

**City of Leawood
Planning Commission Minutes**

February 28, 2006
Meeting - 6:00 p.m.
Leawood City Hall Council Chambers
4800 Town Center Drive

CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL: Henderson, Perkins, Jackson, Rohlf (absent), Conrad, Munson, Williams, Azeltine, Reynolds (absent)

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA: Klein stated the agenda has been revised. The previous agenda read, "Demdaco, final site plan and revised design guidelines for Parkway Plaza". The design guidelines have been removed from this request. **A motion to approve the revised agenda was made by Henderson and seconded by Azeltine. Motion approved unanimously.**

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES: Approval of the minutes from the January 24, 2006 meeting. Azeltine asked if the minutes that the Commission is approving tonight are the same ones that the Council received in their packet last week. Lambers stated, yes, in draft form. **A motion to approve the minutes from the January 24, 2006 meeting was made by Perkins and seconded by Williams. Motion approved unanimously.**

CONTINUED TO THE MARCH 14, 2006 MEETING:

CASE 07-06 MISSION FARMS - MIXED USE Request for approval of a final site plan. Located at approximately 105th Street and Mission Road.

CASE 16-06 IRONHORSE CENTRE - LOTS 5 THROUGH 8 Request for approval of a final plat and final site plan. Located at the southeast corner of 151st Street and Nall Avenue.

CONTINUED TO THE MARCH 28, 2006 MEETING:

CASE 79-05 135TH & MISSION OFFICE RETAIL - PHASE II Request for approval of a special use permit, preliminary plat and preliminary plan. Located at the northwest corner of 135th Street and Mission Road. **Public hearing**

CONTINUED TO THE JUNE 27, 2006 MEETING:

CASE 08-06 LDO AMENDMENT - SECTION 16-2-9.2 NON-RESIDENTIAL USES Request for approval of an amendment to the Leawood Development Ordinance. **Public hearing**

CASE 09-06 LDO AMENDMENT - SECTION 16-3-9 DEVIATIONS Request for approval of an amendment to the Leawood Development Ordinance. **Public hearing**

CONSENT AGENDA:

CASE 17-06 MERRY LEA FARMS - 3RD PLAT Request for approval of a final plat. Located at 140th Drive and Mission Road.

CASE 20-06 MISSION RESERVE ANNEX - 2ND PLAT Request for approval of a final plat. Located at 15310 Sherwood Street.

A motion to approve the consent agenda was made by Henderson and seconded by Azeltine. Motion approved unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS:

CASE 01-06 TUSCANY RESERVE VILLAGE Request for approval of a rezoning from SD-NCR (Planned Neighborhood Retail) and SD-O (Planned Office) to RP-3 (Planned Cluster Attached Residential District). Located north of 137th Street and west of Chadwick.

Staff presentation: Presentation by Mark Klein. The applicant is requesting approval of a rezoning from SD-NCR and SD-O to RP-3, preliminary site plan and preliminary plat to allow the construction of eight condominium buildings to contain 30 dwelling units on 7.5 acres for a density of four units per acre. This piece of property was part of a previous approval when Tuscan Reserve came forward back in December of 2001. The portion south of 137th Street was approved for the residential portion of the development. The portion to the north was approved for commercial, to include some office and retail. The applicant is now requesting to change the southern portion of this to RP-3. As part of this application, the applicant has negotiated with the church to take some of the property that was previously owned by the church and incorporate it with this development. It is approximately 175 ft. along the northeast portion of the property. There is a detention basin that was serving the church located at the south end of the church property. That portion will now be part of this property and the detention will be removed and replaced at the southeast corner of this development. The applicant has provided future plans for the commercial portion of the development at the northwest corner of the property. The commercial part of the development is not part of this application. Information on that portion was provided to give the Commission insight into what the applicant is proposing in the future. Staff has worked with the applicant to get the condominiums to tie in with the commercial portion of the property. There is a stipulation included that they will continue to work to tie that in prior to final site plan application approval. Staff is recommending approval of this case with the stipulations stated in the staff report.

