

City of Leawood Planning Commission Minutes

January 11, 2005
Work session – 6:00 p.m.
Meeting – 7:00 p.m.
Leawood City Hall
4800 Town Center Drive

CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL: Henderson, Perkins, Rohlf, Conrad, Duffendack, Munson, Williams, Azeltine, Pilcher

REMAND FROM THE GOVERNING BODY:

CASE 80-04 20/20 BUILDING (FORMERLY KNIGHT RIDDER) Request for approval of a final site plan. Located at 89th Street and State Line Road.

Staff presentation: Presentation by Diane Binckley. This case was placed on the consent agenda and then pulled off at the Council level and remanded to the Commission to allow the Commission to review it in an open forum and add any comments as to why the Commission is in approval of supporting a deviation. The deviations for this project include the fact that the proposed trash enclosure is not attached to the building, but encroaches on the side yard setback. Staff is supportive of these deviations because there is nowhere appropriate to locate the trash enclosure that is not at the front of the building and that also allowed for the trash trucks to be allowed to access the trash enclosure appropriately. Therefore, to have it detached, although at a close proximity, seemed appropriate. It is also at the rear of the building. The setback is based on the fact that trash enclosure is next to a large cliff area and sets at the furthest point away from any of the residential properties in the area. Staff supports this request. The Commission recommended approval of this case previously. The applicant is available for any questions.

Perkins asked if there is a portico requested for the front of the building. Binckley stated, yes. The applicant is requesting a covered portion to be added to the front of the building. The color will match the current color of the building.

Williams asked approximately when the office building was constructed and why a trash enclosure was not provided at that time. Binckley stated she believes it was built in the late 80's. She is not sure why a trash enclosure was not included at that time. Perhaps they were planning on handling the trash internally. In recent years, there has been some concern about leaving trash dumpsters outside with no sort of protection.

Munson asked what kind of activity happens at this building. Binckley stated nothing right now. The owners are in the process of getting new tenants. Munson asked if it is zoned for office. Binckley stated, yes.

Henderson stated the Commission has been insisting on attached trash enclosures for the past few years. He then asked what would happen if they required the trash enclosure to be attached. Binckley stated staff has looked at the site and there is no place to attach a trash enclosure. Duffendack stated the purpose of the requirement to attach the trash enclosure has to do with primary design. It is generally a better architectural solution if trash enclosures are designed into the building when it is built. He does not believe the intent of the requirement is to make it retroactive. If a trash enclosure was not originally required, then to force it onto the architecture of the building seems inappropriate. Henderson agreed with Duffendack in principle. He was questioning whether the corner of the building could be turned into an internal trash enclosure. Duffendack stated they would need to be concerned about the loss of windows or the visual access on the outside. He feels it is a better solution to allow a detached trash enclosure. Henderson stated he is worried that more buildings will be built and trash may become a larger item than

it is now. They may be faced with this situation with other older buildings. He then asked what this implies for the Commission on such cases.

Williams stated the Commission does not have any control over trash dumpsters. He then asked staff if the Commission could start insisting that new buildings get built with some sort of trash enclosure.

Binckley stated there are ways to change the proposed trash enclosure to make it attached, but the question is the intent of the ordinance. Staff looked at locations underneath and there was no way to locate it there. There is no way to place the trash enclosure towards the front and along the other side and allow a truck to turn in appropriately. Staff feels this is the closest spot to the main building. The intent of having the trash enclosure attached to the building is for maintenance purposes. If the enclosure is nearby, they are more likely to keep it maintained.

Williams stated he is comfortable with staff's recommendation.

Pilcher asked for clarification of Council's remand. It seems to him that there are two issues. One is that the trash enclosure encroaches on the 40-ft. building setback and the other is that it is not attached. Binckley stated those are two separate issues. The first is that the trash enclosure is not attached. The 40 ft. setback is because the City considers a trash enclosure as part of a structure and so the building has to meet a 40 ft. setback all the way around, but based on the site constraints and the best location away from the residences, it seemed appropriate to grant a deviation in this situation. Pilcher asked if there is a wall to the north of the trash enclosure. Binckley stated there is a sidewalk, and then along that property line there is a substantial cliff. Binckley showed a photo of the current site and showed where the trash enclosure would be located.

Pilcher asked the height of the concrete block walls around the trash enclosure. Joseph stated 7 ft. - 4 inches. Pilcher asked if there is a top on the trash enclosure. Binckley stated, no.

