City of Leawood
Planning Commission Minutes

July 25, 2006
Meeting - 6:00 p.m.
Leawood City Hall Council Chambers
4800 Town Center Drive

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

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA: The agenda was amended by adding the continuation of the Case 30-06 One Nineteen to the August 15, 2006 meeting. A motion to approve the amended agenda was made by Munson and seconded by Williams. Motion approved unanimously.

Commissioner Reynolds recused himself from the two art location approvals.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS:

APPI:
A. “LADDER” – Approval of site for public art.

Presentation by Ann Kenney, chair of the Arts in Public Places Initiative and the Arts Council. This piece is by an artist named Ilan Averbuch who is an Israeli artist that now lives in New York City. Kenney showed a model and a drawing of the piece of art. The ladder will rise from the water of the lake at the far eastern end of the park. Mr. Averbuch’s view of Israel involves water, the landscape, the cycles of life and death and how it represents human struggle and the resurrection of the human spirit. We think of this as Jacob’s ladder although he called it Calcutta ladder. They feel it is an iconic image, universal, striking and something everyone can relate to.

Rohlf asked the name of the park where this would be located. Kenney stated it is Gezer Park at 133rd Street and Mission Road. It has a sister-city relationship with the Gezer region in Israel. It is for that reason that they wanted someone who would relate to the landscape and the history of Israel. As always, there was a selection committee. They started out with a great number of artists, they then limited it to four, contacted them for proposals and decided on Mr. Averbuch’s proposal. Rohlf asked if there is anything at the park now. Kenney stated there are trails, hills and plantings. They would try to maintain them as much as possible, although the plan does not stipulate that they need to be maintained. Munson stated he believes the park will evolve into something very interesting over time. Rohlf asked staff what the Commission should be commenting on in respect to this piece. Joseph stated the APPI is asking for the Commission’s recommendation of approval for the location.

Perkins asked how deep the water would be in the pond. Kenney stated maybe 10 inches. It will be connected to a series of pathways which will be dry creek beds to some extent. It depends on financing on how much water will go through there. It will be a system of waterways imitating the natural contours of the land in the Gezer region. Perkins asked if anyone has considered a hazard of any kind with kids climbing on it. Kenney stated she does not believe it is possible to climb up on. It is made of recycled materials, granite from highways, steel, wood. The lowest ladder rung will be 12 ft. high. The bottom of the ladder is 3 ft. across. She believes it would be hard to get any kind of footing to get up on it. Henderson stated there are people that can handle repelling very well. Munson asked who would be responsible for maintaining the piece if there was graffiti on it. Kenney stated Parks and Recreation and the Arts Council is responsible for maintaining all of the artwork. Elkins asked if the Commission has had anything to do with the park plan. Rohlf asked for clarification from Lambers on what the Commission should be voting on. Lambers stated the Commission should vote on the approval of the location for the piece of art. This piece and the next are a little unusual because they are on City property. Quite frequently these requests are on private properties that may require easements. Since these are both in parks, it is really not an issue, but it
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is required to go through this process. Henderson asked if the City Engineer has any concerns about the water in the pond. Ley stated there are ponds throughout most of the City's parks; therefore he does not have any concern. Williams asked if the water would be fed so that the water level is maintained. Lambers stated it would be fed and filtered to provide a continuous water flow through the area. The intention is to have the water feature to the west to be self-contained and then have the water flow to the pond to the east and then be pumped back to the pond at the west. Because of the shallowness of it, algae could be a problem so they want to keep the water flowing. The intent is for the park to represent north central Israel. The west pond represents the Sea of Galilee, the hills represent the Golan Heights and then the stream represents the Jordan River going into the Dead Sea. Perkins stated if the first rung is at 12 ft., then all of the other steps would be 2 ft. Kenney stated if the model is to scale, which is must be, then the bottom is 9 ft. across which would make the bottom rung not even 9 ft. up, but it would be in the middle of the lake. Elkins stated if the model is to scale then the first run would be more like 6 ft. from the bottom. Lambers stated there are concerns in terms of people having access to it and the liability. We will have representation from our carriers made to the Governing Body, but it is not in the Planning Commission's jurisdiction to be concerned about.

A motion to recommend approval of the location for “Ladder” at Gezer Park was made by Perkins. Motion seconded by Elkins. Motion approved unanimously.

