

City of Leawood
Planning Commission Minutes
March 22, 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, Jackson, Rohlf, Williams, Elkins, Heiman and Ramsey.
Absent: 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 7-0. For: Pateidl, Roberson, Jackson, Williams, Elkins, Heiman and Ramsey.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Approval of the minutes from the March 8, 2011 Planning Commission meeting.

A motion to approve the minutes of the March 8, 2011 Planning Commission meeting was made by Roberson; seconded by Heiman. Motion approved with a unanimous vote of 7-0. For: Pateidl, Roberson, Jackson, 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 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**

CONSENT AGENDA:

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

A motion to recommend approval of the Consent Agenda was made by Jackson; seconded by Roberson. Motion approved with a unanimous vote of 7-0. For: Pateidl, Roberson, Jackson, Williams, Elkins, Heiman and Ramsey.

NEW BUSINESS:

CASE 29-11 – GEZER PARK – Request for a Revised Final Site Plan, located at the northeast corner of 133rd Street and Mission Road.

Staff Presentation:

Assistant Director Mark Klein made the following presentation:

Mr. Klein: Madame Chair and members of the Planning Commission, this is Case 29-11 – Gezer Park – Request for approval of a Revised Final Site Plan. The Parks Department would like to move the approved fire pit from the west side to the east side, adjacent to a garden shelter, in order to make it more usable. The location is 145 feet south of the Waterford South subdivision and 95 feet east of the Wilshire Place subdivision. It will be tucked into an existing berm, which is 3.5 feet high on the north side and approximately 1 foot high on the east side. The fire pit itself will be 2.5 feet high and will be surrounded by Jerusalem stone, which matches the bathroom. A natural stone retaining wall will go around it as well. Landscaping will also help screen it. The plan also shows a few other changes, including removal of the westernmost shelter and some overlook/interpretive stations. Additional landscaping has been added through the park. Staff is recommending approval of this application and would be happy to answer any questions.

Applicant Presentation:

Chris Claxton, Parks and Recreation Director, 409 SE Stillwater Drive, Lee's Summit, MO, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Ms. Claxton: As Mark mentioned, we are requesting to move the fire pit. (*Places plan on the display board*). The east side of the park, which will have the shelter and the garden where most of the celebratory events will most likely take place, will incorporate the fire pit. When the original discussion took place about the fire pit, the usage plans were what you see today. We will require the users to fill out a permit request from our department that will also be approved by the Fire Marshal. It will also have a lock-down grated top in order to prevent unauthorized use. Staff will be present during any usage. A gas line will be used to start the fire, and we can shut it down when the fire is lit. We will be in charge of keeping it clean and maintained. The Jerusalem stone will complement and match other stone in the restrooms and the shelters.

Chair Rohlf: Ms. Claxton, can you tell me how much of this plan has been completed?

Ms. Claxton: Currently complete are the restroom, the shelter adjacent to the restroom, the tablet in front of the park, the pond area and the parking lot. The playground is currently under construction.

Chair Rohlf: What happened to the overlook/interpretive stations that are scattered?

Ms. Claxton: Actually, those were called overlook/interpretive stations, and they were actually supposed to be sign locations, as I discussed with staff. We didn't want to put signage into the park until things were complete. As you recall, the park is supposed to be an educational experience as well so people can connect with the relationship to the Gezer region in Israel. As an example, a main sign will reflect all that information about that relationship. Potentially, we will have one sign with information about the Gezer archaeological dig area. Right now, we're trying to figure out where those would go and what will be on them. It could be three signs; it could be five signs of museum quality. We want to make sure we get it right and that we're not jumping to create a sign design that doesn't make sense.

Comm. Jackson: Chris, I went by I-Lan Park the other day, and the parking lot was overflowing. How is the parking holding up at Gezer Park?

Ms. Claxton: It is good. We anticipate most of the playground use will come from the neighborhoods and people close by that can get there through the trail. The concern with the shelters is how we will reserve them and what we will plan. We have a good relationship with Price Chopper, and we have used that parking lot before. With the way the park is designed, I really can't imagine a future expansion of the lot, so

we will just have to control it internally, much like we do at I-Lan. We have to let people know when they rent the shelter that it is very restrictive parking. We need them to understand if they have an event, they have to be in charge of the parking. So far, it has been fine.

Comm. Jackson: What is Price Chopper's stance as far as people parking there and going to the park?

Ms. Claxton: We have talked to them. They have additional space, and usually the spots that will be used are on that northwest corner because there are businesses right across from the park, and we cannot infringe on that parking. I'm not suggesting we use that as satellite parking. For day-to-day business, we anticipate being able to use the parking we have.

Comm. Jackson: How is the wadie holding up in the park?