A motion to approve was made by Williams and seconded by Azeltine.

Henderson stated he would hope that the Commission's vote for approval of this would not be perceived as a precedent. He would also like the Commission to discuss, perhaps in a work session, looking at options on how to face additional situations similar to this for older buildings coming in for things related to trash enclosures. Munson asked if this should be conveyed in the motion to the Council. Henderson stated he would like Council to understand the Commission's intent. Duffendack stated it would be written in the minutes, but he does not feel it should be made part of the motion. Binckley stated Council receives a copy of the minutes with their packets. Munson stated he would like the minutes to reflect that the approval of this trash enclosure is based on the fact that this is a unique situation and that it will not set a precedent. Williams asked if it would be appropriate to add an amendment or clause to the motion that applies to potential cases in the future, versus taking some other action separate of this case, that addresses trash enclosures on older buildings in similar situations, but not an action that has no direct bearing on this. We are approving this on its merits versus establishing precedent and stipulations that do not apply here, but we are trying to make them apply later on down the road. Duffendack stated the Commission does not have the power to set precedent. We act on each case individually, always taking into account all of the material presented and we act on each case as a separate case. He does not share the feeling that they are going down a slippery path if they make a vote on a particular case. Williams stated it was not his intent to withdraw or amend his motion, he just wants to clarify that the Commission is dealing with this individual case, and not those that may or may not happen in the future. He does share Henderson's concern on how they address this, and he feels that should be taken up at a different time.

Motion approved unanimously.

Henderson requested that staff place on an early agenda of a work session the concern about trash enclosures on older buildings where that enclosure is not immediately adjacent to the building. Williams suggested also looking at the requirements for newer buildings and whether they feel that it should be a requirement that any new building have the provisions for trash enclosures so that they do not have to face this situation 5 years or so after the building

is open. Henderson suggested rephrasing his original suggestion to say, "We request the staff to bring to the attention of the Planning Commission at an early work session considerations for trash enclosures for all buildings that come to the Planning Commission including newly constructed buildings and older buildings being renovated." Azeltine asked if they should just review that portion of the code. Henderson stated he wants to be specific about what they do, not just review the code. Binckley stated staff understands and it does not need to be a formal motion. Duffendack asked if there is room on the February work session agenda to discuss this. Binckley stated, yes.

CASE 85-04 CHURCH OF THE RESURRECTION - DIRECTIONAL SIGNS Request for approval of a final site plan for directional signs. Located at 13720 Roe Avenue.

Commissioner Rohlf recused herself from this case.

Staff presentation: This case is a remand from the Governing Body. There was a request made for the Commission to make comment on the record as to their reason for support of this case. This was approved via consent agenda on a previous meeting. Council's concern is the size of the directional signs and the fact that a deviation from ordinance has been approved on directional signs for the project. The other comment she heard identified the concern for the size of the wording where it states, "United Methodist Church of the Resurrection" at the top in comparison with the other wording on the sign. The applicant is available if the Commission has any questions.

Henderson asked the comparative value of these directional signs in relation to the directional signs at the new City Park. Binckley stated she does not know. Henderson stated the signs at the park are fairly good sized with 4 to 6 lines of text, as are the church signs. Binckley stated she does not know the size of the parks' signs. Staff is supportive of these signs. Typically, directional signs are at banks with a drive-thru facility in order to give people direction on where to go. The Church of the Resurrection is a different situation. It is a fairly substantial campus setting with a number of people coming from the outside to use their facility. Staff worked with the applicant to move the larger signs back off of the street as much as possible, giving people time to get onto the site, and still be able to see those as they have entered on, but yet be off of the major street, keeping that view away from the public road. Azeltine asked how far away the signs are off of the major roads. Binckley stated they are about 150 ft. off of Nall Avenue and the smaller signs are located internal to the site. One would need to be on the site to see the smaller signs.

Azeltine stated he feels the deviation is justified because it is a private campus and there are not a lot of other public buildings around these signs. The fact that they will be 150 ft. from the street is another good reason for the deviation.