Henderson asked when they anticipate it being installed. Kenney stated probably 2008. It is a time-consuming process. Lambers stated we are anticipating a second piece of art on the west side several years down the road. There will be a balance between the two pieces of art and the park.

B. ARTWORK TO HONOR TEACHERS – Approval of site for public art.

Presentation by Alice Hawk, chair of the Leawood Foundation. The Arts Council, Art in Public Places Initiative, Leawood Historic Commission and the Leawood Foundation are working to do a sculpture at Ironwoods Park that would be located between the nature center and the Oxford school. This piece of art will be done by Dennis Smith, who did the artwork in front of American Century at the Plaza.

Rohlf asked where this piece would be located in the park. Hawk stated it would be on a hill beside the nature center, closer to the nature center, rather than the Oxford School, and kind of up on the hill. The artist has looked at the site and feels that “up” would be good because as people come into the Ironwoods Lodge they will be able to view the sculpture there. Rohlf asked the size of the piece. Kenney stated it would be slightly larger than life-size. Perkins asked if there would be a sidewalk going up to the piece. Hawk stated there will be some plantings there once it is installed. Perkins asked when the piece would be installed. Hawk stated they are hoping for spring of next year. Munson asked the material. Hawk stated bronze. Rohlf asked if this piece relies on a significant amount of funds being raised. Hawk stated they have $61,000 raised for this project and then need another $30,000., so they are still fundraising. They want to be able to let the artist know that they are still wanting him to go ahead with the project and that we are in going to do this.

A motion to recommend approval of the location for the Artwork to Honor Teachers in Ironwoods Park was made by Elkins and seconded by Perkins. Motion approved unanimously.

CONTINUED TO THE AUGUST 8, 2006 MEETING:
CASE 45-06 GARDENS OF VILLAGGIO Request for approval of a preliminary site plan. Located north of 137th Street and east of Roe Avenue. Public hearing

CONTINUED TO THE AUGUST 15, 2006 MEETING:
CASE 30-06 ONE NINETEEN Request for approval of a rezoning from SD-CR (Planned General Retail) to MXD (Mixed-Use Development District) and preliminary site plan. Located south of 119th Street and east of Roe Avenue. Public hearing
CONTINUED TO THE AUGUST 22, 2006 MEETING:
CASE 46-06 TUSCANY RESERVE VILLAGE Request for approval of a final plat and final site plan. Located at the northwest corner of 137th Street and Pawnee.

CASE 50-06 RAJEUNIR MEDICAL SPA – MONUMENT SIGN Request for approval of a final site plan for a monument sign. Located at 11404 Nall Avenue.

CONTINUED TO THE SEPTEMBER 25, 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

NEW BUSINESS:
CASE 41-06 CORNERSTONE – CLADDAGH IRISH PUB Request for approval of a final site plan. Located at the southeast corner of 135th Street and Nall Avenue within the Cornerstone of Leawood development.

Staff presentation: Presentation by Jeff Joseph. The applicant is Kristin Harper with Design Plan. The applicant is requesting approval of a final site plan for the construction of one 9,459 sq. ft. restaurant building on 1.29 acres for an FAR of 0.17. This project is located on lot 4 of the Cornerstone development at the southeast corner of 135th Street and Nall Avenue. This building is a proposed restaurant and will be located west of Ted’s Montana Grill. Adjacent to the west side of the building is a patio with an outdoor seating area. Parking is located on the north, south and east sides of the building. This building will be primarily constructed of brick and cast stone. At the time of preliminary site plan approval staff had some concerns with the materials proposed on the project. The applicant has revised the materials palette in order to match that of the Cornerstone development and the only material that is different is the brick material. Staff would like to get direction from the Commission regarding the brick material. The applicant is proposing three main signs on the building and a variety of non-illuminated vinyl graphics. Per the design guidelines for Cornerstone, only three signs are allowed per building. The applicant is requesting the additional signage as part of their restaurant theme and staff is supportive of that request. Staff is recommending approval of this case with the stipulations stated in the staff report. Joseph showed the proposed materials to the Commission. The darker brick material is the proposed material and the lighter version is the approved material. There is a slight texture change, also.

