

**City of Leawood  
Planning Commission Minutes**

**July 8, 2008  
Meeting - 6:00 p.m.  
Leawood City Hall Council Chambers  
4800 Town Center Drive**

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

*In the absence of Chair Lisa Rohlf, Commissioner Charles Munson led the meeting.*

**APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA:**

Chairman Munson: There are two cases, 39-08 and 44-08, that will be continued to the August 26, 2008 meeting at the developers' request. There will be only one business item tonight, which is the remand of the Leawood Public Library addition.

**A motion to approve the agenda as amended was made by Roberson, seconded by Williams. Motion approved unanimously.**

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** Approval of the minutes from the June 10, 2008 meeting.

**A motion to approve the June 10, 2008 Planning Commission meeting minutes was made by Roberson, seconded by Williams. Motion approved unanimously.**

**CONTINUED TO JULY 22, 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 05-08 – ONE NINETEEN – GREEN EARTH DRY CLEANERS (BLDG A) – Request for approval of a special use permit, preliminary site plan, and final site plan; located at the southeast corner of 119<sup>th</sup> Street and Roe Avenue.  
**PUBLIC HEARING**

47-08 MOLLE OFF SITE PARKING – Request for approval of a special use permit; located south of 103<sup>rd</sup> Street and east of State Line Road. **PUBLIC HEARING**

**A motion to approve the continuance of Cases 122-07, 127-07, 05-08, and 47-08 to the July 22, 2008 meeting was made by Roberson, seconded by Williams. Motion approved unanimously.**

**CONTINUED TO AUGUST 12, 2008 MEETING:**

45-08 CITY OF LEAWOOD COMPREHENSIVE PLAN – Request for approval of an annual review of the City of Leawood Comprehensive Plan. **PUBLIC HEARING**

**A motion to approve the continuance of Case 45-08 to the August 12, 2008 meeting was made by Roberson, seconded by Williams. Motion approved unanimously.**

**CONTINUED TO SEPTEMBER 23, 2008 MEETING:**

42-08 PARK PLACE – INGREDIENT SIGN PLAN – Request for approval of a final site plan; located at the northeast corner of 117<sup>th</sup> Street and Nall Avenue.

**A motion to approve the continuance of Case 42-08 to the September 23, 2008 meeting was made by Roberson, seconded by Williams. Motion approved unanimously.**

**OLD BUSINESS:**

CASE 35-08 – LEAWOOD PUBLIC LIBRARY ADDITION – Request for a preliminary plan, final plan, and final plat; located at the northwest corner of Roe Avenue and Town Center Drive. **PUBLIC HEARING**

**Staff Presentation:**

Senior Planner Jeff Joseph provided the following presentation:

Mr. Joseph: Mister Chairman and members of the Planning Commission, this is Case 35-08, Leawood Public Library Addition. This case was heard by the Planning Commission on May 27, 2008. Since that time, the applicant has made some significant changes to the plan. The case went on to the City Council, who remanded the item back to the Planning Commission. Some of the changes include a modification of the roof. It used to be a sloped roof, which has been changed to a flat roof. Also, some of the ground-mounted equipment has been relocated to the rooftop. These are the main changes. In addition, per the recommendations of the Planning Commission and Staff, the applicant relocated the trash enclosure to be attached to the building. They also added some pavers along the walks.

Staff prefers the earlier plan. If the Planning Commission were to approve this case, Staff is recommending the stipulations requested in the Staff Report. If you have any questions, I would be happy to answer them.

Comm. Roberson: What are your objections, if you could spell them out?

Mr. Joseph: If you look at the elevations, the earlier elevation showed a sloped roof that matched with the existing building. They are also adding screening for the rooftop equipment that doesn't really blend in with the sloped roof. These are the main concerns by Staff.

Comm. Roberson: I assume that you are talking about the sloped roof over the new addition.

Mr. Joseph: Yes.

Comm. Neff-Brain: On the proposed schematic, where is the mechanical equipment?