Williams asked what type of tie-in connection staff is looking for. Klein stated staff is looking at pedestrian connections and building relationships. The applicant has stated they want to protect the condominium portion of the project by constructing a wall/fence. That detail is shown in the packet. Staff has worked with the applicant to provide several pedestrian paths that go through there and to the commercial portion of the development. It is staff's intent to continue to develop those paths and continue to develop an orientation of the buildings to invite people from this portion of the development into the commercial portion.

Henderson asked what would happen if the Tuscan Reserve homes association is negligent in providing the Lord of Life storm water detention requirements. Ley stated they have to provide an annual inspection on that detention pond and if they do not do that, then the City does the inspection and back-charges the homes association for that fee. Henderson asked who pays for the removal of the storm sewer connection. Ley stated the original stipulation required the developer to install a pipe to the commercial portion. The developer wants to look at possibly doing some bio-engineering techniques to that channel instead of installing that pipe. It would be the developer's cost. Henderson asked if Ley believes everything will work out okay with these adjustments. Ley stated, yes. Henderson asked if the Commission will see this case again. Ley stated, yes, when they come in for final site plan and when they come in for the commercial portion.

Perkins asked how the 7.5 acres would be handled when the applicant comes back for the final application for the commercial portion. Klein stated the rezoning is done at the time of preliminary, so that is being done now. The portion of the property that was the commercial portion is zoned either SD-NCR or SD-O and then the portion of the property that is owned by the church is SD-O. At this point, the meets and bounds will get changed and the future commercial that is left over will still maintain the zoning that it is currently, either SD-O or SD-NCR.

Henderson asked if each of the connected units will require a two-hour fire rated occupancy separation wall or a sprinkler system, and not both. Klein stated the plans would be reviewed by the fire marshal at the time of building permit and he would make that determination. Henderson asked who would decide if it would be a separation wall or a sprinkler system. Klein stated he assumes it would be the fire marshal.

Perkins asked if the church had a detention pond on their property. Klein stated the church currently has a detention pond on its property but it appears it has not been maintained very well. Perkins asked if staff believes that all of the water from the retail, condos and the church will go into the large pond in the lower right-hand corner of the property. Ley stated, yes.

Perkins asked if the pond will be capable of holding all of that water. Ley stated they are only required to detain the church property. The commercial and residential portions will get detained with the previous development, south of 137th Street.

Henderson asked if this expanded detention pond will impact what was previously approved for Highlands Ranch, just east of where this is located. Ley stated the downstream water surface elevation does not change. The peak flows will remain the same.

Azeltine asked how the stipulation regarding the applicant investigating ways to connect to future developments would be regulated. Klein stated staff is looking at the amenity areas that are more closely related to the residential portion to try to draw people from the condominiums into the retail. Azeltine asked if that is an issue of connectivity. Klein stated it is an issue of both connectivity and orientation of the building. Azeltine asked if staff does not feel a need to make that part of the stipulations. Klein stated it is a stipulation right now. Part of the reason it is not more set in stone is because the applicant is showing what they are planning for the commercial portion, which is not part of this application. They would need to come back for preliminary for that portion of the development, and at that point we would need to know more about the orientation of the building.

Conrad stated there is a section of land at the intersection of Pawnee and 135th Street that does not appear to be on the approved preliminary plan. Klein stated it appears to be another piece of property and he would need to check on that. Conrad stated that piece of property seems critical to the proposed build-out of the retail. Marcano stated the applicant just informed her that at the time of preliminary they did not own that property, so that is why it was not included. Conrad asked if they own it now. Marcano stated, yes. Conrad asked if that would require a rezoning in the future. Klein stated he would believe so.

