

City of Leawood
Planning Commission Minutes

August 10, 2010

Meeting - 6:00 p.m.

Dinner Session – No Discussion of Items – 5:30 p.m.

Leawood City Hall Council Chambers

4800 Town Center Drive

Leawood, KS 66211

913.339.6700 x 160

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

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA:

A motion to approve the agenda was made by Roberson; seconded by Williams. Motion approved with a unanimous vote of 6-0. For: Pateidl, Roberson, Neff-Brain, Williams, Elkins and Heiman.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Approval of the minutes from the July 27, 2010 Planning Commission meeting.

A motion to approve the minutes of the July 27, 2010 Planning Commission meeting was made by Neff-Brain; seconded by Roberson. Motion approved with a unanimous vote of 6-0. For: Pateidl, Roberson, Neff-Brain, Williams, Elkins and Heiman.

CONTINUED TO AUGUST 24, 2010 MEETING:

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

CASE 72-09 – LEAWOOD DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE AMENDMENT – SECTION 16-2-5.3 – R-1 DISTRICT FRONT ENTRIES – Request for approval of an amendment to the Leawood Development Ordinance. **PUBLIC HEARING**

CASE 73-09 – LEAWOOD DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE AMENDMENT – SECTION 16-2-5.3 – RP-1 DISTRICT FRONT ENTRIES – Request for approval of an amendment to the Leawood Development Ordinance. **PUBLIC HEARING**

CASE 64-10 – TOWN CENTER PLAZA – LOT 9 – WALGREENS – Request for approval of a Special Use Permit and Preliminary Site Plan, located at 4701 Town Center Drive. **PUBLIC HEARING**

OLD BUSINESS:

CASE 65-10 – TOMAHAWK CREEK PARKWAY SCULPTURE GARDEN – OPPENHEIM SCULPTURE – Request for approval of public art, located along Tomahawk Creek Parkway in the north pond, south of College Boulevard.

Staff Presentation:

City Planner Melissa DeBoer made the following presentation:

Mrs. DeBoer: Madame Chair and members of the Planning Commission, this is Case 65-10 – Tomahawk Creek Sculpture Garden – Oppenheim Sculpture. The applicant is April Bishop with the City of Leawood and is requesting approval of a piece of public art along Tomahawk Creek Parkway. The art is proposed to be located in the north pond just south of College Blvd. This sculpture is entitled “Splash” and resembles a splash from a giant stone thrown into the water. The piece will be constructed of stainless steel and poly-carbon. It is approximately 20’ in height. The base of the sculpture is approximately 6’ wide, and the top is about 18’ wide. It will be lit with LED lighting animation and ground lighting from the shore. Staff recommends approval of this application with the stipulations stated in the Staff Report and would be happy to answer any questions.

Chair Rohlf: Before you get started, I want to thank you for coming back this evening. I know our meeting went long last time, and you were out there the whole time.

Applicant Presentation:

Anne Kenney, Chair of Art in Public Places, 9814 Overbrook Court, Leawood, KS, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Ms. Kenney: That is just fine. Dennis Oppenheim is one of the premier public artists, both national international. We had him here in ‘04 and decided we couldn’t spend as much money as a piece of his would cost. He was very taken with our city, particularly with the Sculpture Garden. At the time he was here originally, it wasn’t formed, but he loved the Tomahawk Creek Parkway sites. When we asked him for an application this time, he sent in a picture of our own lake. We were overwhelmed. We talked to Brian a great deal and did not want to get into a water issue, but seeing it proposed in the water was just wonderful. Our selection committee includes Bruce Hartman from the community college and Jerry Nerman, who is a collector. Carl McCaffree is the chair, and he is a collector. This is a well-versed group of people, and we all think this piece will be an iconic piece for the city and one that will bring visitors to look at it. We hope you approve it.

Chair Rohlf: Thank you. Any questions?

Comm. Roberson: Did we not look at any local artists for something like this?

Ms. Kenney: Not for this particular piece. We usually do – sometimes we put out a call for artists; sometimes we look specifically at a certain person we think would fit the bill. In this one, we had Carl and Bruce Hartman with five names of people they thought were preeminent artists they thought would do a fine job. Because this is probably going to be our most expensive piece, we wanted an internationally known artist.

