

**City of Leawood  
Planning Commission Minutes  
June 9, 2009  
Meeting - 6:00 p.m.  
Dinner at Bristol – No Discussion of Items –following meeting  
Leawood City Hall Council Chambers  
4800 Town Center Drive  
Leawood, KS 66211  
913.339.6700 x 160**

**CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL:** Pateidl, Roberson, Jackson, Neff-Brain, Rohlf, Rezac, Williams, Elkins, and Heiman.

**APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA:**

**A motion to approve the agenda as amended was made by Elkins, seconded by Roberson. Motion approved unanimously with a vote of 8-0. For: Pateidl, Roberson, Jackson, Neff-Brain, Rezac, Williams, Elkins and Heiman.**

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** Approval of the minutes from the May 26, 2009 meeting.

**A motion to approve the May 26, 2009 Planning Commission meeting minutes was made by Elkins, seconded by Heiman. Motion approved unanimously with a vote of 8-0. For: Pateidl, Roberson, Jackson, Neff-Brain, Rezac, Williams, Elkins and Heiman.**

**CONTINUED TO JUNE 23, 2009 MEETING:**

CASE 54-06 – LDO AMENDMENT – SECTION 16-2-10 ARCHITECTURAL STANDARDS – Request for approval of an amendment to the Leawood Development Ordinance. **PUBLIC HEARING**

CASE 81-08 – LDO AMENDMENT – SECTION 16-4-9.3 FENCES AND WALLS – Request for approval of an amendment to the Leawood Development Ordinance. **PUBLIC HEARING**

CASE 06-09 – MADDEN MCFARLAND INTERIORS – Request for approval of revised final site plan, located at the southwest corner of State Line Road and 135<sup>th</sup> Street.

CASE 15-09 – PARK PLACE – MICHAEL SHAE SALON & DAY SPA – Request for approval of a final site plan, located at 11520 Ash Street.

CASE 20-09 – LDO AMENDMENT – SECTION 16-4-1 ACCESSORY USES (RESIDENTIAL EMERGENCY GENERATORS) – Request for approval of an amendment to the Leawood Development Ordinance. **PUBLIC HEARING**

CASE 26-09 – LEAWOOD SOUTH COUNTRY CLUB – WIRELESS TOWERCO – Request for approval of a Special Use Permit, Preliminary Site Plan and Final Site Plan, located at 12700 Overbrook Road. **PUBLIC HEARING.**

CASE 27-09 – LEAWOOD SOUTH COUNTRY CLUB – SPRINT NEXTEL ANTENNA – Request for approval of a Special Use Permit, Preliminary Site Plan and Final Site Plan, located at 12700 Overbrook Road. **PUBLIC HEARING.**

CASE 28-09 – NEIGHBORHOOD RETAIL CONTAINING A BANK WITH DRIVE-THRU AT 151<sup>ST</sup> STREET AND MISSION ROAD – Request for approval of a revised preliminary plat and revised preliminary site plan, located at the southeast corner of 151<sup>st</sup> Street and Mission Road. **PUBLIC HEARING.**

**NEW BUSINESS:**

CASE 01-09 – GARDENS OF VILLAGGIO – LOT 3 FINAL PLAT – Request for approval of a revised final plat, located north of 137<sup>th</sup> Street and east of Roe Avenue.

Chair Rohlf: The minutes should reflect that Miss Jackson has recused on this matter.

**Staff Presentation:**

Assistant Director Mark Klein made the following presentation:

Mr. Klein: Madame Chair and members of the Planning Commission, this is Case 01-09 – Gardens of Villaggio – Lot 3 Final Plat. The applicant is requesting approval of a revised final plat to reduce the number of condominiums from three to two. This is the office building within the Villaggio Development just on the north side of 137<sup>th</sup> Street. Building S is the only one that has been constructed. They later came back and did a condominium plat of that building to divide it into several units so they could sell different parts; now they are requesting to remove one of the lines within the plat. Staff is recommending approval of this application with the stipulations.

Chair Rohlf: Mark, this isn't the same agenda we had last time, is it?

Mr. Klein: This is Gardens of Villaggio. That one was actually for a final plan and final plat together; however, the applicant has decided to withdraw the final plan portion and return with a different plan at another time.

Chair Rohlf: Thank you. Does anyone else have questions for staff? Then we'll hear from the applicant.

**Applicant Presentation:**

Doug Patterson, 4630 W. 137<sup>th</sup>, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Mr. Patterson: I'm the developer of these three buildings, one of which is up and you see now. S.O. Development developed this building and platted it into three units. Our law firm expanded, so we bought two of the three units. Because of some fire code, we have to combine those two units into one. The condition about providing a mechanism to fund common areas is in the original condominium declaration that was submitted. We approve of the three conditions in the staff recommendation.

Chair Rohlf: Does anyone have questions for the applicant? Thank you, Mr. Patterson. I don't think there's much need for discussion on this particular item.

**A motion to recommend approval of Case 01-09 – GARDENS OF VILLAGGIO – LOT 3 FINAL PLAT – Request for approval of a revised final plat, located north of 137<sup>th</sup> Street and east of Roe Avenue – was made by Roberson; seconded by Elkins. Motion approved unanimously with a vote of 7-0. For: Pateidl, Roberson, Neff-Brain, Rezac, Williams, Elkins and Heiman.**

*Commissioner Jackson rejoined the meeting.*

CASE 30-09 – PARK PLACE – BUILDING G AND PARKING GARAGE B – Request for approval of a revised final site plan and revised final plat, located north of 117<sup>th</sup> Street and east of Nall Avenue.

**Staff Presentation:**

Senior Planner Joe Rexwinkle made the following presentation:

Mr. Rexwinkle: Madame Chair and members of the Commission, this is Case 30-09. It's a final plat and final plan for Building G and Parking Garage B in Park Place. This development received preliminary site plan approval from the Planning Commission on April 14<sup>th</sup> and from the Governing Body on May 18<sup>th</sup>. The plan proposes a five-level parking garage identified as Parking Garage B which contains 423 parking spaces and a building identified as Building B which is 71,238 sq. ft. It is a three-story building with the first floor, commercial and the upper two floors, office. The subject site is bounded by 117<sup>th</sup> St. on the south, California Pizza Kitchen and Ash St. on the west, 116<sup>th</sup> St. on the north and undeveloped land within the Park Place plan on the east. Parking Garage B is located immediately north of 117<sup>th</sup> and east of California Pizza Kitchen, and the building is located north of the parking garage. (*Refers to overhead presentation*). These are the elevations proposed for Parking Garage B with a combination of pre-cast concrete, aluminum panels, brick veneer, glass and decorative metal screens. The top of the page shows the south elevation which faces 117<sup>th</sup> St. The middle shows the east elevation on the right-hand side and the west elevation on the left-hand side. The bottom shows the north elevation which would face the alley on the south side of Building G and is proposed to be composed mostly of pre-cast concrete and brick veneer as an accent material with storefront glazing in the area where the stairwell and elevators would be. The west elevation would face California Pizza Kitchen and is proposed to be constructed mostly of pre-cast concrete and brick veneer. The east elevation is proposed to be composed mostly of pre-cast concrete as well with brick veneer and storefront glazing in the area of the stairwell. The east, north and west elevations of the garage are not proposed to be constructed of the same standard and design of the south elevation, which you can see has more detail and more building materials. As a result, in staff's opinion, the elevations as proposed do not comply with certain sections of the Leawood Development Ordinance referenced in Comment One of the Staff Report. These sections require that the buildings are to be designed such that all four sides of a building are constructed to the same standard of design and maintain a consistency in architecture in such that equally valued materials and colors wrap around all elevations as a solid mass and such that all ground floor areas of the garage not required for retail or commercial use or ingress and egress be articulated and designed to create a harmonious appearance with the buildings the garage serves.

We'll move on to Building G (*Places elevation diagram on the overhead.*) The plans show Building G to have ground-level commercial storefronts along the entire north, east and west elevations with a small portion of the south elevation to have commercial

storefronts. The north elevation shown at the bottom of this page is divided into six facades with the predominant building material alternating between stucco and brick on each façade. Staff has recommended that the columns on the north elevation be extended to the ground level to provide a differentiation between the facades at the pedestrian level. The south elevation facing the parking garage consists of one façade predominantly in the center of the building with the storefront facades wrapped around either edge, as is shown in the middle of the page. The majority of the south elevation does not contain ground-level storefronts, and this elevation features architectural styles and materials inconsistent with those found on the other elevations. In staff's opinion, these elevations as proposed do not comply with sections of the Leawood Development Ordinance referenced in Staff Comment No. 2 in the Staff Report. Those sections require that plans avoid long, monotonous, uninterrupted walls and that all four sides of a building be constructed with the same standard of design and maintain a consistency in architecture and such that equally valued materials and colors wrap around all exposed elevations as a solid mass.

