

City of Leawood  
Planning Commission Minutes

June 12, 2007  
Meeting – 6:00 p.m.  
Leawood City Hall Council Chambers  
4800 Town Center Drive

**CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL:** Shaw, Roberson, Jackson, Rohlf, Conrad, Munson, Williams, Elkins, Reynolds

**APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA:** Rohlf noted a revision on tonight's Agenda with regard to the special meeting on June 21, 2007. She then called for a motion. **A motion to approve the agenda was made by Elkins and seconded by Williams Motion approved unanimously.**

**CONTINUED TO THE JUNE 21, 2007 MEETING:**

This work session on height and massing of buildings will be held at 9800 Overbrook Road, Leawood, KS 66206 at 5:30 p.m.

**CONTINUED TO THE JUNE 26, 2007 MEETING:**

**CASE 35-07 AT&T VRAD CABINET – 12901 Roe Ave.** Request for approval of a special use permit, located at 12901 Roe Ave. **Public Hearing**

**CASE 44-07 PARKWAY PLAZA – SUMO RESTAURANT** Request for final plat and final plan, located at north of 135<sup>th</sup> Street and west of Briar.

**CASE 45-07 HALLBROOK OFFICE –** Request for approval of a rezoning from SD-CR to SD-O, preliminary plat and preliminary plan, located at the southwest corner of College Blvd. and State Line Road. **Public Hearing**

**CASE 48-07 IRONWOODS PARK IMPROVEMENTS –** Request for approval of a revised final site plan, located approximately at 146<sup>th</sup> and Mission Road. **Public Hearing**

**CONTINUED TO THE JULY 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**

**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 56-06 LDO AMENDMENT – SECTION 16-2-5.3 (R-1 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.**

**CONTINUED TO THE OCTOBER 9, 2007 MEETING:**

**CASE 28-07 WEST SIDE AT MISSION –** Request for approval of a rezoning from SD-CR and SD-O to MXD, preliminary plat and preliminary site plan, located at the northwest corner of 135<sup>th</sup> Street and Mission Road. **Public Hearing**

**NEW BUSINESS:**

**CASE 49-07 GEZER PARK –** Request for preliminary site plan and final site plan for a public park, located at 133<sup>rd</sup> Street and Mission Road. **Public Hearing**

*Commissioner Reynolds recused himself from this item.*

**Staff presentation:**

Mark: This is Case 49-07, Gezer Park. They are requesting approval of preliminary site plan and final site plan for Gezer Park located at the northeast corner of 133<sup>rd</sup> Street and Mission Road. This property was part of the settlement agreement for the Price Chopper that is located at 135<sup>th</sup> and Mission Road. Currently there are berms that are being constructed on that piece of property, and there is also a walking trail that runs along its southern edge. This walking trail is planned to extend all the way from State Line over to Nall Avenue.

The applicant is the City, and improvements are planned for the park to be called Gezer Park. It is to represent the Gezer Region in Israel, and the reason there's a water feature there is to represent the water that flows through that region. As part of the plan, parking is proposed for approximately 25 spaces. There are also some shelters and restrooms. There's a playground area and a piece of artwork that's located in the pond that's over on the east side of the development. Staff is recommending approval of this application. To further explain the project, I'd like to hand it over to the Parks Department, Chris Claxton.

Chris Claxton, Director of Leawood Parks and Recreation, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Ms. Claxton We are bringing this plan before you tonight. We have been in the process of this project for close to two years, and during that time one of the first things that was identified in the park was the proposed addition of the art piece, which is to be installed as soon as we get some direction on approval by the artist, Elan Arbach. That piece, at the time we were working with Dennis Reynolds, who was part of our Art in Public Places Initiative, and so at that time as we began designing the park, Mr. Reynolds was retained by the City to actually help us with the design of the park. And he has done so. We would like Mr. Reynolds to give his description of the park, explain his design to you and the concepts, and certainly staff will be available to answer any questions you may have after that time.

**Applicant's presentation:**

Dennis Reynolds, 9800 Overbrook Road, Leawood, Kansas, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Mr. Reynolds: Glad to present tonight the design for Gezer Park. As you may or may not know, I've been hired by clients internationally to design recreation facilities, and so it was a terrific opportunity for me to be able to work for the City of Leawood to design a park right here in my own back yard, Gezer Park. I've got a series of images at the beginning of this. We'll go through them pretty quickly, but they're there to give you a point of reference in terms of the kind of the types of design issues that we looked at, as well as the quality of the environments that have come out of some of those issues on other projects.

Gezer Park is really unique in that it's being designed as a passive neighborhood park that has unique characteristics that reflect our sister city, which is actually a region, Gezer region, and its terms of its history and culture and ecosystems and geography. We've had a series of meetings with City staff, the Gezer Park Design Committee, the Public Arts Selection Group, as well as the Parks and Recreation Board to put together these drawings. This project here, and the slide show coincides with the handouts on your desk. So that may be an easier way to follow the power point is just to use the handout. It's the same exact images that people here are seeing on the TV screen. This project is in Traverse City, Michigan. It was designed to respond to the sand dune types of environments that they have up there in that park of Michigan. Not an exact copy, but reflective of the character of it. Likewise, Gezer Park would not be an exact copy of what's in Gezer, but would use plants that are adaptable to our environment but that would have similar characteristics to Gezer. We also anticipate extensive use of stone. The project on the top is in Shanghai. The one on the bottom is in Cleveland. Both of these are uses of stone where we have the color, the texture, the permanence and the scale that would be similar to what we would be using for Gezer Park, and certainly stone is a major part of their environment. And we see using that stone for seating areas, for interactive play areas where you have maze like areas that children can kind of explore, retaining walls that are sculptural as well as parts of the water features. The next page is an example of how native stone was used at Penn State University's Beaver Stadium, as well as the other image is in Springfield, Missouri at their convention center where it's used for benches and signage.

The next image shows an elementary school playground where we used quite a bit of stone that had fossils in it. We'd like to explore that for Gezer Park so that school children can come and visit and look out and seek out the fossils that speak to the history of Kansas in its geology. Play areas that are attracted to all age groups, maybe a sand volleyball area or lounge chairs. So we'd have something for all age groups. A bio-retention system, this was done for University of Ohio Wesleyan University where we directed storm water into these areas where it's collected and allowed to return to the ground water system. It's very cost-effective as well as environmentally sustainable. And we're looking at using some of those systems at Gezer as well. This project in Foshong, China collected that storm water into a shallow basin that acted as a reflecting pool, and we see something similar to this for the art feature at the far east end of Gezer Park. The water feature, I might say, will also have a closed loop system and will also look for other sources to keep that water replenished into the high quality.

We've talked about, in earlier design committees, the Wadi, and how it's characteristic of the Gezer region where it's dry most of the time, but during a storm event it collects the water. And that's where the plants naturally grow because that's where the storm water is directed. So we'll use some strategies like that. We've also discussed having some areas where the slopes are steepest and it's hard to get grass to grow because the water doesn't soak into the ground. On those areas, having some taller grasses that are only mowed once a year. Not the big tall prairie grass that everybody likes to talk about. Think of the rough at your

local golf course that has about 18 inch high grasses. We think that's the best way to handle some of those steep slopes. In other areas, we'll irrigate and mow the turf. And we've also talked about mowing turf where kids would be sledding so they have short grass to do that.

Pathways will link the various neighborhoods to the nearby school and the various features of the park. The next image shows a water feature in downtown Columbus, and the design committee really responded to this image in the upper left hand corner as an example of a water feature that had incorporated some sculpture. This park actually told a story of discovery, so we're looking at a system similar to this for Gezer Park. Another water feature that uses native grasses such as the Horsetail Reed as a part of it. And then a water feature again in Cleveland that also included things such as a fogging system or a zero depth basin, which we will explore as we go into construction documents. The next drawing showing the stone retaining walls again and kind of the idea of exploring. People of all ages do explore around the stone and sit on the stone and learn things about the stone. Another image was a project in Shanghai where it shows the water feature actually elevated. This one, I think it's interesting in that it had a teahouse as a part of it. It's the French concession in Shanghai, and so the teahouse responded to that cultural influence of both the French and the Chinese. And we see elements of Gezer Park, such as the shelters being influenced by the Gezer region in terms of the architecture. Landscape with a grove of trees that has optic lighting beneath some glass boulders as a kind of unique lighting element. I don't know if we'll do that for Gezer, but there's certainly lots of playful things that we can do as a part of the park.

