Councilmember Diane Forte  
Councilmember Bob Johnson  
Councilmember Beto Lopez  
Councilmember Hillary Shields

**Absent:** 2 - Vice Chair Carla Dial  
Board Member John Lovell

Note: Councilmember Carlyle joined the meeting at 6:07 PM

**3. Approval of Agenda**

A motion was made by Councilmember Forte, seconded by Councilmember DeMoro, that this agenda be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

**Aye:**

Mayor Baird  
Councilmember Carlyle  
Councilmember DeMoro  
Councilmember Edson  
Councilmember Felker  
Councilmember Forte  
Councilmember Johnson  
Councilmember Lopez  
Councilmember Shields  
**Absent:**  
Councilmember Carlyle

**4. Public Comments**

There were no public comments presented at the meeting.

**5. Items for Discussion**

**A. [2020-3866](#) Ignite Comprehensive Plan Workshop**

Mayor Baird reviewed that the Planning Commission had done a very good job at the last joint meeting about the Comprehensive Plan; and this meeting would continue the discussion. Ms. *Sheila Shockey*, owner of Shockey Consulting Services, had sent some videos in preparation for this meeting. These were posted on the City's website.

*Ms. Sheila Shockey remarked that the videos she had sent were essentially building blocks for the project. She added that Mr. Ryan Elam and Mr. Josh Johnson would give an overview of the process, followed by a discussion of the fiscal model.*

Mr. Elam summarized the presentations given so far, and some of the work that had been done. This had included surveys, podcasts, videos, community meetings and steering committee meetings; as well as the discussion this evening. The next meeting would have a land use map that would be the basis for much of the discussion. This meeting would summarize and wrap up much of that input.

Mr. Johnson reviewed that the City staff had been gathering public input on a variety of subjects related to the Comprehensive Plan. That had started with the strategic plan; and the fiscal impact model would provide additional information about the plan. The City was now at the stage where it could start developing not only the land use map that was tied to the Comprehensive Plan but also start forming goals, policies and objectives. The plan and map essentially knitted many different aspects of the city together. Water Utilities, for example, was currently working on a waste water master plan, using the draft land use map to lay out the future of their part of the city's infrastructure.

The land use map and the plan would be the hub of a wheel that would inform many areas of the City operations and the future of Lee's Summit in general. Participants in future meetings would need to consider the implications of these goals, policies and objectives. They could result in changes to the zoning code as well as parts of the Design and Construction Manual, which was used in site development decisions. There had been considerable discussion about major plans and ideas; and the specific picture had started to develop at this point. Staff might have a draft land use map as well as recommended policies at the next meeting in 2021.

Ms. Shockey then announced that Mr. Tyler Waldorf, also with Shockey Consulting, would give an update on the engagement and community workshop. He had met with staff, and many of the ideas to be discussed had come from the community itself.

Mr. Waldorf emphasized that this had been a very constructive process with a lot of useful feedback from the community. He referenced the engagement summary document included in the pre-workshop materials, and spoke about some of its highlights. The vision statement from the Ignite strategic plan had focused on "*A vibrant community ensuring the finest quality of life for all generations.*" They had started this engagement process in early July, after the first wave of the Covid pandemic.

The displayed first page gave a summary of the tools and methods that had been used in involving the community at large. They had done seven online topical surveys, with over a thousand cumulative survey responses. The top categories were community vision, quality of life and housing. There was also a supplemental forum discussion where people could provide some open-ended discussion of these topics. Housing and transportation were the focus of the most interest. The City had also had an opportunity to host four topical focus groups, including members and partners within Lee's Summit as well as the metro area in general. Those topics addressed design guidelines, economic

development, neighborhoods and housing, and workforce development. Additionally, about 80 Lee's Summit residents had served as a 'pulse' panel, which was intended to give the City quick feedback on the pulse of the community.