The plans were also not submitted with site amenities, for which they received the development bonus with the original Park Place plan. Staff believes amenities such as fountains or statuary should be part of the consideration of the final site plan. The applicant has also suggested that the details of the design of the parking garage are ongoing, and since this is a final site plan staff believes those details should be determined at this point. As a result of non-compliance with referenced sections of the LDO and the evolving design of the garage, staff recommends continuance until the design details comply with the LDO.

Chair Rohlf: Thank you. Questions for staff?

Comm. Williams: Do the previously approved and constructed buildings at Park Place follow the same recommendations you are making for this building? I have two specific points: the first being that the columns extend to the ground level for the retail storefronts and the second being that the currently constructed buildings, including the parking garage, meet the same level of design material requesting on this one.

Mr. Rexwinkle: I don't believe the existing buildings were required to connect columns to the ground level; they certainly aren't built that way.

Mr. Klein: Regarding the four-sided architecture on Building A, which more or less mirrors Building G with the parking garage on one side adjacent to the street and then retail shops on the first floor with office above, the difference between that one and this one is the fact that you have a one-way service drive off Nall Ave. that comes behind and is exclusively a service drive. That area has no destination locations for pedestrian traffic along that alleyway. Staff has always contended, as we brought up at the preliminary plan, that a portion of this façade on the north elevation actually will have storefronts on the western and possibly the eastern portion of it with future destination buildings located farther east. Staff isn't viewing this similarly to Building A with the alley and the first parking garages, as it seems to function a little differently. There is much greater opportunity for people to utilize the sidewalk and to go to other buildings to the east.

Comm. Williams: So your position for taking a different approach on this is that there will be pedestrian traffic going down this alley?

Mr. Klein: Staff feels there is greater potential for pedestrian traffic, yes, that this is not exclusively a service drive.

Comm. Williams: What would you want to see changed to make this meet your definition of four-sided architecture?

Mr. Klein: We'd like to see more variation. They have broken up the façade with the color pattern, but there's not much relief in the building on the eastern half of the south elevation. In addition, we'd like to see a wider sidewalk to allow for pedestrian traffic and pavers to match the north side. I realize that the applicant is trying to keep the storefronts and niceties and detail on the north side because that's the main focus; however, by bringing the storefronts around on the south elevation, unlike on Building A, they are changing the function of the building, we feel, because there will be destination buildings to the east that will be directly accessible from the walkway. I don't know that people are necessarily going to walk out of the parking garage through the via, go on the north side of the building and then go east to access some of these buildings.

Comm. Williams: I don't disagree with what you said. I raise the question that we have so much of this development built and we've had some of these same discussions; yet, it has been allowed. A case in point would be on the east side of that main retail strip. We had the discussion back when the building was proposed and then again when the residential unit to the east and north was presented. It very much looks like the back or alley of a building. This looks a lot better than what is on the back of that building, in my opinion. There is no parking garage across the alley from the other one.

Mr. Klein: Sure, and I think as that case went through, there was a lot of discussion on the back of the building with the residential component and the via that went through the middle of it to the access point where the main streets joined. Originally, I think there was more stucco there, and we tried to bring in a little bit more brick and materials to break up the façade. Staff has always tried to ask for the four-sided architecture. I understand your point about the parking garage at this point; it's just that staff sees this functioning differently.

Mr. Coleman: Our job is really to apply the LDO to the applicant's plans. We're moving forward and trying to make sure the applicant's plans meet the requirements of the LDO as it stands and not so much compare it to what was done in the past.

Comm. Williams: I guess my point is unless the LDO has changed since what has been built, are we now changing the rules?

Mr. Coleman: The existing buildings stand for themselves, the Planning Commission and Council approved those in the past, but this is a new building. It is subject to the same LDO requirements, and so staff is reading those plans, comparing them to the LDO and commenting based on the LDO.

Comm. Williams: Thank you.

Comm. Pateid: I might make a comment. I agree that a parking garage is to be built on the south side of this structure; however, I happened to drive by this afternoon to take a look at it. Roughly 25% of the seating area of the California Pizza Kitchen has a view of

the back of Building B. The back of Building B is broken into four sections; whereas, the front of Building B is eight sections, which (to me) is a very basic divestiture from four-sided construction concept. It's not a matter necessarily of the building's size or construction, but rather articulation and appearance that is counter to what the people of the City of Leawood expect to be moving toward in commercial development, which is something that is very new to this community. Consequently, I view the staff recommendation as part and parcel to the long-term aesthetics we want in the City of Leawood. The warehouse appearance of the back of Building B is objectionable, at least to me.

Chair Rohlf: Could I just correct that to Building G? You're not talking about the parking garage.

Comm. Pateidl: No, I'm talking about Building G; I'm sorry.

Chair Rohlf: Does anyone else have a question for staff? Then we'll hear from the applicant.

**Applicant Presentation:**

Jeff Alpert with Park Place Developers, LLC, 11551 Ash St., Leawood, KS, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Mr. Alpert: Along with me, Melanie Mann; our architects of record, Patrick Lenahan and Jeff Burgess with BDY Architects; our Director of Construction, Ted Lopez and Judd Claussen with Phelps Engineering. There's a lot of information to go through and a lot of stipulations. We'd like to walk through those. Most all of you, with maybe one or two exceptions, were not present when we took this project through the original zoning process in which we discussed in-depth the design philosophy that Park Place carries with it. I thought it might be helpful to revisit that philosophy and take you through some of the concepts that drive the design process for us. First of all, just to walk through in a little more detail the architecture of the two buildings for which we are requesting approval, I'm going to ask Patrick Lenahan to come up and walk through some of that.

Patrick Lenahan with Berger Devine Yaeger Architects, 3700 Broadway, Kansas City, MO, appeared before the Planning Commission, referred to the display boards and made the following comments:

Mr. Lenahan: (*Refers to display boards.*) Just to start with a site plan to orient us, this area in pink is Building G, this is Garage B, and this is the Phase II area of the project. This is the existing California Pizza Kitchen. The components of this complex are designed specifically to front 116<sup>th</sup> St. here, Ash St. on the west side, 117<sup>th</sup> St. on the back. Future buildings will have a pedestrian connection with the garage. In keeping with the rest of the development, Ash and 116<sup>th</sup> St. are the primary commercial street ways of the project. That's where the tenants have storefronts and where the commercial activity occurs. California Pizza Kitchen fronts primarily Ash St. and 117<sup>th</sup> St. The garage, which is similar to the garage along Nall, is fronting that side with parking access off that street. I'll start with Building G. I think staff did a good job of describing the general layout of the building and how it's divided into its various parts, but we see it basically as really three star facades and some other background facades that result in a unified block. This is the west end of the north elevation. That's one of the primary facades. The center façade with the via that connects to the garage

basically centers itself on the block. The buildings in-between fill in that space in a more low-key way. The building on the west end is what I would call a very classical commercial architecture reminiscent of older bank structures, perhaps. It will have quite a bit of glazing to convey that office style above and will be accented by the vertical columns with glazed ceramic tiles and other decorative components to really emphasize those vertical components in contrast to the areas of glazing. The center façade is even more monumental in tone because it is the center of the building and is where pedestrians come in from the garage. It is an all-brick façade in which the brick is used in multiple designs: turned vertically for soldier courses, on end for roll-out courses, as stack bonds and as running bonds. Those are mixed with the window placements and spandrels between, which are treated in a very detailed way with trims and lines of the mullions. The center bay window is finished in metal panels with trims as well, which is very similar to many buildings you see in downtown Kansas City. The easternmost façade is basically a brick portion at the lower level, transitioning to stucco at the upper level. Kansas City has numerous examples of this, particularly in commercial buildings that are nearby residential neighborhoods trying to tie themselves in to some of the shirtwaist-style houses and other stucco and brick houses you see in those neighborhoods. All those facades get trimmed out with some plaster work that mimics the properties and appearance of polished limestone with a little sheen. The intermediate facades include a brick façade with a commercial style with groupings of windows and more soldier-course ribbing. These other intermediate facades will be primarily stucco because they are secondary facades and trimmed out with a number of profiles and some decorative cast-stone elements. The end facades wrap around the ends of the building to acknowledge their exposure to the east and west. The east façade is a continuation of the same building style of a brick base and stucco work. We've added some vertical bay window elements. This gable roof is a faux slate roof with the appearance of the commonly seen slate roofs in Kansas City. On the west side, that same commercial architecture wraps around the west end of the building as well. These facades also wrap around the south ends of the building at key locations. The west façade wraps around the south face of the building, specifically where it is exposed to view behind and above the California Pizza Kitchen restaurant. We took into account that you can see that façade from the intersection of 117<sup>th</sup> and Ash St. and above and behind California Pizza Kitchen as you move along 117<sup>th</sup> St. On the east end of the south façade, this short stretch of building reflects the same gabled architecture of the east end, and it does so particularly here where that pedestrian passage occurs between the future commercial buildings and Building G because that's really the point of prime exposure to that pedestrian activity. The area between this façade faces the parking garage and cannot be seen from 117<sup>th</sup> St.; it's a narrow alley. We really don't want to encourage pedestrian traffic through that alley because we want people walking past the storefronts and shopping. Nevertheless, the materials include architectural pre-cast concrete with some detailing to the top cornice line and a brick base with soldier courses to accent some of the horizontal lines. There will be some storefront with the lobby for the office space where light will come in. There is some articulation with additional columns and trim work around the center where the via occurs and where the overhead bridge occurs from the garage to the office space. Really, those are the points at which that pedestrian activity is concentrated and that we want to reinforce with the architecture. The remaining portions of the facades are frankly difficult to view because of the narrow confines of the alley and parking garage.