And the public art being integrated, a large piece that's done by Elan Arbach out of stone that's a ladder that will be placed in the middle of the pond. I apologize, I don't have a picture of that actual sculpture, but I think we have it on a board that we can show you in a minute.

An example of a project Katherine Gustafson did for a memorial to Princess Diana where the land forms, the sculpting of the land, was really part of the art. And we're very excited about sculpting the berms to make them much more of a piece of environmental art. We don't want to diminish the berm's abilities to screen the neighbors from the adjacent commercial. We're not going to change the existing berms. We want to sculpt and add land forms on the street side so they become much more into not only to Gezer, but also become more attractive. Here's another project that was in central Ohio, the sculpting of the earth was responding to the serpent mounds that are found in that region. So grading and just grass on some interesting land forms can be very interesting and speak to a place's culture and its history.

That's enough of how we got to where we're at. Gezer Park, the park on the drawing here, Mission Road on the left, 133<sup>rd</sup> on the south, single family residential neighborhoods to the north and east. The Price Chopper is right across the street, south of 133<sup>rd</sup>, and the elementary school is just across the street west on Mission Road. I'm going to zoom in to talk about some of the specific features. On this western third of the site, you see the area where we're adding some sculptural land forms, so as you drive down Mission or 133<sup>rd</sup>, the park is more inviting. We have the water source, the beginning of the water source in this zone. And it travels from this western portion all the way to the eastern portion of the site. The playground is right in this portion of the site as well using the stone as playful elements and having additional features such as the little manual digging machine and opportunities for climbing and exploration and finding fossils. Also on this slide you see, K, shown as a play area. We've heard and seen that people use some of the open lawns for casual sports, and we want to be sure and provide that. So we're providing an area for casual catch or soccer practice to occur as well.

In the central portion of the site, you can see the parking lot that's located there off of 133<sup>rd</sup>. It's also designed to have a turnaround at the end of it. We think this is important so that we have people who are using the shelters can have close access when they're using those. We also think that's helpful to having maybe a school group that might be visiting the park be able to use the parking. And just in general, there's no parking on this side of the street, and we don't think it's appropriate to have people park in a private commercial lot on the far side of 133<sup>rd</sup> Street. We're showing three shelters, which are labeled E, and then F labeled as the restrooms. These would be on a timer that locked automatically at a predetermined time in the evening and then open up again on the timer in the morning. In this area also there would be a tablet that was given to us by our sister city, and it will be located within the water feature. It's a tablet that talks about their calendar.

On the eastern third of the site then, we pretty much leave the existing trees and land forms alone, but we do gather the storm water and create a small water feature where the sculpture will be located in the middle of that water feature. And this will also provide some additional detention for the area. We certainly want to maintain the existing quality of storm water management, and we'll look for opportunities to increase the ability to manage storm water as a part of this project. Then the addition of pathways that link up these features as well as the neighborhood, the school and the commercial area and the parking lot.

We're excited about the opportunity for this. It's a really unique park. It's a neat way for our community to learn about Gezer, and we hope it provides opportunities for all Leawood residents to have activities that communicate what's important about Gezer as well as what's important about Leawood and its region.

Chairman Rohlf: Is there anyone else that will make a presentation this evening, Ms. Claxton? Just be available for questions.

Ms. Claxton: Yes, that's correct. We'll be available to answer any specific questions that the commission would have.

Chairman Rohlf: All right then, we will have questions at this time. We probably will have questions off and on this evening, but if any of you have questions specifically for Mark or for Mr. Reynolds or anyone else that might be available, now is our opportunity. So I will be calling on you by name this evening. So if you would wait until I've done that, I would appreciate it. All right, Mr. Roberson.

Comm. Roberson: Dennis, can you define your definition of a passive park?

Mr. Reynolds: Sure. Chris may be more qualified.

Ms. Claxton: I'll do that if you don't mind.

Comm. Roberson: I don't mind.

Ms. Claxton: Our definition of a passive park is one that does not host organized activities, particularly activities like soccer, basketball, like the aquatic center. It does, I guess besides talking about what it does not do, I should tell you what it does do. It does provide a gathering place. It does provide opportunities for cultural experience. It could be history. Again, places to walk, for people to have open play. So that is typically what we would consider as a professional definition of passive.

Comm. Roberson: And example of that in Leawood would be?

Ms. Claxton: I think it would be very similar to what you see in I-Lan Park.

Comm. Roberson: Let's talk about this water feature a little bit if you don't mind. Water is a magnet for kids. What kind of depth are we talking about here in terms of water? Can you explain that a little bit more in terms of what you're looking at here?

Ms. Claxton: Brian Anderson, our Superintendent of Parks, is also here, and there's two areas of water that I think you're probably referencing. One is the Wadi, which starts at the west end and primarily heads east into this retainage area, which is there to not only provide the retainage but to act as the basin area for the statue. And we envision that as not being a very wide piece and also not being very deep. And I know that's not specifically what you want to hear, so I'll go on. The depth is probably going to be somewhere around two to three inches maybe as it moves down to four. Our goal is to get it as shallow as we can and still have it do its job, because we're going to experience as its moving and getting out some point of evaporation. And what we don't want it to do is to be dry. It will be recirculated, and so it will contain potable water. It will not be just open water. In terms of the depth of the sculpture area, I think again that is only going to be as deep as it needs to be to support that sculpture, the look of the sculpture. Again, somewhere between three and probably five inches of water. And that area is also only about a quarter of an acre.

Comm. Roberson: In terms of this water feature, is it contained? In other words, is it a channel that is going to be built? So you'll have a starting basin, a channel and an ending basin? In other words, it won't be on natural ground? Or will it?

Ms. Claxton: I think it would be on natural ground. That's the way we discussed it. Was it not, Dennis?

Mr. Reynolds: Yeah, I mean there's some variables in terms of the water features. We've talked about a liner. We've talked about a rubber liner versus a clay liner, and we've also talked about more of a concrete type liner. So I think as we go into construction documents, we'll be testing our budget to understand which of those three options we'll be using.

Comm. Roberson: So it will be lined?

Mr. Reynolds: Yeah.

Comm. Roberson: Okay, I'm sorry. I was not being very clear. That's what I was looking for. Thank you. Let's talk about the ladder real quickly. Again, my vision of a ladder is something sticking out of the ground with rungs on it and having kids getting up there and then jumping off and breaking a leg or two. I assume that's not quite what we're talking about here.

Ms. Claxton: Right. Is that sketch on that small black board, Dennis? I know there are some representatives from the Leawood Arts Council here tonight. I believe the lowest rung of the ladder also is, I want to say significantly off the ground, possibly eight foot off the ground. Because the piece is 25 feet high. Some of you may recall when we brought the piece in visually to you. I do not have a photo with me, but Dr. Kenney, who is the Chairman of Art in Public Places Initiative, I think she does have one. And we can just put that on the overhead.

Comm. Roberson: While we're waiting for that, I do have another question. One of the issues that's come up with respect to I'd say the bathroom and the shelters. It is possible crime or unsavory individuals hiding out in these things. What kind of problem have we had in Leawood with respect to that? And secondly, I understand they're going to be locked from what I heard. Are the shelters open enough so that things like that can happen at night? Tell me a little bit about what's going on there.

Ms. Claxton: The shelters would be open. Now the park would follow the park hours that all of our facilities follow. Even though a park may be open, which in the summer our parks are open until 11:00, we don't take shelter reservations only until 10:00. We are not proposing to have all of these shelters at this time, at least, to be rented shelters. We're looking at them primarily as gathering places, but some of them may be in the future. The bathrooms, you already mentioned, would be on a timer, so those would be maintained. We also have maintenance staff that handle the trash and maintain bathrooms, make sure there's the proper equipment

and supplies. I know that Chief Meyer with the Police Department has done some research into that. I think we've been very fortunate in Leawood. In the ten years that I've been here, our parks have very, very minimal vandalism or problems. I'll be happy to ask Chief Meyer to come up if he'd like to share, if you would like to hear from him what he's found in that regard.

Comm. Roberson: That might be beneficial.

Chief John Meier, Police Chief, Leawood, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Chief Meier: I was asked by Mr. Lambers, the City Administrator, to do some checking into crimes or problems that we've had in the parks. So I went back to the year 2000, and basically in the City Park at 106<sup>th</sup> and Lee, from 2000 to date, we've had 35 crimes reported in that park. And of those 35, 18 of them were basically cars that were broken into when people were at the pool or were out walking and whatever. We've had a few criminal damage to properties. In none of the city parks, other than an incident in 2004 on the Greenway Trails, has there been any type of crimes against person or violence against a person. As was mentioned earlier, this park could be similar to I-Lan, and I-Lan opened in 2003, and from 2003 to date, they've had three incidents there. Two of those were some damage to some property there. I have the statistics for the City parks if you're interested in them, but basically crime in the parks has not been an issue in Leawood.

