

City of Leawood  
Planning Commission Minutes

April 22, 2008  
Meeting - 6:00 p.m.  
Leawood City Hall Council Chambers  
4800 Town Center Drive

**CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL:** Shaw, Roberson, Jackson, Rohlf, Munson, Elkins, and Heiman.  
Absent: Conrad and Williams.

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

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** Approval of the minutes from the July 24, 2007 meeting, October 9, 2007 meeting, and March 25, 2008 meeting.

Approval of the minutes from the July 24, 2007 meeting. **A motion to approve the July 24, 2007 minutes was made by Roberson, seconded by Munson. Motion approved unanimously.**

Approval of the minutes from the October 9, 2007 meeting. **A motion to approve the October 9, 2007 minutes was made by Roberson, seconded by Heiman. Motion approved unanimously.**

Approval of the minutes from the March 25, 2008 meeting. **A motion to approve the March 25, 2008 minutes was made by Roberson, seconded by Jackson. Motion approved unanimously.**

**CONTINUED TO THE MAY 13, 2008 MEETING:**

CASE 08-06 LEAWOOD DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE 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 LEAWOOD DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE AMENDMENT – SECTION 16-3-9 DEVIATIONS Request for approval of an amendment to the Leawood Development Ordinance. **PUBLIC HEARING**

CASE 53-06 LEAWOOD DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE 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 LEAWOOD DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE 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 LEAWOOD DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE 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 LEAWOOD DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE AMENDMENT – SECTION 16-2-5.4 (RP-1 DISTRICT) Request for approval of an amendment to the Leawood Development Ordinance. **PUBLIC HEARING**

CASE 73-06 LEAWOOD DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE AMENDMENT – SECTION 16-4-5.10.1 (RP-2 DISTRICT) Request for approval of an amendment to the Leawood Development Ordinance. **PUBLIC HEARING**

CASE 58-06 LEAWOOD DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE AMENDMENT – SECTION 16-2-5.5 HOME OCC. Request for approval of an amendment to the Leawood Development Ordinance. **PUBLIC HEARING**

CASE 66-07 LEAWOOD DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE AMENDMENT – SECTION 16-4-5.7 PARKING LOT CONST. STANDARD. Request for approval of an ordinance to the Leawood Development Ordinance. **PUBLIC HEARING**

Mr. Lambers: Just to advise the Commission, on May 13<sup>th</sup> we have all of the public hearings on the LDO amendments. It would be my intent to obviously have the public hearings. I have no way to gauge as to how much time they are going to take. If they take half of the meeting time that we have, I would suggest that we simply adjourn the meeting and have a Work Session to discuss the public comments. If the public comments are presented quickly, it would be my suggestion that we recess into Work Session that evening, discuss them, and then have the Planning Commission give any additional direction to Staff for those ordinances to have them placed on the following agenda for your consideration.

Chair Rohlf: Will you make sure that this information gets along to Commissioners Conrad and Williams?

Mr. Lambers: Yes.

**CONTINUED TO THE MAY 27, 2008 MEETING:**

CASE 122-07 – PARK PLACE – THE ELEMENT HOTEL – Request for approval of a final site plan; located at the northeast corner of 117<sup>th</sup> Street and Nall Avenue.

CASE 127-07 – PARK PLACE TOWNHOMES – Request for approval of a preliminary site plan and final site plan; located at the northeast corner of 117<sup>th</sup> Street and Nall Avenue. **PUBLIC HEARING**

CASE 27-08 – PARK PLACE – BUILDING G – Request for approval of a preliminary site plan and final site plan; located at the northeast corner of 117<sup>th</sup> Street and Nall Avenue. **PUBLIC HEARING**

**OLD BUSINESS:**

CASE 02-08 – ONE NINETEEN - ELIZABETH SALON – Request for approval of a final site plan; located at the southeast corner of 119<sup>th</sup> Street and Roe Avenue.

**Staff Presentation:**

Assistant to the Planning Director Mark Klein provided the following presentation:

Mr. Klein: Madam Chair and members of the Planning Commission, this is Case 02-08, Elizabeth Salon (Salon One19 & Spa). The applicant is requesting approval of a tenant finish within the One Nineteen development at the southeast corner of 119<sup>th</sup> Street and Roe Avenue. This case has been before the Planning Commission on several other occasions, the first time was on January 29<sup>th</sup>, when the Planning Commission approved a tenant finish. I have placed that tenant finish on the dais in order for you to refresh your memories. It then went on to the City Council; however, at that time, they decided that they would like to make some adjustments to their design and asked that they be remanded back to the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission heard that remand on March 25, 2008. With the revision, they had replaced the brick portico and glass canopy with brick columns on either side of the entrance and also a black awning over the main entry doors.

The Planning Commission had concerns about that and did not feel that it met the design criteria for the development as far as having a grand entrance into the space and that it didn't tie-in with the rest of the development. The Planning Commission also had some concerns as they wanted to see how this site tied-in with the rest of the building as it wrapped around the west end. There were also concerns regarding the landscaping. They have worked with the RED Development to provide the elevations. They are now back before us at this meeting. They have made another change. The black canvas awning that was over the entry doors is gone and has been replaced by a hard horizontal canopy over the main entry. Also, they have provided some black canvas canopies over each of the windows on either side. The rest of the façade is still stucco as far as the south elevation and their portion on the west elevation.

Staff is recommending denial of this application based upon the fact that we don't feel that they have met the request of the Planning Commission. There wasn't any effort to put additional masonry on the elevation besides the stucco. The entrance still doesn't appear to be the grand entrance that the design guidelines call for. I will happy to answer any questions.

Chair Rohlf: Before we move on to the building itself, what about the landscape plan? Is it pretty consistent with what we saw in the overall final?

Mr. Klein: Right. On the front, most of the building is the plaza area with some cut-outs where landscaping is located. In this case, they have a sidewalk that wraps around that west end and they have provided some landscaping. There are trees on the west elevation of this tenant space and some additional shrubs of various varieties as it leads into the main entrance.

Chair Rohlf: Does anyone have questions for Staff at this point. Alright, I think we will hear from the applicant.

**Applicant Presentation:**

Nick Ewing, 1289 Oak Street, Kansas City, Missouri, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments in addition to distributing display boards for review:

Mr. Ewing: We were approved on the agenda a couple of months ago and we had the same amount of brick that we took off of the portico. We were approved with no issue of brick on the west. That has not been changed. The shell building was also approved without brick and there was no issue with that beforehand. Surrounding us we have brick to the east, west, and north. We feel that we ought to break it up on this corner, which matches what they have done on the north with brick, brick, metal, and then more brick. You asked us last time to match what they have done on the north. We feel with the brick surrounding us, we have done that. On the landscaping plan, we have the dogwoods in front of the west elevation as well. We're asking for your approval on everything except for the signage.