*(Continues to refer to the display boards.)* Moving to the parking garage, that same philosophy applies; so the primary façade of the parking garage is the south façade that

faces 117<sup>th</sup> St. We've actually updated this façade a little bit since the last submittal was made because we discerned a solution to one of staff's comments, which was an expressed preference not to use so much in the way of aluminum panels. Where we had an aluminum panel indicated along this bottom line, we have changed that to the decorative metal grille work and have given a little pre-case right above the brick panels so that you have a transition from brick to this thin, pre-cast cap to the decorative metal grilles above that. We've retained the metal fascia along the top, and we think that is still adding a degree of refinement to the façade of this garage by varying the materials a little more. Because those are high in the air, that surface is something that will reflect sunlight with sheen and, we think, will add a bit of variety beyond the basic language of the pre-cast and the brick. The other facades respond to the direction to which they are facing. The west façade primarily has its point of articulation at the corner that faces 117<sup>th</sup> and California Pizza Kitchen with these vertical pre-cast and brick elements and some vertical steel elements. At the northwest corner where our stairwells and elevators are, there is a little exposure to some pedestrian access and California Pizza Kitchen out of the garage. That has been developed with brick work and pre-cast work as well. On the east side, the main point of articulation is the stair tower at the northeast corner, which relates to where the pedestrian sidewalks in front of the future tenants occur. On the north elevation, those points are explicitly related to where the corner faces those future tenants and, at this point, where the connection to the via and Building G occurs. Again, this zone between those highlighted points of the building is simply not very exposed to view. The approach is to spend the money where you see it, and that's at the ends and at the crosswalks.

*(Continues to refer to display boards.)* Staff also mentioned that we have been working on the detailing of that screening to determine how it really works. It's been a time-consuming process to arrive at this because we're trying to respond to so many points of view about the garage. We've basically arrived at these decorative metal grilles that will be applied in a plane ahead of the curtain wall center. As much as you see the glass panels on the west side of the garage at Nall, you will see that same feature on this building; but at the spandrel locations, there will be another layer of development with the decorative metal grilles. Those will cast shadows against the spandrel panels and create some really nice effects. At other points of the building, we don't have that curtain wall; it's just a grille that screens the slope of the ramps in front, giving it a bit more transparency and depth. We have a sample of the material. This is not the pattern, but it is the material *(refers to material sample)*. It is a cut-out metal material, painted to a color we specify. We'll use something very similar to this, just maybe not quite as thick. It will mount to the building ahead of the curtain wall. With respect to the architecture, that really covers it. If you have any questions, I'd be happy to answer them.

Comm. Elkins: Can you tell me, on a comparison basis, how the length of Parking Structure B compares to the length of Parking Structure A that currently exists?

Mr. Lenahan: Having not been involved in Parking Garage A, I don't know its precise length. Judging from the current site plan, I'd say Garage B is about 2/3 – 3/4 the length of Garage A. It's about 70' shorter.

Comm. Williams: On your south elevation, the wide band on the ramp going down is actually a wall behind your curtain wall so that the cars are out of view?

Mr. Lenahan: That's correct

Comm. Williams: Then going to the back of the building where you talk about pre-cast concrete panels, help us understand (for those who are not familiar) the process of pre-cast panels. Are they cast completely off-site and set up in place? Ultimately, why a pre-cast concrete wall panel in this case?

Mr. Lenahan: In this case, the building is actually going to be framed entirely of pre-cast concrete components. We're using a system of pre-cast columns, hollow pre-cast floor and roof planks that allows us to get a clear span inside the space with no columns. It also provides a smooth finish to the underside of each floor deck, which Jeff has seen as potentially marketable to certain kinds of office tenants who may not have the traditional approach to doing office space with suspended acoustic ceilings and things like that. So that smooth finish is really an asset, and it will go up very fast. As part of that, a lot of our lateral load resistance for the building is going to occur via these concrete panels in the back wall. They will help to stiffen the building in the lateral direction. We are able to use that architecturally as well. They will be cast at the plant and will be an architectural-grade finish with color and texture specified by us. They will employ brick embedded in the base of the pre-cast panel. At the base of our elevations, the panel will come out finished, and we'll add some trim pieces to finish up the top. The windows will be inserted after the fact as well. It also allows us to get a finish on that wall without having to resort to a lot of stucco, which we've tried to reduce on the project. The use of pre-cast on this panel, coupled with the use of pre-cast on the garage side gives us a little bit of unity in that alley, even though we're not trying to encourage the alley as a true architectural feature.

Comm. Williams: Are the ends of the building that have very different architecture being built out of pre-cast also, and then how are the facades being built?

Mr. Lenahan: This particular by right (*referring to display board*) here will be the pre-cast. We're going to have to build a façade over it in order to get this detail. The pre-cast panel will not be seen in that location because we're adding a second façade essentially at that point. Again, this portion of the building is what's exposed at 117<sup>th</sup> St. Once you get past this point, the garage starts to block the view, so the level of detail wasn't as necessary. The two end bays and the end bay over here are not the pre-cast construction. We don't need the lateral load resistance the full length of the building, so we were able to build those the same as we're building the other three facades.

Comm. Williams: What would you see as being possible with that pre-cast?

Mr. Lenahan: Our direction from the owner is not to do much more than what we've done. There are some things you can do with some reveals and a little bit of profiling with pre-cast. To get much beyond that, you would have to build a second façade on top of the building to get to this level of detailing, which would be quite an expense.

Comm. Williams: Again, point out on that façade where the garage would stop.

Mr. Lenahan: The garage pretty much mirrors this stretch of façade here (*referring to display boards*). From here to here is covered by the garage in the same elevation.

Comm. Williams: The windows on the backside are real?

Mr. Lenahan: Those are real. The way the second-floor office space plays out, that will likely be a common corridor that links the stair towers of the building so there won't actually be office space against the windows unless the tenant carries the entire floor.

Comm. Williams: I see someone brought in a sample of the brick, but do you have a sample of what this concrete finish is going to look like?

Mr. Lenahan: We can't get a sample of the pre-cast yet. We're starting to have trouble getting samples from suppliers on a lot of buildings unless those suppliers are guaranteed they will get the job.

Comm. Williams: Since I think this may be potentially one of the first pre-cast walls in the City of Leawood outside of garage construction on the Nall side, what might be some buildings in the Kansas City area that would be similar in wall construction and finish?

Mr. Alpert: I can give you one example: the Quintiles building on 115<sup>th</sup> just west of Lamar. I believe there's a three-story office building on 133<sup>rd</sup> between Roe and Nall.

Mr. Lenahan: The new IRS building downtown is pre-cast, although it is a very different style.

Comm. Rezac: Speaking of that, is there any pattern in the pre-cast?

Mr. Lenahan: We've mainly restrained it to reveals at this point – the vertical points that occur between each panel - and we've got a couple of horizontal reveals associated with the windows. We really concentrated the more detailed scale of material use at the pedestrian level with the use of the recessed brick and panels. We've got brick in a couple of different colors and two different orientations. It's more akin to what is currently at the west side of Building A.

Comm. Williams: No further questions on my part.

Comm. Jackson: What's the percentage of exposed pre-cast on that south elevation?

Mr. Lenahan: It's an aggregate of southwest and southeast elevation together. On that façade, the exposed pre-cast is more like 60%, but it amounts to 11% of the total building.

Comm. Jackson: Thank you.

Comm. Heiman: Mr. Alpert, I'm looking at this and trying to get a comparison. When you're leaving Parking Garage B heading toward building G, I know we're not calling it a service alley. As you're leaving Parking Deck A and going into Building A in the center there, is that similar to what we're talking about here?

Mr. Alpert: Yes, it's the same concept.

Comm. Heiman: I've done that trek many times, and never would I have walked right or left from the via. That's my only question.