Mr. Joseph: This is the location of the sloped roof (*referring to elevations placed on overhead*). They have changed this to a flat roof with screening for the equipment (*points to location of equipment*).

Comm. Heiman: Can you point out where the new trash area is located?

Mr. Joseph: The earlier plan proposed the trash enclosure in this location (*referring to location near drive entrance from Town Center Drive on site plan drawing*). It has been moved to the southeast corner of the new addition. It is not really an enclosure but is just a screened wall.

Comm. Williams: Is the trash enclosure going to have doors on the drive-up side so that people going to the book drop-off won't see the trash?

Mr. Joseph: I believe it is a similar situation to what we have at City Hall. We have a screened wall that bends around and restricts the view. It is a similar design.

Comm. Neff-Brain: On the proposed schematic, where are they planning to hide the equipment? Is it not shown?

Comm. Roberson: It is right here. There is the wall – there is the trash enclosure.

Comm. Neff-Brain: They're putting the trash enclosure on the front?

Mr. Lambers: It is the best choice of all of the evils we have in dealing with this site. We thought it would be best to have it in the roundabout but it wouldn't fit because of the equipment. Having it at the front was a potential traffic hazard. Given the fact that their trash is really just papers and there won't be any emissions from it, we believe it is the best that this site offers in terms of being feasible.

Comm. Neff-Brain: It couldn't go on the north side?

Mr. Lambers: No.

Comm. Neff-Brain: Because of the slope?

Mr. Joseph: Right. There is a 3-1 slope.

Comm. Williams: I have questions on the proposed alterations and the mechanical equipment surround. They are noting it as a metal screen, yet the glass clearstory that it is adjacent to is supposed to be a metal canopy?

Mr. Joseph: That is correct.

Comm. Williams: Are they supposed to be the same color or are they actually supposed to be different colors as the elevation indicates? On the 3-D image, it is pretty much shown as the same color.

Mr. Joseph: If this design is approved, we would like to have them the same color so they will blend.

Comm. Williams: I would concur with that.

Comm. Neff-Brain: Prior to the new construction, where is the trash enclosure now on the existing building?

Mr. Lambers: It is in the circle area.

Comm. Neff-Brain: It is on the front side now?

Mr. Lambers: Correct. They indicated that there would not be enough space to accommodate both, and we have agreed with their assessment. It just wouldn't work with the mechanical equipment being there. Plus, having the garbage trucks go through there may cause problems as well. Again, this is the best of the least desirable options that are there with this project.

Comm. Williams: For the disposal company to have access to the trash containers, they will have to roll the containers out into the drive-way?

Mr. Lambers: Yes, just like we do here at City Hall. It is basically a replica of what we have here. The City Council acknowledged this. Their concern in remanding it back was the change in the roof configuration from the original proposal.

**Applicant Presentation:**

Rick Wise with Clark Enersen Architects, 15412 W. 91<sup>st</sup> Terrace, Lenexa, KS, appeared before the Planning Commission, provided a presentation via PowerPoint, and made the following comments:

Mr. Wise: As stated by Staff, we have changes to the design. The changes came about while making modifications recommended by this body as we started talking about the trash enclosure location. After our last meeting, we did get some budgetary pricing from the contractor that we are working with on this project. We found that the project was over-budget. At that time, we started looking at alternatives to help mitigate our cost issues, which has driven us to this new design. Let me first take you where we have been and what you have seen before (*Mr. Wise reviews original design via PowerPoint*). The addition is still on the east of the existing building, but you can see in this diagram that the trash enclosure area was in the southeast corner of the parking lot. There was a large mechanical enclosure in the center of the book drop-off area.

The original as well as the current scheme of the front entry contains a bench element in the center of the two columns that exist there. You can see that we are including the brick pavers that the City has asked for into the parking area as well as incorporating it into the front entry piece to make it a little more complete.