Comm. Roberson: Can you explain to me what you've done to the front entrance with the changes?

Mr. Ewing: Last time we had a fabric awning in front of the entry. Now we have a metal canopy. Above the windows, we had the metal louvers. Now we've moved the fabric awnings above the windows because at the last meeting, you asked us to match what was being done on the north. This is what they have on the north, the fabric awnings above the windows. We did that.

Comm. Munson: As seen in the Staff Comments, "The total height of the proposed sign is 4'5¼". The maximum height of multi-line signs permitted by the sign criteria for the One Nineteen development is 36". What sign are they referring to? Is that the one on the front of the building in the top illustration?

Mr. Ewing: Yes it is. That is our signage and logo. We felt that it fits in nicely right there between the columns.

Chair Rohlf: Unfortunately, it doesn't comply with the ordinance.

Mr. Ewing: Yes, we understand that. We're just asking for approval.

Chair Rohlf: I know you've changed the name of the salon. It's no longer the Elizabeth Salon. I believe you've also added a logo that we didn't have before. It appears that there is a big difference between what is allowed and what you are proposing in the sign.

Mr. Ewing: We just ask for approval of the building and then we will come back with a revised signage logo.

Comm. Heiman: So, really what we're approving is the design and the awning but not the sign at this point. Is that correct?

Chair Rohlf: Mark, is this something that they would bring back?

Mr. Klein: Right. The way the stipulation reads right now in terms of signage, they would have to come back before the Planning Commission and City Council.

Comm. Munson: It was pointed out at the last meeting on this particular project that the goal of the City of Leawood was to develop this as a very high-end, top class, top drawer kind of place, right?

Mr. Klein: Right.

Comm. Munson: How far does this miss that?

Mr. Klein: Staff has concerns with just the grand entrance in terms of what was called for in the design guidelines. They do have the horizontal canopy that is called for and is actually used on other parts of the building. On the north elevation, however, most of those canopies actually span across the entire frontage of the space, not only the entry doors but across the windows themselves. I have an elevation of the overall One Nineteen development for you to look at. There is only one area in which that is not the case, which was adjusted for the Apple space because it grew so large. That one canopy was shortened to keep it from cutting off into the Apple space. This tenant space is actually on the back of the building, so it is really what makes a statement on that side. That is part of Staff's concerns in addition to the amount of stucco being there.

Comm. Jackson: Is this the elevation that you're considering? *(Referring to packet information.)*

Mr. Klein: Correct.

Comm. Jackson: It looks like there are buildings that are limited with metal just over the entry way and then the windows have black awnings - in the original drawing before anything began to be built.

Mr. Klein: I think there was one called Zuma that did not extend clear across. If you look at the corners of the building, you see that the hard canopy continue across. On several of the other tenant spaces, they also have much larger storefront windows with more of a block-rectangular storefront. The horizontal canopy also extends across the full frontage of those and a little but beyond.

Comm. Munson: Is this the building we're talking about? This one? *(Referring to elevations from packet.)*

Mr. Klein: Correct. It's on the south elevation, right in that area?

Comm. Munson: On the backside of the rest of these buildings, it's just the backside?

Mr. Klein: Right. It was originally intended that they have all the storefronts on the north side of the elevation facing outward. It was then decided that they were going to try and wrap some of the storefronts around the ends on the east and west side. That is the effort that is being done right now. Rather than having just a storefront look more like the back of the building, it was Staff's understanding that the Planning Commission wanted to see a continuation in terms of the architecture and style of the building as it wrapped around the corners.

Mr. Ewing: I have an elevation that shows more of the south if you would like to see that (*distributes elevation*). It shows that there is not that much brick on the south elevation.

Comm. Munson: As far as being in synch with the total development, would the north elevation being the one that you read with the rest of the buildings as you're looking to the south?

Mr. Klein: Correct. If you're looking toward the south, the north elevation would be the primary façade of the main center. Again, the effort was to go ahead and wrap the east and west corners of this building. Originally, the south side of the building was more or less a service drive with service doors.

Comm. Munson: What is your attitude on the way the north elevation looks?

Mr. Klein: I think that Staff has been supportive of the north elevation as far as a contemporary feel?

Comm. Munson: There are no signs on it, correct?

Mr. Klein: There are signs. As each one of the tenant spaces come in, they propose signs. Right now, on the upper elevation especially, they show some examples of what the store signage may look like but none of them were real at the time. You might recall that The West Elm was one of the tenant spaces that went in here. Z Gallery and North Restaurant were other ones.

Comm. Roberson: What is your feeling on the west elevation?

Mr. Klein: Staff had some concern. As you start at the north elevation on the west side and you wrap that corner, you will notice that a lot of the façade at that point is brick with masonry on it. As you go along down to this space, this is really where you have most of the stucco. I think originally this was kind of incorporated into the building simply because you started having the service areas tucked around back there. Now with an actual tenant space on each of the corners, part of Staff's concern is that all of a sudden you have the brick masonry as it starts wrapping around that west end but is more or less all stucco as it continues on to the southern portion.

Comm. Munson: What is the challenge to the applicant to conform to what is expected?

Mr. Ewing: May I add that we are adding the dogwoods placed in front of the west façade, so it won't be all that visible in the first place. If you do want us to add the brick, where do we end with it? It would basically take over both facades.

Comm. Munson: Again, why don't you conform to what is requested?

Mr. Ewing: We feel that it wasn't necessary at the outset, so we didn't place the brick there. It's also a budget reason. If you have to add the brick, it would have to be added into the budget from the beginning.

Comm. Roberson: I'm confused.

Mr. Ewing: It was approved.

Comm. Roberson: That was my next question. The original plan was approved and Staff didn't object to the stucco at that time. Is there a reason?

Mr. Klein: I think part of this came from the last Planning Commission meeting that we had when the Planning Commission started asking questions regarding how this transitions into the tenant spaces on the south side of the building. From what I recall from the last meeting, there were actually a lot of questions as far as how this should tie into the front of the building. Part of those concerns is what Staff is trying to address at this point.

Comm. Roberson: I don't remember having a concern about the stucco in our last conversation, but I could be totally wrong in that area. I don't know about the rest of my fellow-Commissioners.

Comm. Jackson: We did.

Comm. Roberson: Thank you.

