

City of Leawood
Planning Commission Minutes
March 8, 2011
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, Rohlf, Williams, Elkins, Heiman and Ramsey. Absent: Jackson and Neff-Brain.

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, Williams, Elkins, Heiman and Ramsey.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Approval of the minutes from the February 22, 2011 Planning Commission meeting.

A motion to approve the minutes of the February 22, 2011 Planning Commission meeting was made by Roberson; seconded by Heiman. Motion approved with a unanimous vote of 6-0. For: Pateidl, Roberson, Williams, Elkins, Heiman and Ramsey.

CONTINUED TO APRIL 26, 2011 MEETING:

CASE 73-10 – LEAWOOD DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE AMENDMENT – SECTION 16-4-1.3 RECYCLE BINS – Request for approval of an amendment to the Leawood Development Ordinance. **PUBLIC HEARING**

CASE 105-10 – LEAWOOD DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE AMENDMENT – SECTION 16-2.7 (Table of Uses) – Kennels – Request for approval of an amendment to the Leawood Development Ordinance. **PUBLIC HEARING**

CASE 114-10 – LEAWOOD DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE AMENDMENT – SECTION 16-4-6 – PERMANENT SIGN REGULATIONS – Request for approval of an amendment to the Leawood Development Ordinance. **PUBLIC HEARING**

CASE 119-10 – LEAWOOD DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE AMENDMENT – SECTION 16-2-7 (Table of Uses) – KENNELS – Request for approval of an amendment to the Leawood Development Ordinance. **PUBLIC HEARING**

CASE 05-11 – TOWN CENTER PLAZA – AMORE DESSERT CAFÉ – Request for approval of a Final Sign Plan, located at 4821 W. 117th Street.

CASE 10-11 – BI-STATE/CENTENNIAL PARK – HAUTE HOUSE – Request for approval of a Final Sign Plan, located at 1920 W. 143rd Street.

OLD BUSINESS:

CASE 04-11 – TOWN CENTER PLAZA – LOT 9 – WALGREENS – Request for approval of a Final Site Plan, located at 4701 Town Center Drive. (This case was remanded back to the Planning Commission by the Governing Body at its February 21, 2011 meeting)

Staff Presentation:

Senior Planner Joe Rexwinkle made the following presentation:

Mr. Rexwinkle: Madame Chair and members of the Planning Commission, this is Case 04-11 – Request for approval of a Final Site Plan for a new Walgreens store located at the southwest corner of Town Center Drive and Roe Avenue within the Town Center Plaza development. On October 18, 2010, the Governing Body granted approval of an associated Preliminary Site Plan and Special Use Permit for this store. On January 25, the Planning Commission voted to recommend approval of a Final Site Plan to the Governing Body. On February 21, the Council voted 7-1 to remand this case back to the Planning Commission in consideration of the following concerns: the height of the building, the size of the site in relation to the floor area of the building, the appearance of the scale of the building from adjacent streets, the color of exterior brick used and its consistency with the exterior brick used elsewhere in Town Center, the scale and height of the tower elements, the articulation of each façade, the placement of the building at an elevation higher than surrounding sites and streets, and the visibility of the building interior from the outside of the building. The plans have been modified to address these concerns. Regarding the appearance, scale and articulation of the building, the applicant has increased the projection of the pilasters by approximately eight inches and has proposed brick in a basket weave pattern throughout the building exterior, as well as decorative aluminum trellises under windows and other minor elements. The applicant has provided illustrations showing the elevation of the building and surrounding buildings in relation to the proposed store. and has reduced the height of the towers and the remainder of the building by approximately two feet. The maximum height of the building at the height of each tower is 32 feet, four inches. The majority of the building is 22 feet, 4 inches in height. The existing building is approximately 19 feet. The top of the tower element adjacent to the intersection of Town Center Drive and Roe will be approximately 40-43 feet above the street level. The remainder of the building will be approximately 30 feet above street level along Roe and 26-30 feet above street level along Town Center Drive. For reference, the existing Heartland Bank building stands approximately 32 feet above Town Center Drive. On Roe Avenue, the east end of Town Center Plaza, including the Barnes and Noble store, stands approximately 55 feet above Roe. Staff recommends approval of this plan with the changes that have been incorporated, subject to the stipulations in the report.

Chair Rohlf: Questions for staff?

Comm. Ramsey: What is the approximate square footage of the existing building?

Mr. Coleman: It is approximately 7,500 square feet.

Comm. Ramsey: The proposed building is twice the size.

Mr. Coleman: That is correct. The size and lot coverage was approved in the Preliminary Plan. That particular issue is not a Final Plan issue.