Mr. Alpert: (*Begins a Park Place Design Philosophy PowerPoint*) Like I said at the beginning, I thought it would be helpful to review some of the underlying design philosophies that drive these drawings that you see. We want to start with the design philosophy that the design of Park Place is an urban-style mixed-use community. When we say "urban-style" it means high-density, tall buildings that are close together – something more like what you would experience in a downtown area, as opposed to a suburb. Rather than have buildings set in the middle of parking lots with asphalt all around and a few trees here and there, we really strive to create what we call a *Main Street Experience*, where we use the street as an outdoor room. The distance between the buildings, the height of the buildings and the width of the sidewalks related to the width of the street all go to create a feel that you get when you walk down this street. If you've walked down our Park Place streets, primarily Ash Street at this point, you get a certain feeling that you don't find anywhere else in Leawood. It's intended to be unique, and it is really the underlying concept of this design. We utilized varied reality-based architecture. We have a building like the Aloft Hotel, which is relatively contemporary, next to a more traditional building like the Aubrey Building, creating that reality in variety. It's an attempt to replicate what might have been done over many, many years if the project had evolved and we weren't trying to get it completed in a short period of time. You can see it on the Country Club Plaza which began in the 1920's. You see traditional, Spanish, contemporary design all mixed together. What our design firm, Street Works, has taught us is that we develop a design hierarchy which responds to the needs of our tenants and their customers. In doing that, we have three different zones that we try to identify on the site plan. The first is the Primary Zone. It is where our primary public spaces occur, where the highest volume of pedestrian activity and energy take place, where our storefronts and entrances are located. It's the highest level of design and material and also is the highest level of sidewalk finish, which includes landscaping. (*Refers to Primary Zone diagram on the overhead.*) In this plan, you can see all the blue represents this Primary Zone of architecture. If you follow the arrow, you've got Ash St. running north and south and 116<sup>th</sup> St. running east and west. Those are where our shops and restaurants are located and where we put the most attention to detail. You can see it at the entrance to the Aubrey Building. You get the feel that it's unique; it represents the feel of an outdoor room. (*Refers to Secondary Zone presentation.*) The Secondary Zone is what we define as having lower volume of pedestrian activity. It might include storefronts, but not store entrances. The building design and materials are similar to what would be found in the Primary Zone. We would typically have a somewhat lower level of sidewalk design with not quite as significant landscaping or street furniture. It does include landscaping and street trees. The sidewalks could be pavers or concrete. Examples of that would be along Nall where you have visibility but you don't have a high level of pedestrian activity. Along 117<sup>th</sup> St., we have that Secondary Zone. The portion of the street between California Pizza Kitchen and Building G we consider to be that same secondary zone as well. We don't expect much pedestrian traffic there, but there might be some. Again, since the entrance to the parking structure is located on the west end and cars will be going in and out, we feel that section of the street deserves a higher level of finish. Our Nall parking structure is an example of that. The north end of the Becker building has barely any sidewalk, but we have dressed it up to a higher level. (*Refers to Service Zone presentation.*) The third zone is the Service Zone where we have little or no pedestrian activity. It has the rear store entrances for deliveries and employees. The building design is minimal, and the materials are more basic. We do concrete sidewalks, and we have no landscaping or street trees in that zone. All of the areas in pink are what we consider the Service Zone areas, including the south side of Building G, the north side of the parking garage, the

area between California Pizza Kitchen and the parking garage and so on. You can see where we have that minimum level of finish except at the point where the via occurs and you can walk from the parking structure to the via and through to the retail street. That gives you a sense of how we arrive at the design hierarchy and how we come up with our designs. (*Refers to display boards*) In the case of Building G and the parking structure, we firmly believe that section of this service drive has cars entering in here, exiting and going to the west. It is one-way from this point east for service vehicles only. While we acknowledge an occasional person may walk up and down this alley, our intent is to discourage the activity, and one of the ways to do that is to make it a less pleasant place to walk. If we create a high level of design and finish along the east and north ends of the building, we believe people will walk that way and across because it's a more pleasant experience. The via is a high level of finish. Other than that, we believe we are respecting the hierarchy by creating a lower level of finish in this area and putting those dollars where we think they are most important along the north elevation and then wrapping around the west end. If you have any questions, I'd be happy to answer them at this point. Then I'd like to walk through some of these stipulations and maybe try to get a sense of where we might be.

Comm. Pateidl: Looking at your plot plan, there's a future Building J and a future Building K on the east end of Building G and Parking Garage B. Is that the via between those two buildings, or is that a walkway between those two future buildings?

Mr. Alpert: (*Refers to display boards*) When we come in with the final design for these buildings, they won't look much like this. The intent is that there will be a continuous storefront from this point up to this point. Most likely, there will be a service drive back here. The Primary Zone will be here on the west edge of those buildings.

Comm. Pateidl: My concern is you've got future residential development being built to the east of this complex. This plot plan looked like we would be feeding pedestrians into the area of the parking garage or the alleyway. When we were in the preliminary of this plot plan, we talked about having a traffic engineer advise us about the safety issues related to that one-way or two-way street. Also, is there an issue between you and staff as it relates to the width of the sidewalks on the south side of Building G?

Mr. Alpert: To answer your first question, I believe that has been resolved and Mr. Ley might want to speak to that. We did have a traffic engineer look at that, and I believe they agreed with our recommendation to have two-way traffic only to the point of entry to the garage and then one-way traffic for service vehicles on east to the end of the block.

Comm. Pateidl: Do we have that report in concurrence with Mr. Alpert's interpretation?

Mr. Ley: Yes, Transystems submitted a traffic study, and they just briefly described their recommendation on that alley.

Comm. Pateidl: That's fine. The second part relates to the width of the sidewalk. Do we need a deviation on that matter?

Mr. Klein: We're looking for an agreement. There is no specific LDO requirement for the sidewalk; however, if they have storefronts, the LDO states an 8' minimum width. Wherever there is a storefront entrance, they do need to have an 8' wide sidewalk. We feel the sidewalk along the south side of Building G needs to be wider to reflect the

possible pedestrian traffic. That's where the applicant and staff are at a disagreement. They did try to increase the width of the sidewalk with some bump-outs on the south side of the parking garage adjacent to 117<sup>th</sup> St. which pushed the building back a bit farther. That ate into what they were giving us on the sidewalk on that other side. That's one of the issues staff would like to address with the applicant and is part of the reason we are recommending a continuance.

Comm. Pateidl: But one way or the other, that's not a deal breaker.

Mr. Klein: Staff would really like to see it meeting the ordinance.

Mr. Lenahan: Just to add to that, we've actually done some analysis to the width. The preliminary plan submittal had a stipulation to take 3' off the sidewalk on the north side of Garage G and add it back to the south side of Building G. At the same time, we were also trying to get some articulation to the façade to create variety in the face plane. By the time we did that with both the garage and building, those offsets took away those 3'. We added it up here, and we found that the thickness of the architectural components of the garage and the offsets in the building took away the space. At the narrowest point on the east end, we've got a sidewalk 5'3" wide; when that building cuts back again, we get another 1 ½' back, so 6'8 ½" along most of that length.

Mr. Alpert: If I could add, the only way to achieve 8' at this point is to either A) move the entire complex of buildings and the alley to the north and take it out of the sidewalk on the north side of Building G, which really goes to the heart of our design concept in a negative way or B) take it out of the building. Now you're talking about economics. The building is a couple hundred feet long. Taking 2' out of the building is 1,000 sq. ft. and is significant dollars. Again, if we are going to use it for what we believe it should be intended for, which is just service activities, then the 5' – 6 ½', we think, is more than sufficient. I believe it's actually a little wider than the sidewalk we have either on the Aubrey Building or the Becker Building.

Comm. Jackson: Mr. Alpert, remind me how people in that parking garage get to buildings on the east side – J and K.

Mr. Alpert: (*Refers to display boards*) They can actually walk on a sidewalk here and across a drop-off and go directly into the parking structure. We will have vertical circulation in the northeast corner of the parking garage with a stair tower and elevator, so without having to cross this street, they can actually enter into the parking structure here, go to any of the upper levels and walk to their car.

Comm. Jackson: But if they're unfamiliar with the layout and park just anywhere in that parking garage, I'm guessing they'd probably go down to the street level and walk east.

Mr. Alpert: If you're unfamiliar, chances are the first thing you're going to do is head for this location, go to the ground and walk through the via to get on the main public street. If you are accessing these buildings on the east end, you're probably going to walk down the ramp and cross the street and be in those buildings.

Comm. Jackson: Are you talking about the ramp inside the parking garage?

Mr. Alpert: Right, people do in every parking garage. You park your car and walk for a certain distance along a drive lane until you get to a point of either exit or vertical circulation. It's no different than a parking lot.

Comm. Heiman: Is there parking on the street between the buildings?

Mr. Alpert: Yes, along 116<sup>th</sup> St.

Comm. Heiman: What about between Buildings J and K?

Mr. Alpert: No, I think this will come out more when we come in for development approval for these buildings because they will change somewhat in configuration. This is designed as a drop-off; this is not intended to be parking. There won't be any street parking along this short section of that street.

Comm. Neff-Brain: It's clear that staff is requesting a continuance to get some items cleared up. Is yours a timing issue? What are the parameters?

Mr. Alpert: Yes, we have a 25,000' national insurance company with whom we have a signed lease, and we have to deliver their space by October of 2010, which means we have to be under construction by the end of August.