Comm. Roberson: If you stick metal into water, it usually rusts at some point. How do you prevent this from rusting?

Ms. Kenney: This is a stainless steel piece, and I don’t think it will actually be stuck in the water; it will be on a platform just below the water. Part of the frame will be in water, but he seemed to think it would hold up well.

Comm. Neff-Brain: It looks almost like smoke in the picture we have.

Ms. Kenney: That is a misting effect, which we are not doing. We are doing lighting with animation, and it will be a computerized program that can be changed with varying colors and speeds.

Comm. Neff-Brain: What will light up?

Ms. Kenney: There will be lights running up through the cables that are in the frame.

Comm. Neff-Brain: And those balls at the top?

Ms. Kenney: Those will be lighted.

Comm. Neff-Brain: So it will be different colors?

Ms. Kenney: No, it will not be different colors. It will all be clear. The lights will be clear; the piece will be stainless steel. He gave us several options, including color, misting and the one we selected, which was strictly stainless steel with clear balls and just the lights (*Shows picture*).

Comm. Roberson: I've driven by that spot a number of times. Quite frankly, the only people that are going to be able to see it are the people on the pathway. It seems like an isolated location for such an expensive piece.

Ms. Kenney: It's right near the roadway. We think it will have vehicular view as well.

Comm. Roberson: But if you spend any time craning your neck to look at that piece of art, you're going to run off the road. It's only a few seconds as you drive by. The only people who will be able to enjoy that piece of art are the people on the pathway.

Ms. Kenney: The committee disagrees. That seemed, to us, the best location. We looked at Site 5, which is the biggest, southernmost lake, but that is simply too deep to deal with. So many people fish there that lures would get caught in the piece. It was not as workable. This area is being reformed anyway. It's no more isolated a spot than the Hunt Growing piece is, and we've had very positive remarks about that and its location.

Mary Tierney, Leawood Arts Council, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Ms. Tearney: The Parks and Rec Superintendant of Grounds indicated that there were some nondescript trees over there to be removed, which will open up the space a little more and makes it more visible coming from the south.

Comm. Roberson: Like I said, right now, it's a very narrow focus as you drive by.

Ms. Tearney: Yes, he did say brush would be removed to open it up.

Comm. Heiman: Where will the utility boxes be installed to handle the power for this?

Ms. Kenney: We don't have the electric proposal yet, so we don't know exactly how the artist intends to do that. It involves more money, so we needed approval before checking into it. He had suggested it might come from the box that powers the watering equipment. He didn't know if that would be enough power. If it is not, we could draw it from one of the city street lights, which we own.

Comm. Heiman: It would be somewhere on the shore, I would assume.

Ms. Kenney: Yes, and we're aware of the fact that it is a floodplain.

Comm. Williams: I'd like to go back to your comment about fishing lures on the big lake. I'm in the park a lot myself, and I have seen people fishing. Will fishing be discouraged from this area?

Ms. Kenney: Brian Anderson feels that will not be a problem because it will be too shallow for fishing.

Chair Rohlf: Any other questions? Thank you. I would ask for additional comments, and if there are none, a motion.

A motion to recommend approval of CASE 65-10 – TOMAHAWK CREEK PARKWAY SCULPTURE GARDEN – OPPENHEIM SCULPTURE – Request for approval of public art, located along Tomahawk Creek Parkway in the north pond, south of College Boulevard, including all three staff stipulations – was made by Elkins; seconded by Elkins; seconded by Williams. Motion approved with a unanimous vote of 6-0. For: Pateidl, Roberson, Neff-Brain, Williams, Elkins and Heiman.

CASE 66-10 – I-LAN PARK SCULPTURE – JESSE SMALL SCULPTURE – Request for approval of public art, located at 12601 Nall Avenue.

Staff Presentation:

Senior Planner Joe Rexwinkle made the following presentation:

Mr. Rexwinkle: Madame Chair and members of the Planning Commission, this is Case 66-10. It is a request for approval of a public art piece located at I-Lan park. The piece is entitled "Gate to I-Lan" and resembles a gate with lanterns. The piece will be located within the park, north of the shelter and between the parking lot and pedestrian trail. It is proposed to be constructed of mild galvanized steel with a silver-grey finish and is proposed to be 16' in height by 17.5' in width. Staff suggests the piece be constructed of steel that meets commercial-grade standards for rust prevention. Staff recommends approval of this plan, subject to the stipulations in the Staff Report.