Comm. Roberson: Thank you.

Ms. Claxton: If I could just add to that, I think one of the unique things about this park that we do not have at any other park, and that is that it has the cross streets. It has 133<sup>rd</sup>, which is getting busier by the day. And it also has Mission. Whereas City Park only has Lee that comes by, and Ironwood only has Mission, and I-Lan only has Nall. So, I think that's a benefit to the amount of traffic that goes by there, and even a commercial development that's around it is a benefit to deterring that, in my opinion from what I've seen.

Chairman Rohlf: All right, any questions at this end?

Comm. Jackson: There's been some comments about needing sledding routes in there. Dennis, can you show where those are?

Mr. Reynolds: In general, I think some of the local residents commented that the kids do like to use the sledding on both sides, south and north. It sounded like that maybe more on the north because that holds the snow. In winter, it doesn't get the sun, so the snow stays there longer. I guess they figure out a way to stop before they get to the fence. What we talked about doing is being sure that there were sufficient layings or gaps in these areas on the steep slopes where they can sled and not have to worry about the tall grass that might be there. Even though it's only 18 inches, 18 inches of grass would kind of slow you down when you're sledding. I don't have a specific area other than just to say that the north slopes along here, and the south slopes along there, in general where it was indicated they sled.

Comm. Jackson: And then there was comments some residents wanting more trees between them and the park? Is that in the plans?

Mr. Reynolds: Well we've shown quite a few more trees. We've focused some trees here where the pathway comes in from the neighborhood in the northeast as well as this area where the pathway comes close to a backyard. And then some additional plantings down in this area as well, again reinforcing pathway systems. And then otherwise they're in areas of the play area, the shelters, the parking lot, and this edge here to define the difference between the play lawn and the street. So that's where we focused right now, but the berm really provides the screening for the residents from their views to the south. So this plan does not show extensive plantings along those property lines at this point.

Comm. Jackson: And that northeast corner, would those be evergreens that you would put in there?

Mr. Reynolds: I'd see a combination of both. I think we brought some of the four seasonal aspects of deciduous plants as well as some evergreens.

Comm. Jackson: And then how about the playground, is there a certain age child you're trying to take care of there with that playground?

Mr. Reynolds: I think your best playground is one that attracts all ages, my parents down to a toddler. Because it's interesting, it has variety to it; it has something to kind of discover each time that's a little bit different. So I do think it will be a terrific opportunity for kids in the neighborhood to use. We talked during the design sessions with the committee about even field trips from the elementary school that might learn about the region and some of those fossil type aspects of the playground. So I think it's much different than your typical orange and purple piece of steel. We don't anticipate any of that. We see something that's much more sort of earthy and typical of the region.

Comm. Jackson: Well I do want to congratulate you. You've put a lot into this area that when you drive by, it doesn't look that big. It's a very innovative plan, very new for this area. It looks like a lot of fun for the residents.

Comm. Williams: How much of the existing park is going to be redone to create what's on this plan?

Brian Anderson, Park Superintendent, City of Leawood, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Mr. Anderson: Looking at how much of the changing of the ground overall, is that the question, or grading and that type of thing?

Comm. Williams: Right.

Mr. Anderson: I think we're going to keep things as they are with the addition of some minor additional berms over on the west side, I believe, that we talked about, plus whatever we would need to do to get the water feature installed. As many of the trees that are currently there that can stay, we plan to leave.

Comm. Williams: All right, thank you. Now also, there was discussion from Dennis on area K being an open area for soccer or ball of some sort. Roughly how big is that area?

Mr. Reynolds: The parking lot is 60 foot wide, a typical parking lot. So you can see it's about 120 feet roughly north/south, and maybe more like 200 feet or more on the east/west direction. Again, typical if you were having a little soccer practice, informal soccer practice or playing catch.

Comm. Williams: That seemed to be reasonable size. That's what I was trying to get a feel for. And the pond area where the ladder art feature is going to be, your drawing illustrates something going on to the north side of that pond. What exactly are you anticipating going on there?

Mr. Reynolds: We were looking at just an area where maybe there would be some casual seating, and so there may be some large pieces of stone that are kind of cut into the slope a little bit so you can kind of have a place to sit and look at the sculpture piece. It kind of has a gentle slope into the water feature.

Comm. Williams: And is the surface sand or gravel of some sort?

Mr. Reynolds: Right, it may be a cobble or a sand or something of that nature.

Comm. Williams: And I guess in that theme as well as in other aspects of this, is the material intended to try to again replicate what would be in the sister city area?

Mr. Reynolds: Correct, right. And you may be surprised, I mean sand is not necessarily the prevalent material. It's rocky and small stones, but not necessarily Sahara Desert sand.

Comm. Williams: Sure. Exactly. I've had the opportunity many years ago to be in the region on business. It was one of my first surprises. I guess carrying that along, I had the opportunity to experience the Wadi concept over there, and when I look at the plan here, I don't understand exactly how you plan to address that issue.

Mr. Reynolds: Yeah, and we're still not got into construction documents yet, so I don't know if I have a real clear answer for you. One direction we do want to pursue is to have the surface water drain into this Wadi type feature. And so during storm events, it would go from being just a few inches deep to maybe nine inches deep or a foot at the most and act as a detention type aspect to it.

Comm. Williams: Would that be in the area I?

Mr. Reynolds: Yes. That's the biggest area where we'd have that runoff contributing.

Comm. Williams: So the lines radiating off of the channel, that would be your Wadi?

Mr. Reynolds: Those are like diverter channels that take that storm water and get it into the Wadi. So the Wadi is actually the more serpentine feature.

Comm. Williams: Okay. But that would always have water in it?

Mr. Reynolds: We'd like to be able to keep water always in it. We've talked about whether it's city water or a well water source, something that can be recirculated. So we'll be supplementing that closed loop system during storm events basically.

Comm. Williams: So again, the goal here is to always have water in that circulating from the source on the west side down to the pond on the east side.

Mr. Reynolds: Right, right. It was interesting when they showed the design to people in Gezer, they picked up on the fact that that was. It was not intentional on our part, but they understood that it imitated the Jordan River and how it flows through the region. So they were very excited about that as a feature.

Comm. Williams: I think my last question for the moment, the stone that you discuss having throughout the site, is that going to be native stone from here? Or are you looking at importing stone actually from Israel?

Mr. Reynolds: The cost is prohibitive to ship in the stone from outside the region, so we would be using stone that you might find in St. Mary's, Kansas or Emporia or areas south of there even, which is a Kansas limestone. But it does have a similar buttery color and texture that is what's found in the region.

Comm. Williams: I guess one other question that I do have that wasn't discussed, is there any lighting proposed for the park area?

Mr. Reynolds: We've not talked about it in real detail. We think that there would be lighting on the shelters and restrooms and parking lot. How those have timers on them to go off at certain times of the day, or do we have them on from a security standpoint, a lower watt light? We don't know at this point.

Comm. Williams: And is there light on the art feature?

Mr. Reynolds: The art feature does have up-lights on it, set in the water, that would shine upon it.

Comm. Williams: All right, thank you. That's all the questions I have at the moment.

Comm. Munson: Dennis, it appears that most of the improvements that I'm looking at occur on the south side of the ridge, if you will, on the south side of the slope. Is that correct?

Mr. Reynolds: That's right.

Comm. Munson: Item M, overlook, is that at the top of the ridge? There's two of them that I see.

Mr. Reynolds: Right. We wanted to have something to kind of make it more meaningful to use those pathways, so an overlook maybe again as simple as a stone slab to sit on and maybe a small sign that could have maybe some sort of interpretive message to it that speaks to the region.

Comm. Elkins: Mr. Reynolds, a couple of questions. First, in your presentation you made reference to architecture that's similar to the Gezer region. Can you describe for us just generally what that architecture is like?

Mr. Reynolds: Well, we're still researching, and we did have some pictures come back from the group that toured the region. The Souk is a marketplace in that region that also may have some elements to it, that basically wood is prevalent. And there may be some sort of canvass or wood slats as a roof type element for shading. Again, the details are still to be determined, but we'd like something that fits in more than just a generic shelter that you could buy out of a catalog.

Comm. Elkins: What are the architecture of the cities like in the region?