Mr. Waldorf then called attention to the right-hand column on the displayed summary. It cited various ways in which Shockey Consulting had utilized the existing City outlets for reaching the community, including podcast, email 'blasts', newsletters and social media. All had helped ensure that the engagement process covered a broad range of Lee's Summit residents. The consultants had mapped the responses in the online surveys that had included contact information. Mr. Waldorf then displayed the map showing the geographical pattern of these responses, which showed fairly even distribution throughout the Lee's Summit area. Mr. Waldorf displayed some of the survey response summaries from the seven topic areas. Many of the ideas were consistent with what the community at large was responding to.

Community workshops had been held over four evenings during the week of November 16th with a total of about 80 participants. Most of the discussions had centered on the "five big topics" covered in the videos shared with the Council and the Commission. At the end of each of these workshops, the consultants had asked a poll question to get their priority responses on the issues covered that evening. Across those four evenings, the most prominent priority was "improving ability to bike and walk for recreation and transportation"; and the second was "preserving natural resources, greenways and open space." The third priority was a tie between "focus [on] higher density residential and commercial business and activity centers" and "attracting new jobs with flex/tech industrial and grow new entrepreneurs". The consultants had also provided a breakdown of responses from each of the districts.

Ms. Molly Saunders, also with Shockey Consulting, addressed the fiscal impact model in detail, including best practices and case scenarios. The information she would be providing would not all be specific to Lee's Summit but the concepts would be applicable. The vision statement implied ideas of sustainability and ensuring that decisions made today would have a positive impact on the future; and the fiscal impact model was partly about ensuring that outcome for future generations.

Of the policies set, and decisions made, by elected officials the city budget was among the most important. This influenced what levels of service could be and what would be accomplished. The way that land was used because the way land was used in a community, because that had a direct impact on tax revenues as well as what investments needed to be made on infrastructure and services. It could be used to "*evaluate the potential financial outcome of cumulative land use and development decisions*" of the City over time. It could also influence agility and resilience in decision making, because City officials could know in advance what the consequences of decisions might be. It could also increase the City's ability to respond to an occurrence that caused a major change in the community.

Ms. Saunders then gave an explanation of the fiscal modeling process, which brought land use planning and financial indicators together. She encouraged questions from the Councilmembers members and Commissioners. The fiscal model for Lee's Summit that City staff and the consultants were putting together started with some of the information already presented this evening. It actually started with the strategic plan, as that determined what the critical success factors were; and those factors would influence land use decisions. The consultants had taken a look at the existing major plans and the plans that were in process; all of which were being considered in putting the Comprehensive Plan together. That would mean involvement of the City Council, Planning Commission and staff throughout the process. The consultants had also been doing market analysis, with demographic trends and changes, and job projections. Looking at the market could reveal what could realistically be expected from industrial and commercial growth and population projections.

All this information was used in developing the land use approach, in which the consultants had taken a holistic perspective but then narrowed it down to opportunity areas. The activity center concept placed strategic development in areas of concentrated density and special places, including industrial uses and strategies for maximizing industrial land. This approach could mean a boost to revenues.

The next step after feedback from the Council and Commission would be developing a land use map showing where various land uses would be and how many acres would be dedicated to what land uses. Modeling the financial applications such as property and sales taxes, and looking at development patterns would help in estimating what expected revenues would be, what investments would be acquired and what expenses would be incurred with different types of development. Realistic estimates of capital and maintenance costs of infrastructure, could determine what kind of facilities were needed to support population growth. These would go into an estimate of overall expected cost.

After all these factors were put together, the consultants ran some scenarios, including the possible financial outcome of using a current vs. proposed development approach. The latter made use of activity centers and industrial land use and housing strategies including how industrial development would affect net revenues. Ms. Saunders added that the consultants could put some numbers on the model and bring them back to the Council and Commission; but it was important to understand where and involving what ideas those numbers came from.

Ms. Saunders then covered some best practices and case examples, emphasizing that fiscal impact was just one factor. Other considerations had to include what would the market bear. The community vision and benefit were also valuable parts of decision making. The right choice might have the highest revenue outcome but meet some other important goals. The scenarios were based on a 'sample' US city, and not on Lee's Summit specifically. The densities and property attributes were based on national averages.

Ms. Saunders noted that different land uses could vary in both type and intensity, with transition an important factor. A gradual increase in density, for example, was preferable to an abrupt change from low density to high.