Applicant presentation: Presentation by Chase Simmons of Polsinelli Shalton and Welte. Simmons introduced the development team. They are taking office property and changing to residential. *The applicant handed out some pictures of the existing detention pond to the Commission.* The current pond is causing the developer some concern of having to develop downstream of it. The applicant showed pictures of the development south of 137th Street that has already been built by this same developer in order to show the type of quality and attention to detail done by this developer. It was about a 72 acre project. South of 137th Street was zoned by the City for RP-4 and RP-1 development. It is completely developed at this stage. There are homes either occupied or built on almost every lot. There are large fountains, statuary, walking paths and a lake. The walking paths will continue through to this new development. This is an integrated community. They have done things that were not required by the Planning Commission or the Governing Body. This developer put in 4-inch caliper trees along Pawnee Street without being asked to. They plan on doing the same amount of quality with this project. As they looked at the other developments around 135th Street corridor they realized that it made sense to look at something other than office north of 135th Street. *Simmons described the site plan.* It was not great visibility for offices. They originally only intended to develop the 5 acres that Tuscany owns, but as they looked at the retention area it became apparent that they would not want to develop downstream of it. Also, from an aesthetic standpoint, it was something that needed to be cleaned up. They began to work with the church and they have taken the area that was their detention area and moved it south so there is a large water feature at the corner of Chadwick and 137th Street. It will still serve the same purpose. It will take care of the water better than it does today, but it will be an amenity for this project. It will tie in with the walking trail. They will be taking full responsibility for the pond. It will only be detaining water from the church. All of the water from the Tuscany Reserve residential area south of 137th Street and the future commercial area is designed to go down to the very large pond. That has been designed that way and approved by the City for five years now. They have very strict covenants for the residential component of the project. The developers live in the neighborhood and plan to for a long time, at least until it is fully developed.

Presentation by Marjorie Kennamore. The piazza homes are a continuation of the lifestyle community concept that they originally envisioned for Tuscany Reserve. Tuscany Reserve has a wide variety of lots to choose from. The smaller villas have exceeded their expectations in terms of quality and price range. The ones that will be immediately next to 137th Street and the berm, which will then be across from the stucco and wrought iron fenced yard, will be in the \$800,000 and \$900,000 range. They feel that part of the obligation to the neighborhood is to maintain a certain quality of life. It seems like a nice extension of the concept of a village. They have done a lot of research to develop this concept. There are covered terraces

so that each of the four home owners has privacy. The homes are designed to be primarily first-floor living; however, there is a basement which is optional for a finish. There are elevators for the upstairs units which are integrated with the floor plans as well as exterior stairs, so each unit will have two ways in and out. Each unit will have an attached two-car garage. The units will be around 2,600 to 3,100 sq. ft. on the main level. That is very market-driven. They anticipate the price range being from \$650,000 to \$850,000. The high quality of the homes will be carried out regardless of the size or price. They believe commercial is not the highest and best use for that area. They hope the commercial piece will be one of the best examples in the country for urban development.

Henderson asked if the streets in front of the piazzas would be cobblestone. Kennamore stated, yes. They will be pavers in a European street design. The cul-de-sacs do not connect with a road, but with a pedestrian path. It will be the same caliber as seen in Tuscany Reserve.

Perkins asked how people would enter the upstairs units. Kennamore stated they would enter either through the exterior stairs or through the garage elevator. The lower-level units enter through their garages or through courtyards.