Comm. Elkins: (*Referring to picture in the packet*) What is this picture depicting? Is this looking down from above?

Mr. Rexwinkle: I believe it is looking down from above.

Comm. Pateidl: In conjunction with this application, have there been any structural drawings presented? It does have some mass and height, and it is subject to a frequently flooded area. Do we have the structural strength to maintain the integrity of this piece?

Mr. Rexwinkle: You have received everything we have received, and we have not received structural information.

Applicant Presentation:

Anne Kenney, 9814 Overbrook Court, Leawood, KS, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Anne Kenney: Did you have these (*Refers to drawings*)? I don't know what else you need. We can certainly get engineering information if you want. I know that the artist is concerned about wind. He has installed these cut metal pieces in other places, and he knows about wind.

Comm. Pateidl: The reason for my question is to see what information has been provided to the Planning Department for their evaluation and if we've taken into consideration that there can be strain, both from water and wind, on this type of a structure. I would like to know if that has been evaluated as we are looking

at this in terms of approval for installation. Is it necessary and important? I am posing that question because I don't know, as I have no idea about the weight or the stress. Apparently, none of us do. That does concern me.

Mr. Klein: This piece would be required to have a building permit. At that time, they would look at footings and how the structure is attached to the ground to ensure it could withstand the elements. In the Planning Department, we don't typically see the construction detail of a lot of the buildings because what you approve has to go through the Building Department to meet all the codes.

Comm. Neff-Brain: I would be more concerned with the stainless steel hanging off because if that came down and hit someone, it could be tragic.

Mr. Klein: I think those are actually bolted in place.

Ms. Kenney: That's right. He has installed these in other places. They've been attached to walls, primarily.

Chair Rohlf: Has he installed one of this height anywhere?

Ms. Kenney: Yes, bigger and higher. He has done several in Iowa along a stone wall.

Chair Rohlf: Staff has recommended hot-dipped galvanized steel. Would that be acceptable to the artist? I know in the memo, Ms. Bishop indicated it was mild galvanized steel with rust-resistant matte finish. Is the hot-dipped galvanized steel different from what is in the memo about the mild galvanized steel?

Mr. Klein: I believe it is different.

Chair Rohlf: I just want to make sure the artist is aware of the recommendation that we might be approving this material.

Ms. Kenney: I didn't bring the artist. He was willing to come, but I wasn't sure when we would come up.

Mr. Coleman: There are different grades of galvanizing. We would like to see commercial-grade to avoid a rusting issue.

Chair Rohlf: And it doesn't affect the overall design feature?

Mr. Coleman: No.

Ms. Kenney: We'll check it out with him. The only problem I could foresee is that he does the cutting. I don't know if the nature of the steel would affect the cutting equipment. I doubt that there is a problem.

Mr. Coleman: He probably cuts the pieces, and then they are galvanized and put together.

Comm. Williams: The drawings show the height from the ground to the bottom of the lanterns at slightly over 9'.

Ms. Kenney: I understand that it is 12' of pole and 4' of lanterns. I also understood it to be 12' from pole to pole. That isn't what was just read.

Mr. Rexwinkle: Commissioner Williams, I read the plans the same way you do with 9' ½".

Comm. Williams: I assume that's the dimension to the ground.

Mr. Rexwinkle: I believe so.

Comm. Williams: In other artwork that has been discussed in the past, concern was expressed about people climbing on it. Granted, 9' is pretty high up, but there are a lot of people that could probably jump and grab it.

Ms. Kenney: We discussed it considerably, and I really thought it was 12'. I see what you're saying. I thought it was 12' to the lanterns and then 4' above that. I can clarify that. He also had a sleeve on the square pole. The pole was added as a safeguard and was changed from a round pole. The sleeve was removed because it was viewed as something that could be a launching pad. We'll have to check the dimensions.

Comm. Williams: Are you comfortable with the 9' to the ground?