Chair Rohlf: We did spend a lot of time with the prior design on the black awning over the front. We talked a lot about the awning, which was kind of the focus at that point, but we did talk about the amount of stucco in contrast to our other buildings.

Comm. Roberson: I remember the concern about tying-in, which is when we asked to see the landscaping and sidewalk plans.

Mr. Ewing: We are unique to all of the other business in the development. We're on the southwest corner and still match what is going on with the north to a degree. If we would add the brick, where would be place it without making almost the whole façade brick?

Comm. Jackson: Is there any stucco on the north elevation?

Mr. Klein: I believe there is stucco, but not large quantities.

Mr. Ewing: I also have that elevation (*distributes north elevation*).

Mr. Lambers: When we had the Planning Commission meeting, I think the sense that Staff perceived is that the intent was for the Planning Commission to have the applicant go back and redo the entryway, which I think they have complied with, but they also wanted to see the transition of this from what is on the front from the west to the south. We recognize that the landscaping would be there to temper some of the presentation, so we were not looking for it to copy the front but to show some connection to it. Our opinion is that there is no transition, it is just a stark change. It is not our job to design it for the applicant. I thought you provided an indication and our comments have been that the transition is just not there to what we believe the Planning Commission envisioned. I put it back to the applicant that you don't need to have full brick. You can certainly have a large amount of stucco, but it should transition to where there is just some connectivity. That's all we were asking for. They came back and we understand because of cost constraints, they don't want to put any of the brick there. We said to take it to the Planning Commission. I think we're halfway there with the front entryway but, again, I don't think it is consistent with the direction we were given last time. We were at a stalemate with the applicant, so felt it best to just go back to the Planning Commission and see where things were at.

I would say that if you believe we are correct, I don't want it to go back to the Staff. I would prefer that you provide direction for them to integrate some brick into it and have it go forward to the Council with Staff deciding whether or not it is sufficient enough to recommend support. We need to move on as we have other projects that deserve our attention.

Comm. Munson: Is the applicant or RED Development responsible for doing the transition around the corner, landscaping, sidewalk, etc?

Mr. Lambers: The landscaping is the responsibility of the development.

Comm. Munson: Have you approached RED Development on this issue?

Mr. Ewing: The issue of the elevations?

Comm. Munson: No, the issue of transition with the landscaping and other items that have been brought up. You're responsible for the materials. They're responsible for helping you achieve that transition. We don't see that yet.

Mr. Ewing: I believe that I gave you a landscaping plan.

Chair Rohlf: It's the last page. I think it's hard to visualize what it really looks like. There's not a colored elevation taking that front around to the side. When it's not in color and we can't see the contrast of materials, it's difficult.

Comm. Roberson: If I understand correctly, there needs to be a movement from the front to the back that would include brick on the back side, in this case the south side. What we're asking for is to see some brick on that south side, I believe.

Mr. Lambers: That is correct. It was not intended to be to the extent that is on the front. We recognize that while this is functioning as a front entryway, we are trying to be reasonable to how this actually is going to be perceived; therefore, a lesser amount but at least some presence of it. We talk about stucco being an accent material, and that is 20% of any one side and no more than 25% total of the entire buildings. In this case, I can see going the reverse and expect brick at 25-28%. If cost is an issue, then welcome to the City of Leawood.

Chair Rohlf: I guess I'm confused when I look at these elevations. I thought this was the end building in the line on the back. It's the very west building. It isn't where Commissioner Munson pointed it out on the landscaping plan.

Comm. Munson: It's a little confusing. I thought it was this building right here (*referring to site plan drawings*) and when I held it up, you confirmed it. Is it this building right here?

Mr. Ewing: Its south of that.

Mr. Klein: This is the north elevation (*pointing out markers on site plan displayed on overhead*). As you wrap around this west elevation, the tenant space is located in this hatched area. As you wrap around, you have a lot of the masonry as it continues; but, if you look at the overall color elevation that the applicant provided, this area shows the transition to all stucco. This is primarily stucco along here. Granted, most of the rest of the back of the building is also stucco, but it tends to be more of the service areas. Again, what they're trying to do is wrap the east and west end-cap with the main north side of the building.

Chair Rohlf: Are they sharing with the building to the north. Is there a building to the north of that?

Mr. Klein: I believe there is a tenant space that takes up this area in here.

Chair Rohlf: There are just the two sides then?

Mr. Klein: Right. They do have storefront windows on the west elevation as well.

Comm. Munson: There is really no north façade to it.

Mr. Klein: No. It has a little bit on the west elevation and then the south elevation. This is the main entry on the south elevation, and this is the side on the west elevation (*referring to site plan drawing*).

Comm. Jackson: If we required a little brick, it wouldn't be much on that west side. It wouldn't take a whole lot.

Mr. Klein: There isn't that much there.

Mr. Ewing: How much would you need - the whole thing, the bulkheads, the recessed areas?

Comm. Munson: How about as high as the bottom of the windows.

Comm. Elkins: I think Mr. Lambers talked about that it might possibly be acceptable for 25-28%.

Chair Rohlf: Well, the brick columns on the front have to be a pretty small portion of that façade.

Mr. Ewing: They are about 8-ft. high and 4-ft. wide.

Chair Rohlf: When you use the square footage calculation.

Mr. Ewing: Yes, but they are pretty grand though. I believe at the meeting last month, you talked about the entry not being that noticeable. With the columns and now the canopy with the added awnings over the windows, we've addressed that.

Comm. Roberson: I think what we're asking for very simply is for you to add brick. We can't put it any plainer. If you don't want to do that, we can vote.

Jose Rangel with RED Development, 4717 Central, Kansas City, Missouri, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Mr. Rangel: One of the things that we failed to mention is that the building is up and in place. Adding brick to it would require a little bit more construction as far as trying to tie-in some kind of foundation to support that back corner of the building. Although we do transition at the inside corner from brick to stucco as we head back south from that wall, predominantly most of what you see on that south side of the building is going to be the stucco. I would have to talk with Mr. Ewing and his client as to what we can do to help emphasize the south side a little more to incorporate that design, if that makes sense. The building is in place and the footings and foundations are already established. Creating a brick ledge or doing something differently might take a little bit of work. Not to say that it's impossible, but we are pretty much at a complete state at that back corner.

Mr. Lambers: Jose, could you not put a brick veneer on that without requiring substantial support?

Mr. Rangel: On that west wall?

Mr. Lambers: On the west and south walls. Basically just a thin shaving of brick but not a full brick.