Munson stated it seems that Council had two concerns. One was the size of the signs and the other was the size of the word, "resurrection". Henderson stated it looks like the word, "resurrection", is large. Williams stated the Sprint campus does not have large logos that say, "Sprint", on their directional signs. The ordinance allows a maximum of 6 sq. ft. There are 4 1/2 sq. ft. taken up in just the logo piece. That is a major contributing factor to the need of the deviation. If they reduce the size of the logo, they reduce the size of the sign, while not impacting the information they are trying to convey. Perkins agreed with Williams. He does not see a need for the church's name on the directional signs. Pilcher asked if the church has any monument signs. Binckley stated there is a monument sign on Roe Avenue. With future development, and as they get closer to Nall Avenue, there is potential for more monument signs. Dick Cooper, the applicant, is available for any questions.

Dick Cooper, representing the Church of the Resurrection, stated when the church added the most recent addition, they decided not to put a sign along Nall Avenue because they knew Nall Avenue would eventually be widened. They felt they should wait until that project was completed. One of the reasons for the signs is so that a person would see a sign soon after turning in. They would like to do something on the Nall Avenue side, where there is no monument sign.

Williams asked why they are proposing two signs at each of the roadways. Cooper stated they were trying to be able to get information to people quickly as they drive through. There are two buildings. They wanted to color-code each building and its contents with a certain color. Williams stated it seems that having two large signs with a lot of information on both could be very confusing, particularly to a person who is new to the campus. Cooper stated they were trying to give people a small amount of information as they first came onto the campus, then more detailed information once they were closer to the buildings. In most of their correspondence, they list "lot A" or whichever lot is closest to the building they need to get to.

Henderson asked if they could separate out directional signs from directory information. Cooper stated they are planning on having directory signs inside the buildings. Henderson asked what it is that they actually need, if they were to take off the big word, "resurrection", and they were to separate the two buildings. Cooper stated if they were to take the logos off, people are looking for direction for the room they need to go to, then which building, then which parking lot to park in that would be closest to the building. Henderson stated he feels that a person coming to the campus for a funeral would not be able to use the proposed directional signs to figure out where to go. Cooper stated if a person read about the funeral in an obituary, it would say, "Church of the Resurrection Chapel". Henderson suggested the sign to have just "chapel" and "classrooms" listed, instead of all of the detail they are proposing.

Munson stated that Councilman Gill stated in the remand that the applicant is requesting 200% more than allowed. Munson then asked Binckley if she knew how he came up with that number. Binckley stated she does not know. She believes that could have been identifying the number of wall and monument signs allowed. Munson stated the Commission normally does not want any kind of advertisement on directional signs and he feels the logo and name of the church could be considered that. He is afraid that the signs could become too confusing. He then asked if it could be done in a simpler way with fewer signs. Cooper stated they want people to be able to use a sign to figure out where to go. They could go back to look at the number of signs. They could probably take the logo off of the signs.

Henderson stated he would like them to figure out how to use just three words to get people on the right path and not rely on a sequence of signs. Munson asked if the applicant considered 6 sq. ft., individual signs so that people could read them as they drive along the driveway. Cooper stated they did look at that, but their fear was that they would end up with more signs. The primary things they want people to see is which building, which parking lot, which rooms and some key features like sanctuary, chapel and Discovery Arc. They tried to identify the major key features of the building and then how to get people into those specific areas.

Perkins suggested removing the resurrection logos from the top and moving everything to the top. Cooper stated it would certainly be less square footage. Henderson stated he saw signs like this at the park and they got him to where he was going. Duffendack stated he feels the difference is that this is a signage system, not just individual signs. There will be other buildings later that will make them re-sign the parking lot at a later point. Cooper stated the signs are designed to allow the word bars to be changed as things change. Duffendack stated he feels it is a good system.

Azeltine asked if there would be any reason for anyone to drive by these signs and not go to the church. Cooper stated only if the person were cutting through the property to get to Nall Avenue or Roe Avenue. Azeltine asked if there are any businesses or prospective businesses that would need to drive by these signs to get to their building. Cooper stated, no. Azeltine stated he believes that should be the main rationale for granting the deviation. The church is not impinging on anyone by having the signs there.

Munson asked if the special use permit is temporary. Binckley stated the special use permit for the church runs with the life of the church.

Williams asked what other signs exist today that these would relate to. If they are directing people to parking lots, then there must already be parking lot designations. He then asked if there are already signs out there to say where each of the parking lots are located. Cooper stated there are currently vinyl letters on the light poles. Those are the

only indicators that would tell a person where they are on the campus. Williams stated his concern is that with the number of signs and size, it seems to detract from the buildings themselves. Some of this information is clearly necessary. Cooper stated there are a large number of signs that are not anywhere near a building; they are out along a roadway. Williams stated the east building is showing five signs and the west building is showing two signs. There are two on the south side and one on the north side. Cooper agreed with Williams.