Ms. Kenney: No, I want it to be 12'.

Chair Rohlf: Any other questions? Thank you. With the height the applicant would prefer, does that affect the report we have here?

Comm. Williams: If you're talking about increasing the sculpture by 3', it would get you to 9' to the bottom of the lantern. Based on the dimensions we're seeing here, that puts the top of the sculpture at roughly 20', which is pretty tall. I honestly don't know how that relates to the shelter house that is out there now. It might be taller than the eaves of it.

Chair Rohlf: The measurements in here are not what are envisioned by the applicant, so we wouldn't be able to approve this version.

Comm. Neff-Brain: Would adding 3' change the stability?

Comm. Williams: It certainly would change that factor, and that would be something they would have to take into account on the two posts they have here. It is just a question of engineering. They may have to change the column. Depending on the thickness of the steel tube, the extra 3' might just be fine. They would have to take a look at it when it gets to the construction phase.

Chair Rohlf: Ms. Kenney, did you want to comment?

Ms. Kenney: This original plan shows 12' and then $\frac{3}{4}$ beyond that. It shows 12' across, too, which is my understanding.

Comm. Roberson: It's only 10' across.

Chair Rohlf: We don't have that particular drawing. Ours is 9' with a total of 13' on the bottom and 17' on up.

Comm. Williams: It is very different.

Chair Rohlf: I'm not sure if we just have the wrong diagram in our packet. I think we need to continue this matter to get that worked out and make sure everyone is on the same page with the various heights. What you just showed is consistent with what you thought, but it's not what we have here in our packet.

Ms. Kenney: I could have him come, too. I just didn't know when we were going to be on the agenda.

Chair Rohlf: If it's not an inconvenience, I think we would probably like to talk to him just because of the height of the structure and where it sits in the park, if he is local.

Ms. Kenney: He is half local and half in China. He is here now, and I think he would be fine to come. He needs to correct these drawings because that was never the concept.

Chair Rohlf: Then if you are in agreement, I would ask to move that. Mr. Klein, can you tell me when our next date would be?

Mr. Rexwinkle: August 24th.

A motion to continue CASE 66-10 – I-LAN PARK – JESSE SMALL SCULPTURE – Request for approval of public art, located at 12601 Nall Avenue to the August 24, 2010 Planning Commission Meeting – was made by Williams; seconded by Elkins. Motion approved with a unanimous vote of 6-0. For: Pateidl, Roberson, Neff-Brain, Williams, Elkins and Heiman.

CASE 54-10 – MISSION FARMS – DEVELOPMENT MONUMENT SIGN – Request for approval of a Final Sign Plan, located at Mission Road and 105th Street.

Chair Rohlf: I don't see an applicant in the audience. Do you think there is a chance they could be running late?

Mr. Klein: We haven't been contacted to our knowledge, unless they have left a message while we have been here. Your options are to continue the case to the August 24th meeting or take action. Staff is recommending denial of this case, and so at this case, the applicant would not have a chance to really present the case.

Ms. Shearer: My recommendation might be to consider continuing this. My only concern is I might wonder if the applicant has something to say in response to the Staff Report.

Comm. Neff-Brain: Were they at the last meeting?

Mr. Rexwinkle: They continued it from the last meeting; they weren't there.

Chair Rohlf: We can continue it to the August 24th meeting?

Mr. Klein: Yes.

A motion to continue CASE 54-10 – MISSION FARMS DEVELOPMENT MONUMENT SIGN – Request for approval of a Final Sign Plan, located at Mission Road and 105th Street to the August 24, 2010 Planning Commission meeting was made by Williams; seconded by Elkins. Motion approved with a unanimous vote of 6-0. For: Pateidl, Roberson, Neff-Brain, Williams, Elkins and Heiman.