Mr. Rangel: That's the other alternative. I don't know if it necessarily has to be brick. It could be one of the other approved masonry products that is a thin set and could possibly be applied to the façade element.

Comm. Munson: It would have to be a material that would meet the Staff's requirements. Correct?

Mr. Rangel: Correct.

Chair Rohlf: And the design guidelines.

Mr. Rangel: That is a possibility, Mr. Lambers, to do some kind of thin brick that we adhere to the face of the panel and that does not require additional foundation or structural work at the base.

Mr. Lambers: Again, I think that 20-25% would get us there, I really do.

Mr. Rangel: That's 20-25% on both the west and south side, or just combined between the full façade for Salon One19?

Comm. Roberson: Both sides.

Mr. Rangel: Okay.

Chair Rohlf: I would encourage the applicant to make sure that the signage is within the guidelines if we're going to go ahead and let this go on up.

Mr. Lambers: I wanted to talk about that. We're seeing a real morphing of signs and logos. If you recall, for the Mission Bank they wanted to have the logo and three lines. This is a continuation of that attempt. If the Staff were to consider this, we would say that this would have to fall between these two lines (*referring to front elevation display board*). If you get this creep here, I guarantee then you will get a creep over here and we'll start having four and five lines. Before the applicant leaves tonight, I think it would be good for them to have a sense. If the Planning Commission agrees with what has been approved in the past, the logo would need to be contained within these two lines of signage as it would be consistent with the maximum that has been approved recently.

Comm. Munson: How about the issue of size? As Staff points out, it looks like there is a dramatic difference. The proposed sign is 4'5¼" and the sign criterion for the development is 36". That's substantial.

Mr. Lambers: To put these inch parameters in concrete, as soon as we draw the line someplace - it's off. We have to make individual judgments based upon the façade itself. It's a good guideline for us to evaluate. If they want to come in and go 4-5 times that amount, obviously we would have some real concerns. I think to allow some adjustment based upon the façade that is in question, it should be looked at on an individual case basis and not feel constrained that the 36" or 28" is gospel, it just doesn't work. Again, we're not talking about the sign tonight, I just would like them to go back with a sense of what is acceptable so that I can put the sign on the Consent Agenda, have them go through the process, and get them into business.

Mr. Rangel: I agree with Mr. Lambers and that was going to be our request as well. We will go back in and make the adjustments to the signage to meet both the criteria and City of Leawood ordinance. If we can go ahead and go through that process, we will make the adjustment and it should be completed at the next level. It shouldn't be a problem.

Chair Rohlf: I think that the main concern is that the signage is proportional to the building size.

Mr. Rangel: I think it is very important that it does become balanced on the façade. In some instances we have rules and regulations that state what the size of the sign is, but you get larger tenants that probably require something a little more proportionate to the scale.

Chair Rohlf: It sounds like you're agreeable to do what you need to do before you come back before the Council.

Mr. Ewing: We have a revised logo that is actually about 19-ft. wide. We would not be able to fit that between the columns.

Mr. Lambers: That's fine. What I'm saying is that we don't want to create three character lines, which is what that one does up there. You're talking about having a straight line with a logo on each side, which is what Sprint has and is fine.

Mr. Ewing: So, we can place that above the columns?

Mr. Lambers: Yes. The idea is not to have three levels of signage there. Is that what you're going to propose (*referring to an illustration held by Mr. Ewing*).

Mr. Ewing: Yes.

Mr. Lambers: That's fine.

Comm. Jackson: If we could put the first two Staff recommendations into stipulations, that allows it to go through and then the signage has to be approved eventually. We don't have to approve it tonight.

Chair Rohlf: Not the signage. I think what we're not ready to approve is that we just have the recommendation of the additional 25% brick.

Comm. Jackson: Could we change No. 5? My idea would be to change it to, "the façade of the building should include 25% brick on both the west and south sides."

Mr. Lambers: Could I suggest a range of 20-25% to give him some flexibility?

Comm. Jackson: 20-25%?

Mr. Lambers: Yes please.

Chair Rohlf: So, it would be that the facades on both the west and south sides should have approximately 20-25%.

Mr. Ewing: Just on the west or also on the south?

Comm. Roberson: West and south. Both sides.

Mr. Ewing: Okay.

Comm. Jackson: Now, I think we could approve it. Couldn't we?

Mr. Lambers: Staff would recommend approval.

Comm. Munson: What do you call that brick?

Mr. Lambers: They indicated it would be a material that is approved as part of the design guidelines. It may or may not be brick.

Mr. Ewing: When the original drawings were submitted, it was approved without brick. It was also approved on the Consent Agenda without brick. We can't figure out why you want all the brick now.

Comm. Jackson: Perhaps an oversight on our part.

Chair Rohlf: We hadn't seen all of the buildings. When you changed the south elevations significantly, it gave us another opportunity to look at this. That is always something that can happen. We are suggesting this to make it a better building and to make it fit into the overall development. It is a pretty significant part of that south elevation and so that is our recommendation.

Mr. Ewing: I just want to clarify, is that 20% on the west and 20% on the south?

Mr. Lambers: It's 20-25% on both sides. You have the flexibility to use your architectural skills to decide what best matches the building within that 5% range.

Mr. Ewing: What I'm asking is if that is the total or if you have to have the 20-25% on the south and the west side.

Chair Rohlf: On each side.

**A motion to recommend approval of One Nineteen – Elizabeth Salon, request for approval of a final site plan, located at the southeast corner of 119<sup>th</sup> Street and Roe Avenue, Case 02-08, with a change in Staff Recommendation No. 5 to read, “the façade of the building shall include 20-25% of materials approved under the development guidelines on both the west and south elevations with stucco being 75-80% was made by Jackson; seconded by Roberson.**

Comm. Elkins: I just wanted to take a moment to address the applicant and developer. In my view, the applicant was placed in an untenable situation because of failure of coordination with the developer. For any other developers in the room, this is one commissioner's perspective and certainly not the perspective of the entire commission: I think it was unfortunate that the tenant, and in many respects the last tenant in the collection of buildings, was put in the place of having to answer for why their particular space didn't tie to the rest of the building. In my view, that seems to me like a developer responsibility. I know that the applicant has been frustrated by this process and I appreciate that. I am not sure that there was anything that the Staff or Commission could have done about that because our responsibility is to make sure that the building is true to our guidelines as well as to the ordinances and plan that was approved. I think it is incumbent, and this is a perfect example, of the tenant and the developer to work together. In my view, what we spent the last hour talking about is largely something that was a developer responsibility. I'm sorry that the applicant was put in that position. Having said all of this, I am supportive of what we have come up with.