Azeltine asked the height of the highest building. Kennamore stated 36.5 feet at the highest peak. Simmons stated the ordinance has a limit of 35 ft.; therefore they would be requesting a deviation by the Board of Zoning Appeals or be required to take them down to 35 ft., which would require a modification of the plan. That would be the architect's decision. Azeltine asked if the applicant is in agreement with all of staff's stipulations. Simmons stated, generally. They have had two community meetings on this and the plans have been available in the Tuscany Reserve office and it has been very well received by the people that are already in the area. In regard to the stipulation regarding integration, on the overall site plan, it is a different commercial layout than what is on the board and in the packets. They have worked with staff to better integrate it. Staff has been primarily interested in an interrelation in the area. They have extra green space, pedestrian connections and a covered piazza area between the two commercial buildings closest to the residential in order to draw people in. That will be detailed more when it comes in for final application. In regard to the stipulation regarding the construction of Chadwick, they understand that. This developer paid for all of Pawnee. He wants to make sure that they are clear on the lineal footage, but that is a City Council issue. The stipulation that has been changed tonight regarding the drainage is one that they will need to continue to work with staff, up to approval from City Council and prior to final development plan. It is stipulation 1B in the Public Works memo. Based on the conversations he has had with staff, he is confident they can come to an agreement. Henderson asked if the applicant is agreeable to two signs. Simmons stated they have turned in plans for the signs and they are agreeable to that.

Conrad asked if the applicant has control for the parcel at Pawnee. Simmons stated they did not when they originally came forward, but they do now. Conrad asked where the wrought iron fence and solid stucco wall is proposed to be located. He then asked staff if the fence complies with the ordinance. Klein stated, according to the ordinance, they are allowed to have a fence larger than four feet, as part of the approval process. Conrad then asked if the gates would be open or locked. Simmons stated they would be open walkways. There would not be gates. Conrad stated the percentage of wrought iron versus stucco should be looked at. Kennamore stated they want ventilation and some structure along 137th Street. There might be only wrought iron along the back side. Conrad stated the plans state there are gates. Simmons stated they will make sure that is clear as they move forward. Conrad stated the new wet basin seems to be significantly larger than anything that was previously planned. Harold Phelps stated the existing detention basin has flumes that comes off of the parking lot and goes right into the detention basin. It has not been maintained very well. They saw that as an eyesore. The idea was to take the existing detention basin and relocate it and make it an amenity to this project and upkeep it to the level and standard of the project. Conrad asked if most of the flow comes down the stream on the west side of the church property and then it would be piped underneath. Phelps stated, yes, underneath the courtyard areas and parking. Conrad asked if that would be a private or public stormwater system. Phelps stated it would be public for that portion of it, then once it hits the detention basin it would be private. The outlet system would be private, then it would tie back into a public system. Conrad asked about the bio-swale. Phelps stated the church relocated that stream out and around the church. It originally went right through the building. Staff had some concerns about the increase flows in that relocated stream from the commercial development. The discussion was to bypass the man-made stream or put that money into some type of bio-solution. Conrad asked if the storm sewer line referenced in item 1B of Public Works comments is the one that runs east to west. Phelps stated it is not shown on the plan, because they just received that comment. He believes the idea is that the

revised stipulation would allow some flexibility and allow them to work on a solution, rather than having a fixed solution tonight.

Public hearing: Elaine Wilson, soon to be a resident at 3110 W. 138th Street, which is the lot directly south of the new retention pond. She and her husband are extremely excited this piece of property is going to be developed in the manner shown tonight. They were happy with the previously proposed office, but the retention pond is much more appreciated.

Marg Pateidl, 13925 Canterbury Circle. She is very pleased to see this before the Commission and hope it passes.

A motion to close the public hearing was made by Henderson and seconded by Williams. Motion to close approved unanimously.

Henderson stated Tuscan Reserve is one of the nicest showcases in the greater Kansas City area in regard to its landscaping and attention to detail.

Perkins stated he is not a proponent of stucco. The elevations shown by Kennamore tonight are not the same as the ones included in the packet, which reflect a lot of stucco on the left elevation of the Legano or the right elevation of the Portifino. He would like to have it be put in the record that staff works with the developer prior to final to work with the stucco to make it look more like what Kennamore showed tonight. He feels it is too much in the plans shown in the packet.

A motion to approve was made by Williams and seconded by Azeltine. Munson asked if the additional memo from Public Works is included as part of the motion. Williams stated it is included by staff stipulation number 18, which incorporates the Public Works memo on file. **Motion approved unanimously.**

CASE 15-06 LEAWOOD MIDDLE SCHOOL Request for approval of a final site plan. Located at 2410 W. 123rd Street.