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

Staff Presentation:

Assistant Director Mark Klein made the following presentation:

Mr. Klein: Madame Chair and members of the Planning Commission, this is Case 20-09 – Leawood Development Ordinance Amendment. This is to regulate emergency generators within the city of Leawood for the single-family homes. Currently, the ordinance has nothing that addresses this issue. From time to time, we'll get questions, especially during times of power outage. We brought this before the Planning Commission, and it was approved; however, the City Council had concerns dealing with portable generators. They wanted to ensure it was very clear that people could have a portable generator in case of emergency. The previous ordinance did not address that aspect. They also wanted to make sure propane was a possibility to use, and that is in the ordinance. Staff communicated with one of the commissioners with regard to some of the issues currently proposed with this. We previously worked with the Building Department and contacted them again. We also contacted AB May since they install a lot of these generators, especially in the city of Leawood. We would like to make a recommendation and a couple of changes to the ordinance you have tonight. One, there is a limitation currently proposed of 14KW and 36 cubic feet. AB May said that a lot of the larger homes actually have 200-amp service. In order to meet that requirement, they would need a 20KW, which would have dimensions closer to 48 cubic feet. We would also like to recommend that a building permit is required. Staff is recommending approval of this application and would be happy to answer any questions.

Comm. Williams: Going back to the size of the generator, you wrote that, "Any generator larger than the standard shall be approved by the Governing Body." Are we still looking at having larger ones come in?

Mr. Klein: Yes, we wanted to leave that open. If it was larger than the 20KW we are proposing tonight, it would have to come before the Planning Commission and City Council. I talked with the Building Department to get an idea how many applications we have for these generators, and last year, they saw four or five. He said it seems to be increasing as the price of the generator comes down.

Comm. Williams: You mentioned before that some of these could be propane-powered generators.

Mr. Klein: Correct, and the portable generators could be gasoline; the permanent would be propane or natural gas.

Comm. Williams: The locations you mentioned on the recommendations, I'm assuming those take into consideration clearance from the house so the fumes don't get in the house.

Mr. Klein: The Building Department checks for those clearances to meet code. Each manufacturer has specifications for all the different generators. Three feet is the minimum distance from the house, and screening needs to be the same to allow the unit to breathe. One recommendation would be to add in that they have to meet manufacturer or ordinance specifications.

Comm. Williams: I think that would be a good addition, particularly if they are saying a generator needs to be farther than 3' away from the house. Where would that change take place?

Mr. Klein: We could probably add it on 28(c): "Any permanently installed generator shall be screened. Such screening shall be installed within 3'5' of the generator," adding, "or as manufacturer's specifications dictate." Then in 28(b), "All generators shall be situated no more than 3' away from the primary residential structure," adding, "or to meet manufacturer's specifications."

Comm. Pateidl: We're looking at two different situations: the regulations related to a permanent emergency power unit and incorporating, in the same ordinance, rules and regulations as they relate to the portable.

Mr. Klein: Yes.

Comm. Pateidl: I'd like to put a few of my observations in context. I happen to be looking at one of these permanent installations on behalf of my country club, so I've become a little familiar with the literature. In my experience over the years, I've had business acquaintances, one of which died from asphyxiation from a portable generator and another of which died from electrocution due to some faulty electrical installation. With those two thoughts in mind, one of the things that concerns me in having both of these issues together is the location requirement that, "it will be in the rear yard, will be within the confines of the corner of the house and will be within 3' of the foundation." The instructions for Carrier specifically say to not install these units below a deck or in any confined area. I would suggest that, if we are going to limit the location to behind a house for the portable units, we are, in essence, inviting an unhealthy situation for our citizens. If they were to read this ordinance, they would say, "Aha, I've got my portable generator, fire it up and go." I object to what we're doing there. Secondly, it seems like we're trying to pay a little more attention to the aesthetics of this deal than we are the mechanics of addressing an emergency. I certainly encourage and support the recommendation that the units would be required to be removed within 48 hours. Quite candidly, during the course of an emergency with a power outage, I can't imagine anybody objecting to the aesthetics of a portable generator being on the side of the house or any other location that is more conducive to the conduct of power without extended runs, which opens up the other element of danger. I do think sound control is a very important aspect of it, but my point is I think we're trying to be careful about how the city of Leawood looks, and in the process of that, we're not really addressing the citizens in the course of an emergency. I would encourage that we reconsider how we reference the use of portable generators.