On the original design with the previous mechanical enclosure, you can see the small gabled roof as part of the addition. The rest of the addition was a flat roof (*reviews various views of original design*).

As I mentioned, we have run into some budget issues as part of this project and started to look at alternatives. This shows the current layout for the site and the current location for the trash enclosure (*reviews revised design via PowerPoint*). In terms of how Deffenbaugh would access the trash, the containers would be rolled off to the side and taken into the book drop-off area for pick-up. It was a recommendation at our last meeting to have the trash enclosure tied to the building. We feel that this is the best location to incorporate all of the functions that we need with the book drop-off, which is obviously needed for patrons using the library. It is in front of the building.

The footprint of this building is smaller than what you have previously seen. When we looked at the mechanical system that we had, it was one of the larger cost items for this project. The previous system was on grade in the center of the book drop-off with a substantial screen around it. The new solution put all of the mechanical equipment on the roof and minimizes the amount of paved area in the center of the book drop-off as well as the amount of screening required around the enclosure.

We again started to look at the architecture of the existing building in trying to figure out the best approach for the addition and what the exterior would look like. The existing library actually has a lot of different forms on it, but it is actually a more Modernist approach than City Hall. The view of the west side of the buildings shows three small dormers that look onto the courtyard and are right next door to City Hall. City Hall is a much more formal classical architectural image than the library. The library is much more simple and modern in its appearance than City Hall.

As we go to the east side of the library building, there are three square blocks that have been added to that side. Even from its original design, it wanted to be more modern as it went toward the west and this is reflected in the existing architecture. One of the things that we noticed was really strong in the building and that we wanted to incorporate was the horizontal banding. There are two bands of pre-cast concrete that occur on the building and surround the existing addition completely.

We looked at modifying our design knowing that we had to get the mechanical equipment to the roof, which is a very important part of our design at this point as we are looking at about a \$230,000 savings compared to the previous layout of having the equipment in the book drop-off area. As we looked at trying to incorporate a gabled roof and a rectangular box for the mechanical equipment, a triangle and a square just did not seem to mesh and go well together. We felt that a better approach for the architecture of the building was to incorporate a horizontal element on the roof structure for the clearstory, for the children's area below, as well as to enclose the mechanical equipment. On this view looking back from the northeast, you can see that we would still have a raised element for the children's area and clearstory windows around it. We want to introduce natural light into that space and will try to do this as part of the design. Again, it is really not that different from the architecture that is currently there. I would be happy to answer any questions.

Comm. Williams: On the mechanical equipment in the new proposed plan, where does it fit in the scheme of the clearstory?

Mr. Wise: The clearstory element for the children's area does not run the full depth of the building. It is not all the way from the back of the building to the front south edge. The raised clearstory element is pushed back from the front quite a ways, which is why you really don't see it as much from the front view of the building. You will see it more from the north as you are driving down Roe Avenue. From the south, you won't be able to see it much.

Comm. Williams: On looking at the 3-D image of the northeast side of the building, I am not seeing any mechanical screening at that point. Is this because you have the screening held back some distance off of the roof parapet?

Mr. Wise: The mechanical equipment doesn't touch the front or the north edge of the building. It is held back from the north edge as well, which is why you can't see it from the north view.

Comm. Williams: Approximately how far back is it on the north?

Mr. Wise: I believe it is 15-ft. I don't have the exact dimensions.

Comm. Williams: Is it about the same on the front?

Mr. Wise: No, the front is held back about 30-40 feet from the edge of the building. It aligns with the front edge of the clearstory.

Comm. Williams: So, it is flush with the south face of the clearstory. On the north, it is about 15-ft. back as you are illustrating the clearstory on the back edge of the building.

Mr. Wise: Yes.

Comm. Williams: In that regards, your elevations are depicting a standard louvered screen around the mechanical equipment while you have this metal panel and glass for your clearstory. Why are there two distinctly different appearances on something that is so strong?