Williams asked if the applicant is proposing a veneer or an actual brick. Joseph stated they are proposing a thin veneer and the approved material is a thick brick. Perkins asked the percentage of brick on the building as opposed to the other materials. Joseph stated 26% of the building is brick.

Rohlf asked if all of the stipulations include all of the specific ones for this building as well as any for the overall development. Joseph stated some of the stipulations are only for this building. Rohlf asked if the Commission should be concerned with what has already been approved for the overall. Joseph stated, no. Rohlf stated they have not seen any renderings for the water feature. It was her understanding that the water feature would be part of this application. Lambers stated it was represented as that and then it turned out to be a misunderstanding on this applicant’s part. The developer is in the process of working with staff on the water feature. They have made a presentation, however, Lambers found it to be not substantial enough to warrant the City to participate in financing it, so they will re-doing it, however that is independent of this application. Rohlf asked how that was approved in final. Lambers stated the Commission approved a water feature. It will come back with a true plan, just as the other buildings in the development. Rohlf asked if it is tied to this lot. Lambers stated, no, it is tied to the whole development.

Conrad stated he believes this is a place where there should be integration of this building and the corner feature. That whole corner should be integrated. He thinks it is important to see how they tie together. Lambers stated they are under different ownership. This applicant only has its relative share of this development. Staff will make sure it is integrated. In fact, the integration of the plan is really not the point of contention; it is the size of the water feature and also the fact that
they only had one layer to the water feature. We are looking for a multiple layer of cascading water and much larger than what they were proposing. They thought they were under a budget of $750,000 when the City has $1.1 million set aside in special benefit district financing for this project. We have told them that they need to go back and expand it. It is up to them to do so.

Henderson asked if Henry Klover is still the architect for the development. Lambers stated, yes, but that would not be for each of these individual lots. Henderson asked if Klover would be involved with the corner feature. Lambers stated RED Development has contracted with an architect that has a specialty in water features, so Klover is not involved.

Henderson asked if EIFS will only be used as an accent and not 1/5th of the external elevations. Joseph stated the applicant is proposing EIFS as an accent material and it is used on 21% of the building. The rest of the materials are brick and cast stone.

Williams stated the drawings make reference to a cast cornice. He then asked what is proposed for the cornice material. Joseph stated the applicant would be better able to answer that question. Williams stated staff has the exterior materials listed as brick, yet it is not the brick as we would know it. He then asked if it needs to be stated in the stipulations to allow the veneer. Joseph stated, if the Commission approves of the material, it would need to be added as a stipulation and also only for this project. Williams asked if the applicant is proposing cast stone or cultured stone. Joseph stated cultured stone.

**Applicant presentation:** Presentation by Mike Halstead with Halstead Architects in Indianapolis. Dwayne Hicks with Klover Architects is available. The plaster glass is a fiber-reinforced concrete. They are using that for the windows and the cornice. The cornice-line cannot carry the weight of the real cast stone because of the projections. In regard to the water feature, they met with staff about 9 months ago and had an integrated design with the building and have since been told they were not to be designing it. Lambers stated staff did like their design and it was better than what was proposed by the developer. Halstead stated it is a thin brick and that is the only reason the color is different. They asked three different manufacturers to try to match the approved brick with a thin brick and no one can match it. They feel it is fairly close. There is cast stone and cultured stone. In the renderings, the cultured stone is the field and then there is cast stone at the window details. There are about 20 Claddagh Irish Pubs in the country, either built, under design or completed. Halstead showed a video of one of their restaurants near the airport in Indianapolis. They will be using a warm palette of colors. There is a fire pit in the patio. Along the length of the water feature will be the patio that will seat about 50 to 60 people. They will seat about 200 people inside. The applicant agrees with all of staff's stipulations.

Rohlf asked if the wording on the awnings would be on the east or north elevation. Joseph stated he believes it was labeled wrong on the plans. Rohlf stated she likes the design. Halstead stated the materials are 24% brick, 26% stone, 21% EIFS, and 11% plaster glass.

Henderson asked about the safety features surrounding the fire pit. Halstead stated there would be a security railing and they would also have a separate railing all along the patio. Henderson asked the height of the railing. Halstead stated it will be 3 ft. 1 in. Henderson asked what material the floors would be made of. Halstead stated it would be all tile. There is a new porcelain tile now that simulates wood and that might be used in the country pub area. Henderson asked if that could be loud. Halstead stated they hope it will be noisy. They want people to be there. Henderson asked where the heating would be located. Halstead stated they would be gas-fired rooftop units. Henderson asked if the heat would come from the walls or the floors. Halstead stated it would come from the ceilings.