Staff presentation: Presentation by Mark Klein. The applicant is requesting approval of a final plan to modify the elevations of the Leawood Middle School. This building is located north of 123rd Street. Currently, the Leawood Elementary School sits closer to the street and then this building sits a little bit further back. The applicant has indicated they are having some problems with the brick façade on the existing building; therefore they want to do an update to the elevations of the building. The update would include about 60% of the elevations. The brick that would remain would be located on the gymnasium. The applicant is proposing to replace the brick façade with a cast concrete that matches the cast concrete addition that has already been completed. The applicant is also proposing cast concrete with a thin red brick veneer to be embedded into that to help transition between the portions of the building that are cast concrete and the portions of the building that will remain brick. Staff is recommending approval of this case with the stipulations stated in the staff report. *Klein displayed the materials board.* In addition to the cast concrete and brick being proposed, the applicant is also proposing a blue metal flashing that will match flashing that is already on the building. They are also proposing to use an insulated metal panel along some of the taller portions of the building. They plan on moving one of the signs about 27 ft. from where it is currently. That sign will be painted to match the blue metal flashing. The sign is currently blue, but the paint has faded.

Conrad asked if his employer is involved in this project. Burke Kitchen, with Horst Terrill & Karst Architects, stated Conrad's employer is not involved.

Henderson asked if this is scheduled to be completed in the summer of 2006. Kitchen stated, yes. Henderson asked if they believe it will be done in three months. Kitchen stated his contractors say it can be done.

Applicant presentation: Presentation by Burke Kitchen. This building was built in 1978. There were two buildings built with identical sets of plans and they have identical sets of problems. The brick that was used is not a severe weather brick, which needs to be used in Kansas. A couple of weeks ago, when it was so cold, you could touch the bricks and they would fall off in your hand. Several other construction details have allowed enormous amounts of water into the walls. The walls

on the interior of the building look like they have a bad sun burn that is peeling, so they have to repaint the interior of the building every year. They also believe there is potential for mold to be growing behind the casework. The walls were built such that they cannot leave the block and just take the brick down. They were built with reinforced block, which does not hold up. They have been able to leave most of the Blue Valley school buildings in Overland Park with the brick. They cannot on this one, because the brick will not stand up. That is one of the reasons they are going with the pre-cast concrete. Speed is the other issue. They are trying to get this done in two months.

Blue Valley has a couple of issues with a couple of the stipulations. In regard to stipulation number four which talks about screening any ground-mounted equipment, they prefer not to screen any of the stuff right up against the building because it gives places for children to hide. It also gives places for non-children to hide, which is even worse. They can screen them, but would prefer to push those screens away, so they are not right up against the building, if that is acceptable. In regard to stipulations five through eight which talk about other landscaping, they are not doing any new landscaping. Some trees may need to come down during demolition, but those would be replaced to comply with stipulation number five. In regard to stipulation number nine which talks about clear glass, the windows on the original building are clear glass and the windows on the 1995 addition are tinted. They are going to go back and match those so that the entire building looks like one. In regard to stipulation number three which talks about screening of the rooftop equipment, in 2010 the school district will be removing almost all of the rooftop equipment. They would like to comply with the stipulation, but just delay it until 2010.

Jeff Christian, Design Construction Manager with the Blue Valley School District, stated it is their intent to do major mechanical work on this building in 2010. Most of the rooftop equipment will be moved to the ground. They are trying to maintain the weather resistance of the building walls and roofs. There are roughly 22 units that have been up there since the building was built 28 years ago and in order to screen them they would need roughly 15 screen elements on the roof. That would require over 100 roof penetrations in order to provide the screen, providing more opportunities for water to get into the building. They want to do the appropriate long-term solution. They feel it serves them best if they can access their equipment on the ground and be properly screened. They agree with the intent of the stipulation. They would not want to spend around \$200,000 to \$250,000 to screen the rooftop equipment that has been there for 28 years, just to remove the equipment in 2010. The district is prepared to give written assurance that they will perform this project and comply with stipulation number three. They would like to have a time frame in order to accomplish that to be extended to the summer of 2010.