In terms of maximizing revenue it was often helpful to think about two different types of development on approximately the same size properties. A display of two contrasting commercial sites showed a single building on .72 acre, with a lot of parking and a small building footprint, with a revenue per acre of \$6,692. That was less than half of the \$12,940 for .76 acres with a mixed use development with mostly on street parking.

Another scenario involved 420 acres of vacant land. It could be developed in three different ways, with different financial outcomes based on property tax increases. Scenario 1 was a typical suburban development with larger lots and low intensity commercial development. Property tax revenue per acre was \$32,600. The next scenario involved increasing density and the intensity of uses. A medium-intensity development would add some multi-family housing, some industrial use and "Main Street" commercial use. That increased the property tax revenue per acre to \$53,000.

The high-intensity scenario was not equivalent to development in Lee's Summit. It would involve high intensity Main Street commercial use as well as mid-rise mixed use, warehouses, urban multi-family and townhome development, and mid-rise mixed and office uses. Some park space would be added to preserve some open space and offset some of the density. The property tax revenue per acre would increase considerably, to \$108,667. These examples illustrated how land use decisions impacted the bottom line.

Regarding infrastructure costs, high-intensity uses were more expensive but these costs did not significantly vary among low, medium and high intensity. Roads, water and sewer costs were mostly unchanged based on land use, though high intensity had higher costs for roads. Other considerations not accounted for in the model included capital costs from new public safety facilities and operational costs. Ms. Saunders acknowledged that the calculations for this model were for a sample 420 acres, not the entire community.

Various scenarios might be better financially. A funding gap did not mean abandoning the plan. Although tax increases were not popular, increasing taxes and/or fees were an option. Another was keeping taxes and fees unchanged but decreasing levels of service; and the third option was to "*shift development pattern(s) and infrastructure investments to maximize revenue and minimize cost*". Shifting development patterns could go beyond the Comprehensive Plan. Several approaches existed in terms of policies for sustainable development. A high ratio of a building's footprint to the land it was on would result in minimum lot coverage, as would multi-story buildings, smaller buildings, narrow lot frontage and small lot sizes. Narrow lots could have the same square footage as broader ones if they were deep enough.

Ms. Saunders then asked for some discussion. Mr. Arbo noted that about 20

years ago, in the early 2000s, the City had updated a comprehensive plan that did not have as broad a range as the present one. They had tried to introduce a fiscal model, with some success. Among the things he had learned from this process was that a fiscal model tended to be most effective for a large scale, big-picture conversation. At the time, it was assumed that the model could be applied to a development such as a shopping center or apartment complex to determine whether the development was financially feasible. Lee's Summit covered about 67 square miles and an assessed valuation of \$2.3 billion; so one shopping center or apartment building was not a major factor. The model would be useful in looking ahead to the probable future.

Staff had assumed that the fiscal model could be maintained by having each City department responsible for updating their expenditure and revenue factors; and in fact it could be only six months before the model would become outdated and not suited to current needs. He was already in discussions about long-term plans to ensure a single point of responsibility for maintaining it.

Councilmember Johnson agreed with many of Mr. Arbo's remarks about sustainable development issues. He had kept a record of revenue and assessment issues; and had recently done his own review of the last decade of assessed valuation for both residential and commercial properties. Every year for the past decade, the assessed valuation for real property was over 80 percent residential. Essentially, City Hall was being financed by residential homeowners.

Councilmember Johnson then asked if the Commissioners and Councilmembers were familiar with the Missouri Tax Incentive Financing law. Ms. Saunders replied that she was. Councilmember Johnson remarked that much of Lee's Summit's retail development over the last decade had been done with tax increment financing (TIF). This had been something of a drag on property taxes, as most of the funds stayed with the developer rather than being used for funding of public services such as the fire and police departments.

Mayor Baird remarked that he would like to go through these numbers more thoroughly. This Council was very analytical and would be interested in the information about revenue generated per acre in terms of types of development. Ms. Saunders responded that once the model was done, the densities and land use types would be specific to Lee's Summit and not general averages. It was not likely that the near future would involve high-rise office buildings.