Mr. Reynolds: Well prevalent use of stone, adobe, and so for the buildings that you live inside, certainly masonry, that type of materials would be appropriate. And the picnic shelter, I think we'd be interested in looking at something that uses some sort of masonry material or stucco type material.

Comm. Elkins: Is there anything that currently exists in Leawood, either in Ironwood Park or even a commercial development, that would give us a sense for what those materials are like?

Mr. Reynolds: You know not off the top of my head, but we could research and find some examples. It's probably types of architecture you might find more in Albuquerque, New Mexico than you would Leawood, Kansas.

Comm. Elkins: Mr. Reynolds, as I recall, the current paths that run through that area are asphalt, I believe. Is that correct?

Mr. Reynolds: Right.

Comm. Elkins: And do you anticipate that when the park is complete, that those will continue to be asphalt?

Mr. Reynolds: Yeah, we prefer asphalt. It conforms to the landform easier. It blends in because of its darker color as well. So if it's constructed properly with the right sub-base and the drainage tile underneath it, it has a longevity equivalent to concrete. So we would continue to use the asphalt.

Comm. Elkins: And I guess I'd be curious on your thoughts as to if there are any features in those paths that would discourage skateboard aficionados?

Mr. Reynolds: We haven't really talked about it as a committee. I'm sorry, what was your question?

Comm. Elkins: That would discourage skateboarders? I would think that as it stands right now, that would be fairly attractive. Especially with the verticals on the north end of the facility, that that would be relatively attractive to skateboarders.

Mr. Anderson: Our trail system right now is open for skateboarding and roller blading and things of that nature. I would anticipate there not being anything to prevent that per se, at least at this time.

Comm. Elkins: Oh, I know that I've seen, this again is for Mr. Reynolds. Sorry Dennis, but I know I've seen some concern expressed in some of the interactings of what not, that the current topography of the park as a whole tends to funnel air movement. I've heard the phrase wind tunnel used some. My sense is that the concern is moving generally west to east and a little bit south to north. In looking at the facility and in your experience in designing these facilities, is that an issue? And is there anything to be addressed there? Or do we just live in windy Kansas?

Mr. Reynolds: Well yeah, I've been in some really tense urban environments. I think it's pretty hard to predict the wind tunnel mature effect. There may be down at the end where there's a break in the berms some higher winds. It's pretty hard to quantify that. We're not that smart, but it is where we showed some trees on the planting plan there. Certainly evergreen trees can diminish some of the concerns about wind.

Comm. Elkins: And Mr. Reynolds, I've frankly forgotten. Hopefully you'll have a better recollection than I, but on the north boundary of the park, at least to the east and the west, there are remnants of a hedgerow. Is there still a hedgerow generally in place along that boundary? Is the hedgerow on the City side, or is it on the private side?

Mr. Anderson: The hedgerow is a little bit on both. It just depends upon where the fence is. The fence is right on the property line. In some cases it's on the homeowner's side, and others it's ours.

Comm. Elkins: On that portion that's on the City side, does the plan include anything in the way of taking out the old Osage Orange trees?

Mr. Anderson: No.

Comm. Elkins: So you'd leave those as they stand?

Mr. Anderson: Yes.

Comm. Elkins: And then, I don't know that we ever got back, Dennis, to the picture of the sculpture that I guess I refer to as the Jacob's Ladder. I'm not sure if that's the title the artist has given it or not, but again, I share Mr. Roberson's concern about ladders look to me like they're supposed to be climbed, especially when I'm 15 or 16 years old. And so if it's ballpark a 24 or 25 foot tall sculpture, and there's seven rungs in there, if they're evenly spaced, that gives you what, about a five or six foot height for the first one? Do you have any sense for where that first rung's going to be?

Mr. Reynolds: Yeah, well they're intentionally not evenly spaced. It does taper, and it does change the spacing between them as it goes up higher. The artist has indicated that the first rung is about eight feet off of the ground. And realize this was an early concept sketch by the artist, and we expressed a concern for safety as well when the art group commissioned him. So he's indicated it's eight feet off the ground.

Comm. Elkins: And I know one of the things that I'm very pleased about that has developed in Leawood is the Art in Public Places Initiative. I'm just curious, do you have any sense back in terms of what types of vandalism we've had? It's a relatively new program as I understand it, but are there any returns back yet on the vandalism to the art in public places?

Mr. Reynolds: Anne Kenney is here tonight, and she may be more qualified to answer that question.

Comm. Elkins: I know we've lost one deer, but other than that I don't know what else.



Ann Kenney, 9814 Overbrook Court, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Ms. Kenney: We've lost one deer, and that was replaced by, to some extent insurance, and to some extent Chuck Peters who donated it in the first place. And then Pastoral Dreamer had a little spray paint on him, and that has been corrected. The young man who did it is in custody and will be doing some form of community service. So far that's the only thing that's happened.

Comm. Elkins: Thank you, Ms. Kenney. Thank you, madam Chairman.

Chairman Rohlf: All right, any more questions? Anything else down here before we move to the public hearing?

Comm. Munson: Yeah, Dennis, what's the targeted drainage? What kind of water, storm water runoff do you anticipate for this area?

Mr. Reynolds: Really the only storm water that's coming into the system is what's landing on the site, and even that's not all the site because the berm cuts off the water shed to the north. So it's a fairly limited water shed to start with. We're not substantially adding impervious surface, and any impervious surface we would be adding we'll compensate for that by providing additional storm water detention.

Comm. Munson: Where will the detention be? Down here at the east end?

Mr. Reynolds: Right, down towards the east is where we'll gather it.

Comm. Munson: Let's say God pours one of those buckets of water He pours on us every once and awhile, what would be the maximum amount that that could handle? Any idea?

Mr. Reynolds: I don't, but I would anticipate that it would store to about a foot in depth in order to provide the...

Comm. Munson: And how many square feet?

Mr. Reynolds: Oh I think it was a quarter acre as I recall, the pond.

Comm. Munson: How much?

Mr. Reynolds: About a quarter acre.

Comm. Munson: Thank you.

Chairman Rohlf: All right, do we have any other questions at this time before we move to the public hearing? All right, this case does require a public hearing. I'd like to see a show of hands for those who would like to speak in the audience this evening? We have a few individuals. I will start on one side of the room and work my way back, and then come up and work this way.

**Public Hearing:**

Bill Herdigan, 5008 West 148<sup>th</sup> Street, Leawood, Kansas, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Mr. Herdigan: I live with my wife and two daughters. I would like to start by saying that I believe that the City of Leawood and the Planning Commission have done a great job over the years of balancing the development, the residential development as well as the commercial development. And one of the things that goes along with that balance, I believe, is how we use green space and public space. The developments for this park, I think, is very much in line with that balance that we seek in our community. We moved here five years ago, and one of our decisions to buy a home in Leawood was because of the balance and the quality of life that it provided us. So we would ask that you would consider these improvements that have been proposed today. Thank you.

Kevin Jeffries, 2919 W. 124th Terrace, Leawood, Kansas, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Mr. Jeffries: I just want to say what a tremendous investment in our community that's being proposed here, enhancing the value of all of our homes in the area and investing in an already \$4 million asset owned by all the citizens of the City of Leawood, all 30,000 of us. I'm very excited personally about the opportunity to use this. I have four children and a wife. We all live here in Leawood, lived here for almost 20 years, and the opportunity to have a park this close to our home that we can take our children to that they can play and explore. I've got a nine month old at home that I'm sure will get a lot of use out of that park, so I'm very excited to see that. And thank you for bringing forth this plan. So many times we hear against the people who are only against things, and with

very minimal effort I've put forth an effort to get people in the community that may be aren't against things. I put maybe a couple hours at work into getting some people to come out, and I think they've sent some letters to the Planning Commission and e-mails supporting this project. I think it's real important the Planning Commission always keep in mind that there are a lot of people that you hear from the noisy folks who are against things, but a lot of times you don't hear from the people who are fine with things and think Leawood's a great community and love living here. And I just want you to remember that just, again, with minimal effort, a lot of people were concerned that this park might not go forward and responded to my request for them to get out and let you all know that this is a good thing for our community. If I put in the effort that some of the people who are against it put in, I'm sure I could get even more voices out there. So I think that's real important.

One important thing, too, I know people are concerned about the restrooms and the security risk for that. Young moms taking their kids to a park that are just potty training their kids, they want a bathroom close. It's very, very important. And to have to take the kids across a busy road like 133<sup>rd</sup> Street to go to the restroom at Price Chopper, usually you don't have that much time. So if you want people to really use that park, it's important that there be restrooms. And most port-a-potties are just not very satisfactory. Not only are they unsightly that they have in some of the other parks, but I personally think they're probably more dangerous than a standing facility. So that's really all I have. Thank you.