**The motion passed following a unanimous vote.**

**NEW BUSINESS:**

CASE 12-08 – PARK PLACE – RA SUSHI – Request for approval of a final site plan; located at the northeast corner of 117<sup>th</sup> Street and Nall Avenue.

**Staff Presentation:**

Senior Planner Jeff Joseph made the following comments:

Mr. Joseph: Madam Chair and members of the Planning Commission, this is Case 12-08, Ra Sushi within the Park Place development, located at the northeast corner of 117<sup>th</sup> Street and Nall Avenue. The applicant is Loretta Reeves. The applicant is requesting approval of a final site plan for a restaurant tenant space within the Park Place development. This tenant space is located just north of the Morton's Restaurant that was approved earlier. This is at the southwest corner of the Park Place development. Staff has some concerns regarding the architecture of the building, similar to what we had with the Morton's Restaurant. I also included the architecture for Morton's in the packet. Staff is recommending additional features along the south and west facades of the building just to break the continuous stucco that the applicant is proposing. With that, Staff is recommending approval of this case with the stipulations stated in the report. If you have any questions, I would be happy to answer them.

Chair Rohlf: Is this the plan where you wanted us to take a look at the color of the glass?

Mr. Joseph: Yes. It's a darker glass than what is there right now.

Comm. Roberson: If I understand correctly, this is directly opposite of Morton's on the other side of the driveway.

Mr. Joseph: Yes it is.

Comm. Roberson: The stucco you are talking about is the part that is in the driveway going underneath the hotel?

Mr. Joseph: Correct. There was a similar situation with Morton's.

Comm. Jackson: I really can't visualize where this is going in. Jeff, can you point out where Morton's is versus the hotels versus Ra Sushi.

Mr. Joseph: This is the Aloft Hotel. The storefront is on the east side with the drive-thru going underneath the hotel. Morton's is on this side of the hotel. The other side of Ra Sushi is on the south side of the building (*referencing a display board of the east elevation*).

Chair Rohlf: That's the south side of the drive-thru?

Mr. Joseph: Yes.

Comm. Jackson: Where is the entrance to Ra Sushi?

Mr. Joseph: The entrance is on the east side. (*Presents south elevation, pointing out areas of stucco.*) Based on Staff's concerns, they added some features on the columns, but we don't think it is enough to break up the façade.

Comm. Munson: That is actually part of the drive-thru tunnel. Is that where it is? It would be one side of the enclosed drive-thru tunnel.

Mr. Joseph: Yes.

Comm. Munson: On the south side is Morton's. What does their façade look like?

Mr. Joseph: It's brick with cast stone pillars. They also have wooden louvers. To break up the façade, they added some windows.

Comm. Munson: Their north elevation is fairly well articulated according to this drawing, correct?

Mr. Joseph: Yes. The Planning Commission recommended those changes for Morton's.

Chair Rohlf: Right, I think we had a discussion about the canopies. I can see that we probably do need to add something.

**Applicant Presentation:**

Michelle Wright, 102 Trout Lily Drive, Covington, Virginia, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Ms. Wright: Madam Chair, Commissioners, Staff, community, thank you for your time on the agenda this evening to introduce Ra Sushi to your community. We're looking forward to being a positive member of your commercial community. Ra Sushi is one of three concepts within Benihana National Corporation. Benihana has longevity that extends farther than many, many, many restaurant concepts and corporations in the United States. Several years ago, Ra Sushi, which was born in Scottsdale, Arizona, joined our corporation. Ra Sushi has locations across the United States. It is a vibrant, energetic concept that is especially drawn to developments such as Park Place because of the pedestrian-friendly nature of the development, the excitement, and the walk ability of the design.

Rather than address point by point the design that our architect has presented to Staff and that has been approved by Park Place staff, I would prefer to address or respond to your questions and discuss Staff comments. I think perhaps the best place to start with this would be to further clarify what Mr. Joseph has shared with you about these particular elevations for Ra Sushi. This has the Aloft Hotel over the top that extends on towards Morton's (*referring to south elevation*). This is the drive-thru. This portion of the south elevation is at the rear of Morton's and has visibility toward a small parking area and 117<sup>th</sup> Street in the distance. This elevation is actually the rear of the Aloft building. It is below an approximate 7-ft. drop from Nall Avenue. It is the actual rear of the building. The landlord does have street trees and landscaping along that street buffer. What we're hoping this evening is that you will consider approving the elevation and the signage as presented. We feel that we have complied to a large extent with the design guidelines for the development and we have added features to the elevations that have been particularly questioned. Due to the physical location of those particular elevations, we feel that the elements are sufficient as presented. With that, we can step into addressing your questions and concerns as well as discuss Staff comments.

Chair Rohlf: Do you have a typical design of your restaurants?

Ms. Wright: We do, but this steps outside of what we would consider prototypical. Again, Park Place working with the City developed a lot of specifics that go beyond a lot of our location design guidelines. The natural earth tone colors and various materials are specific to your neighborhood. One thing that is prototypical that I would call to your attention is the Ra Sushi signage that is presented in the package (*referring to east elevation*). Concerning the size of the signage, the average letter height in the Ra Sushi letterset does exceed the 18" but only by 1.57-inches. When looked at in context with Morton's adjacent to us and Aloft beside us and then specific to the design of the façade, we do feel very strongly that the 1.57-inches is not significant as far as being outside of your boundaries and that it is appropriate to the façade. Since we have addressed articulation and have changed materials on the south elevation and since it does face toward the drive-thru, which is also somewhat pedestrian, and the smaller parking area, we really desire the Ra Sushi letterset that is on that south elevation.

Comm. Jackson: Can you show us what you added to the design?

Ms. Wright: Yes, with Jeff's help. On this elevation (*south*), we've added the columns, which are brushed aluminum. This design is carried over from the east elevation, which is the entry façade. We added the decorative sconce lighting features all across the south elevation. Of course, there is the sign letterset that I mentioned to you. We also added the glass differentiation to add interest and also as a functional feature as far as a view from outside into our restaurant.

I might add that the material board shows a bluer casting as does this, but the actual most desired color is more of a smoke color that works with the granite, which is another feature that we added along the base of the building. Additionally, this metal canopy edging was added and comes around to the east elevation so that there is some integrity between the two sides. Jeff, did I leave out anything?

Mr. Joseph: No.

Comm. Roberson: Jeff, quick question. Morton's entrance is on the north side is it not?

Mr. Joseph: Yes, it is on the north side.

Comm. Roberson: So, patrons coming into Morton's would be looking at that façade?