Perkins asked why they are asking for the change in the brick. Halstead stated it is because they could not find a thin brick that would exactly match the thick brick.

Conrad asked where the trash enclosure would be located. Halstead stated it is hidden inside the back area. There is a fake doorway that is an Irish design used on other pubs. It would be inside the building. Conrad asked if there are freezers near the trash. Halstead stated, no, the trash is partitioned off.
Reynolds asked if it is possible the water could come up to the retaining wall for the patio. Halstead stated it was anticipated, but he has not seen the new design for the water feature. Reynolds asked if there is anything specific they should be concerned about with the umbrellas. Halstead stated they would be made of the same color as the awnings.

Rohlf asked if the patio is on the west elevation. Joseph stated the elevations were labeled wrong in the plans. Reynolds stated the patio is labeled as the north elevation in the plans.

Williams asked for the reason for changing the brick. Halstead stated it is a cost factor. If the walls get bigger then the foundation gets thicker. Williams asked if the Commission has approved brick veneer as an exterior cladding like this. Joseph stated it has been approved with Parkway Plaza. Williams asked if “cast brick” is a correct description. Halstead stated he believes these are actual bricks that have the face sliced off of them. Williams asked for a description of the installation of the brick. Halstead stated it is plaster back-up, so there is a rough coat of plaster and then it is inserted into the plaster. Williams asked if it is generally the same installation as the cultured stone. Halstead stated, yes. Williams stated that is a concern because there have been situations where that type of material has fallen off the wall. Halstead stated they have used this in all of their other pubs and have not had any problems. Williams stated he was struck by the use of EIFS for the half-flashing on the parapets. Halstead stated it should be metal or something more durable than that. Williams stated he appreciates some of the changes made since the preliminary plan was approved.

Henderson asked if people would be parking in this lot in order to walk over to see the water feature and if that would significantly encroach on the parking for Claddagh. Dwayne Hicks, of Klover Architects, stated Klover is not the primary designer. They do have regular meetings with COR group to go over all of the issues with the development. Klover is involved with everything at some point. They are looking at how the water feature is integrated. Originally, Claddagh had part of their patio extending over the lot line and going to the water feature. It was determined that it had to be completely separate. They want to make sure the water feature is integrated with the corner, taking a path off of the sidewalk. They are providing a concrete wall with a cultured stone. The only concern Klover would have on that wall would be the effect of water on the cultured stone. The water could be pulled back so as to not be against the wall. Henderson asked if he would see any problems with parking. Hicks stated there may be times, such as St. Patrick’s Day, when their parking is more. Seville Home would not be using their parking during those times. He does not see events happening in the water feature that would draw any crowds.

Williams asked if the areas where the horizontal bands are would be EIFS. Halstead stated if it is separating stone from brick then it would be cast stone. If it is in the EIFS band then it would be EIFS.

A motion to approve was made by Williams with an amendment to stipulation number 32 to add, “the brick to be a cut thin brick veneer as submitted, in lieu of the approved full-brick installation”, an amendment to stipulation number 33 to add, “the stone wall material will be cultured stone and not cast stone”, and an amendment to stipulation number 34 to add, “cast stone to be used for trim areas, such as around windows and separating brick and stone materials”. Henderson seconded the motion. Joseph suggesting adding something to state that the brick veneer be approved only for this building and not others in the development. Williams stated since this is an approval for this building only he would think that should be sufficient. Lambers stated it would be better to have it included because we have had problems in the past. Williams amended his motion to change stipulation number 32 to read, “the brick for this project only to be a cut thin brick veneer in lieu of the development’s approved full-brick veneer construction.” Henderson accepted the amendment to the motion.

Conrad stated he is going to vote against the motion because he feels this corner was meant to be integrated. He feels the Planning Commission is failing in what they are tasked to do. This building has a hexagonal stone tower, a fire element, a retaining wall with stone cladding, an ornamental hand rail and lights atop each of those elements and the other half behind the corner is a parking lot. The Commission has seen numerous proposals for the development of the corner and he strongly feels that this is extremely important.