Chair Rohlf: I do have concerns. It appears that, although this is a Final Plan, we are still dealing with some of the issues we would address at Preliminary Plan stage. We have read the minutes from the City Council meeting, and I am a bit concerned about why it was remanded back with these issues.

Mr. Coleman: Some members of the Council felt they voted erroneously on their original vote. The Preliminary Plan that establishes the size and use of the building was approved. The Final Plan deals with

the site, the landscaping, the architectural elements and the height of the building. City Council felt a need for additional articulation of the facades of the building because the brick pilasters were only $\frac{3}{4}$ of an inch in relief from the wall. They wanted to see more depth in those elements. We have worked with the applicant, and the result is what you see tonight. The applicant has lowered the overall height of the building and the towers by 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ feet. They have articulated the façade by differentiating the pilasters from the rest of the wall by eight inches. They have articulated a frame around the exterior light fixtures on those pilasters. They also included some trellises on the north side. They have addressed all of the Final Plan concerns that were indicated by the Council. The size of the building in relation to the site was fixed at Preliminary Plan, so that was really not on the table tonight.

Chair Rohlf: You feel that the issues that relate more to the Preliminary Plan have been addressed and we should focus on the Final Plan and related issues?

Mr. Coleman: Yes, the size is the only issue to disregard tonight.

Chair Rohlf: I noticed on Page 10 of the Staff Report that the point is addressed. I'm not sure I understand the language there and how it pertains to our discussion tonight.

Mr. Rexwinkle: That language was taken straight from the LDO and the section regarding criteria for review of Preliminary Site Plans.

Chair Rohlf: The one thing that concerns me a bit about this building is, if I recall correctly, many commissioners were absent during the Preliminary Plan review. At the Council level, some of these issues were not addressed, either. Now, it is coming through as a Final Plan, and we are raising issues that probably should have been discussed a bit more thoroughly previously.

Mr. Rexwinkle: At the time Preliminary Plan came through, staff recommended denial, and this was one of the reasons. We presented a table illustrating the ratio of the building area to the size of the property in comparison to other Walgreens sites through the county.

Chair Rohlf: I believe Stipulations 3, 4 and 7 on Page 11 have now been accomplished.

Mr. Rexwinkle: The third stipulation pertains to a pedestrian crossing from the sidewalk along the private drive to the west of the site. The Site Plan shows a striped crosswalk across the parking lot, and the stipulation pertains to completing that crosswalk with the pavers. If we can confirm Stipulation No. 4 was completed prior to Governing Body, we will remove the stipulation.

Applicant Presentation:

Fred Logan, 8610 Mohawk Lane, Leawood, KS, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Mr. Logan: I am a member of Logan, Logan and Watson law firm. We thank everyone for all your work on this. We are happy to address concerns raised by the Council, and we feel we have addressed them completely. We are well within the ordinance requirements with respect to all matters pertaining to Final Development Plans. We have an extensive landscaping plan that goes far beyond what the ordinance requires and far beyond anything else at Town Center. We have addressed all the concerns raised by City Council. I want to be clear that Stipulations 1-20 are acceptable to us. With respect to Stipulations 3, 4 and

7, we have already resolved at least two of those, which will be apparent by the time Governing Body takes up this matter.

I am accompanied this evening by Seth Reece and Brad Sonner, engineers from Olsson Associates; Nick Telowitz and Jim Pinter, architects from Nova Group and Doug Henzlik, the applicant with Henzlik Oliver Real Estate. You will soon see a 3-D animation that will give you a sense of the building's appearance on the site. I would like to emphasize that this does not include all of the landscaping in order to give a better view of the building.

We believe we have addressed all of the concerns. The elevation of the Revised Plan is actually three inches lower than the existing building. The brick colors match the existing brick at Town Center, and the articulation of each elevation has increased.

Nick Telowitz, Nova Group Architects, 6312 Hazelwest Court, Hazelwood, MO, 63042, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following presentation:

Mr. Telowitz: (*Refers to display boards*) The design intent is to provide a quality building that meets the requirements of the city ordinances, is complementary to the Town Center vernacular architecture and addresses the concerns of the Governing Body. This will be the only outlet building along Town Center Drive with architecture complementary to Town Center Plaza. The bulk of the building height between the towers has been lowered from 24 feet to 22 feet, 3 inches. The tower eave at the top of the tower below the slope roof begins has been lowered from 28 feet to 26 feet, five inches. The peak of the tower has been lowered from 34 feet, 2 inches to 32 feet, 4 inches. It should be noted that the relationship of these heights is roughly 3-5 feet lower than similarly proportioned buildings within Town Center Plaza. The tower cornice detail below the eave of the roof maintains a separation between the top and the tower.