Mr. Joseph: Yes.

Mr. Lambers: I have a question for the applicant. What is the purpose of the sign on the south façade?

Ms. Wright: The south façade has visibility of the vehicles that are coming in on this side, essentially driving underneath the hotel. It also has visibility to a small parking area that is behind Morton's. Although limited, it would also have visibility toward 117<sup>th</sup> Street. With the drive-thru design, it essentially turns this space into a corner position with public view on this side and on the entry elevation.

Mr. Lambers: If that is the case, then wouldn't you agree that this side has high visibility from three sides. Therefore, for the purpose of the sign, the façade should be equal in terms of its presence and probably should be closer matched to the improvements to the east as opposed to the backside, which is the rear of the building.

Ms. Wright: Typically I would agree with that but due to the small size of the parking area that is behind Morton's and due to the fact that the signage is proposed toward that rear, we don't feel like the visibility is high-visibility. It is limited visibility.

Mr. Lambers: I guess I would argue that if your sign is justified, then the façade upgrade is justified. I think that the sign is appropriate to be there, but I think the façade needs to be upgraded accordingly.

Ms. Wright: We would be happy to work with Staff as long as the signage is included rather than mandating an upgrade in terms of architectural details but eliminating the sign.

Chair Rohlf: I think you could have the sign.

Comm. Roberson: I think you just took care of the issue. I do have one more question for Staff. In terms of the smoked glass, is there an issue?

Mr. Joseph: Usually, the Planning Commission doesn't like the spandrel glass. The color types of glass we have approved are similar glasses, such as the different colored glass sometimes used by Peters & Associates.

Comm. Roberson: Is this considered spandrel?

Mr. Joseph: Actually, the glass that is along the base of the storefront is spandrel glass.

Comm. Roberson: We don't approve of that from what I remember.

Mr. Joseph: We don't usually.

Chair Rohlf: Is the glass two-tone?

Ms. Wright: Yes.

Chair Rohlf: It looks dark blue and blue but on your materials, is it really the combination of the material 8-blue spandrel and the taupe one?

Ms. Wright: No, because the architect suggested that the lower portion down at the street have a bluish cast to it. On further consideration, he realized that it did not fit as well with the building coloration and adjacent granite. It has been recommended that it might be more in keeping with your design standards if the glass was more of a smoked color to go with the granite. Here again, the use of the thicker spandrel glass is a functional issue as far as the view from that area into a bar area of the restaurant. Rather than blue, we are talking about a smoked coloration only in the lowest portion of the design.

Chair Rohlf: It appears we've reached an agreement for revisions to the south elevation. Have we been clear in the direction of that particular elevation as far as some of the things that would make it more consistent?

Ms. Wright: What I think I heard was that you would like us to review Morton's elevation changes with the landlord and then coordinate with Staff to arrive at more articulation on that elevation.

Chair Rohlf: I believe that is correct.

Comm. Elkins: There is only one thing that I am not entirely clear on and I feel duty-bound to bring it up, as did Commissioner Roberson. Usually it is my good friend Commissioner Williams who is up here talking about the evils of spandrel glass. We acknowledged that there is spandrel for a portion, which looks like roughly 25% to me. Typically, we have resisted spandrel glass. When we talked about it for Sullivan's, the whole wall was spandrel glass. I understood that concern, but I've just never had the same appetite for this issue as Commissioner Williams. In his absence, I feel like I should at least put it on the table and see what the rest of the Commission feels about that.

Chair Rohlf: Do the design guidelines have anything in there that would allow this?

Mr. Joseph: Usually, we don't allow spandrel glass for the whole application. Sometimes if there is a column inside the storefront, they use the spandrel glass to hide the columns.

Comm. Elkins: I take it that Staff is supportive of the use of spandrel glass here.

Mr. Joseph: In minimal areas. Not the whole storefront or anything like that. They can use it just in minimal areas.

Mr. Lambers: What is proposed is acceptable. Basically it is an accent material and that is the purpose it is serving. Sometimes it serves to camouflage things that need to be hidden and other times it is just an accent. I think that Commissioner Williams would not have an objection to what is proposed here.

Comm. Elkins: I think that answers my question.

Mr. Lambers: What I would suggest is that the applicant attempt to make improvements to the south façade. If the Staff finds them acceptable, we will forward them on to the City Council. If we are unable to reach an agreement, we will bring it back to you for your consideration.

Chair Rohlf: I believe our stipulations are appropriate except for that it probably wouldn't hurt to look at the west elevation once they have started designing something on the south so that we could leave that language as it is.

Mr. Joseph: Madam Chair, looking at the signage, I think it is proportional to the building.

Ms. Wright: So, it's approved as presented?

Chair Rohlf: Yes.

Ms. Wright: Thank you.

Chair Rohlf: We will take out stipulation No. 2, which would mean that we would now have ten stipulations.

**A motion to approve Case 12-08, Ra Sushi, request for approval of a final site plan located at the northeast corner of 117<sup>th</sup> Street and Nall Avenue subject to ten stipulations with No. 2 being removed and Nos. 3 through 11 being renumbered as Nos. 2 through 10 was made by Munson; seconded by Jackson.**

**The motion passed following a unanimous vote.**

CASE 26-08 – ONE NINETEEN - JP WINE BAR & COFFEEHOUSE – Request for approval of a final site plan; located at the southeast corner of 119<sup>th</sup> Street and Roe Avenue.

**Staff Presentation:**

Senior Planner Jeff Joseph made the following comments:

Mr. Joseph: Madam Chair and members of the Planning Commission, this is Case 26-08, JP Wine Bar and Coffeehouse within the One Nineteen development. This is located at the southeast corner of 119<sup>th</sup> Street and Roe Avenue. The applicant is Jake Schopp with Icon Architecture. The applicant is requesting approval of a final site plan for the approval of a tenant finish within the One Nineteen development at the southeast corner of 119<sup>th</sup> Street and Roe Avenue. The tenant space is located on the eastern end of the main retail center within the development. Staff had several concerns about this project, but the applicant has agreed to most of the changes that needed to be made. The only concern that is pending is the architecture on the west elevation. There is a section of stucco façade that needs to be addressed with this application. Staff is recommending approval of this case with the stipulations stated in the report. If you have any questions, I would be happy to answer them.

Chair Rohlf: When you indicated that you worked with the applicant, was that on the materials?

Mr. Joseph: One of the concerns was about the patio furniture. The signage needs to comply with design guidelines. The maximum allowed is 36" and the applicant has agreed to take it down to this. The blade sign also needs to be non-illuminated, and the applicant has agreed to this as well. Those were the main concerns.