Comm. Neff-Brain: How long will it take you to get plans to the point that staff would feel more comfortable with them?

Mr. Alpert: I think what we're talking about here is a difference in philosophy. We firmly believe that the plan we have is consistent in every respect with the plans we had brought in and had approved for the first phase. It is consistent with all the design philosophies for Park Place. Quite frankly, we don't know where to go. If it was an issue of a little added articulation on a building façade or a color that somebody didn't like, that's something we can deal with. Even the issue we had with the parking structure where we came in with a revised plan tonight was a response to an issue staff had that we felt was a reasonable concern, and we addressed it. We didn't meet the LDO on our first phase. This is absolutely 100% consistent with Phase One, which I hope I've been able to demonstrate to you tonight.

There are a couple other issues I'd like to address; the next issue relates to Stipulation No. 7i, requesting us to revise elevations of Building G which show columns from each individual façade extending to the ground. Going back to philosophy, storefronts are, without a doubt, the key component of creating the character of our pedestrian-oriented street. We believe the storefronts should reflect the individual character of the retail tenants versus the character of the architecture above and that the retail character should envelop the base of the building architecture; therefore, the base building should not – except maybe at special gateway entrances – extend to the ground. An example of that would be at the via where the architecture carries all the way to the ground, framing the opening. I can show you some examples that we have collected over the years to demonstrate this architectural concept. (*Refers to overhead display*) This is Santana Row in San Jose, CA. You can see the storefront doesn't really relate to the building above; it really is its own entity. It steps back from the façade above and clearly doesn't continue that architecture. Z Gallery, also in Santana Row, shows two different building sections. You can see the change in color of the banding just above the

storefront. Here, Z Gallery bridged those two building concepts and did not carry that architecture down to ground level. This is a building in Boston where you can see the storefront actually extends to the left of the building and carries on out. Again, it's what the pedestrian on the street experiences. They really don't see the building above, so carrying that architecture to ground level doesn't have a lot of meaning for the pedestrian. This is FAO Schwarz on the Plaza. You can see the storefront carries its own character across and doesn't really bear any relationship in terms of materials to the façade of the second floor. Any questions on that?

In that case, I'd like to go to Stipulation 7j. The staff has requested a revised landscape plan showing landscaping and paver patterns at the northeast corner of Building G. (*Refers to display boards*) The landscape plan that we have provided with the application shows the landscaping held back to this point on the corner and back to a point that is roughly even with the north façade of the building here. The idea is to keep this open. You can see there is no landscaping in here so we don't impede pedestrian traffic movement coming across this crosswalk and down the street or across this crosswalk. This is all pavers and is designed to keep the corner more open. It's the exact same concept as what would be the northeast corner of the Aubrey building up here. Based on that, we would request that stipulation be removed.

Comm. Pateidl: I'm sorry Mr. Alpert took on 7j before 7i and I didn't get a chance to raise a question, but we've heard his comments regarding the architectural theme he's professing. What's the rebuttal from the staff? What are your feelings with respect to the columns and the articulation of the storefront?

Mr. Coleman: Our concern is that the buildings don't float and that when they get done with the architecture on the ground floor, there is a connection between the upper building and the lower building. I would respectfully disagree with some of the comments Mr. Alpert made about, for example, the FAO Schwarz building. The only difference in those columns is that FAO Schwarz painted those columns a different color than the top. Originally, the columns went all the way to the base and give the feeling of weight for that building. This is a pre-cast building. In those places with nothing coming to the ground, there will be a concrete column there because the pre-cast panels have to be held up by something. The question is what those columns will be wrapped with. It should reflect something of that original building because these buildings are all trying to imitate 1920's brick-constructed buildings, not pre-cast or steel facades. Generally the columns were all masonry architecture, and the weight of those buildings had to be carried to the ground. That's what we're after. The other issue with the architecture is we don't feel the parking garage very much relates to Building G in its architecture, and we don't think the building is even successful as the parking structure that was built on Nall, which is sunken below Nall quite a bit. This structure is not; it sits right up on 117<sup>th</sup> St. The north façade, if you caught it in the slides Mr. Alpert presented, is hidden by another building in the entry. Awnings and glass windows on that entire north façade that wrap that corner hide the building. On the parking structure we were just talking about on the east façade, where there are going to be two new retail buildings, that's a pedestrian way along there with a drop-off. Those are going to be facing the east elevation of this parking garage, which is not articulated. The façade of the parking garage primarily comes out as cast concrete, standard parking garage that has some ornamental ironwork on it and glass and metal with a large metal façade at the top. We can't see that this is consistent with the architecture for Building G.

Chair Rohlf: I think before we move further, we need to decide how we're going to continue this meeting. In looking at this as a final plan, there are so many stipulations and sub-parts of stipulations that, I think, are open for so much more discussion. Some of these are truly compliance with the LDO. I don't know where staff is willing to give and where we're not willing to give. I don't see how we are in a position this evening to go through these stipulations one-by-one and come up with what we would approve or deny. I think there are a number of outstanding issues here and can see why staff asked for a continuance. You have brought in some revised plans based on comments staff has made. They have asked for lots of things to be decided before you would even go before the Governing Body. I don't know what your thoughts are, Mr. Coleman, but I don't see how we have enough information on these LDO requirements to move forward on a number of these items this evening.

Mr. Coleman: We agree that bringing in the metal is an improvement we asked for, but we haven't had a chance to look at what he brought in and make any comments on it. That's one of the reasons we asked for the continuance to July 14<sup>th</sup>.

Chair Rohlf: Is there anything else in the staff report that you would anticipate changing before taking this plan to City Council, or is this where you stand right now?

Mr. Alpert: We truly believe we have brought in a quality design that reflects all the design characteristics and philosophies that have driven Park Place from the very beginning. We're very happy with this, and I frankly don't know what, of significance, we would change. I'll give you a couple examples. The columns sit back of the façade. You don't need to wrap columns from the outside. We've got lots of examples in Park Place now where the façade just goes right over the front of structural columns, so that's not an issue. When you have two buildings come together and you continue some kind of column down to the ground, you're talking somewhere in the neighborhood of 2'-3' of column with another 2' of column right next to it to carry the next building design; so basically you've got 4' of columns that takes 4' of storefront out in what may be a very strategic area for a store. These are the kinds of things that have to be considered. It's not just about making a building look at certain way, but about making it functional as well. Because we're in the business of leasing retail, we have to maintain maximum flexibility for our tenants. Again, it goes back to the design philosophy that the retail storefront is really what drives the bus on this thing because it's what people see when they're walking down the sidewalk. This isn't new; this is exactly what we've done on Phase One. We don't see how we can change it without significantly compromising not only our principles but what Park Place has been from its inception to this point.

Comm. Neff-Brain: We have 28 stipulations, some of them with a huge number of sub-parts. There's got to be agreement on some of these. I'd like to see the disagreement because this is overwhelming.

Mr. Alpert: We actually have no problem with any stipulation on this list, other than No. 7. Now, No. 7 is a monster, but if you start breaking it down, you've got, I believe, Stipulations b through h that all speak to pretty much the exact same thing, and that is the design philosophy. If you determine that you have to go by the letter of the LDO, then I would imagine you have to vote for these stipulations; but if you believe that the design philosophy for Park Place is a good design philosophy and what needs to continue, I don't think those stipulations belong in this approval.

Comm. Neff-Brain: Are you okay with everything but b through h?

Mr. Alpert: No, and I can go through them one-by-one if you'd like.

Comm. Williams: I think that might be beneficial for the body to find out where you have the strongest disagreement with the staff.

Mr. Alpert: I'll start with 7a. We talked about the width of the sidewalk on the south side of Building G, and we've designed it anywhere from 5' – 6'8". Given that it's a service area, we feel that is adequate. Stipulations b through h, I think you understand where we are on that one. Stipulation 7i is the issue of the columns going all the way to the ground. I hope I've been clear on the reasons we feel that is not warranted. Stipulation 7j was the paver area on the northeast corner of Building J. Hopefully I explained why we feel that is not appropriate. 7k, we're fine with. 7l, I haven't addressed. This is the issue of rooftop equipment and the site lines and visibility of that equipment. I think we're in agreement that if the equipment is visible, it needs to be screened. Where we have a problem is the sentence that reads, "The top of the parapet shall be a greater height than the top of the mechanical equipment." Now, if the parapet is 4' high and the mechanical equipment is 6' high but sits 30' back of the parapet, then from a site line perspective, nobody's going to see it. We certainly agree with the screening concept; it's just that we want that one sentence struck. Moving on to Stipulation 7m, because of the complicated nature of everything we're doing, we haven't had the opportunity to specify the street furniture and other amenities that will go on the street. It's always been our intent to continue along the same line as the existing furniture. We've always intended that our signage package and our street amenities would come back to you before installation. Stipulation 7n was a request from the staff to change our material elevation sheets so that only the materials that are on a sheet are shown on the sheet. We have a palette of materials, and it is on each colored elevation sheet, which I believe you have in front of you. Not every one of those materials is on every elevation, but rather than pick the ones that are on each sheet, in the interest of saving the architects time and the developers money, they put all the materials on each sheet. Each one is designated so you can easily reference a brick. 7o and 7p, we actually have a model that we were hoping would be complete for tonight, but it did not get done. We're not sure the LDO requires both, but rather just the model. 7q, We get a sense of what they want, but since there was no explanation in the comments, we weren't exactly sure. We want smooth and safe traffic flow, so in this instance, once we understand what exactly is being requested, I'm sure we can work that one out. That's it.