Motion approved 5-2. Conrad and Munson against.
Commissioner Conrad recused himself from this case.

CASE 47-06 ST. MICHAEL THE ARCHANGEL Request for approval of a preliminary site plan. Located approximately north of 143rd Street and east of Nall Avenue.

Staff presentation: Presentation by Jeff Joseph. The applicant is requesting approval of a preliminary site plan for a 52,854 sq. ft. two and a half story worship center and a 576 sq. ft. field house/concession building. A preliminary plan and special use permit for a 61,268 sq. ft. worship center was originally approved for this site in 2001. With that application a 23-lot residential subdivision were also approved. The new church building is proposed just to the east of the existing two-story education facility. The proposed materials are cast stone and stucco that will match the existing education center. There is an access provided from Nall Avenue. There are 549 parking spaces. The height of the proposed worship center is approximately 97 ft. This height is in compliance with the development ordinance regulations for churches. The ordinance allows up to a height of 105 feet, however, an additional 3 ft. of setback is required for each additional foot above 35 ft. when adjacent to residential. They are providing 330 ft. on the north side and 365 ft. on the east side. Staff is recommending approval of this case with the stipulations stated in the staff report.

Rohlf asked if there is anything that has carried over from the previous approval. Joseph stated the main difference is the height of the worship center. Rohlf then asked for a description of storm water and how this site will work with Glen Abbey. Ley stated staff has concerns with the exiting pipe from the detention pond on St. Michael's property. When St. Michael's put that in they did not have an easement on the east property so they had to take the exiting pipe to the north and drain it out. The pipe runs to the north and the water exits to the south. Public works staff wants them to clean that up and take that pipe so it drains easterly and line it up with that creek. The other concern is that the pond does overtop. When they came in with Villas of Chapel Green they ended up taking on additional water to that pond. The size is correct, but the exiting pipes are too small. That will be verified on the final submittal by St. Michael's. Rohlf asked if Ley has looked at that in regard to what is being proposed for Glen Abbey as well. Ley stated, yes. There is a stipulation on Glen Abbey that requires those easements to get the pipes from St. Michael's into that channel.

Perkins asked if that is tract B. Ley stated, yes. Perkins asked if that flows to the property to the east. Ley stated, yes. The exiting pipe will probably be larger. Perkins asked what size they are proposing. Ley stated it will be determined with the drainage study.

Henderson asked the probability of the concession stand exceeding 1,000 sq. ft, thus requiring a sprinkler system. Joseph stated they are proposing 576 sq. ft. so they are in compliance. If they propose to enlarge it then it would need to come before the Commission.

Williams asked if they are proposing cast stone. Joseph stated, yes.

Applicant presentation: Presentation by Dave Livingood with GLPM Architects, representing the client. The applicant concurs with all of staff's recommendations except stipulation number 10; that all downspouts should be enclosed. The architectural feel for this building is a very classical design which would typically include copper downspouts and gutters of a very high quality. He asked for consideration to explore that during the final design submittal. The intent is that they would deposit directly into the storm drainage system.

Rohlf asked how that proposed material would work. Lambers stated staff would not support the request for external downspouts. Staff has been requested repeatedly and has been consistent in requiring that downspouts need to be concealed.

Henderson asked the height of the tower. The numbers were different when this was approved preliminarily. Since that time the applicant received a variance from the Board of Zoning Appeals. He then asked why it now stands at 97 ft. plus the cross. Livingood stated during the original submittal in 2001 the provisions where not in place to allow the additional height. As the design has changed the focus from the educational center to the church one of the things they have done is to make the plan more compact. The footprint on the original submission was 30,600 sq. ft. They are now proposing 24,000 sq. ft.
They have taken some of the seating off of the floor and raised it up. As a result of that, they were looking at more volume within the church and looking at the historical character and classical designs and honoring the proportions that have been set up with this type of structure. That is one of the reasons the height has increased a little. Henderson asked if the tower would be hollow or if there would be a cell tower inside. Livingood stated the parish has no desire to look at cell towers. The height is occurring over the sanctuary. There is a small tower with an elevator underneath it. That is for some of the headroom required for the elevator. The highest tower is a rotunda-type space to let light in. Henderson asked if it is constructed so that it will not change in function. Livingood stated, yes.