Mr. Wise: As we have looked at it, it probably would not be different materials. It would be the same material screening the mechanical equipment that creates the clearstory. We would not change materials.

Comm. Williams: When you say you wouldn't change materials, do you still have some louvers?

Mr. Wise: The mechanical enclosure is bigger than the mechanical equipment so that airflow can get around it. On the side facing the west, there wouldn't be any so that airflow could come in from the west – beside the other gabled roof. The mechanical screen is only facing to the north and south. There is a small return just for structural reasons, but the side facing the west is completely open as no one will see it.

Comm. Williams: When you say that no one will see it, have you taken your 3-Ds and gone around that side to be sure that this is indeed the case?

Mr. Wise: We have.

Comm. Williams: City Hall isn't going to see your mechanical equipment?

Mr. Wise: No, they won't as the gabled roof of the existing building is so much larger that it blocks the view. If it were a flat roof over the existing library, you would see it; but the large gabled roof does become a screening element for us.

Comm. Williams: In terms of lighting for the interior, how does the lighting for this clearstory that you are proposing compare with the amount of light coming in the clearstory with the gabled roof?

Mr. Wise: Natural light should be similar. We probably have a little more natural light on the flat option just because we have a taller amount of clearstory glass. On the gabled roof option, the windows were much shorter. You will probably have a little more natural light on the flat option versus the gabled option.

Comm. Williams: That is natural light coming in from three directions since you are blocking the west side.

Mr. Wise: The west side would be blocked.

Comm. Williams: What is the depth proportion of the top of your clearstory metal panel? What are the heights of the metal panel and of the clearstory? How do those proportions compare to the horizontal banding around the building?

Mr. Wise: It is taller. I don't have the exact dimensions, but I think the height of the clearstory element is close to 4-5 feet. I would have to check some dimensions to verify this, which I would be happy to do.

Comm. Williams: My big reason for asking is that from the northeast corner, it looks like the clearstory is becoming too massive for the building as compared to the previous approach of the smaller gabled roof. With that said, obviously the existing gabled roof is a massive and dominant architectural form. Could you go over once more why you chose to incorporate more of the flat roof clearstory structure versus the smaller gabled structure?

Mr. Wise: There were a couple of reasons. First, trying to incorporate the gabled roof and the screening element we had to have for the mechanical equipment, the triangle and the square, just seemed incompatible. In order to have the screening element connected to the architecture of that gable just didn't seem to fit and was out of place. It didn't seem to work well with the existing architecture and I don't think that it would look that nice. Another thing is that the current building has a slate roof that is failing. The library has had lots of problems with the existing roof and obviously doesn't want to go down the slate route anymore. We will be putting a simulated slate on the existing gabled roof that meets the City of Leawood requirements. In trying to minimize the amount of simulated slate shingle that they have had problems with in the past has been another issue. Another advantage to having a flat roof is that we want the roof of the addition and the existing structure to be as sustainable as possible. A flat white roof is a more sustainable approach than having a dark simulated slate shingle. It is better on the sustainable side to increase the amount of white roof.

Comm. Williams: For my colleagues here, please explain why it is more sustainable.

Mr. Wise: With LEED [Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design], which gauges sustainability, you want to have a high albedo roof so that you can reflect the heat back and not create a heat trap. Dark roofs and asphalt parking lots are going to trap heat in cities. A reflective roof will reduce the urban heat island effect. A white roof is better as it doesn't generate as much heat. One building on its own probably isn't going to do a lot but as the industry changes and more buildings do so, hopefully it will bring down temperatures. That is the concept and is what is being promoted.

Comm. Williams: This may be getting out of our purview here, but to follow this discussion a little further, how much insulation would you have in the gabled roof versus the flat roof. How does that affect the space down below with the heating and air conditioning? Energy consumption is part of sustainability also.