Henderson stated it seems to him they are facing another issue and not only the size. In comparison with the Church of the Nativity, this church has multiple entries and the Church of the Nativity has two. He feels that maybe there is a different mindset between Council and the Commission on the ideas of the signs.

Munson stated he is thinking of Johnson County Community College and they do not have a lot of signs like this. They put the name of the buildings on the buildings. Cooper stated they looked at that for an option. Williams stated he is hoping that Commissioner Munson is not suggesting that the church put signs on their buildings to read, "east building" or "west building". He would support the proposed signs before he would support signs on the buildings.

Conrad stated he feels that it is not until a person gets into the intersection of parking lots G, F and H where the vehicular traffic really has an opportunity to make a decision. He wonders the effectiveness of those signs. There is a difference between vehicular traffic and pedestrian traffic. He questioned the usefulness of the three locations of the "AA" signs. Cooper agreed. The church wants to make sure that a person has information before they have to make a decision. If one is coming in on the extreme southwest, they have three choices before they even get up to see a building. They want to let people know that they have these parking lots coming up, but if they are coming to the chapel, they should not park in these lots, or else they would have a long walk. That was part of the decision-making. They erred on the side of over-communicating. It was certainly not to create sign pollution. They could look at the north-south connector, perhaps those "AA" signs be moved in and then remove the one off of 137th Street. Their concern was that people were given information before they had to make a decision.

Williams asked the relevance of a visitor knowing the location of a parking lot. If the parking lot designations are on the light poles, then people can see those. They need to know which road will take them to each building, but not necessarily the parking lots.

Henderson asked Duffendack if the Commission would need to make a decision tonight on the remand. They have raised the issues of size and relevance of information. He then asked if the Commission could ask the applicant to come back with revised additions of the signs. Duffendack stated that is a possibility. It sounds as if Cooper has other ideas for the signs in addition to the ones brought up by the Commission. Cooper asked for a continuance to allow the applicant to resubmit.

A motion to accept the applicant's request for a continuance to the February 22, 2005 meeting was made by Henderson and seconded by Williams. Motion approved unanimously.

CASE 84-04 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN Request for approval of the 2004 Leawood Comprehensive Plan.

Staff presentation: Presentation by Diane Binckley. This is a remand from the Governing Body. Staff requested to remand this item because there were some discussions that came about from a specific property owner who holds property at the northwest corner of College and Tomahawk Creek Parkway after approval from the Planning Commission. A letter came in from the attorney's office that represents that individual and she is going to read it later into the record, as promised. Approximately four years ago, there was a comprehensive plan amendment for this piece of property, which is owned by the Longs. It is approximately 5 1/2 acres. The Commission has recently seen a plan for this piece of property. The property was changed to Open Space - Public. The zoning change was approved based on comments and directions from various individuals and because of the lack of comments back from the property owner and also because it is about 90% in the flood plain. Since that time, there has been a request that we change that use. Council also felt that it should be changed back to residential. It has been shown as residential as far back as Binckley could find on the comprehensive plan. Staff is recommending that zoning

change tonight. In addition, staff is also recommending the comprehensive plan document show a dashed orange line around properties that staff feels are also appropriate for continuing care or assisted living type facilities. Staff is also requesting the Commission include that in your approval. There was also a request by a Council member to change the pedestrian bike trail map to include a new bike trail section that would connect from State Line Road, along the north side of the Ward Parkway parking lot and then on to the south which would ultimately connect into the Estates of Old Leawood property and the green space there. Since the Commission last saw this document, staff has been in contact with those property owners trying to obtain approval for those bike trails. Staff has shown it on the comprehensive plan because they have received approval from one of the owners and feels the other owner is in approval as well. There were some comments made by one of the council members asking for certain modifications and wording and those were shown on this submittal.