Chairman Rohlf: That does make me want to point out to you all that I hope you've seen our copies of various letters and e-mails. I believe some of those have received those at home, but for those who have not, they are here on dias for you to look at. Anyone else on the second row?

Kim Jeffries, 12211 Sagamore, Leawood, Kansas, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Ms. Jeffries: I know, similar name as the person you heard before, but I am the sister. I get a vote, too, I guess. I, too, am just thrilled with the potential of this park, and I help care for two elderly adults and I'm pretty excited about the paths and the water feature and mainly the parking. One is in a power chair, the other in a wheelchair, and it's great for them to be able to get out in the fresh air and actually get over to enjoy the water and the park. So I very much appreciate it and look forward to seeing it. Thank you.

Bridget Murphy, 12920 Glenfield, Waterford Subdivision, Leawood, Kansas, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Ms. Murphy: I had some prepared notes, but after listening to the design I wanted to say it sounds like an absolutely beautiful park. My concern is that it is on the walking path for many of our children between our homes and Price Chopper or school. My concern is that mostly the parks, from what I can see, are destination parks. And when we talk about crime, I am the parent of a child with Down's Syndrome. He's 15 years old. His best friend also lives in our neighborhood who is also developmentally disabled. Both of these boys have cognitive disabilities. Mental retardation would be the more common term for it. At this time these boys are ready to walk to Price Chopper by themselves, but they are not ready to be in a public park, especially one with open restrooms. And I know I heard that the restrooms will be locked at dusk. These boys aren't out at dusk. We certainly wouldn't let them wander alone in the dark. Our concern is for our unusually high population of children with special needs in the Waterford, the Wilshires, Cherry Creek, the subdivisions that surround Mission Trail. My son was the first child with a developmental disability to be included in the regular education classes at Mission Trail Elementary. And in the past ten years, Mission Trail has emerged as really one of the best programs in the greater Kansas City area for children with developmental disabilities, which has attracted families with these children to this neighborhood, which will attract these children to this public park. Now when you look I-Lan Public Park, on three sides it's a wooded area. And on the fourth side, if you count the left turn lane, it's Nall at 45 miles an hour. And there is no crosswalk between I-Lan and I believe it's Deer Run is the subdivision. So basically it would be suicide for a child with a developmental disability to try and cross Nall at 45 miles an hour to get to I-Lan Park. So naturally you would have a parent with this child. I think the same for Leawood City Park, Ironwoods. They're just not accessible to young children and children who would be like my son. But this park, if you're living west of Mission, you would have the opportunity to use the Mission Trail crosswalk. And if you were living east of Mission, you don't have to cross a street to get to this park. So my concern is that this park will attract people that are not part of our neighborhood. And when you have a developmental disability, you certainly have a lack of good judgment. More importantly, you have the inability to testify against someone in any reasonable manner. So while I love the aesthetics of the park, I think it would be wonderful for our particular population in our neighborhood that if it had somewhat of a fence or a barrier so that there was truly an entrance to the park rather than the ability for all of our kids to just cut across and be in a public park near public restrooms, even if it is during the day. Thank you so much.

Alec Wineberg, 13252 Delmar Court, Wilshire, Leawood, Kansas, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Mr. Wineberg: As a point of reference, the Pastoral Dreamer is about in my backyard. This is a terrific plan. It's very exciting. I think it's going to be a great asset for the neighborhood, and I think there's a lot of foresight in designing it. The water feature clearly will be very, very attractive. Thanks for the thought process.

Terry Levine, 13217 Pawnee, Waterford, Leawood, Kansas, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Mr. Levine: I live at that house right there right next to the park. We've been there for 15 years and have seen the emergence of this whole concept. First, I want to comment that this is a beautifully designed park. There is a lot of neat features to this, but I want to bring up a few points for the Committee's consideration. One is as was brought up, the location of the shelters. The safety issue is somewhat of a concern, although I was glad to hear from the Chief that it's not as much of an issue. However, as a consideration, maybe these shelters could be moved closer to the street so they have better surveillance and motion lights underneath them so that at night, if any teenagers or anyone was there, they would at least turn on.

The second issue is the stream that goes through, and although it's a very neat concept that it does look like the Jordan River, the concern also is that I don't know how wide this is going to be, whether it's going to be four inches wide or two feet wide, and whether or not it's going to be a safety hazard. If this does dry up during the summer, whether or not there's going to be enough water to keep it filled. And it does sound like quite an expensive deal to go ahead and use the recirculation aspect or even dig a well.

The third aspect is the water feature down here, which is a very beautiful and neat concept. If you didn't have this stream, there would be a lot of extra money to go ahead and make this some type of zero depth fountain or at least a water feature with lots of fountains and possibly some more creative lighting or such to make it a beautiful piece. Critical to the whole park project is irrigation. Right now it is not irrigated, and I think that explains failure of a lot of the trees and a lot of the grassy areas that have occurred.

When the plans for this park were first done, there should've been a gate that was locked, and there really isn't one at this point, and so I would request that be put part of the plan, a gate that could be locked the same way that there would more than likely be a locked gate at the parking lot. And I want to go ahead and emphasize lastly that quite importantly is this area here that was brought up. As the wind does go through the park, it is an exceedingly windy area right there. So, if when you're designing this park, if you could put in a number of trees to help at least block some of that wind, not only for myself but for all the surrounding neighbors that are in this particular part of the neighborhood. So thank you for your attention.

John Pickard, 3649 W. 127<sup>th</sup> Terrace, Leawood, Kansas, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

**Mr. Pickard**: I am representing the Board from Waterford Homes Association, which is the 339 residences just north of the park. And I wanted to ask, can I ask the park people questions? Just specifically, what's the size of I-Lan Park compared to the size of the proposed Gezer Park? It's the same size? Okay. In the parking that's specified in the plan there, how many stalls are there?

Unidentified and off-mic/off-camera: Shown on there is 16, but we've talked as many as maybe 25, which is similar to the first parking lot that we had at I-Lan [*inaudible*].

Mr. Pickard: Okay, are you going to allow parking in the circle?

Unidentified and off-mic/off-camera: This is going to be drop-off.

Mr. Pickard: For drop-off, okay. I took the opportunity on the way here tonight to drive through and drive to I-Lan Park, and I counted a total of 30 parking places, including the two handicapped parking places. How many of the 16 are going to be handicapped stalls?

Unidentified and off-mic/off-camera: I believe we'd have to have two, because that's how many are required for this size park. Dave, can you handle that? I'm sorry, Dave's with City Hall.

Dave (?): I believe there'd be two handicapped stalls stated by code.

Ms. Claxton: I just wanted to make a comment about the number of spaces at I-Lan. One of the reasons there are more spaces at I-Lan, and I didn't know if you were aware of it, that's a trail head, and many of the cars that are parked there are utilizing the trail that runs from I-Lan over to Tomahawk Park. So that was part of the demand for the extra parking in that location.

Mr. Pickard: Just a further concern is the density of the development. There are, I believe, two structures, the shelters. There are two shelters in the park, and there are proposed three here. So this seems like to me a more densely used park for picnics and things. You said that that's for not necessarily organized activities, and I would like to argue that I've never been to a picnic at a shelter that wasn't organized. So I'm going to say that you're going to have more parking than you think. And the points that you made was that you didn't want people parking at Price Chopper, which is private parking. I believe you're going to have a lot of overflow. So what part of that park, say you had to double your parking there, are you going to give up? That's all I wanted to ask. Thank you.

Mary Holland, 13213 Howell, Leawood, Kansas, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Ms. Holland: My home backs up, it's like the second lot over from Mission. Let me also say that a lot of the things that you all want to do here would be very nice and aesthetically look very nice in that area. As it is right now, it's a greenway that's barely even mowed. So it looks horrible most of the time. I apologize, I'm shaking. I'm not very good. Our concerns, I live in that home with my husband and four children, all 13 years and younger. That area is basically a concern for us with safety. The number of people who will be coming to that area to gather and the possibility of the suspects who might be coming there. I speak to this, which brings to things that come to light, the recent Kelsey Smith ordeal. Those things are all prevalent in our minds right now. And areas open like this that invite people coming from all over, not just Leawood. And we all know that it's not just going to be used by Leawood. We're so close to the state line. There are people that will come from Missouri, Overland Park, Olathe, everywhere. Safety, safety, safety. The bathrooms are a real concern for us. I question, in addition, the need for additional shelters in the Leawood area. We have all the shelters in the Leawood City Park. We have them in that Tomahawk Creek. We have them in I-Lan. We have them in Ironwoods. They're not used 100 percent of the time, so the drive for additional shelters in that type of area, that type of usage, I wish you would consider the true need for that rather than just putting those there because.