Mr. Wise: It is. We are required by code to have a certain R-value of insulation on the roof regardless. The standards are set by ASHRAE [American Society of Heating, Refrigerating, and Air Conditioning Engineers] and we follow those as far as thickness. I don't know necessarily that the thickness of the insulation would change in either solution. I guess I would have to investigate that more, but I don't think the thickness and R-value would change depending on the roof style. We are required to have a certain thickness and R-value on roofs in this climate. We would meet those requirements. I don't think that changing the roof pitch would affect that.

Comm. Williams: Do you know what the R-value requirement is in order to share with our body today?

Mr. Wise: In this climate, the average R-value required by code is about 19.8-22 for a commercial building.

Comm. Williams: Again, this is outside of our purview and responsibility but with your concerns and statement regarding sustainability, I just wanted to see how you were following through with that.

Comm. Neff-Brain: Could you tell me how tall the structure enclosing the mechanical equipment is?

Mr. Wise: It is about 8-ft. tall.

Comm. Neff-Brain: You're using the metal because it is the lightest weight?

Mr. Wise: We used the metal because it is lightweight and as the material is already on the existing building, we are incorporating the element into the architecture. The metal is on the three boxes on the east side of the building. We felt it was appropriate to reuse the material on the top of the building.

Comm. Neff-Brain: I know that trash collection isn't much of a topic for conversation now, but tell me where the mechanical equipment was originally, and still may, going to be placed. Is this not a space for the trash collection as it needs to be joined to the building?

Mr. Lambers: With the mechanical equipment, there was not enough space with the circle drive and they would have had to expand it. They felt that this would be a problem as it would have to be on the north end as opposed to the south.

Comm. Neff-Brain: If the mechanical equipment goes on the roof, would there be enough space for the trash?

Mr. Lambers: There is space, but there would still be a problem with trucks maneuvering through there as people try to drop off books. Our position is that the mechanical equipment needs to be where it was originally proposed and the trash enclosure needs to be where they are proposing it now. If there is a decision to do something different with the mechanical equipment, you might want to look at that possibility; but, again, that is not Staff's position.

Comm. Elkins: I just wanted to review in more detail the discussion you had with Mr. Williams regarding the gabled roof versus the proposed clearstory. What other options did you look at?

Mr. Wise: The flat roof coming to the top was the best option. The big issue is trying to screen the mechanical equipment and have it incorporated into the gable. Every time we did that, we just kept adding expense to the project that we just couldn't bear. We felt that the flat roof was the least expensive option and better approach to try and make it incorporated with the mechanical equipment. Obviously, if the budget was unlimited, we could do many more things. As we were limited in that regard, this came to the top as a good solution.

Comm. Elkins: If I understood correctly, what you told Commissioner Williams was that when you looked at the small gabled roof with the screening for the mechanics on the top, it just didn't look right. Correct?

Mr. Wise: It just didn't look right with the architecture that was on the existing building or the addition that we are trying to create.

Comm. Elkins: When you went through the discussion with Mr. Williams, I think you confirmed that when you look at it from the perspective of the northeast side, the mechanics are not going to be visible. Is that correct?

Mr. Wise: It can be visible depending upon the elevation you're at. Depending on where the angle is from where you are looking at the building, I don't believe you will be able to see it unless you get all the way to the north edge of the City's property, looking through the trees. We do have a screen on the north edge, but it is just held back from the north edge. The screen does exist.

Comm. Elkins: If you look at it from the south side, will it always be visible?

Mr. Wise: The mechanical enclosure will be visible from the south even if there were no clearstory, gabled or flat. I have an image that shows that. We would still have to screen it to meet the City's requirements.

Comm. Elkins: In your estimation, looking at it from the south, the proposed clearstory together with the mechanical screen is more consistent than if you add the gable.

Mr. Wise: Yes.

Comm. Elkins: From your perspective as an architect, could you describe for me how the new proposed architecture of the addition ties into the original building. You mentioned that “it is not really all that different.” I would like for you to explain that please.