Councilmember Forte stated that the difference between the acreage and the increment of what that acreage could go to was amazing. Lee's Summit might not have a nine-story building but the incremental difference was impressive. She suggested that Ms. Saunders address Councilmember Johnson's remark about the model might include a TIF or other tax abatement. That would give an indication of what the payback on the investment would be in terms of density of development.

Ms. Shockey displayed a summary of methods for achieving the goals of the vision statement. She reviewed that there were ten building blocks and 16 goals,

all aligned with the Ignite strategic plan. They were focusing efforts on the long-term strategies, infrastructure and investments in land use policies. The discussion about the Ignite strategic plan was the basis, but the consultants had also looked at trends and disruptors. The market analysis had heavily influenced the recommendations they made, looking at Lee's Summit in a national and regional context; as well as by sector. They had also considered strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and challenges specific to the community; and also looked at national best practices for high-performing and growing suburbs similar to Lee's Summit. That had to include looking at the community vision, goals, the market, and the impact of all these factors.

The four "building blocks" had been reviewed at the last community meeting: preserving natural resources, open space and historic resources; enhancing single-family neighborhoods in view of changes in housing market demands, strengthen the community 'anchors' and locate them where they could best serve both Lee's Summit and the region in general; and strengthening the Downtown neighborhood in particular.

Neighborhoods and Housing Strategies. Ms. Shockey noted that there had been positive feedback from both the Planning Commission and City Council in terms of agreement on the items such as filling sidewalk gaps, adding curbs and gutters and generally modernizing and improving maintenance of the streets as well as any infrastructure pipes underneath them. Strengthening infrastructure often acted to encourage homeowners to make improvements to their own properties as well.

Building new neighborhoods to meet changing market needs. This had also been a highlight of the community meetings.

Building new neighborhoods around a grid street network. The fiscal impact model provided additional information and the consultants would provide more information.

Making sure that infill housing fits the neighborhood's character. There were some varied opinions but the consensus was that this was an important, or very important, aspect.

One item that definitely needed more information was the issue of allowed accessory structures in single-family residential neighborhoods; and specifically accessory dwelling units. Ms. Shockey asked the Commissioners and Councilmembers for some feedback and questions, with a presentation at a future meeting in mind. They could then focus on how these would work and what the advantages and disadvantages would be.

Commissioner Sanning remarked that accessory dwelling units [ADUs] were an interesting concept, though the Home Owners Associations were effectively excluded. His concern was the full use of those particular options when the ADUs came in, as he regarded them as essentially rental units with possible options for low-income housing. He was not sure how they would be used and where the limitations were, as there was no oversight except in the codes. Ms.



Shockey noted that this had been brought up at the community workshop in specific terms, such as how parking would work. She would bring back information about some of the possibilities.

Regarding accessory dwelling units, Mayor Baird asked some direction regarding how the City could exercise some control, such as requiring the property owner to live in at least one of the dwelling units on the property. He noted that an accessory structure could be a detached parking garage. Drastic changes would be likely in the next decade and were already happening, such as self-driving cars and transportation alternatives such as Uber. These changes would have to be factored into conversations about parking needs, and he would like to see some detailed information on that.

Councilmember Edson remarked that ADUs could work in some areas and on some lots; specifically larger lots. Many Lee's Summit neighborhoods had smaller lot sizes; and others had larger lot sizes with smaller homes. It was likely that an ADU would work better with a larger lot. She wanted to see some specific information about where an accessory dwelling unit would be appropriate and what lot size might be required.

Commissioner Funk noted that there would need to be an enforcement mechanism if ADUs were allowed, including a determination of what lots were suited for that and what were not. In some cases, the grade of the lot and potential drainage issues would need to be considered. Ms. Shockey responded that many of these issues could be addressed by the zoning codes. Mr. Johnson stated that there were variables involved that could be addressed if the City decided to allow accessory structures.

Commissioner Trafton noted that zoning designations and requirements could be a factor in allowing ADUs. They might, for example, be restricted to lots with RLL zoning, and PMIX zoning already allowed them.