Chair Rohlf: Have you passed along Staff's recommendations regarding these extra architectural features, which are set out in stipulation No. 3? Have you had any discussion on that at all?

Mr. Joseph: No, not about that.

**Applicant Presentation:**

Jake Schopp with Icon Architecture, 1511 Westport Road, Kansas City, MO, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Mr. Schopp: I'm here presenting JP Wine Bar and Coffeehouse, a locally owned restaurant group with locations in Lee's Summit as well as downtown Kansas City. I would encourage anybody to visit if you're in the neighborhood. To reiterate what Jeff said, we've gone through his issues and comments, none of which are objectionable. Comment No. 3 regarding the architectural features was clearly just a surprise. We were under the impression that the building shell had been approved previously and we weren't addressing that façade whatsoever other than the infill of the windows and the panels. All of the material selections, including the patio, have previously been approved by the developer as well as by Staff and the Commission. The brick is existing. The entire façade on both sides with respect to the stucco are 100% masonry. We are just adding on with the additional metal panels, which were previously approved and are part of this shell building. We're incorporating a wood tone that we have agreed to maintain on a rigorous schedule, which I believe was previously approved for some under-work for various canopies and soffits along the walkway. If there are any questions, I would be more than happy to address them.

Chair Rohlf: Jeff, what part of the elevation on the east is of concern? Is it the stucco system that you're referring to? It appears that there is quite a lot of architectural features there.

Mr. Joseph: The tenant space that you are looking at today is this area right here (*referring to site plan drawing placed on overhead*). The patio area is on the eastern end. There is a small portion of stucco that is hanging out and doesn't have anything on it. The main concern that Staff has is that this is the main entrance to the retail center. As people are driving in, this is the first thing they will be looking at right beside the patio. It is very easy to change that by just adding some type of horizontal feature and brick it up.

Comm. Roberson: You're suggesting maybe just continuing these metal awnings?

Mr. Joseph: Yes, across the façade.

Chair Rohlf: Does the applicant have a comment on that?

Mr. Schopp: My only comment would be that I'm not sure if that is the exact answer, but we are willing to work with Staff to figure something out. My impression is that this is a perfect neutral façade, which allows this tenant space and the one adjacent to become their own without meshing too many design elements into one another. I don't believe that the adjacent tenant has the metal panels, but I'm not sure. It's terminology that is used with a lot of different mall developments and that neutral break is very important. Again, we're more than amicable to work something out with Staff.

Chair Rohlf: Does anyone have direction or a question for the applicant on this east facade?

Comm. Munson: This illustration of the façade is what you're proposing (*referring to packet information*).

Mr. Schopp: Yes sir.

Comm. Munson: The Staff wants them to do what?

Mr. Joseph: Carry the horizontal feature across the façade.

Mr. Schopp: Jeff, are you talking about the soffit overhang or the metal panel and the façade itself?

Mr. Joseph: I would like to leave that to the architect. I don't know what kind of features he can carry through.

Mr. Schopp: You made a recommendation just a minute ago and I'm not sure that I quite grasped it.

Comm. Roberson: Actually, I think the recommendation was a suggestion that you carry the metal canopy across.

Mr. Schopp: Okay. I thought he was talking about the flat metal wall panel.

Mr. Joseph: No, it's the actual canopy.

Mr. Schopp: That's probably a good suggestion actually and a very usable one because there is a door there.

Comm. Roberson: There are two doors it appears.

Mr. Joseph: There are two doors showing there.

Mr. Schopp: One of them will go away.

Chair Rohlf: I believe that the current stipulations take care of Staff's concerns including No. 3, which is "The applicant has agreed to work with Staff on providing some additional architectural features on that east side." Unless there is further discussion, I think we are ready for a motion.

**A motion to approve Case 26-08, JP Wine Bar, located at the southeast corner of 119<sup>th</sup> Street and Roe Avenue, subject to Staff recommendations Nos. 1 through 9 was made by Roberson; seconded by Munson.**

**The motion passed following a unanimous vote.**

CASE 33-08 – ONE-NINETEEN DEVELOPMENT REVISED DESIGN CRITERIA – Request for approval of a final sit plan; located at the southeast corner of 119<sup>th</sup> Street and Roe Avenue.

**Staff Presentation:**

Assistant to the Planning Director Mark Klein made the following comments:

Mr. Klein: Madam Chair and members of the Planning Commission, this is Case 33-08. The applicant is requesting approval of a final site plan to modify the materials within the approved design guidelines of the One Nineteen development. What this request refers to is that the applicant is proposing to add an additional gold tone panel as opposed to a clear anodized aluminum, which is silver. They are proposing to add this in a number of places, particularly higher up on the building as far as on the elevations. There is actually a plan that was included in the packet that shows the areas that they propose adding this to. I will let the applicant actually go through that with you as far as where the silver metal is proposed to be kept as well as where the gold-tone metal is proposed to be used. In addition to that, Planning Assistant Julie Chilcutt just handed out a sheet of paper that has several stucco colors on it. On the left side of the paper are the original stucco colors that were proposed with the design criteria. The applicant is proposing to add the equivalents on the right side of the paper that they would like to use instead. The printing of the paper is a little bit misleading, so I have both the original material board for the One Nineteen development that shows the oyster shell as well as the chocolate mousse and a revised material board that shows the other three stucco colors. Just to give you a warning, on the original material board the stucco colors are fairly small. *(Material boards were passed among the Commissioners for review.)*

Mr. Lambers: Just to let the Commission know what our concern is, as you recall, this shopping center was intended to display a very contemporary presence. Certainly Crate & Barrel took some getting used to by most people who looked at it. Our concern is that they are moving more towards an earth tone presence with these color changes are moving away from the contemporary. We just wanted to bring this to your attention so that you can have the benefit of this discussion.

Chair Rohlf: As far as the locations of the panels, this has not changed?

Mr. Klein: The locations of the panels are pretty much what they were originally. It's basically the replacement of this silver metal panel with more of the gold tone.

Comm. Munson: You're saying this is not contemporary enough? (*Referring to the proposed material board.*)

Mr. Klein: Well, that's part of Staff's concern. It's gone to more of a warmer tone. The actual silver color is called champagne. That metal panel is approved. There is more of a gold tone panel on there as well that they are proposing be added to those areas where the red lines on this diagram are located. The original material board shows the original stucco materials as far as actual samples. You can compare that against the proposed stucco colors. (*Clarifications were made regarding the original and proposed material boards.*)

Comm. Munson: In other words, the new ones don't look as crisp as what was originally approved?