**Public hearing:** With no one present to speak in regard to this case, a motion to close the public hearing was made by Henderson and seconded by Williams. Motion to close approved unanimously.

Henderson asked if the LDO would include mosques as public religious worship for the setback allowance in regard to height. Lambers stated the LDO did not list that then it would be interpreted so that it would.

Lambers stated he would like the Commission to be aware of the height of the proposed building and its proximity to residential. There was no one present to speak at the public hearing but there were many people present to speak regarding height on other developments. He would like the Commission to be aware that what is decided with this case could be looked at for future cases. Rohlf stated it was her understanding that it was not an issue because the Board of Zoning Appeals had already approved it. Lambers stated the ordinance has changed since then to allow this height. He just wanted to make sure the Commission realizes this is an almost 90-ft. structure adjacent to residential. Henderson stated the Commission has already approved a height of 155 ft. for the Church of the Resurrection.

Williams stated the height of the tower component and its size proportion in relation to the building is different than a 90-ft. high apartment building that has greater mass and could potentially block a view. Residents sometimes choose what they will accept as tall buildings and what they won’t and based on the lack of public present tonight it seems they are okay with churches but not condos.

Reynolds stated he fully supports staff’s comment about additional landscaping to the east. He then stated he does not see anything inherently wrong with gutters that are well-designed and of the material discussed. He would be willing to consider allowing it on this project, provided they would be tied to the storm water system. Williams stated he would agree with Reynolds. A building of this classical style is often featured with copper drains and downspouts. It could actually be an enhancement and not a detraction. If properly done, they can be quite nice and an asset to the building. He would like to see what they would like to propose. Perkins stated he would be supportive of looking at that situation for this case only, although he could see the problem of setting a precedent. Lambers stated staff has a mandate that it is not to be recommended. That does not preclude the applicant from requesting it.

Elkins asked if it would be binding to the Commission if this plan is approved with the stipulation that downspouts be enclosed. Lambers stated the applicant could propose it during final plan approval. The stipulation would need to be changed during final plan approval.

**A motion to approve was made by Perkins.** Williams asked if he would like to change stipulation number 10 regarding enclosing the downspouts. Perkins stated his understanding is that it could be changed during final plan. Lambers stated it would be better to leave the stipulation in as written then let the applicant come in with a design. If the Commission does not like the design then the stipulation would be in place. Reynolds seconded the motion. Motion approved unanimously.

Conrad returned to the meeting.

**CASE 48-06 GLENABBIEY OF LEAWOOD** Request for approval of a final plat and final site plan. Located at 4900, 5000 and 5100 West 143rd Street.
Staff presentation: Presentation by Mark Klein. The applicant is requesting approval of a final site plan and final plat for the development of a 31-lot single-family subdivision on 27.31 acres for a density of 1.14 dwelling units per acre. The Commission heard the preliminary for this case a couple months ago. This is the first phase of that development. That development included three 10-acre tracts. This piece includes the first two 10-acre tracts on the west and the southern portion of the 10-acre tract to the east and leaves lots 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25 and 26 to be developed as a second phase. As part of this application, the right-of-way for those lots will be dedicated with this project. That was a stipulation as part of the preliminary. Staff is recommending approval of this case with the stipulations stated in the staff report.

Rohlf asked if the layout is the same as the preliminary. Klein stated, yes.

Williams asked if there are any other monument signs in Leawood that have the developer’s name on them. Klein stated JC Nichols has a plaque located on theirs. Some along State Line Road do, but none of the recent ones that have come through. Lambers stated we do not do that in Leawood.

Applicant presentation: Presentation by Jason Meier, vice president of development for Matt Adam Development. They believe this will be the best residential development to happen in Leawood. They are very proud and excited to bring this development to Leawood. Matt Adam has done multiple developments in cities in Johnson County and they are all very high-end, custom developments. They agree to all of staff’s stipulations, but would like to discuss the name being on the monument sign. That has been a signature for every development that Matt Adam has done. They believe the name means high quality. They drove around Leawood and found multiple other signs with other developer’s names on them, such as Rodrock, Acuff and Rhodes. A precedent has been set. That is the only stipulation they would like to discuss.

Rohlf stated she believes the signs they saw were in Overland Park. Lambers agreed. Henderson stated Rodrock is in Overland Park. Meier stated he thought the Hills of Ironhorse was in Leawood. Klein stated half of it is, but the other half is in Overland Park. Meier stated they were looking at the Amli signs also. Lambers stated those are in Overland Park.