Ms. Shockey remarked that the community meeting had been divided on policies and approaches to a vacant lot or lots in a neighborhood; and specifically whether a new home built on an existing vacant lot would have to fit into the neighborhood's existing character. It was an issue in first-ring suburbs in the Kansas City region, where a large home might be built in a neighborhood where homes were typically smaller. She asked if the Commission and Council were confident that the existing codes addressed that. Commissioner Sanning responded that this subject had recently come up in Planning Commission meetings. He had a concern about which developer would have the responsibility to conform to an existing, and remarked that this was often a sensitive subject. He was not certain whether there was a responsibility for separate properties or homeowners in terms of conformity, outside of City codes and City standards.

The next subject covered was the issue of extending infrastructure to new areas of development where new housing options were financially feasible. The majority in the community meeting considered that taking financial feasibility into account was important. One individual did not consider it important, and

another had asked for additional information beyond the financial model. Ms. Shockey asked if there was any discussion about the issue of whether the cost of extending infrastructure was feasible.

Councilmember Johnson emphasized that he agreed with the comment from someone who *"would like to see more small single-family homes being brought forward than townhomes"*, and specifically more small single-family homes in the \$250,000 to \$350,000 price range than townhomes costing \$350,000. Ms. Shockey acknowledged that this had been brought up at the community meetings.

Councilmember Edson observed that neighborhoods with townhomes and four-plexes along with large single-family homes were becoming more common. Before this year, there were a lot of neighborhoods with homes all about the same size and in the same price range. People in the millennial generation typically did not like this kind of cookie-cutter neighborhood. They preferred neighborhoods with a lot of variety in style and size, where a resident could change homes as their needs changed over time, or where a neighborhood might include two or three generations of residents. At present, Lee's Summit did not have many neighborhoods like that. She would like to see more neighborhoods that included 1,500 square foot homes as well as 4,500 square foot homes, and a variety of styles. Ms. Shockey observed that this was something that Ms. Saunders had referenced about the scale of buildings and variety of sizes in residential neighborhoods.

Mayor Baird noted a trend in real estate where people might be downsizing in terms of house size, though not necessarily price. If a home included a lot of amenities, the price per square foot might be high regardless of the home's size. He wanted some more information about this trend.

Commissioner Kitchens noted another trend toward maintenance-provided properties, with chores such as yard work being done through a central organization. Strategic planning would need to allow for this trend. Concerning multiple generations in a neighborhood, he noted that accessory dwelling units would probably be an essential part of elderly parents or grandparents living on the same property as their children or grandchildren. These arrangements allowed many elderly people to live independently, but with family on the same property; so some consideration should be given to not be overly restrictive about ADUs, with some reasonable code limitations.

Ms. Shockey then displayed a map showing areas of single-family development. As Councilmember Johnson had observed, most property tax revenue came from residential use, which was also most of the land use in Lee's Summit. Allowing residential uses to grow and change with the market and with residents' needs was the direction the community should take.

Additional "building blocks" included developing *"new areas of Lee's Summit that increase the options, anticipate market demand and fit the character of our vibrant community."* Others included encouraging more light industrial businesses that would provide employment opportunities, and encouraging

commercial development and redevelopment projects in activity centers. The latter might be discussed in terms of where new development with higher intensity and density could be located; both commercial and residential. The consultants, working with City staff, had identified five areas with the highest potential for both new development and redevelopment.

The item most discussed at the community workshops was the importance of well-maintained, accessible sidewalks without gaps, as well as a trail and street network. *“Adapting to future transportation technologies and demand”* had been the basis of the references to self-driving cars and ride services. The fiscal impact model would be valuable in building and maintaining *“sustainable infrastructure to serve the community without burdening future generations.”* Overall, the City's goal and its approach to land use was to preserve certain things that people were drawn to and that made the community strong. Another objective was to strengthen foundational areas such as Downtown and transform certain places with new development or redevelopment.

One question for the community was *“Do we fuel our future [via] growing the tax base or jobs, or both?”* “Both” was the majority preference. Lee's Summit had jobs centered around health care and retail trade plus some manufacturing and jobs related to entertainment and recreation. However, some change and necessary adaptation would occur in the near future. Anything with a wage lower than \$17 per hour was likely to be vulnerable to automation and robotics. Employment patterns in the future would be a factor in determining what the associated land use would be.