Mr. Wise: I’ll go back to the images (*refers to PowerPoint*). As I pointed out earlier, as you look at the existing building, the architecture sort of evolves. You can look at the west edge of the building in comparison to the east edge. On the west edge, you have these three elements that are coming out with the small gabled roofs. If you go to the opposite side, the west, you have the same three elements but they are now square and blocked. The existing building already has that difference in architecture if you look from one side to the other. I don’t want to speak for the original architect, but I think he was trying to be respectful of this building and the plaza just to the south so that there was continuity between the two buildings, even though they are very, very different. As you grow and move more toward the east, the architecture changes. It is not a carbon copy. They could have easily have had the same three gabled roofs on the west side, but they chose not to. We just took that same element and incorporated it into the design as part of the children’s area. Instead of facing to the east as it currently does, it would face to the north. I don’t feel that it is dissimilar or that it is a complete departure from the existing architecture as it currently does exist on the building. Unfortunately, this piece [the current east side] will be covered up with the addition and you will no longer see it when the new building is built. It will be hidden.

Comm. Williams: I’ll just elaborate a little bit on the applicant’s comments regarding the evolution of the architecture. I’m not speaking precisely for the architect but in listening to your explanation and seeing your images, one of the things that the evolution is doing – the gabled structures on the west side that open to the courtyard is relating to a smaller scaled environment. It is a more pedestrian-oriented environment versus the east side where it is opening up to a larger green space and scale of activity. I have always liked that in this building. I hate seeing that go away, but I do like the use of the metal and the larger windows on the east side. Again, I can see the applicant’s comment in trying to maintain some of that. It would be nice if some of that could be incorporated into your new windows as well to make reference to what has been done before. That may be another topic of conversation before the evening is over.

Comm. Neff-Brain: From a sound perspective, is there any difference from the street level if the mechanical is on the ground or up on the roof?

Mr. Wise: It would be better from the street level to have the mechanical equipment up on the roof. Interior to the building we will have to resolve sound issues to having mechanical equipment up on the roof; but acoustically around the building, it will be less noisy to have it on the roof.

Comm. Neff-Brain: I assume it can be resolved internally because buildings all over have their mechanical on the roof.

Mr. Wise: Yes. Essentially, what we will do is separate the structure for the mechanical equipment from the structure of the building so that any existing vibration noise won't transfer into the building itself. We are looking at that.

Comm. Williams: On the mechanical equipment for a moment, you're looking at having a very large space. Are we talking one huge piece of equipment?

Mr. Wise: Yes. We looked at several different options. The existing building has the mechanical equipment right behind the front entry of the building. It is above on the roof in the area that is recessed between the two slopes. We looked at that as an option, but there is simply not enough space to get the mechanical equipment in support of the existing building needs and the new to fit within that space. The footprint of the piece that we are looking at is essentially 8-ft. wide, 8-ft. tall, and 40-ft. long. It is a large piece of equipment when you go to a rooftop piece. On the original scheme, we had a fluid cooler out in the yard area and heat pump throughout the building. Obviously, this became cost prohibitive.

Comm. Williams: On the existing elevation, the glass gable sets how far back from the front?

Mr. Wise: I don't have the exact dimension, but I think that I gave an estimate of 30-40 feet.

Comm. Williams: In terms of architectural form, on the front of the building you actually have two triangular roof forms with a horizontal roof form between the two. As you step back, it becomes a full gabled roof. So, there are three different roof forms on the existing building.

Mr. Wise: As well as the flat roof that exists. It is a pretty busy elevation actually.

Comm. Williams: In looking at some of these elevations, you lose that because you're not seeing it in full three-dimension. When you look at it closer on the front entrance, that issue does come out quite strongly.

Mr. Wise: The elevations can be quite misleading as it would actually make you think that the clearstory element could be right above the front entry when in actuality, it is recessed back quite a bit. The elevations are good depictions but the perspective from pictures is obviously better to help sell what it is going to look like.

Mr. Lambers: I have a question for the applicant. My understanding is that the existing windows on the east side with the contemporary features will be removed. For the new east side, I am seeing something that is less contemporary and more consistent with the existing building. Is that correct?