Perkins asked staff's opinion of the applicant's request to delay the screening. Lambers stated they are required to screen the equipment. He does not have any doubt of any assurance they wish to provide the City, however, being a school, the City would have no recourse that we would normally have in other buildings, which is to suspend their certificate of occupancy. That is where the difficulty lies and the reason for staff's position. Jackson stated Leawood Elementary does not have the screening in front of it either. She then asked if there would be a way to get the school to screen the elementary school when they come in for the updates in 2010. Lambers stated they are not obligated to screen the elementary school.

Conrad asked if there are plans to re-clad the elementary school. Kitchen stated the elementary school is a slightly different case. There were additions done in the mid-80's and in those areas they can remove only the brick, so they will not need to remove the entire wall, as the middle school. Conrad asked if they have a date planned for recladding the elementary school. Kitchen stated they had planned to do it at the same time as the middle school, but the contractors were not sure they could get the entire thing completed in two months, so they put it off until next summer. Conrad stated they would have the same issues in a year for the elementary. Kitchen stated the elementary school is not planned for the mechanical upgrades.

Perkins stated he does not see how to word stipulation number three to take care of this problem until 2010. We cannot be assured of where we will be by then. Lambers stated if they were suggesting a year from now, that would be the usual time frame that the City is used to working with an applicant. It might be advantageous for the applicant to go back and see if they can reallocate resources for a different project to go ahead and coordinate with this, within the next 12 to 18 months, to avoid the expenditure of the screening.

Williams asked if there was a stipulation for screening when the schools were remodeled in the 80's. Lambers stated, no. Williams asked why the screening stipulation applies to this case, since this is a repair project and not a remodel. Lambers stated because they have triggered the process that requires them to come into compliance with requirements that are already in place.

Conrad stated it seems to him that they should leave stipulations 3, 4, 5, 6 & 7 intact, from a planning standpoint. He believes the applicant would have the ability to present it to Council to request any amendments to those stipulations. Klein stated the Governing Body has the right to amend the stipulations. Conrad stated that would be his preference.

Klein stated there is a stipulation that they replace any landscaping that they damage or destroy with the caliper that the code requires. Staff is also recommending additional landscaping around existing ground-mounted equipment that currently does not have any screening. Kitchen stated the applicant does not have an issue with that. Stipulation number eight requires landscape irrigation. They do not irrigate any of their landscaping other than their sports fields. Their grounds keeping staff does a respectable job in maintaining those. They would like to ask for that stipulation to be waived, with the stipulation that if any of the plant material does not survive the first 12 months that they would be able to revisit it at this time. Conrad stated this issue was visited with Prairie Star School. He then asked what the Commission decided on that case. Lambers stated if there were subsequent improvements to buildings, then the stipulation would be required. That stipulation was modified because we did not want the school district to come back when a new building was to be constructed and think that they did not have to irrigate. We understand there will be no more new buildings, so that was why staff conceded. They agreed to maintain the landscaping manually for that, but we also made it clear that it will be irrigated if a new building came in. We also added that if it failed then irrigation would be required to go in with the new landscaping. Conrad asked if it would be appropriate to re-write this stipulation to something similar to the one that was approved for Prairie Star. Lambers stated, yes.

Conrad asked to be shown on the elevations which windows would be changed. Kitchen described it on the plan. Conrad asked if there is any energy efficiency with the tinted glass. Kitchen stated a small amount. They just want to match the addition that was done in the 80's. Lambers stated staff is okay with the tinted glass.

A motion to approve was made by Conrad, rewording stipulation number eight to be similar to the one written for the Prairie Star School and deleting stipulation number 9. Williams asked if Conrad is planning on keeping stipulation number three. Conrad stated he feels there has been enough discussion on that and he would defer that to Council.

