

**City of Leawood
Planning Commission Minutes**

**March 13, 2007
Meeting - 6:00 p.m.
Leawood City Hall Council Chambers
4800 Town Center Drive**

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

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA: A motion to approve the agenda was made by Williams and seconded by Munson. Motion approved unanimously.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES: Approval of the minutes from the February 13, 2007 meeting.

Henderson pointed out a correction on page 5 where it should read "2006" instead of "2007". Also, on page 7 he has no idea what the resident speaking during the public hearing meant. He asked for the unclear sentence to be cleaned up or thrown away. A motion to approve the minutes was made by Henderson, with his corrections. Motion seconded by Roberson. Motion approved unanimously.

CONTINUED TO THE APRIL 24, 2007 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

CONTINUED TO THE MAY 22, 2007 MEETING:

CASE 53-06 LDO AMENDMENT – SECTION 16-2-5.7 (RP-4 DISTRICT) Request for approval of an amendment to the Leawood Development Ordinance. Public hearing

CASE 55-06 LDO AMENDMENT – SECTION 16-2-5.2 (RP-A5 DISTRICT) Request for approval of an amendment to the Leawood Development Ordinance. Public hearing

CASE 57-06 LDO AMENDMENT – SECTION 16-2-5.4 (RP-1 DISTRICT) Request for approval of an amendment to the Leawood Development Ordinance. Public hearing

CASE 58-06 LDO AMENDMENT – SECTION 16-2-5.5 (RP-2 DISTRICT) Request for approval of an amendment to the Leawood Development Ordinance. Public hearing

CONSENT AGENDA:

CASE 18-07 PARKWAY PLAZA DENTAL, P.A. Request for approval of a final site plan. Located at 13450 Roe Avenue, within the Parkway Plaza development.

Rohlf stated a memo was placed on the dais with a correction to the signs on the building. The signs are to be located on the south and west sides.

A motion to approve the consent agenda was made by Williams with the correction noted and all of staff's stipulations. Motion seconded by Elkins. Motion approved unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS:

CASE 04-07 ST. MICHAEL THE ARCHANGEL Request for approval of a final site plan. Located north of 143rd Street and east of Nall Avenue.

Staff presentation: Presentation by Jeff Joseph. The applicant is David Livingood with GLPM Architects. The applicant is requesting approval of a final site plan to allow the construction of a 52,854 sq. ft. worship center and a 576 sq. ft. field house or concession building. The property is located north of 143rd Street and east of Nall Avenue. This church building is proposed just to the east of the existing education building. This building will be constructed of brick, cast stone and stucco to match the existing education building. The main entrance is located off of 143rd Street. There is also an access provided off of Nall Avenue. There are 571 parking spaces. This parking will be shared between the education center and the worship center. The site plan is the same as approved during the preliminary plan; however, the elevations have been revised. The crossing tower has been eliminated from the elevations. Also, some of the columns along the east elevation have been removed as well. Staff is recommending some type of tower element be added back to the building. Staff is recommending approval of this case with the stipulations stated in the staff report.

Rohlf asked Ley if all of the storm water concerns have been remedied. Ley stated the applicant has submitted a revised storm water study which Ley reviewed and approved.

Henderson stated this proposal seems to suggest that water is coming from farther west and north. Ley stated that is correct. When the Villas of Chapel Green were built, they did not anticipate that water coming in, and it is overtopping because the pond is too small. Henderson asked if Ley thinks this mechanism of increasing the flow of water without stopping the flow of water will work. Ley stated it will still hold water back, but it will actually bypass. Originally, the water upstream would stay underneath the street, but instead it got routed through the detention pond. Increasing the pipe will keep the pond from overtopping, which it is doing frequently. This will not impact 143rd Street.

Rohlf asked if the gutters have been discussed. Joseph stated there is a stipulation that says they need to be enclosed.

Williams stated he thought the Commission allowed them to have the gutters because of the architectural elements and materials. Joseph stated the only place they were showing downspouts was on the crossing tower, so now they are not showing any downspouts.

Henderson stated this seems to be a large amount of directional signs. Joseph stated this is what the applicant is proposing. It is up to the Planning Commission to decide whether it is appropriate or not. Henderson asked why the signs are needed. Joseph stated these are not big signs.

Roberson stated he goes to the Church of the Resurrection. It is mass confusion when people get in there, and if it were not for the volunteers that direct traffic, people would not know where to go. There is confusion on Sundays and during other events.

Henderson asked if the ordinance changed and if there is a reason the applicant chose 4 ft. for their fence. Joseph stated the Planning Commission could recommend a change to the height of the fence. 6 ft. fences are allowed by ordinance.