Mr. Lambers: That is correct. I did not feel comfortable making an administrative approval of this as I felt it was too significant from the original approval.

Chair Rohlf: They are actually proposing the use of both of them?

Mr. Lambers: Yes, Madam Chair.

**Applicant Presentation:**

Bob Carlson and Chris Sogus with DLR Group, 7290 W. 133<sup>rd</sup> Street, Overland Park, Kansas, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments with the aid of a PowerPoint presentation:

Mr. Carlson: We have a plan on the screen that shows the locations of the new metal panel color. Again, we are using both. We are using the silver and are proposing the use of the new metal panels. The yellow areas on this site plan show the locations of the new metal color. It's really on the two end-caps of the two retail areas on the east and west and then two other locations on some of the inline stores. The elevation is the end-cap. It's really the yellow band that is up above the brick on either end on the east end, the west end, over the two-story space, and some smaller areas around the canopy. The yellow shaded areas are where we are substituting the new color for the silver. We're still using the silver. There are glass panels in various locations and we feel that the silver color works well adjacent to the glass. We are keeping that color wherever we have those glass panels. However, we thought the more tan color worked better with the brick.

Also, when we looked at the silver material on site against the sky, we thought it disappeared too much. Part of the reason for the step-backs at the corners is to break up the building mass a little bit and create a notch there. The little bit of a darker color helps accentuate that notch against the sky. It's hard to see the changes in these elevations because they are small. We'll go to some blow-ups. Also, it does show up on the east and west elevation in the high metal strip there. It continues around the backside and in towards the interior of the building, both the east and west.

We are showing the two-sided elevations, the side of the west on the top showing the metal band wrapping around and going toward the interior of the center. This is the south elevation of the other side, which again shows the metal panel wrapping around the end-cap of the retail. On the blow-up, this is really what we are talking about. This is the very end east end-cap. There are various strips. This is showing the silver and more of the earth tone. Chris will show you the actual panels. The approved panel is being used at a location like this where the glass panels are. We are using the silver panel associated with the glass. We like the darker color to accentuate that notch and also feel that it looks better with the brick. On this blow-up, the metal panel is used as a back-drop for the canopy over the store. We took some photos of it in shade and in sunlight this afternoon. Because this is the north façade, it will be mostly in shade. It turns it a little bluer and a little darker. In the sunlight, as you would expect, you get more reflectivity and both materials actually turn lighter. We actually went up and put these panels in their locations on site against the insulation. You can see the difference. We really do create more of a profile for the building with a little darker color, which we thought was desirable.

The other consideration is how it fits into the overall center. We do want to tie Crate & Barrel and all of the other retail stores together on the site. Here are those same two panels leaning up against Crate & Barrel. It shows how it blends in and makes it a good fit with the existing buildings. The proposed panel really kind of picks up the chocolate milk color that is on the existing Crate & Barrel building. I would be happy to answer any questions.

Chair Rohlf: At what point did you figure out that you needed to change this particular material? Is there a building down there that you have the metal on already? How did you get to the point where you knew you had to change something?

Mr. Carlson: I think when we took the sample panels out to the site and looked at it against the brick, we thought that we could maybe do better. That is when we looked at the other colors and saw this. We thought it might be a better fit and brought it to Staff's attention. It is an important project and a significant change, so we're here tonight to explain.

Chair Rohlf: This is something that we would need to add to the design guidelines.

Mr. Klein: Correct.

Chair Rohlf: Is this consistent with RED Development? Do we have an agreement with them about this particular change?

Mr. Lambers: They agree.

Comm. Jackson: To me, it looks like it maintains a contemporary design. What are your thoughts on that?

Mr. Carlson: I think it does. I think it matches Crate & Barrel very well. It has the nice crisp white, which is the distinguishing thing for the building. The form of the building is unchanged. It's a significant material but it is not a lot of area on the building. It tends to be high up and I think it is still a contemporary building. It's still pretty unique to Leawood and I don't think we've affected the quality or overall look of the project in a real significant way. We think it actually makes the building a little bit better.

Comm. Jackson: I may be the only one on the panel who likes contemporary design. I still find it pleasing.

Chair Rohlf: Mark, did you have an opportunity to do the same thing with the samples? Did you take them out to the site and give them an overview?

Mr. Klein: We went out on site with the applicant to look at the building and the proposed materials. They have a large mock-up on site as well. Yes, we did go out there and look. That is the reason it is before you tonight because there was some concern as far as how it affected its relationship with the rest of the center and the Crate & Barrel building that is already there as well as the contemporary design.

Comm. Munson: I would like to observe that probably more than any project that I've been associated with in my years on the Planning Commission, the Staff and City Administrator have probably been on top of this one and are more familiar with this than any that I have ever seen. I know that the architects know what they are doing but on the other hand, I feel that the desire to keep this a contemporary look and tie it in with Crate & Barrel shows the impact that Staff's work is done as far as trying to evaluate how this is finally going to wind up. I tend to support Staff's position on this. It's a subjective thing, but I think that they see this as tying everything together and making it look contemporary. To me, the silver probably is a more contemporary color than gold. That's what I think.

Chair Rohlf: I think it is pretty subjective. It's hard to tell by this small sample.

Comm. Heiman: My only comment would be that in looking at the original plan against the backdrop of the sky, to me the silver does tend to get lost a little more. I think the new color that is being proposed would tend to probably give more definition to the outline of the building. I personally would be in favor. It doesn't appear to me a major change. I do think that one component in my mind would move me to approve.

Chair Rohlf: Do we need to add a stipulation since there are none on this particular report this evening?

Comm. Jackson: Do we need any stipulations since we're just adding a color?

Mr. Klein: It depends on what you want to do. If you're just adding a subset of the materials they are proposing, you would need to stipulate which ones are to be added or excluded. If you are adding all of the ones that they are proposing, including the three colors of stucco, then I think the approval of this case would have them added to the design guidelines.

Chair Rohlf: I guess I would ask the applicant, would you anticipate any other changes with these panels?

Mr. Carlson: No.

Chair Rohlf: Is anyone prepared to make a motion? Do you prefer the silver or both colors as the applicant has proposed?

**A motion to recommend approval of Case 33-08, One Nineteen development revised design criteria, request for approval of a final site plan, with the stipulation that we add the metal and three stucco colors as represented on the material boards was made by Jackson; seconded by Roberson.**

**The motion passed following a vote of 5-1 (Against: Munson).**

*MEETING ADJOURNED.*