Motion seconded by Perkins. Williams asked for the record to state that stipulation number three is in keeping with the position that it is what the LDO requires and they are looking to Council to make any changes as they feel appropriate. Conrad stated that is correct. **Motion approved unanimously.**

CASE 18-06 PARKWAY PLAZA - DEMDACO - FIRST PHASE Request for approval of a final site plan. Located at the northwest corner of 135th Street and Roe Avenue.

Staff presentation: Presentation by Jeff Joseph. The applicant is requesting approval of a final plan to allow construction of a three-story, 60,000 sq. ft. office building. The applicant is Kevin Wilkerson, representing Demdaco. This project is located within the Parkway Plaza development located at the northwest corner of 135th Street and Roe Avenue. There are two office buildings proposed within lot 2 of the development. A three-story building is proposed at the southeast corner and a one-story building at the northwest corner. This application deals with Phase One, which is the three-story office building. The proposed building will be constructed of brick, pre-cast concrete panels, cast stone and glass. Natural stone is proposed on the planters located on the southeast and northwest elevations. During the preliminary application process staff had some concerns with the materials used on the building. Since that time the applicant has worked with staff and has added concrete tiles instead of standing seam metal and they have also added stone around the building with the planters. During the preliminary application process, one of the citizens had concerns with the screening. Since that time the applicant has increased the landscaping on the north side of 133rd Street. They have also added a 3-ft. berm along the parking areas to screen the parking. The applicant is proposing three signs for this project. Only two signs are allowed per

the LDO and the design guidelines approved for the development. Staff is recommending approval of this case with the stipulations stated in the staff report.

Henderson asked if staff has any preference on which two signs they would prefer the applicant to keep. Joseph stated, no.

Williams stated he does not see much of a change from what was shown at preliminary in terms of architectural design. He then asked staff to point out what changes have been made. Joseph stated the applicant was previously proposing a standing seam metal roof, which did not blend in with anything in the development. They have changed that to concrete tiles which match with the residential buildings on the east side. Staff asked them to add stone to the building. The applicant felt adding stone to the building would make it look heavy, so they added the stone planters to the front and the back of the building. Williams stated he recalls one of the Commissioners, who is not here tonight, had a lot of concerns with the relationship of the building to the street. Creating the edges that define streets is supposed to be part of the design concept for this development. The other buildings in the development have a harder edge to the street and this one doesn't do that. Joseph stated the applicant is not willing to change that.

Henderson stated the shift to concrete tile roof seems to be desirable. He then asked what color the roof will be. Joseph stated they are proposing a gray color, but the applicant would be able to better answer that.

Applicant presentation: Kevin Wilkerson of the Trammel Crow Company stated he is the developer of record for the project. Wilkerson then introduced the development team.

Presentation by Dave Kiersznowski. He and his wife own Demdaco. From their standpoint, they do not view this as simply one option in many in Kansas City. They sought after this location because they love idea of being in Leawood. They think it is a wonderful place to live and work and send their children to school. They also would love to be part of a mixed development community. They are viewing this as a long-term decision for their corporate headquarters. They feel this is a perfect location.

Munson asked what product or service Demdaco provides. Kiersznowski stated they are a wholesale gift company. They design, manufacture and distribute things you might find in a Hallmark store.

Wilkerson stated there was a great deal of thought put into the orientation on the site. They worked at great length with the ownership of the development. Given that this is a three-story structure and the other office is a one-story structure, this is the furthest removed from any residential component. It is oriented similar to the condos on a 45 degree angle. With the southeast side not being the main entrance to the building, it serves the plaza theme with a patio being on that corner.