Chair Rohlf: One of the things we never really came to a decision on is No. 8. I believe we deleted it from the preliminary plan stipulations. Is that correct, Mark?

Mr. Klein: It was deleted from the preliminary plan, but it's been determined that this body and the Governing Body doesn't have the ability to waive that LDO requirement; therefore, before the applicant can proceed and get Governing Body approval for this final plan, that would have to be repealed or changed. We do have it scheduled for the meeting on the 23<sup>rd</sup> to amend the LDO.

Comm. Neff-Brain: So the basic disagreement between the applicant and staff is 7a through 7j and that one sentence in 7l. How different is the parking structure in the building that's built now? You say you feel like this architecture is very different from the

building to the parking garage. Do you feel what is constructed now is more in compliance with each other?

Mr. Coleman: I think it's more integrated into the complex because it's actually connected at the second level from the north end to the building. You drive underneath offices that have windows and awnings on the north façade.

Mr. Alpert: It's just an office building that happens to wrap around the north end of that parking structure.

Mr. Coleman: It is more nestled in there because it's down below Nall one or two levels, and this one is maybe 3'-4' below 117<sup>th</sup>. If you just forget about all the other buildings in Park Place and think about this garage, this garage could be basically anywhere.

Mr. Rexwinkle: Comparing this alley to the one between Building A and Parking Garage A, that alley connects Nall to the north portion of the Park Place site; whereas, this one connects two internal portions of the Park Place site. On the west end of the alley, you've got the Aloft Hotel, California Pizza Kitchen and Ash St.; on the east end, you've got potential buildings J and K with storefronts facing the east end of the alley. Staff disagrees in the sense we believe there's a likelihood pedestrians will use this alley as the plan builds out. We want to make sure it's accommodating to pedestrians. We understand that it doesn't have the storefronts that the north elevation in Building G has, but it should accommodate pedestrians safely. One of our concerns is about the width of the sidewalk on the south side of Building G. We want it wider partially because the service doors on the south side of Building G open outward onto the sidewalk. They may be 3' wide, and we're concerned about pedestrian safety on that sidewalk.

Comm. Neff-Brain: Could those open in?

Mr. Alpert: They're actually set in. We've pulled them back in approximately 3' so when the door opens, the edge of the door is even with the edge of the façade, and so that is not an issue. We'd be happy to pull them back in if we need to. They do need to open out for fire code.

Comm. Rezac: How many columns are we talking about? There are some columns on the elevation now, and it appears we're only talking about 4-5 columns.

Mr. Coleman: There are a few. The main ones we're concerned about are the ones at the corners of the buildings. For example, on the west building, we feel the façade has been properly articulated. We're more concerned about the articulation on the building on the east façade where there is nothing shown. It wraps all the way around the alley, but then it stops one unit short of where it is on the front of the building and becomes the long pre-cast section.

Mr. Rexwinkle: For a direct number, we might be talking about three on the north elevation: the very east end of the north elevation and also the second to last façade toward the west end of the north elevation.

Comm. Neff-Brain: So those columns are hidden?

Mr. Alpert: The actual structural columns sit back. When they say “columns” I think they’re really just talking about a detailing of structure that would carry the façade down in front of an existing column.

Comm. Neff-Brain: So it's more of an ornamental thing.

Mr. Alpert: Right.

Comm. Roberson: The current stores don’t have that if I remember right.

Mr. Alpert: Some do; some don’t.

Comm. Roberson: But the storefronts were put in by the storefront owners.

Mr. Alpert: Correct, and in some cases, they incorporated those columns; in some cases, they removed them. In one case, they just painted it in to match the storefront that they put in. There is no consistency. Again, if you look at some of the pictures I brought, you see instances where they just go right over them. Typically you’re going to have a structural column, but you have a veneer of some kind over it that either gets carried to the ground in some manner or gets replaced by the storefront façade design.

Comm. Roberson: I guess what you’re saying is even if you did carry them down to the ground level, that a storefront could come in and literally remove those.

Mr. Alpert: Unless you didn’t approve the storefront because they took away your column. Certainly, somebody could come in and take them out.

Comm. Williams: I think the picture of Z Gallery speaks to the fact that you have the structural column, but it’s integrated into the storefront instead of being an extension of the stucco above. As a result, the Z Gallery storefront looks very nice and would look very different with yellow stucco running to the ground.

Comm. Roberson: Couldn’t agree more.

Comm. Rezac: Just to be clear, you had shown a diagram that showed Primary, Secondary and Service Area. Is the service area between the garage and Building G flanked by two primary corridors?

Mr. Alpert: I’ve got the plan on the screen.

Comm. Rezac: So there’s a secondary corridor on the west side.

Mr. Alpert: Yes, the section opposite California Pizza Kitchen. If you look at the elevation, you can clearly see a higher level of finish on that section on the west end.

Comm. Roberson: I would contend that the secondary section should be a primary because people are going to come out of that garage and walk west. There’s going to be more traffic than you’d expect.

Comm. Rezac: That was my concern. To me, it almost seems like there's a service piece there that's being forced between what will be two primary pieces. Visually, that will be noticed.

Mr. Alpert: If you look at the way we've designed it, it really is primary in all respects. The only reason it would not be considered primary is we would likely not have a store entrance on that side. If you look at the architecture and the fact that we continue the storefront around where you see the voids on the ground level, the width of the sidewalk and landscaping around there, it really is finished to a primary level in almost every respect. (*Refers to display boards*) Looking at the elevation from this point over, you can see the high level of finish on the face of the building. If you look at the site plan, we've got wider sidewalks, planters, street trees, high quality street lighting. It's all finished to that high level in this particular section here.

Comm. Williams: In many respects, it's finished to a much higher level than California Pizza Kitchen.

Mr. Alpert: I think you're right. (*Refers to a photo of California Pizza Kitchen*)

Comm. Rezac: Back to the service area, from what you're describing, it sounds like you do not see people walking from the area on the west side that we were just discussing down to Buildings J and K.

Mr. Alpert: I can't stand here and tell you nobody will walk down that way, but the whole idea is not to encourage it. We want people to walk around and down our main street. First of all, we want people to shop. If they're walking down the back alley, they're not going to window shop. It's not just about the shortest distance between two points; it's about the experience that we're trying to provide for the patrons of Park Place.

Comm. Rezac: I understand that, but I think human nature will take some people down that road.

Mr. Alpert: Yes, I guess you can make it a first-class experience to go every single direction you can possibly go, or you can encourage people to go the way you want them to go. Not everybody will, but most people will because it's more fun. I'm not sure we could ever really create that highest level of experience walking along the backs of shops and blank doors no matter what we did back there.

Comm. Neff-Brain: If you go out the parking garage directly through the building, you'd get to the north side, but if you turn left to go down the alley, then there are two storefronts across from California Pizza's north side?

Mr. Alpert: We've created an opportunity for storefronts, but again, we will not probably let a store have an entrance on that side.

Comm. Neff-Brain: But there would be big windows. I don't really have a problem with the pre-cast as you go east; it's as you go west because I think people are going to come out of that parking garage and go west to get up to California Pizza Kitchen and by those two storefronts. You've got three sections of pre-cast concrete as you come west.

Mr. Alpert: Yes, it's finished to a higher level, but that has to be blank because that's the exit stair for the offices above and the mechanical rooms. (*Refers to overhead diagram*) We would not be able to have storefronts in this section no matter what. From this point west to the end of the building, these would be glass storefronts finished to look like the other side of the stores.

Comm. Neff-Brain: But going to the east, you've got three sections before you come to the area where you go under the building to go to the north. If you're coming out the parking garage on the other side, wouldn't you tend to come out at that point and turn west to go up to Ash? It seems to me where that street widens up, you're going to have more pedestrian traffic because people will come out of the parking garage at that point and turn west.

Mr. Alpert: I can't stand here and tell you that nobody will do that. Again, our intent is to draw people through the via and get them to the north side of the building and on the main retail street. We've got pavers all the way to this point. If a person does what you're suggesting, he would be walking on a higher-finish sidewalk from this point west.