Lambers stated this is one time when the process has resulted in a dynamic project for Leawood. This will be a signature project.

Rohlf asked if the applicant has discussed Ley’s comments about the storm water situation with the church. Meier stated they have not discussed that stipulation specifically, but that was a stipulation that came up during preliminary and was discussed internally. They were a little concerned that they were providing storm water access to a private entity across their property, but it is really not going to affect them that much and they understand the benefits it will have for the City, so they have no objections to that. Rohlf asked if they were aware of the design for the church property before they designed this. Meier stated, yes. They understand the height will be significant but they feel it is a great addition to the City.

Perkins asked how long they think it will take to get developed. Meier stated this first plat does not contain the seven lots on the easternmost portion. All of the lots for the first plat have essentially been sold. They would like to get everything approved as soon as possible. They would be looking at about two to three years for a full build-out for the entire project. They have had great response from home builders and the people who would buy the lots from the builders.

Reynolds stated he feels the lake will be a great addition. He then asked what the serpentine walls will be made of. Meier stated real stone. It will be an architectural feature for that entry. Reynolds then asked if the bridge will be a real stone veneer on a concrete retaining wall. Meier stated it will be a real stone bridge. Also, one of staff’s comments was incorrect. It was stated that they will be providing the architectural street lights around the round-a-bout only and Matt Adam has decided to put ornamental lights for the entire development. Reynolds asked if the 30-40 ft. pole that was shown would not be part of the development anymore. Rohlf asked if there would need to be a change to the stipulations. Klein stated, no. Typically, that is an upgrade and staff is thrilled to get the more decorative fixtures.

Williams asked if the fire marshal’s concerns have been satisfied in regard to trees being planted so as to allow fire truck access. Klein stated that will be something that the fire marshal will look at as they go forward. He also had concerns with access to the large lot. Williams stated the trees in his neighborhood would be a major problem for any large truck that
would need to get through. Klein stated the street trees that they are providing are larger than required. Williams asked if they would be located a couple of feet off of the curb. Klein stated they are normally located between the sidewalk and the curb. Rohlf clarified that the fire marshal’s concern regarding trees is just for the existing house.

A motion to approve was made by Williams and seconded by Munson. Motion approved unanimously.

Rohlf stated she thinks with the newer members as well as older, it might be beneficial to have some type of a work session to discuss the differences of a preliminary plan versus a final plan and things to be reviewed at each level, somehow to focus the Commissioners on what might be appropriate questions at those stages so we can stay more focused. She thinks they could use some guidance. She feels staff has to participate a lot in the meetings. She could use some better direction on the plans. Reynolds stated he would welcome some help to clarify what should be looked at during preliminary versus final. Lambers stated he could try to schedule a work session. Some of the situations lately have arisen where the Commission is requesting final plan items at preliminary. The Commission needs to have faith in the process that when the Commission does give preliminary approval, that is all you are doing. Having a checklist of items of things in those categories available to the Commissioners to consider would be helpful. Rohlf stated she would like to have it as a work session as soon as possible. Conrad stated he would like to visit the bonus points and how they are calculated. Lambers stated as part of this we will get a better comfort level for the process than there is now. Munson stated the first meeting of the month used to be a work session with no public hearings. He then asked why things have changed. Lambers stated because of the time limit on the meeting he has to gauge the time. He wants to make sure we have ample time to get to an applicant so that people don’t get delayed for weeks because of an arbitrary time line. Rohlf stated she feels a work session would have been helpful on the One Nineteen project. Lambers stated the issue of having a work session on an actual case raises procedural issues. Everyone is entitled to have the same information and when there is a work session, the Commission would get a presentation that the residents are not there for. Rohlf stated the public could attend the work sessions. Lambers stated they are notified through the process of the public hearing. They would not be notified of a work session. Perkins stated he has spoken with Lambers in what goes into preliminary discussions with staff and how they get to a point to bring it to the Commission and he found a lot of comments helpful. Lambers stated he will look at the first meeting in September to have a work session. He would need at least a month in advance. Henderson stated they used to set a time for a work session and not let other things crowd it out.

Meeting adjourned.

Lisa K. Rohlf, Chair