Applicant presentation: Presentation by David Livingood. There is an existing facility and the goal is to blend the two facilities together. The intent is for the church to have a hierarchy to the school. As they have gone through the design of the church, one of the key aspects the parish has asked for is it to be classically correct. In regard to the directional signs, there are different places that different people need to get to. There is a preschool, school, church and church offices. The signs are 3 ft. tall by 2 ft. wide, so they are not large signs. *Livingood described the location of the proposed directional signs.*

Rohlf asked how they determined where they would need the signs the most. Livingood stated they approached it coming in from the main entrances and looking at how people enter the site. Rohlf asked if there are any directional signs on the property right now. Livingood stated there are no directional signs currently on the site.

Livingood asked for the Commission's consideration on two of the stipulations in the staff report. The first is stipulation 6, regarding the elimination of the crossing tower. The other is stipulation 10, regarding the downspouts. The downspouts were not approved at preliminary, but the applicant was asked to present additional information during final plan application. In regard to the crossing tower, they understand staff's concern. As they prepared the design originally it was something that they wanted to be part of the project. As they refined the design they looked at it from a financial and an acoustical aspect. The challenge with the dome was how to deal with the acoustics. Some of the recommendations evolved around putting a plexiglass ceiling, another was to make all of the materials soft so the sound would be absorbed. Financially, they looked at the impact of the cost of construction. Pricing has increased substantially. The budget for the church has grown substantially, so they looked for reductions. They did not want to reduce the detail. They did not want to reduce the quality of the project. They looked at usable square footage components. The baptistery was usable space that could not go away. They looked at the scale of the project and the size and element that needs to go there. It is either all or nothing. He asked the Commission's consideration to allow it to go forward without the crossing element. In regard to the downspouts, he is not sure why the ordinance was put into place. He would assume it is to control the quality of downspouts and how they function. They are proposing all copper guttering and downspouts. Rohlf asked the number of downspouts. Livingood stated approximately four on each elevation. *Livingood passed out photos showing examples of the downspouts.* They will be copper in all aspects.

Munson asked if the copper would have any kind of electrolytic affect on the surface behind the downspouts. Livingood stated there could be some possibility of staining, but the key would be to appropriately detail that so that it would not happen.

Rohlf asked if the artist's rendering is the correct elevation proposed. Livingood stated, yes. Rohlf asked if they looked at enclosing the downspouts. Livingood stated they did, and that could cause some long-term issues. He does see some exposed downspouts elsewhere in the City. Rohlf asked if staff thought of any designs that could work. Joseph stated this is a stipulation that is used on all projects. The architectural features are looked at during final plan. Since they are using copper downspouts, staff would like to leave it up to the Commission to decide.

Henderson asked if the reason for the fence is to keep people in the playing field. Livingood stated, yes. Henderson then asked why they chose 4 ft. Livingood stated there are two fences around the property right now. The athletic field is used by the school during the day. The fence is for the safety of children running into the street. The intent is to not be a self-contained field so that families could sit in their car and watch the game. Henderson then asked if the bleachers are permanent. Livingood stated they are removable. Henderson asked if they would be on the ground or on pavement. Livingood stated on the ground. Henderson asked if they plan on expanding the bleachers. Livingood stated they do not plan on it. Henderson asked if they would be copper. Livingood stated, no, they would be aluminum.

Jackson asked the grades in the school. Livingood stated preschool through 8th grade.

Henderson asked if the bell tower on the west elevation is carillon. Livingood stated, no. Henderson asked if the bell tower would be used to house a cell tower. Livingood stated, no. The arch at the top would be open so the bells would be located at that elevation, which is below the roof line. They are looking at 2 to 4 brass bells. They will be used at the beginning of services and at certain occasions, such as funerals. Henderson asked if they would be used before 8 a.m. or after 10 p.m. Livingood stated, no.

Munson stated he feels the signs are necessary with the activity at this development and they will help to cut down the circulation of vehicles looking where they need to go. He feels the signs are needed. He then asked to see the design of the signs. Joseph stated the applicant has given the size, but the design would be given when they apply for sign permits. Munson stated he is not as concerned about the tower. He thinks it will read as a classical building. He thinks the copper downspouts are a reasonable solution for this site. He supports what the applicant is proposing.

Williams stated he agreed with Munson's comments.

Henderson is against the directional signs. He does not want to approve them, not knowing if they are needed. Roberson stated he disagrees with Henderson. It is his own experience that directional signs are important and they do help people. Jackson stated it is a large piece of property and with all of the children that will be about; she feels the signs are necessary. Elkins asked what the concern is for the directional signs. Henderson stated the concern is with the function of the sign. They do not need to have the name of the church on them, such as how the Church of the Resurrection requested. Joseph stated the Church of the Resurrection proposed much larger directional signs. These are only 6 sq. ft., which is allowed by the ordinance.

A motion to approve was made by Williams with the removal of stipulations 6 and 10. Motion seconded by Munson. Motion approved 5-1. Henderson against.

Meeting adjourned.

Lisa Rohlf, Chair