Comm. Jackson: That parking garage is just such a prominent piece of this - unfortunately because I know you don't want it to be - but it is as you come along 117<sup>th</sup> St. and as you start to enter. It's a prominent building in Leawood just because of the huge expanse of Town Center that's open behind it. I know that's not what you would prefer to have opposite you, but that is what's there; so this building is going to stick out. I'm afraid it's going to stick out like a sore thumb if it's not classed up a little bit. I like what you've added; I think that does a great deal. I'm not quite convinced it's enough. I'd like staff to be able to look at it more and tell me what they think of it. I also think the experience begins as you walk out of your parking garage, so to have 60% pre-cast concrete right there is a bit too much.

Mr. Alpert: I'm not sure where you're talking about.

Comm. Jackson: The south side of Building G is where your experience is starting in Park Place. You're saying at eye level, they're going to be seeing more brick. I guess to a layperson like me, if you could scale it for me so I could see that, it would be helpful.

*Inaudible comments*

Comm. Jackson: So the darker is the red and the lighter is the light brick.

*Inaudible comments*

Comm. Jackson: Is there some way, when you get the modeling done that you're going to do, that you could help me see that? It also depends on the distance between the garage and that other building as to how much of Building G I see as I come out of that parking garage.

Mr. Alpert: If they flip back to the computer, I could show you a picture of the Aubrey building and the garage we have up and what you see when you come out of that.

Comm. Jackson: And it's the same distance?

Mr. Alpert: It's pretty much the exact same distance. It's almost the exact same condition with a framed opening into the via, an office lobby to the left with storefront and then a brick level on both sides.

Comm. Jackson: Instead of the white concrete, it will be paver all down that side.

Mr. Alpert: Pavers to the left.

Comm. Neff-Brain: Is that brick on the base?

Mr. Alpert: Yes.

Comm. Pateidl: Masonry or pre-cast, I think, is the question.

Mr. Alpert: This is laid up as traditional brick, but in terms of thin-set brick on pre-cast, it virtually is the exact same look.

Comm. Pateidl: But it's what we're looking at here?

*Inaudible comments*

Comm. Jackson: What was the top material on that building with the brick on the bottom?

Mr. Alpert: It's stucco above that one. It's got tone and texture to it and is designed to be an attractive finish material.

Comm. Neff-Brain: I think we need to see that.

Comm. Jackson: It's hard to imagine. That's a lot of our difficulty, I believe.

Chair Rohlf: I'm not really sure where we are on this particular point this evening. I haven't heard from all of the Commissioners. Mr. Williams, Mr. Elkins, I don't know how you feel about the present state of the stipulations. I'm not sure anyone here would be able to carve out modifications to these stipulations that would be appropriate for a vote this evening. If I'm mistaken, please let me know otherwise.

Comm. Williams: Madame Chair, I'll start with my comments. I'm in large agreement with the applicant on the concept of primary facades and treatment and so forth. Because I have more experience with building materials, I don't have a problem with the pre-cast concrete in itself, depending on what the actual color and finish is. This could begin to look like the stucco they already have. I don't think you're going to go out and do architectural treatments with big aggregates sticking out, but it would be good to see a sample - even if it's not a physical board sample but just a photograph - of what this surface might look like. I understand the staff's point when they talk about four-sided architecture in the stipulation in the LDO, but I think if you look at the LDO and at your typical development in the City of Leawood or anywhere else in suburbia, you're talking about a building that is, to a large extent, free-standing; it's not a building that's on an alley very close to another building as we have at the Park Place. You want the four-sided architecture so you see the building more complete. With the building on an alley with limited visibility, I think you have the opportunity to scale it back a little bit. I think

they've done a reasonable job in doing so. The last photo of the parking garage and existing building is not an unpleasant façade. It doesn't have the same degree of ornamentation of the front side, but for limited use and visibility, it's appropriate to me. I'd like to ask staff about the objections to the metal panels on the garage. Is it because you didn't see what they were going to look like?

Mr. Coleman: We haven't seen a sample of it, but it appears to be basically a luco bond.

Comm. Williams: Oh, it's that metal panel, not the decorative grate?

Mr. Coleman: Correct.

Comm. Williams: Okay, so if it's a luco bond type product, you have a problem with that on this garage?

Mr. Coleman: I don't have a problem with the material in and of itself; I have a concern about it in this particular application. We don't have that extensive use of a flat metal panel in the building.

Comm. Williams: I agree with you that it may be a little out of place with the decorative metal screen that they have on the undulations of the brick.

Mr. Coleman: If some other things were done on the façade of the parking garage, I think maybe; but right now, no.

Comm. Williams: I have a question about the stipulations. I would agree with Mr. Alpert's position on most, if not all, of the things he would cut out of the stipulations on item No. 7. That's the only issue we thought he has any problems with. I would have a little concern with projects getting approved that don't have all documentation going on to the next level. I would support a continuance to bring the package to us addressing the loose ends here so we see it before we make a final recommendation to the City Council.

Comm. Elkins: I find myself in almost complete agreement with Commissioner Williams and would join in his comments, particularly with respect to the issues that we spent most of our time tonight discussing with Building G. I think they've done a nice job with the Building G concept. My issue with respect to the plan that's before us tonight really goes back to the Parking Structure B in Stipulation No. 8. I know we discussed at great length at preliminary about the way that Town Center has developed vis-à-vis Park Place. I always refer facetiously to the 2 ½ football fields of parking lot between Town Center and Park Place, and I find that very unfortunate. My caution and dissent with Stipulation No. 8 is I'm concerned that we're all moving toward a modification to the LDO that may have unintended consequences in the future. As I say, my issue with the plan as it sits here has to do with Parking Structure B. This is probably a bit of an overstatement, but I'm going to say it anyway: I feel like the functional attributes of Parking Structure B are much different than those of Parking Structure A. While they've made an admirable effort to try to address it somewhat differently, I still come away with a feeling that Parking Structure B causes Park Place effectively to turn its back on the rest of the Leawood Community. You've heard me go on before about how part of our obligation is to view how Park Place interacts with the rest of what, thanks to this body and the developers and City Council, has really been the development from scratch of

what's effectively a downtown Leawood. My feeling is this becomes a boundary between Leawood and Overland Park, and that's fine. I concur with Mr. Coleman about the way it sits down. With that parking structure on 117<sup>th</sup> St., I'm just very concerned about the way it turns its back on the rest of Leawood. We discussed it in great detail, and I finally conceded there is no way to put storefronts in that place. I still think something creative in the 0'-12' level along that parking garage, be it windows with advertising or an outdoor art presentation, needs to be done with that structure. I concur with the applicant on Building G. My issue is with Parking Structure B.

Comm. Roberson: I think they said it quite well. I would concur with both Mr. Williams and Mr. Elkins.

Chair Rohlf: I guess my concern is what will happen between now and, if we do have a continuance this evening, what will be brought back. I don't know if there will be some movement on behalf of staff on some of these.

Mr. Coleman: We'll work with the applicant. We've actually made progress from what was originally submitted, which had contemporary horizontal metal louvered screens on the garage. There has been improvement; we'd just like to see a little more.

Chair Rohlf: So you feel like we're not at an impasse.

Mr. Coleman: We can work with them.

Comm. Neff-Brain: I really would like to see that concrete.

Mr. Alpert: Just for the record, it's the same pre-cast that was used on the first parking garage. You probably drive by it every day.

Comm. Neff-Brain: So I just need to look at the first parking garage more closely.

Mr. Alpert: Here's a photo right here (*places a photograph on the overhead*).

Comm. Neff-Brain: We talked about the pre-cast on the south side of Building G. That's the same as is on the parking garage?

Mr. Alpert: You're talking about the material on the upper portion? It's a similar material. It comes across like fairly smooth stucco.

Comm. Neff-Brain: Also, I'm a little concerned about the use of the metal on the parking garage and that cut-out metal. It seems like one is very modern and the other is more traditional. They don't seem to blend well on the same structure.

Mr. Alpert: The metal on the top is just a smooth surface that has a paint finish on it. It's not like a shiny metal and would not read as metallic. The material board has the paint color it would be painted, and that's what you'll see.

Comm. Williams: If we're talking that top band that, on either side, is the pre-cast concrete, why suddenly introduce that painted metal band?

Mr. Lenahan: (*Refers to display board*) This side is the ramped side of the garage. Part of what we're trying to do in this center portion where the ramps are offset from the horizontal lines is to keep from hanging two pre-cast panels back-to-back – one for the ramp and one for the skin. It's much more effective to use a lighter material to create this horizontal order and let that pre-cast ramp fall into the plane behind it to let the grilles and vertical components and horizontal components bring order to the façade. At the ground level, we can use the pre-cast brick and set it on the ground. It is very easy and doesn't involve a lot of expensive structure. When we get to this upper level, a lighter-weight material like a metal panel which essentially will have the same profile as the concrete panels and would be smooth and will bring variety as a different color, will bring less expense to the structure. Once you get to the ends here, you're back in alignment again. We can use those pre-cast concrete panels again to essentially frame the ramps and the façade at the same time.