Williams stated page 47 talks about the demographic profiles. He would like to know how those numbers were developed. He stated it references a 1996 census and then asked if there are newer numbers than that. Binckley stated there are. The numbers staff came up with were based on the 2000 census and then estimated beyond that. The 1996 reference was an error. Williams stated the term "unique development" is used to describe Parkway Plaza on page 67. In reading the descriptions of any of the other projects, there is no other suggestive description of a particular development. He is not sure if it is appropriate to describe a particular development as "unique" versus the style of the development. In Park Place there is a description of "new urbanist" which he feels it is appropriate, but he feels we should not convey that one development is better than another. Binckley stated she feels the reason "unique" was probably used there is because it is a type of development that we really do not have a name for. She understands Williams' comment, and they could take that descriptive word out. Williams stated even though it is different from other developments, he would not say that it is dramatically unique. He is more concerned about establishing a subjective description about other developments. On page 68, in regard to the 135th Street corridor, it seems the north side is separated from the south side as if they are two completely different areas. He then asked if there is a reason for that, versus having all of the developments along 135th Street identified as 135th Street Corridor developments. Binckley stated 135th Street is the dividing street between the central area and the south area in all of the descriptions in the comprehensive plan. Williams stated he can understand that, but he wonders if it would be better to group those developments along 135th Street. Henderson stated there is a sentence in the comprehensive plan that says that it is used only for the sake of this clarification into three groups. Otherwise, everything else is congruent. There is a qualifying statement that explains what Williams is suggesting. Duffendack is worried that if someone were to skim through the document and look for 135th Street developments they might miss one side of the road. Henderson suggested there could be a statement early on in the document explaining that. Binckley stated these three areas were separated for evaluation purposes because there are differences as far as when they were developed out. Since we do call out this area as selective development areas and are not evaluating any of those statistics, she thinks they could just as easily remove the portions that say "maturing north" and "developing south" and just list them out. They could do 135th Street and then do a sub-category under that. Williams stated he feels it would make it easier to read if all of the commercial development along 135th Street were packaged together. On page 69, there is reference to the Cornerstone Village. It talks about approval "this year". Williams suggested that maybe it should list the year out. He then asked if there is any reason to leave out descriptions for the Villaggio or Leawood Market Center. Binckley stated it was to try to conserve space. If there were a specific development that the Commission would like to highlight, staff would be happy to do that. Williams stated page 79 reads, "no prevailing architectural context exists to relate to adjacent development designs". He then asked if staff is talking about relating to other buildings within the development, or relating to developments across the street or behind the development. Binckley stated that language was added due to a request made by a Council member. Her understanding is that they are looking as if they are at an existing area and adding a lot of buildings, then it would be in the same context as the existing building. For example, if Ranch Mart wanted to add a building, staff would need to ensure that the building matches the existing buildings, since there are no design guidelines. Williams asked if in the case of Park Place, if that development would need to be compatible with Town Center Plaza. Binckley stated, no, because it will be a development in and of itself. It will have its own design guidelines. Williams stated he does not read the statement to mean that, so he feels there should be some additional language to clarify that. Binckley asked if that concept is acceptable to the Commission and if so, that would give staff direction and it could be reworded. Duffendack stated he would not want the interpretation to mean that all developments in Leawood need to look the same. Williams stated the sentence begins to imply some relationship to designs that exist elsewhere.

Duffendack stated he feels the problem lies with the word "adjacent". Binckley stated the word should probably be changed to, "within". Henderson stated he feels that is an important point. Williams stated if this particular item is related to an existing development, then it should be expanded to say that it relates to an existing development, versus a development that has established architectural guidelines.

Conrad asked if there is a definition for institutional housing or continued care. Binckley stated there is a definition in the Leawood Development Ordinance. Conrad stated he would like to know the background for the recommendation to change the property up on College to potentially be institutional housing. Binckley stated she feels that based on the traffic patterns in the area and based on the adjacent uses, staff feels it is an appropriate use in that area. Typically, the owners of assisted living facilities like to place them near fairly busy streets so that the residents can see the traffic go by and they like to be near green space, if possible. It's a quiet use, adjacent to single-family residential and it has worked well in other parts of the City.

Duffendack asked Diane to read the letter from the applicant. Binckley stated that she did not know how long the letter was when she agreed to read it, so she made a copy for each of the Commissioners and she will read an abbreviated version of the letter. The letter is dated January 11, 2005 to Diane Binckley's attention and is from Chase Simmons of the Polsinelli law firm.