I did want to speak to a couple of things regarding the assumption that the berm provides this great protective boundary between us and the Price Chopper. Yes, from my first floor I cannot see the Price Chopper, but from the second floor and my third floor, I can see the entire thing, the lights, everything. Additional lighting is not required in this area. There is plenty of lighting that comes from that parking lot, and I would be opposed to additional lighting in that area.

Secondly, something that was assumed was that the hedgerow belonged to the City. It does not. That is my property. It was my property when I bought the house, and it is additionally my property when the additional square feet were added and the fence put up. Those are well off the property line and within my property, so there is no buffer other than that berm with regards to trees, bushes, very minimal. I would ask you to please look at the Leawood City Park, I-Lan, Ironwoods regarding the space and the width of the buffer that is between any home site and that park facility. I-Lan, for example, if you can look at your plans, there's actually even a creek back there. I mean it's a good 100 feet, 50 to 100 feet. It's not simply a property line and then the park. So I would ask you guys to please a little research regarding that.

I do have concerns with the little, I know you're calling it the Wadi, as far as maybe kids trying to jump over that depending on the width of that, or people not really seeing it and jumping into it. And lastly, I mean with regards to skateboarders and that kind of thing, we have not had any problems with kids or individuals like that, but I do believe that if you add a parking lot, restrooms, shelters, gathering spots, that that could seriously potentially be an area that kids will tend to congregate.

And then finally, I know that our subdivision, Waterford, has experienced quite a bit of vandalism in our pool area, at our entrance areas, and I know that you've done some bit of research regarding the art vandalism. But I also additionally feel that you're going to just open yourself up to vandalism by providing a true gathering place. I speak to the gathering with respect to the shelters, the bathroom, the parking lot. As far as the stones, the plantings, the trees, the beautification, that little play area, I think that all sounds wonderful. Thank you very much.

Marvin Gibbeon, 123<sup>rd</sup> and Aberdeen, Leawood, Kansas, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Mr. Gibbeon: We are not contiguous to this project. However, we have been intimate with this inception both from the Israeli side and the Leawood side from the beginning, and we feel it would be a very strong asset to display what's going on in Leawood today. Aesthetically, I think it would be a great movement. Thank you.

Mary Tuney, 3308 West 127<sup>th</sup> Street, Leawood, Kansas, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Ms. Tuney: I want to emphasize the educational value of this park, which I feel is very important, and I think that Dennis is correct. There will be tours to this particular park. We have I-Lan Park, which is for the sister city of I-Lan, but this one definitely has been designed to teach us all about another country and another way of life. And I thank you very much.

Mark Davidson, 3400 West 132<sup>nd</sup>, Leawood, Kansas, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Mr. Davidson: I would venture to say I go through this park more than anyone else. I ride my bike or walk to Price Chopper regularly, walk my dog. I also ride my bike on the trails. I can go to Ironwoods Park, I-Lan. The only thing that I would ask you is to really consider focusing on the beautiful parts of the water park and all of that and maybe scale down on the shelters and things like that, because I'm certain based on I also ride my bike up and down 133<sup>rd</sup> regularly. I think you will attract a lot of people from Missouri, not that there's anything wrong with that, but I think you need to consider that aspect of it as far as this will be used by people from beyond Leawood. I just think it's something you should think about. I also think that it's real important to consider the idea of focusing again on the things that would attract people without necessarily making it anything that is going to really cause major concerns for the people that live in Waterford, because it is in our backyard. I think it's common for people, the lady that just spoke. I understand her concerns. That's very valid, but I think you want to also balance the people that live very far away and how much do they really have at stake? I mean the impact on people that live in areas way distant from this park is going to be much less than it is going to be on people that, like Terry and that lady and so forth, that are very close to the park. So while it's Leawood and Leawood

City, I think it is important that we also consider the folks that are right there, and their opinions, to me, should be weighted pretty heavily because they're the ones that will be living with it day in and day out. I just hope that you consider those things. Thank you.

Chairman Rohlf: All right, have we covered everyone? Is there anyone else in the audience that wishes to speak?

**Seeing no one, a motion to close the public hearing was made by Elkins and seconded by Munson. Motion approved unanimously.**

Chairman Rohlf: This is our time to ask further questions, discussion points. If anyone has any additional questions for Dennis or for Ms. Claxton.

Comm. Williams: I would have one question at this point for possibly the City staff and its regards. You may not have a way of actually judging this, and some of it may be observation. And I'll throw some of my observation in, and I'll let you all as the park professionals likewise. It comes to the question of traffic and usage of the parks that we have in Leawood and what might be anticipated for the use of this park. Have you done any studies or had discussions as to how many people you might see use a park like this, say on a daily basis or a weekly basis? And let me just add to that, just my observation, I use a number of the parks frequently, and I love parks. Yet, it varies so much as to usage, and yet where you see the big usage is where you have the big events, the soccer, the swimming pool in the summer time. Even if you go to Tomahawk Creek trail, you'll have a fair number of people down there, but even on beautiful days seldom do I see the parking lots full. And you'll run into people on the trail, but it's not massive numbers of people. And I say it that way because they're there. They are used. They're popular, but they don't become a heavily peopled nuisance kind of places. At least that's my observation. I'm interested to hear what your observations are.

Ms. Claxton: First let me answer your question by saying, the way parks are typically defined is they're going to go to obviously a national park, which we all know about the Yellowstone and those types and so forth. Here to get a little bit more specific, you have a regional park, which would be a Shawnee Mission Park. Then you go to what we consider to be neighborhood parks or community park, which I think more defines city park. And these are done not only by the size of the park, but the amenities in the park. You're right, if I had to look at the usership and the visitorship, certainly City Park would be the number one because of the aquatic center, because of the soccer programs, because of t-ball, because of tennis, because of all those things that have multiple users just by the nature of the type of sport or activity that they are. I would consider this to be more of a neighborhood park, and I would consider I-Lan to be a neighborhood park. Having said that, the best way I could probably answer your question would be we have not done any research. We have not done any studies to this particular park, which would almost be, if you will, almost a traffic study for a park. But I would say that if I were to rate the parks, and I have members of all of our supervisory staff here. If I say it wrong, you guys will correct me. I would say that City Park would be number one in that area, and then Ironwoods would be number two. And I would say Tomahawk would probably be number three. And Dan, back there somewhere, probably too, number three? Followed by probably I-Lan at this point. And I can't say because it's always been our position to evaluate those things over time. When we built Ironwoods Park, we really didn't know. You always have a good idea, but you never really know until you get about two or three years of the usership in there. But I would see it as a neighborhood park, and I would also say that typically with neighborhood parks, most of the day-to-day usership that you mentioned does come from the neighborhoods. The people that come in for the picnics or the people that come in to throw the Frisbee, those are typically people that come within a three or four mile radius outside the neighborhood. I hope that gives you a little insight. I'm sorry I can't give you more information, but I don't know specifically how many people you could expect.

Comm. Williams: No, that's helpful. Thank you.

Comm. Conrad: Dennis, if I can go back to a question. You had mentioned phasing in your presentation. Is there a phasing plan or somebody to address?

Mr. Reynolds: We've talked about construction that would allow a major portion of the park to be open when delegates from the Gezer region come in the spring. And I think, Chris, correct me if I get it wrong, but there were certain elements that we really wanted to focus on, the water feature that would contain the art. The area where the tablet would be displayed, which is a part of the linear water feature. I think those two elements were critical for the Gezer timing. The Wadi, being the linear water feature. But until we do final construction documents and understand budgets relative to that. We'll see how much we can afford within that dollar.

Comm. Conrad: So the shelters and the restroom are probably some way down.

Mr. Reynolds: Right now they're not a number one priority for phasing.

Comm. Conrad: And with respect to that, and some of the security issues and everything, certainly the plan is very well laid out. But I think one of the people who spoke asked the question, could those be farther to the south where they would maybe be more easily observed by traffic and the police. They're very nicely nestled where they are right now, but with regards to the security and people maybe doing things they shouldn't be doing.