Mr. Wise: That is correct.

Mr. Lambers: The question is, if you're tying the contemporary feature to a feature that is not going to be there, how is the tie going to be there?

Mr. Wise: We moved that to the north side versus the east. On the north side, it is really just that strong white panel element that occurs at the roofline. We didn't want to be as dramatic as the original but still wanted to incorporate the aesthetic of it. We could have had a big metal box attached to the north side but, architecturally, to be as compatible with the existing architecture as possible, it would be better to have that element be a little more subtle with the brick banding and pre-cast concrete banding wrapping around and a little bit higher. I think that it still achieves that, it is just not as dramatic as the original design. The original design is pretty dramatic as far as a difference on architecture.

Comm. Williams: The windows on the east side of your elevations are noting metal panels above the windows as well as metal panels for the clearstory construction.

Mr. Wise: We are showing pre-cast concrete banding at the wall. As we have elements that are jutting out above windows, we changed to metal. It will be similar in color but, for structural reasons, carrying the pre-cast concrete out that far was cost prohibitive. We wanted to create a big enough overhang of those windows so that we could reduce issues of glare within the library. To do that with pre-cast concrete was more expensive. We do have metal banding on the windows on the east side.

Comm. Williams: You do have some connection then between the windows and the clearstory.

Mr. Wise: Yes.

Comm. Williams: The drop-off drive-thru is a metal canopy also?

Mr. Wise: At this point we are showing it to be metal. It is the same material as the clearstory element. The legs, or pieces that hold it to the ground, try to incorporate the masonry elements. It isn't too dissimilar from what we had shown in the earlier scheme as far as the mechanical enclosure.

Comm. Williams: On the east windows, is there an architectural reason for why you didn't express more of the existing look?

Mr. Wise: Really, we were just trying to simplify the design. Again, I think the white boxes that occur on the east façade are really dramatic.

Comm. Williams: Are you referring to the existing east side?

Mr. Wise: The existing, yes. I think we tried to find something that was a little more subtle in the design that we came up with. It is still reminiscent of the original design but not as dramatic. It really becomes more dramatic at the roofline with the clearstory and metal banding.

Comm. Williams: Are the window frames white?

Mr. Wise: Yes, they will be white to match the existing.

Mr. Lambers: The windows are still the same with regards to either version, correct?

Mr. Wise: Yes.

Mr. Lambers: In looking at the two pictures where you have the flat roof versus the gabled roof, that is really the only difference. Again, that is where we saw the disconnection. Everything else is the same other than the roofs.

Mr. Wise: The only other difference is on the southeast view. We initially had a staff area on the corner right next to the book drop-off. That is now where the trash enclosure is located. The staff lounge moved to the front of the building. The footprint on the south is a little different.

Mr. Lambers: You have stairs and a door in one of the pictures, that is why I was asking if it was the same or not.

Mr. Wise: We currently don't have the entry coming off of that flat, it goes to the west. The stairs moved in their location.

Mr. Lambers: It would be consistent that the stairs would not be in either option.

Mr. Wise: We will not have the stairs in the new solution.

Comm. Jackson: Architecturally, how do you prefer the trash enclosure?

Mr. Wise: We are actually pleased with it in the new location. As Staff has said, it is not that different than what you currently have here at City Hall. You do have to wheel the trash out from an enclosure by the Emergency Exit on this side of the building. To put it in the center becomes too much of a focal element as it will be the first thing you see as you come off of Town Center Drive. To have those swinging gates facing to the south...I think I'm a pretty good architect – but gates look like gates. I don't think they are going to look nice, especially when they are the first thing you see as you come into the parking lot. I think this is the best solution with what our options are and the limited amount of space that we have on site.

Comm. Jackson: I'm fine with the new roofline; I don't have a problem with that at all. I like moving the electrical up on top because it gets rid of the concrete on the bottom.