Presentation by Ron Shallwacker of Finkle Williams Architecture. They worked with Demdaco for four years on their existing facility and multiple projects around the country and their experience with Demdaco is that they are a first-rate company and would be a great citizen of Leawood. They have worked closely with Richard Sailors, Suttle Midlin and City staff to try to come up with what they think is a good solution to a three-story project within this development. The condos to the east are taller and they oriented their building to reflect that corner and open up that intersection, similar to the condos. The application for tonight is just for the 60,000 sq. ft. building. The one-story, 15,000 sq. ft. building is part of the second phase. They tried to orient the building so it would have a strong presence to both 134th Street and Briar. They tried to create a strong link between the two buildings. They also tried to reinforce the pedestrian connection from this project to the balance of the Parkway Plaza development. *Shallwacker described the pedestrian amenities and connections.* The concrete tile for the roof would be the same tile that is currently on the Country Club Bank building. They feel the pre-cast concrete is far superior to the stucco that is listed in the design guidelines for the single-story building. They have come up with a mix that would match the stucco that is approved in the design guidelines. The cast stone and brick would be on the lower part of the building. The window frames are bronze.

Henderson asked how the applicant is designing the space between the two buildings to be used. Shallwacker stated the pedestrian plazas are located at the primary building entrance and there is pedestrian plaza on the rear side as well.

Henderson asked if that is green space. Shallwacker described on the site plan the areas that would be brick pavers,

scored concrete or landscaping. Henderson asked the size of the pedestrian area at the northwest corner of the building. Shallwacker stated it is about 100 ft. from corner to circle. Henderson asked if they would have places for people to sit. Shallwacker stated site furnishings in that area have not been discussed yet. The goal there would be to encourage interaction of the employees by using the permanent seat wall. Kiersznowski stated their goal with having the half-circle seated benches is to get people to talk to each other. He is not sure about adding more benches to the front of the building. The idea with the half-circle seating is to keep a clean look, but a look where community will occur.

Perkins asked for a description of where the tinted glass would be located. Shallwacker pointed out the tinted glass on the site plan. During the day, one would not be able to tell the spandrel glass from the vision glass.

Conrad stated he has struggled with this project and how it has evolved. He then stated the offices were supposed to be brought to a human scale. Due to the verticality of the building, he does not see it as being human scale. He asked the applicant to explain where the human scale is in the architecture. Another issue he has is that the back of the building is turned towards the rest of the development. There has been discussion about interaction with the mixed-use development, but the reality is that the back door is facing the rest of the development. Shallwacker stated, in regard to the human scale of the building, they tried to introduce some texture and bring the scale down where the people would gather. The first floor element is where they tried to bring in some human scale. From the standpoint of siding, it is a different use. It is a corporate headquarters. They are not necessarily trying to draw people to this building, but they have made the back door look like the front door. He thinks that it is very friendly to the rest of the project and it encourages the employees of Demdaco to go out and visit the rest of the development. While they would not discourage people from coming up to their building, it is not a retail building.

Williams asked about the façade that faces the intersection. There is a plaza on the street side. He then asked if there is supposed to be a door that allows people to enter the plaza and allow people to walk to the other areas. Shallwacker stated, yes. There are three sets of doors coming out of the southeast elevation. Williams stated the design guidelines are written for this building instead of the building being designed around the guidelines. If it meets with the approval of the overall developer, then it is fine with him. Visually, it does not fit with the development. The building is fine on its own. Wilkerson responded that it did not happen overnight. It evolved over four months of working with the owner and owner's architect to not only come up with a site plan but an elevation that would be acceptable to them. Williams stated everything else in this development has a strong horizontal position. The elevation shown for this building has a strong verticality to it. That is where it begins to differ from the rest of the development. Wilkerson stated there are certain challenges associated with a building this size as compared to other 5,000 or 6,000 sq. ft. buildings.

Jackson abstained from voting since she is not familiar with this project. Lambers suggested that she state she is present, but not voting, since an abstention would give the impression that she has an issue with the project.

A motion to approve was made by Perkins and seconded by Azeltine. Motion approved 5-0 (Jackson present, but not voting).

Meeting adjourned.

Charles Munson, Vice-Chair