Regarding the articulation of the building, City Council requested that it be increased and improved on the exterior walls. We have about six items we have revised to address this. We reduced the pilaster height to the top of the window height. This creates a surface variation and lowers the scale of the building wall on all four walls. We increased the pilaster thickness to create an eight-inch depth to the brick face below the windows, which increases shadow and building scale. The width of those projected edges of the pilaster is 12 inches now, and the shadow line is 8 inches between the face and the wall. We added projected brick detail at the light fixtures, creating a four-inch depth. Richard alluded to the fact that we have these framed detail areas around the light fixtures. We have done the similar depth projection at the tower columns. We added brick texture in a basket weave pattern above windows and at the towers, which creates a softened texture. We dropped the pilasters at the tower, which creates a panel. This is replicated at each elevation. We increased the area of lighter color accent brick below the water table. Previous to this, the area below the water table went back to the field brick. We had a cast-stone edge, a soldier course and then header course. Then we returned to the field brick, but we changed that color to be a lighter base to reduce heaviness and mass of the building. We also added four fabric awnings, two at each tower. These create additional relief and shadow at those tower areas, and they relate back to the vernacular of Town Center Plaza. Finally, the landscape trellis was added. On the east elevation in front of the wall without windows, we added a landscape trellis to create more interest. We have taken a similar section of landscape trellis on the east and have added one 6x6 section to provide plantings to creep onto the trellis. This adds human scale and a layer that softens the building wall.

(*Continues to refer to display boards*) This 3-D animation is an approximate representation of the proposed site and building design. Some detail features of landscaping, including the trellis and window glazing, may not be represented exactly as described elsewhere in the submittal. These sketches show the articulation to give a better representation of what we are doing. This panel of masonry below the window is squeezed so our insulation is on the interior of the wall. We have changed some block to create less thickness on the wall. At the pedestrian level is an eight-inch projection, and where the windows are set back, the depth approaches twelve inches. With the pilasters, we have achieved the eight-inch depth by projecting out on top of that with more detailing. The light fixture has projected brick detail, and the basket weave pattern is above that. Looking up at that pilaster, you can see a four-inch projection. The pilasters

on the side are out eight inches from the panel below the window and approach twelve inches at the actual glazing.

(Refers to Landscaping Plans on the display boards) The landscaping of the street trees and ornamental trees show projection of 5-10 year growth after planting. The trees meet the ordinance with their diameter, caliper and size. *(Shows the 3-D animation on the overhead)*

Chair Rohlf: This is pretty close to how it is rendered now?

Mr. Telowitz: Yes, there are some details that are not shown with the trellises and the brick.

Chair Rohlf: Are the windows correct?

Mr. Telowitz: Yes.

Comm. Williams: I'd like to go back to the brick colors. I believe you said the brick matches the main building at Town Center.

Mr. Telowitz: Yes, both the field and the accent brick are a close match to what is in Town Center. The brick that was used predominantly in most of the buildings is no longer manufactured. We have a similar situation with the roof tile. We have exhausted all manufacturers and have found products as close to the original as we can find.

Comm. Williams: I have noticed that the bricks on the neighboring buildings of the bank, Sprint and Hereford House do not match Town Center. Neither does the newer Pottery Barn, but they do work well with Town Center. I appreciate the job you have done with attempting to match as well as possible.

Chair Rohlf: Does anyone else have questions for the applicant? This takes us to any further discussion.

Comm. Roberson: I opposed this the last time this came through, and I would have opposed it if I had been here for the Preliminary Plan. This building is too big and too tall for this site. The trees may meet the code, but they will not cover the building; it will be a big monolith on the site. It is ten feet higher than the current building, and I think it would be better suited at a different site.

Chair Rohlf: Thank you. If no one else has a comment, I would ask for a motion.

A motion to recommend approval of CASE 04-11 – TOWN CENTER PLAZA – LOT 9 – WALGREENS – Request for approval of a Final Site Plan, located at 4701 Town Center Drive – with all 20 Staff Stipulations – was made by Williams; seconded by Elkins.

Comm. Pateidl: I attribute much of the effort put forth by the applicant and the changes presented to us tonight to Councilwoman Rezac, and I think she did a wonderful service to the city in making her observations. I also take my hat off to the applicant. I appreciate the imagination and effort that went into softening the architecture on this building and making it more compatible for the area. In response to my cohort next to me, it's like my father-in-law used to say when he cut his boy's hair: "The only difference between a good haircut and a bad haircut is three days." This landscaping plan, given time, will do a wonderful job of softening the side of that building. I am very much in favor of this project.

Motion passed with a vote of 4-2. For: Pateidl, Williams, Elkins and Heiman. Opposed: Roberson and Ramsey.

MEETING ADJOURNED.