Chairman Munson: Mr. Wise, are there other members of your team that would like to speak about the items of concern?

Mr. Wise: I have several people with me including Donna Lauffer, the County Librarian, and Joe Waters.

Joe Waters, Director of Facilities for Johnson County Government, 111 S. Cherry, Olathe, and home address of 3520 W. 92<sup>nd</sup> Place, Leawood, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Mr. Waters: I don't have a lot to add to the conversation other than to say during the course of the redesign, we were actually very pleased from an architectural perspective. We believe that the solutions arrived at really are an improvement in the building. The quality of the light we will get inside and the cost savings also improves the quality of the space and building.

I know that typically you have developers here doing the talking but as another public entity, it is taxpayers' money and we are all serving the very same people. When we see a savings, it seems like absolutely the best direction from our perspective. I just wanted to share that with you.

Chairman Munson: There is a Public Hearing on this case. Is there anyone here who would like to speak?

**As there were no individuals present to speak, a motion to close the Public Hearing was made by Elkins; seconded by Roberson. The motion passed unanimously.**

Chairman Munson: Going back and looking at the case prepared for us by Staff, their feeling was that they preferred the original design with the gabled roof on both sides. There are five issues that they indicate in the Staff Report. Let's have a discussion on what we should do.

Comm. Neff-Brain: I like the proposed changes. I like the mix in architecture as I would like to bring a little bit of modern style to the building. I think that it reflects the art that we have in the area. I would be fine with the changes as proposed.

Comm. Elkins: I am concerned as it seems to me that next to City Hall, the public library is the most important single architectural feature in a community. The library as it exists today at least satisfies what my hopes and aspirations are for the second most important piece of architecture in our community. The last time that we saw this proposal, I expressed concern on the record that the proposed double-gabled roof was out of synch as it was heavy to the west and the single roof to the east seemed like a small little brother. My concern is that the new proposal does that even more so. In my estimation and perspective of looking at it, not as a professional architect, the building now looks a little bit like an aircraft carrier with an island on one end. It is a flattop as it moves to the east. I sympathize with the County and I appreciate the idea of moving the mechanicals to the roof. I think the architect has a very difficult challenge here, but I tend to disagree with my colleague in terms of the mixed architecture. That is part of my concern as it is a single building, it is a library. At best now, it looks like two buildings – one that has a triangular top on it and the other has kind of a turreted top. I don't see it as mixed architecture, with all due respect to the architect. I am struggling to follow this idea of following Modernism as you move from west to east on the building. In conclusion, I don't think that the plan proposed tonight meets the expectations that we are entitled to have in Leawood for the second most important piece of architecture in Leawood, especially when the two pieces are right next to each other. If anything, that exacerbates the problem. I don't see that I can support the proposal as it stands tonight.

**A motion to recommend approval of Case 35-08, Leawood Public Library Addition, request for a preliminary plan, final plan, and final plat, located at the northwest corner of Roe Avenue and Town Center Drive, with Stipulation Nos. 1 through 29 was made by Jackson; seconded by Neff-Brain.**

**The motion carried following a vote of 4-2. For: Roberson, Jackson, Neff-Brain, and Heiman. Against: Williams and Elkins.**

**NEW BUSINESS:**

CASE 39-08 – TOWN CENTER BUSINESS PARK – WALGREENS – Request for approval of a rezoning, special use permit, and preliminary site plan; located at the northeast corner of 117<sup>th</sup> Street and Roe Ave. **PUBLIC HEARING**

CASE 44-08 – TOWN CENTER BUSINESS PARK – DISCOVER O – Request for approval of a preliminary site plan; located north of 117<sup>th</sup> Street and east of Roe Ave. **PUBLIC HEARING**

**A motion to continue Case Nos. 39-08 and 44-08 to the August 26, 2008 Planning Commission meeting was made by Elkins; seconded by Roberson. The motion passed unanimously.**

*MEETING ADJOURNED.*