"Dear Mrs. Binckley and members of the Planning Commission, I write regarding the proposed comprehensive plan amendment for the above-referenced property. My client, Tomahawk Pointe, LLC currently has the property under contract and previously made a zoning application for a small office development on the site. This proposal was withdrawn in order to allow the property to be considered for a comprehensive plan change. It is our understanding that the comprehensive plan was to be heard by the Planning Commission on January 25th, rather than tonight. For that reason, we will be unable to attend the meeting tonight and unfortunately have not been able to provide the historical documentation to the Planning Commission prior to the meeting that we had planned on providing. The property owners, the Longs, also understand the item to be scheduled for the January 25th meeting, thus they have also not been able to submit additional information. Because of this change in scheduling, the planning staff offered to continue this item for two weeks. We declined that offer not wanting to slow the process down. With that said, and on the reliance that we will be given an opportunity to speak at the City Council hearing, below please find the following eight facts, which we feel the Planning Commission should consider this evening.

1. The property in question exists in its current formation due to the past realignment of Mission Road, which was done in order to protect Longwood Forest, placing new single-family homes immediately adjacent to that intersection recreates the problem that the alignment was meant to avoid.
2. The property consists of land historically owned by the Longs as well as land deeded to them as an inducement for dedication of approximately 25 acres.
3. During the time period of the land swap, the City indicated to the Longs that the elevation and realignment of Roe would remove the property from the flood plain affected flow area, thus making the property developable.
4. For over 20 years the subject property was deeded restricted to allow only residential use.
5. During the time period of the deed restrictions the property was shown on the City comprehensive plan for residential, again, despite approximately two decades of residential designation no development occurred.
6. Along this office corridor only two residential neighborhoods on the north side of College Boulevard have developed between State Line Road and Johnson County Community College.
7. The Johnson County wastewater treatment plant is a major impact on the property and has had a negative impact on certain homes in Longwood Forest Estates and Hallbrook.
8. Several years ago the City changed the master plan designation from residential to recreational without notice to the Longs.

In light of these facts, the decades-long record of this property is clear. This is a developable tract and the City of Leawood has asserted such in the past in order to acquire necessary land. Residential development has not occurred, despite that being the only option for many, many years. The City staff, presumably based on this record determined that residential uses were no longer appropriate on this parcel when it was changed on the comprehensive plan designation. Perhaps these facts were not well known during past City actions affecting this property. We believe that it is imperative that the City fully consider these facts when making any decision tonight or in the future."

Binckley stated this item is a remand from Council. Typically, the Planning Commission does not take public comment on a remand case unless it has been controversial or they have been directed to do so. She did make Mr. Simmons aware of that fact and as far as she knew the Commission was not anticipating taking any public comment. His record was needed at the Council level, as opposed to this. He was comfortable not being able to attend tonight and felt comfortable sending this letter.

Munson stated, in response to item number six on Mr. Simmons letter, there is another residential development on College Boulevard. Binckley stated, yes, it is on the south side of College Boulevard.

Henderson asked if the letter requires a response by the Commission. Duffendack stated it has been read for the record. He does not believe any response is required. Binckley stated it is up to the Commission on whether they choose to respond.

Henderson stated he made a number of changes on the comprehensive plan and gave them to staff. Duffendack asked for details on his changes. Henderson stated Williams noted most of his changes. There are some places where more text is needed and other places where statistics are missing. He is not sure if the last major section, future development, is located in the right place. The goals and objectives of the comprehensive plan are in that section. He feels that if it is not in the first part of the document, then there should be some reference in the front explaining where it is located.

Rohlf asked if Mr. Simmons' letter is related just to the comprehensive plan map or also to the text. Binckley stated it is only related to the map. Rohlf asked if Mr. Simmons thought it would be heard on January 25th. Binckley stated in early discussions, she believed this to be heard at the January 25th meeting, but it was moved up due to the caseload for that meeting. Rohlf asked if this document was heard by the Commission during the November meeting. Binckley stated, yes. Rohlf asked for a description as to the process the case has gone through since the Commission heard it last. Binckley stated staff included the comments from the Council members. One Council member had a number of additional comments within the document, some of which were opposite of what the City has done in several years. She discussed those with the City Administrator and identified her reasoning for not including those and he supported her on that. Rohlf asked if the additional comments made tonight would be incorporated. Binckley stated, yes, before it goes back to the Council. Rohlf asked if Binckley felt the Commission's comments tonight would satisfy Council's reason for the remand. Binckley stated, yes. Their primary reason for remand was for the land use at Tomahawk, the pedestrian path and a couple of other minor verbiage changes.

A motion to approve was made by Williams with the additions and clarifications reflected in the comments tonight. Motion seconded by Munson. Motion approved unanimously.

Meeting adjourned.

J. Paul Duffendack, Chair