A displayed slide showed about 12 percent of the city's work force lived in Lee's Summit. This year about 48 percent lived in in Lee's Summit but were employed elsewhere, with 40 percent working in Lee's Summit but living outside the city. Current trends suggested that more people would work at home in the future but also have jobs a few days of the week. Many of the 40 percent of people who came to Lee's Summit to work had jobs in retail. Additional growth was expected in health care related jobs and scientific professionals in animal science plus employees of Logistics LLC. The numbers were based on KC Rising's regional goals. The Kansas City region was working to improve the gross domestic product, number of quality jobs and median household income. Market growth was projected to be substantial, especially in comparison to other regions.

Building Block 6 cited recruiting *“additional light industrial businesses”*, which would increase Lee's Summit's tax base as well as creating more jobs. Employment in the technology, professional and scientific fields could reduce the threat in terms of automation and artificial intelligence. Based on the Site Selectors Guild, suburban demand should be increasing. It had actually been strengthened this year despite the Covid pandemic. Bio tech, life sciences and advanced manufacturing using technology were the two areas that had a strong position in the Kansas City region as well as nationwide.

Lee's Summit had four major sites, including the Airport that would grow and had the highest market potential. Plus additional areas that were zoned

industrial for future development. In addition to traditional industrial use, flex/tech industrial consisted of office use in the front of the building and light manufacturing in the back. The demand for this kind of use was growing in the Kansas City region and had real potential for Lee's Summit.

Another type of industrial use today was a response to so many jobs being automated through artificial intelligence, some manufacturing was done with a 'craftsman' approach, utilizing skills in terms of operating technologies would even include manufacturing via 3D printing. Communities interested in encouraging entrepreneurs were developing innovative technology locations called "maker spaces," using these technologies and tools to collaborate in a single location.

The consultants had asked the community for its opinion of these strategies to attract new jobs and property investment, expand the tax base and tax revenue with flex/tech industrial, and the response had been 100 percent positive in both the workshops and in surveys. There was also considerable interest in extending infrastructure to new areas of development where it was financially feasible. Some responses indicated that it would make more sense to determine where it would work best. Responses to focusing commercial redevelopment and activity centers showed less interest; and maker space had mixed responses as well.

Ms. Shockey then asked for some discussion about future industrial development and employment. Commissioner Loveless said that for him, industrial development came down to the businesses and tax programs the City had in place to track those businesses. Lee's Summit had a fair number of home-grown businesses, some in the industrial centers that the city currently had. For him the key would be programs that the City would be able to implement for specific businesses. Commissioner Lopez said he had talked in the past about this. Obviously the city needed more investment, whether with the flex/tech approach or a combination of that and newer industrial properties and facilities. He hoped that proactive planning would help. In his opinion, it came down to infrastructure.

As the City planned for the PRI development, it might be able to be more proactive with those properties than in the past with existing industrial properties, with water and sewer lines, better roads and better access to major thoroughfares. It was definitely something the City needed to do going forward, as the lack of these proactive measures had definitely been negative so far. It would be essential in attracting this kind of development.

Councilmember Forte agreed with Mr. Lopez' assessment of the importance of infrastructure. The Council had discussed the infrastructure, regarding City-owned property including the PRI acreage. Part of the problem was that someone would want to develop it, often trying to finance the infrastructure via TIFs. The focus should be on proactive financing and not who was responsible for difficulty in doing that. That was where the City needed help. She had been on the Council for over seven years, and she agreed that the biggest challenge in making progress was getting that infrastructure ready. The land and the

potential were already there and there were companies that wanted to be in Lee's Summit; but the City needed to do the preparation work and did need help with that. Concerning the flex/tech approach, Councilmember Forte asserted

**6. Roundtable**

**7. Adjournment**

**There being no further business, Mayor Baird adjourned the meeting at 8:30 PM.**

For your convenience, City Council agendas, as well as videos of City Council and Council Committee meetings, may be viewed on the City's Legislative Information Center website at "[lsmo.legistar.com](https://lsmo.legistar.com)"