Mr. Reynolds: I'd say the number one priority in terms of that would be the shelter, and you notice it is right there at the end of the parking lot. And it could probably be moved closer to the roadway if desirable. The shelter being item number F, I believe, on the plan. Yeah, that F is the closest to the parking lot. But the advantages of that play lawn, it's obviously very open and allows views. And as you say, we purposely placed those structures nestled on to the slope, which is where you would see a structure in the Gezer region. They wouldn't build it out in the middle of nowhere. You'd build it up next to a hillside.

Comm. Conrad: I certainly understand, but to address the security and monitoring of those, I just wondered if there had been any consideration that it could be closer to 133<sup>rd</sup>.

Mr. Reynolds: We did, and you do always balance it, too. When you move things closer to busy streets, then watching out for toddlers that suddenly break away and run off becomes more of an issue. So typically it's a balance between visibility and having a safe distance from a busy street. I think because those views are very open from the street and from the parking lot, we've tried to strike a balance on those issues. Again, the restroom being the number one priority to be sure it's as close as possible. And it could possibly be closer than what's currently shown.

Comm. Conrad: And I guess my last comment, and we did have discussion on the Jacob's Ladder, on the proportions. And it certainly is a very inviting challenge to youngsters I'm sure. I really would like to see at least the current status of that design and the dimensions of it. Even eight feet and then a much shorter distance between the individual rungs, I think we need to make sure that isn't too inviting.

Mr. Reynolds: We can probably have the artist provide that.

Comm. Williams: Dennis, going back to the shelters as they are envisioned at this point where they're currently shown. Approximately how big are the shelters, or maybe how many people would a shelter comfortably accommodate?

Mr. Reynolds: They're drawn approximately 10x20, the size of a parking space. So, the size of a very large dining room in a private residence really. So these are not large, large group types of structures. We've also, the examples that we've talked about are very open, basically a support structure and a roof. Again because they're kind of nestled into the hillside, one side would have a retaining wall which would kind of provide some protection, maybe a seating surface in addition to the furniture underneath it.

Comm. Williams: Okay, thank you. Now another question for you sir. Several residents have expressed concerns about safety, whether it be for children with developmental disability, which I have one as well, or any of us for that matter. In terms of the walkway layout, landscaping plans and so forth, have you taken issues of safety in that regard into consideration? And if so, maybe how? And if not at this stage, what might be things that you would consider as a plan to address these issues?

Mr. Reynolds: Well we have located, again, all of this sort of destinations or in places we go to be visible from casual observers on Mission and 133<sup>rd</sup> Street. I think that's the biggest aspect of providing security is that casual observation from the general public. Pathways as well are located in such a way where again as you use the pathway, you're visible from large portions of the park as well as the adjacent roadways. We don't do things like put dense groves of evergreens that you'd have to walk through or behind where it would create an area where it couldn't be observed what's happening there. Parks, for lots of reasons, not only safety but maintenance, we typically don't use shrubs. Shrubs gather trash. They also hide people. We'd much prefer to see trees, shade trees, flowering trees, things that provide green in that way. So all those things have been taken into consideration, and certainly we could take very seriously some of the comments about the unique population of the neighborhood and if there's other ways to enhance security signage or apparatus.

Comm. Williams: Thank you.

Comm. Elkins: Mr. Reynolds, just as a point of reference, you said that the shelters run currently about 10x20. Can you give me a point of reference as to, and again mispronunciation, the I-Lan run shelters, how do they compare?

Mr. Reynolds: Brian, maybe you can answer that.

Comm. Elkins: My sense is that the I-Lan shelters would be larger.

Mr. Reynolds: I think they are bigger.

Ms. Claxton: They're 20x20's. Well the one is a 20x20. The other one is a little bit bigger. Is it a 20x30? The one with the restroom attached to it. Just to give you an idea of a 20x20, typically we fit four picnic tables underneath that. So we're thinking they're somewhere between that usage, but 30 to 35 people. That's the max, and that's what we advertise that that's what they will hold so that people don't come and get an unrealistic expectation of how many people that can fit under them.

Comm. Elkins: Thank you.

Comm. Jackson: There's been some talk about there's supposed to have been a gate in the northeast corner? Was that promised at some point in time? Or where is that coming from?

Mr. Anderson: I don't recollect a gate being placed up there. What we did do, though, is the City installed a bollard in the center of that. It's basically at the end of the street. It's an entry point to the north end of the park, and we had at one time, I believe, there was a vehicle that drove through there. So in response to that and in response to the resident that asked us about that, we did install a bollard to stop that. We've not had any problems with that since then.

Comm. Jackson: Thank you.

Comm. Williams: I have a question, and I guess I'll pose it to you at this point and maybe someone else on staff could clarify this. This is on our agenda tonight as a preliminary yet final plan. And yet there seems to be a fair amount of ambiguity as to what the final product is going to be. Is it more appropriate to look at this tonight strictly as a preliminary, and then as the plan evolves to come back and see it as more of a final as we would many development projects?

Chairman Rohlf: It was my belief that that was probably an oversight. But Mark, can you clarify that? That it was inclusive.

Mark: It was slated as far as being both preliminary and a final plan. I think that they're looking as far as the overall, for an overall final of this. Maybe more detail will be developed out as far as some specific components. It depends if there are major changes and things like that. It might be that they come back before you, but I can't guarantee that at this point.

Chairman Rohlf: I was just going to ask Ms. Claxton, this appears to be a phased project similar to what we just recently saw in Ironwoods Park with the addition of some buildings and restrooms there. How do we anticipate the actual building process to leave here. I'm wondering at what point it might be appropriate to bring back the plans as if there's a cutoff of some sort. What you hope to accomplish the rest of this year versus '08.

Ms. Claxton: Mr. Reynolds was correct earlier when he mentioned those three components of the first phase. All I am certain of is that those will be projected to be constructed in the Spring of 2008 so that they can be completed for the visit, which would be sometime around the middle to the end of May. I think I might know a little bit more after the CIP is completed. I honestly can't say. I cannot recall if there's funding for the rest of the project, some of it in '08 or some of it in '09. I know there is some in '09, but I believe there is also some additional funding in 2008. And I'm sorry I can't be more specific. That's what I recall right now.

Chairman Rohlf: All right, would the final site plan, if you will, is it dependent upon what you do with this preliminary plan? I know a lot depends on funding and timing and all those things, but were you really looking at getting a decision at the preliminary level before you would move into a final level? Or would this be what you would anticipate it truly looking like if the money's there?

Ms. Claxton: I would say that this would be what we'd be truly looking at. The Council's made it very clear that we have a defined budget that we're not to exceed. I think that's been established on several occasions by the governing body. I think if anything, the opposite would happen. There may be some desire based on the funding that some things may have to be scaled back. But I think the concept, as I mentioned in my very first statement, we've been looking at this for several years with pretty intensely during the last year and have really come to the conclusion that this is what we wanted to present this evening as final.

Chairman Rohlf: Okay. So it would be your preference that we would approve this as a preliminary and final?

Ms. Claxton: Yes.

Comm. Elkins: Madam Chairman, I appreciate Commissioner Williams pointing out the fact that this is a preliminary and final site plan. I find myself in a bit of a dilemma here because I am concerned, as may have been indicated by the questions that I posed to Mr. Reynolds about the specifics of the shelters and the restrooms. You may recall that not in the far distant past we just looked at a program for the improvement of Tomahawk Creek Park, I guess is what it's called. I'm sorry, Ironwoods Park. And the Commission was very interested in the architecture of a shower house facility and some of the architecture there. So I'm concerned that we've got too much ambiguity here to approve the restroom and the shelters. On the other hand, I'm sensitive to Ms. Claxton's concern that some day you need to start this, and it sounds to me like there are very good reasons to get started on what has roughly been referred to as Phase I of the plan. I don't know the procedures of the Commission well enough. Unfortunately Scott's not here tonight, although staff may have some perspectives on this as well as to whether there's some mechanism by which we could approve the Phase I if you will with the expectation that the applicant would come back with more specifics as to the buildings that are actually planned for the site. Those are more by way of observation than really a proposal at this point in time, but those are my concerns. I think the park plan generally is outstanding. I personally am not as concerned about the location, the actual location of the shelters and the restrooms because again, if the park was a quarter mile or a half mile across, I'd be concerned. But my recollection as I drive by there most every day is that whether you put the shelters on the north side up

against the berm or on the south side right next to the street, there just isn't that much difference in my mind. But I am concerned about the architecture, if you will, of what the buildings are going to look like. And maybe I'm giving too much concern towards what's just basically a shelter house, but that's where I stand right now.