Comm. Williams: I think Mr. Pateidl makes a very good point. I recall on a project I was once on, the location of a portable generator was subject to where they could then run the power back in to the house safely. You made a good point for potential of electrocution if we don't have that safe avenue. Maybe that avenue for portable emergency bases isn't off the back of the house. Certainly, a permanent installation can have electrical accommodations, but for something that is portable that might be used once, will the electrical connections be put on the back of the house to plug the generator into their system to make it work properly? My guess is they're probably not going to do that.

Mr. Klein: I certainly understand your concerns. Originally, we were looking at the impact of the aesthetics and noise as well because on the side of the house is close to the neighbor. The noise from the back is not as significant. Regarding power and safety issues, I understand that. It sounds like you would like to exempt the location of portable generators and still keep the requirement that they be removed within 48 hours of restoration of power. Regarding concerns about what would be unsafe placement, such as located under a deck or close to a ventilation system, I see those as real concerns because they are safety oriented and definitely have an effect. Typically, the LDO does not deal with those types of things because those issues would be worked out during the building permit process; whereas, portable generators do not go through that same process. We could look at specifications. My only concern would be leaving ourselves open to liability if we miss something.

Comm. Williams: Certainly one of the regulations to take into account would be the location. Manufacturers have fairly extensive installation guidelines for their own liability purposes. Maybe we need to add that for the portable generators.

Mr. Klein: "Per the manufacturer's specifications" sounds like the best way to deal with that.

Chair Rohlf: Do you think it would be helpful to separate them out?

Mr. Klein: You could separate them out completely or in the section referring to removal, you could add that they have to meet the manufacturer's specifications for location and installation.

Comm. Williams: We could still put in that we don't want to see them in the front of the house while leaving the side as an option. In terms of an emergency generator, people will either buy or rent. By having this ordinance now, we're requiring these people to get a permit for a temporary generator? Okay, and will the city publish that people need to do that for emergency generators?

Mr. Klein: The only concern about the portable ones is, for instance, let's say we have an icing event on Friday at 7:00 p.m. when City Hall is closed. There is no way for a person to get a permit. With a portable unit, we currently would not require a permit. This ordinance would simply clarify that it is an allowed use.

Comm. Elkins: I have a strong concern about the safety issues, but I also have a practical concern about enforcement. The most likely two things we would run into are ice or tornado. My guess is the entire Municipal Government is going to be engaged with a lot of issues other than enforcing whether the temporary generators are within the bounds of our ordinance. I don't have an answer here. I see good reasons for us to have regulations around this, but I am also struggling to understand how we are ever going to enforce something like this.

Mr. Klein: The intent with the portable generator was to do no more than require them to be removed 48 hours after power was restored, which would be easy to enforce with neighborhood officers or resident complaints. We also wanted to ensure the portable generators are permitted. City Council wanted to make sure people had the ability to use a portable generator if the power went out, which is part of why they remanded it back. They also were concerned about people who might have a medical condition and who would need that power to sustain medical equipment. Mainly, the ordinance is designed to 1) allow the portable generators and 2) ensure they don't remain too long.

Comm. Williams: Looking again at what is highlighted here in 16-4-1.3 (D) 14 about portable or permanently installed emergency generators and review of them, I feel we need to take out the reference to portable generators in this section so they will not have to go through this process, which is not practical.

Comm. Pateidl: Stepping back to the highlighted paragraph before that, I am reading it to go, "A, B, C, B, C, D" through Item 28. Am I missing something there?

Mr. Klein: The lettering just got off.

Chair Rohlf: Do you think we should continue this and give you an opportunity to rewrite it? I think there has been significant discussion about some of the safety issues.

Mr. Klein: We can take a look at it.

Chair Rohlf: Are there additional comments we need to pass on to staff about this? You probably wrote some of those comments down.

Mr. Klein: Yes, and it will be the August 24th meeting.

A motion to continue CASE 20-09 – LEAWOOD DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE AMENDMENT – SECTION 16-4-1 ACCESSORY USES (GENERATORS) – Request for approval of an amendment to the Leawood Development Ordinance to the August 24, 2010 Planning Commission meeting – was made by Williams; seconded by Neff-Brain. Motion approved with a unanimous vote of 6-0. For: Pateidl, Roberson, Neff-Brain, Williams, Elkins and Heiman.

MEETING ADJOURNED.