Comm. Roberson: From a layman's standpoint, the garage is very mundane, uninspiring and lacking in creativity. It doesn't appear to be up to Leawood standard. Parking Garage A doesn't look that good either, quite frankly. I was hoping to see something a little bit better for this structure, given its location. Secondly, is July 14<sup>th</sup> appropriate? From his standpoint, he's got a timeline he has to meet, too.

Mr. Coleman: If it was approved on July 14<sup>th</sup>, it would go to Council in the first meeting in August. If it is approved then, he could submit building plans at that time.

Comm. Roberson: My biggest concern is to get this moved one way or the other.

Chair Rohlf: I would ask that this be the only agenda item.

Mr. Coleman: We can do that.

Mr. Alpert: The problem we have is we can't move forward on construction documents because we don't know what we're designing. We are hugely at risk. There's a good chance we may not be able to keep this tenant if we can't accelerate this process in some way. Without the tenant, there is no face. It's a national insurance company, and this project, in this economic environment, doesn't get built without it. Granted, this is a fast-track schedule, and we know it's not your problem, but we were not given a huge amount of time by the tenant to do what we needed to do. We're trying to figure out a way to keep the process moving to do what we need to do. If we're delayed until the first week of August for Council approval, it's probably going to be 8-12 weeks before we can get pricing, which puts us toward the end of October. That means we may have less than 12 months to build this and get them in, and I don't know that we can do that.

Chair Rohlf: The other problem you would face, Mr. Alpert, though is if you would just go ahead and move to the Council level, I don't think they would give you approval based on what has come up from the Planning Commission. Then you'd be even two weeks further behind. It is a dilemma, and I sympathize with where you are.

Mr. Alpert: I have to be honest; we get direction that is just minimal. We really don't like it, but how do we know that it will be different if we come back with something different? Obviously that's the risk we have to take. I'm trying to figure out a way to not have the same lack of support at the next meeting that we're getting tonight.

Comm. Roberson: I think we're in agreement on Building G, aren't we? How far away are we on Building G?

Comm. Williams: I think we're pretty much there. It would be helpful to get a visual of the pre-cast sample, but I don't see problems with the building as a whole.

Comm. Roberson: It's the parking garage we have the issues with.

Mr. Alpert: If we could get approval for G tonight, at least we could start designing G and advance that part while we're working out details on the garage.

Comm. Roberson: I would ask staff if that's appropriate.

Mr. Coleman: I think you would have to separate the stipulations out for each one. I don't know if we could do that now. I would agree with the Commission that Building G is much further along than the parking garage.

Comm. Neff-Brain: I don't think we can approve the building without some place to park the cars.

Mr. Coleman: It would be pretty difficult.

Comm. Roberson: But you've got the direction from the Planning Commission as to our feeling for Building G. If you can resolve the difference with staff, you pretty much have that one.

Mr. Alpert: Could we get more direction from you on the garage?

Mr. Coleman: I said staff would be glad to sit down and work with the applicant and work with them. We can make our suggestions. We're planners; we're not designers.

Chair Rohlf: I think that's the best we can do.

Mr. Alpert: I think we have no choice but to take a continuance. Before we do, could you give us any more direction on what you would like to see on this garage? If we satisfy staff, are we satisfying you; or do you have some specific suggestions that we can take back with us and try to incorporate?

Comm. Roberson: Mr. Elkins gave you a suggestion. I think you need to dress up the south side of the garage. It's not necessary to do the north side, per se. The west side should probably be dressed up since that's going to be visible from the street.

Chair Rohlf: Mr. Williams, did I ask for your expertise in this as far as what types of features would you carry over to make this more harmonious?

Comm. Williams: If we're talking about a color of the parking garage that ties to the color of the buildings behind it, both in terms of the pre-cast and the brick, that helps to pull it in that direction. Certainly you want to see some building motif detail that is similar to one or the other. You don't have that on the current Garage A and the adjacent building. You can have an issue with trying to mimic the architecture of one building on another, versus having buildings that create some sense of continuity and theme. Some of the

theme we see at Park Place is that variety of architecture in buildings and facades. I think for the garage, it's pulling in the coloring. Without doing a full façade that matches an adjacent building, it's hard to say a parking garage is not a parking garage. An example would be Hall's down on the Plaza, where you've got the big parking garage and the store; and basically the store wraps part of that parking garage. The south side looks very different than the north side.

Comm. Roberson: The central library downtown's parking garage is dressed up very nicely in my opinion.

Comm. Williams: Yes, but it doesn't look like the library across the street.

Comm. Roberson: No, it doesn't. I'm not suggesting we make a 20<sup>th</sup> century garage look like a 1920 building, but based on the pictures I've seen, I'm not impressed at all.

Comm. Elkins: I'm not a creative sort, so I don't know if this goes anywhere, but the I was alluding to creating an experience for people driving down the street. One thing might be to build a series of window-fronts like on the Plaza with advertising opportunities for your tenants that are inside Park Place, if you will. I'd like to see something other than a simple brick façade. I'm not a big one for billboards, but what I'm talking about really is kind of a high-tech, modern-age billboard opportunity.

Mr. Alpert: We'd love to do that, but I think we'd be violating another part of the LDO if we came up with some great signage and graphics. How do we reconcile that?

Comm. Elkins: That's a fair point. I'm thinking more along the lines of windows with depth to them and not signs.

Mr. Alpert: But then if you don't have pedestrian traffic on that street, but rather drivers worrying about their next turn and if you were to put merchandise in a window, for example, is it close enough for the driver to discern what the merchandise is? The whole idea of store windows is that you walk by, stick your nose on the glass and really see things up close. These are the kinds of things we wrestle with because I'd love to do great graphics on that garage and make it something really interesting, but you've got sign ordinances that don't allow for that. How do we do that?

Mr. Coleman: We'd be glad to sit down with the applicant and work on this.

Comm. Roberson: I'm sure you can come up with something creative.

Comm. Williams: One thing we haven't taken into the equation from the visibility of traffic on the street and pedestrians on the sidewalk is the landscaping. The landscape plan helps to add to the pedestrian experience. The trees help to screen some of the parking garage – not all of it because of the height, but it softens that.

Mr. Alpert: (*Refers to photograph on the overhead*) You can see this is the landscaping on the parking garage on Nall. It is consistent around the perimeter of the entire project, and I believe most of this is already in place along 117<sup>th</sup> St.

Comm. Williams: Per the plan you have submitted here.

Mr. Alpert: Yes, that is the landscaping that would front the parking structure. This is a year old, so imagine when it's had 4-5 years of growth and gets even more significant. Drive down Nall and see how the landscaping feels along Nall in front of this parking structure and how it really hides a lot of what's going on behind it at the scale you would experience in a car or even walking.

Comm. Pateidl: With respect to what kind of guidance we can give you, I think it should be well understood that this is not the forum for us to redesign a building. The design aspect and issues and details really need to be worked out between you and staff with documentation brought forth that this Commission can make a decision on and pass forward to the Governing Body. Actually with Stipulation No. 8 in here, there is no way that this issue could be approved because of the LDO we have no authority to amend. Granted, we've had a trial balloon go up, and you've got a pretty good target on Building G. I think that's a very successful issue. What about Parking Garage B? Public safety is going to be number one. I still think the sidewalk is something you need to consider. Final documents and preliminary designs lead to mistakes as has been pointed out earlier by members of this commission, and we don't want to do that. Material samples and representation help us have some idea of what we're talking about and understand and appreciate your knowledge of what you're trying to accomplish. You help us help you, but appreciate what our job is.

Mr. Alpert: I appreciate that completely, but when a Commission reacts negatively to what has been presented without a lot of feedback, we could come back with something totally different that would receive an equally negative response as we've received tonight, and we would be no further ahead. We're looking for as much information as we can get so we come back the next time with everyone happy with where we are going.

Comm. Pateidl: We hope we've provided you with some information. I think part of the negativity that's reflected in looking at this application is we knew we were giving you time tonight that could be of no avail because of the stipulations in here. That's not anything to do with the design of the building. It's the fact that we were being asked to make a decision we couldn't make. This time could be better well spent in getting the details done and bringing it forth with the tools we need to do our job.

Mr. Alpert: It's unfortunate we're in this position. I don't blame anybody on this Commission.

Comm. Pateidl: I don't think it's unfortunate. You've got a wonderful opportunity with a wonderful tenant. We want to work with you and get it done. Staff has agreed they'll work with you to get this thing through so it doesn't get bounced back by City Council and put you even more behind.

Mr. Alpert: We understand that. I don't think we have any intent of sending this to the Council.

**A motion to continue Case 30-09 – Park Place Building G and Parking Garage B – Request for approval of a final site plan and final plat, located north of 117<sup>th</sup> St. and east of Nall Ave. to the July 14, 2009 Planning Commission meeting was made by Elkins; seconded by Williams. Motion approved unanimously with a vote of 8-0. For: Pateidl, Roberson, Jackson, Neff-Brain, Rezac, Williams, Elkins and Heiman.**

*MEETING ADJOURNED.*