Ms. Claxton: I think thinking about what we just talked about in terms of the budget, the Park Department would not have any problem if he would like to see specifics on the shelter, bringing those back, too, at a later time. I don't think that impedes anything, and we'd be happy to do that. Since those are the key architectural components of the park, I'd be happy to bring those back to you with more detail.

Chairman Rohlf: I think that's a good way to proceed.

Mr. Klein: Actually they would be very similar to, we have done plans in the past as far as commercial projects where you'll actually approve an overall final, and then as each phase comes through, do more specifics. Here you can see the layout of the trails. I think they intended to construct those trails, and you're seeing the general layout of the park as they want to construct it. But again, the details could be brought back further, and it's something that we've done in the past.

Chairman Rohlf: Right, and I think that the phasing of this project could change over time. But I think would it be, Mark, something that you would want us to define as far as the phasing is concerned?

Mr. Klein: Actually, you might be more specific as far as what you would like to see come back, as far as coming back for a specific final. I know the structures of the park have been mentioned as far as the shelters and the restrooms. I'm not sure if there is anything else that you would like to see.

Chairman Rohlf: So we could have access to the information.

Mr. Klein: Right.

Chairman Rohlf: Since there are no stipulations attached to this staff report, we could formulate them.

Mr. Klein: Sure.

Comm. Roberson: I do have one point. I'd also like to see the sculpture and how it's going to be situated. I think that's an issue that we discussed here a little bit in terms of, quite frankly, having a 16 year old climb to the top of it.

Chairman Rohlf: Just one second, Mr. Elkins. I'm not sure, do you recall what part of the phasing that was in?

Comm. Roberson: No, I do not.

Chairman Rohlf: That's what I'll ask Mr. Reynolds when he gets finished there. Dennis, could you tell us when do the sculptures come in to play? Are they included in this initial phasing?

Mr. Reynolds: Yes, the sculpture by Elan Arbach, internationally recognized sculptor. That would be in the first phase, definitely. He has already begun fabricating that piece.

Chairman Rohlf: Right, and we approved that.

Mr. Reynolds: Yes.

Chairman Rohlf: Yes, we did. I think it was probably before you came on the Commission.

Unidentified: We did?

Chairman Rohlf: Yes we did. And I think all of those issues regarding safety of that sculpture and all of that, I probably think are reflected in the minutes of that meeting, if I'm not mistaken. Is that your recollection?

Mr. Reynolds: That's my recollection as well. I know it came up at that point, and that was prior to him beginning fabricating of the piece.

Chairman Rohlf: I think we do have that covered.



Ms. Claxton: The way I see it as being phased, there's really two major phases. This first phase that we discussed. The second phase would include the architectural components, and really the last would be probably that last piece of sculpture that would go on the west side of Mission. That's what we see being in that final piece that would go in there.

Chairman Rohlf: Okay, I'm sorry, Mr. Elkins, yes.

Comm. Elkins: Thanks, Madam Chairman. That was precisely my point, is I'm not sure that we have a lot of latitude on the sculpture at this point in time. My hope was that at least we could raise the sensitivity level about that, because I still have, I expressed those concerns before and retain those concerns now. I appreciate staff's willingness or the applicant's willingness to give us some latitude with respect to the architecture of the buildings that are going to be built.

Chairman Rohlf: Any other comments or questions?

**A motion to approve Case 49-07, as presented and with the addition of the following stipulation, was made by Elkins, seconded by Munson.**

1. **The applicant will return at the appropriate time to present to the Commission more detailed architectural plans for the currently planned three shelters and one restroom facility that are shown on the current plan.**

Chairman Rohlf: Is there any additional discussion on the motion?

Comm. Williams: I guess it's a question or maybe moving to an amendment.

Comm. Elkins: Friendly amendment?

Comm. Williams: Friendly amendment. And I go back to my question of this being preliminary, final. If this was a commercial project, private developer, we would never look at this as a final plan. On a final plan, you do have, you may not get all the stipulations. Stipulation is the wrong word, but all of the documentation right. But we would have presentations of materials, materials identified. It's been discussed here that there's nothing on paper that shows what those items are. We have had plant species and etc., and I have no doubt the Parks Department will do a nice job with the landscaping. They have certainly done that in the parks throughout the community. I was not on this Commission when the other parks in the city were brought before the Commission for either initial development or modifications. So I'm not sure what was presented to the Planning Commission at that point in time in the process. Really this is a very good start. I just see this as being very preliminary and given again some of the ambiguities that were discussed here tonight, I'd like to see some of those tied down just for the record if nothing else and presented back to us as a final plan. I see Mark over there ready to say something, and I guess I have some history on past parks.

Mr. Klein: Actually from the past parks, and I looked at some of them, and some of the details, it wasn't exactly to the same extent as far as what you normally see as far as some of the major commercial developments. However, what the question was that as far as you indicated, a friendly amendment, was there some more specifics other than what Commissioner Elkins suggested that you would like to see? I heard you say for instance landscaping.

Comm. Williams: I guess where I'm going is to have a final plan be more of the level of documentation of what we would typically see as a final plan. And so, the process is the same for this as we would expect for other developments in the city. Unless the City is exempt from that process, and then I'll shut up and let the process proceed. I guess maybe I'll propose a friendly amendment that I'd like to see this move as a preliminary tonight with the final plan to be approved at a later date.

Chairman Rohlf: I'm not sure, Mr. Williams. I did ask Ms. Claxton what additional plans would come in as a final, and I believe she indicated that there would not be that type of documentation.

Ms. Claxton: When we brought back to you the architectural detail for the shelters and the restroom, we would be probably at construction documents by that time. If it would be acceptable, we could bring a detail of the landscaping at that time, because as you mentioned a lot of what you see is going to remain there. And the things that will be added will probably be primarily in some of those berm areas or at the pitch area, and then around those facilities. And again, these are upright, minimal bushes. If that would be acceptable, we could include that at that time so that it would come to you together at the same time, the detail and the architectural.

Comm. Elkins: Ms. Claxton, would that adversely impact your construction schedule? Or Mr. Reynolds, would that adversely impact your construction schedule?

Ms. Claxton: No.

Comm. Elkins: In that event, I would accept Commissioner Williams' proposal of friendly amendment.

Chairman Rohlf: Do we need a second on the friendly amendment? Just you've accepted it?

Comm. Elkins: Right, by virtue of my acceptance of it as a friendly amendment, there's no need to vote on it. It becomes part of my motion.

Unidentified Female Staff: Madam Chairman, I might note I believe Ms. Claxton didn't understand Mr. Elkins' question. I think that she was looking at bringing back a site plan. I do think the failure to approve a final plan will impact your construction schedule, because they can't build any trails or anything until they bring back the final to that detail. Just so it's clear for the record, I do think there is an impact on the construction schedule.

Comm. Elkins: And I thank the City Attorney for that. That may also impact my acceptance as a friendly amendment. Can we get some clarification from the staff or their consultant?

Ms. Claxton: I'm sorry. Yes, what I was saying was our preference would be to have you accept the preliminary and final tonight, with the stipulation to bring back the detail on the architectural plan and the site plan for landscaping – if that's the only thing you mentioned - at that time, because those would be coherent to come before you at the same time.

Comm. Williams: I guess what I'm looking for is a package of documentation, again, like we expect to get from any applicant proposing working in the City, that does document what the materials are going to be, what the design of components are going to be. We have some description on the record tonight based on testimony, but again, we expect to see drawings that call out for where the paving's going to be, what that's going to be, with stone, gravel, just a whole complete. We wouldn't let Park Place go out and do anything on their property with a document that looked like this. I'm just saying, with all due respect, do we follow the same procedure, or do we make an exception in this case? And if the protocol is to make an exception in this case, then fine.

Comm. Roberson: I'm not sure it's an exception. I think with all due respect, we're talking about a piece of ground that's a park. We're not talking rebuilding. We're not talking about construction. I'm not talking any of that. This is a very simple concept here. We all understand what limestone or sandstone looks like. I think we all understand what a parking lot looks like. We know what the berms look like, and we know what trees look like. So personally, I think we ought to go ahead with Commissioner Elkins' amendment looking for some details at the next meeting, but to go ahead and approve this.

Comm. Williams: Madam Chair, I withdraw my friendly amendment.

Chairman Rohlf: Okay. And I think it was your motion, Mr. Elkins, to include the final plan. We would also have details on the materials and all of that as we would normally have in a final plan. So I'm not too concerned about the actual components of the shelter, the restroom. I think we'll get some of that in our final plan details on that. I believe there is a motion without a friendly amendment.

**Motion approved unanimously.**

*Meeting adjourned.*