Ms. Claxton: It has done really well. It has been through a couple of winters, and the pond is doing well, also. We don't seem to have any issues with it.

Brian Anderson, Parks Superintendent, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Mr. Anderson: I take care of the parks with my crews. We have only had one minor problem with the wadie in which we had to adjust the liner because of some overflow issues. On the west end, it has been fine. We have had a little bit of algae form this spring in our pond, but we can control that with some chlorine.

Comm. Jackson: It is a gorgeous park, and the only concern I have heard is that people would like a playground, which seems to be coming soon. Thank you for all you have done with the space.

Chair Rohlf: Does the access point on the northeast side end up there?

Ms. Claxton: It goes out to Pawnee where the trail comes in. It is where people can access the park through the neighborhood, and they do.

Comm. Elkins: Have you had any reports of vandalism or safety issues with respect to the sculpture and the pond?

Ms. Claxton: No.

Chair Rohlf: Unless we have any further discussion, I would ask for a motion.

A motion to recommend approval of CASE 29-11 – Gezer Park – Request for a Revised Final Site Plan, located at the northeast corner of 133rd Street and Mission Road, subject to the two staff stipulations – was made by Roberson; seconded by Jackson. Motion approved with a unanimous vote of 7-0. For: Pateidl, Roberson, Jackson, Williams, Elkins, Heiman and Ramsey.

CASE 26-11 – PARK PLACE – AS BISTRO – Request for approval of a Final Plan for a Tenant Finish, located at 11652 Ash Street.

Staff Presentation:

Senior Planner Joe Rexwinkle made the following presentation:

Mr. Rexwinkle: Madame Chair and members of the Planning Commission, this is Case 26-11 – Request for approval of a Final Plan for a Tenant Finish for AS Bistro in Building F at Park Place, located at the

northeast corner of Ash Street and 116th Place on the south side of the ice rink and the plaza space. The proposed tenant would occupy the ground level of this building on portions of the south side of the building and most of the northwest side of the building and would also occupy a portion of the rooftop space with a bar and dining area on top of the roof, as well as an outdoor dining area along the northwest side of the storefront, adjacent to the plaza space. A ground-level outdoor dining area will provide seating for 60 patrons, which will be immediately adjacent to the storefront, and will be separated from the plaza space and ice rink area by a minimum of 5 feet, 7 inch-wide sidewalk to allow pedestrian and handicap access around the ice rink. The rooftop dining area is located directly above the tenant space with a view onto the rink and the grassy plaza area. This area will seat 150 people. It will feature its own restroom, bar and a combination of bar table and lounge seating areas. The rooftop dining area will only be accessible from the interior of the restaurant. The elevations propose finishing the building exterior to provide a tenant storefront with the main entrance at the southwest corner of the building facing the intersection of 116th Place and Ash Street. An exit door is proposed for the south side of the building along 116th Place, and the area around the store is proposed to be designed with decorative tile and spaces for future photographs that will be reviewed as part of a Final Sign Plan package. The northwest elevation will be constructed mostly of stacking panel doors that allow that interior of the restaurant to open up onto the outdoor dining area. The base of the wall in this area will be constructed with decorative tile. A retractable canvas awning is proposed along the top of the panel doors on the northwest elevation, as well as portions of the south elevation. A stepped accent wall is also proposed northeast of the outdoor dining area and will feature decorative pots on each step. At the ground level of this wall will be a landscape planter bed. The applicant has not submitted sign details as part of this application and will instead submit them at a later date as part of a separate final sign plan application to be reviewed by the Planning Commission and Governing Body. The plans, however, do identify sign locations and maximum area for signs. These signs are located on the south elevation blade sign above the exit door, on the southwest blade sign above the main entrance and on the northwest elevation wall sign on the parapet above the rooftop dining area. These do comply with the LDO and Park Place Sign Criteria. When the Final Sign Plan comes forward, we will look to this plan for the locations. Staff recommends approval of this case, subject to the stipulations in the Staff Report and would be happy to answer any questions.

Comm. Pateidl: I understand the Fire Marshal approves of these plans. You just commented that access to the rooftop dining was from the interior only. Is there any emergency exit available, noting that a fire pit will be on the roof of this building?

Mr. Rexwinkle: Exiting the rooftop would be down the stairs into the interior tenant space and out one of the doors on the ground level. Our building plan reviewer reviews with the Fire Marshal for life safety issues, and he has approved the plans as they are designed. The plans do meet the code requirements as pertaining to egress.

Comm. Williams: On that subject, you talked about stair access. Are there not two exits from the top dining area?

Mr. Rexwinkle: Yes, there are two stairs and an elevator that come down from the rooftop dining area, and they all go to the ground level.

Comm. Elkins: I understand this is brought to us as a Final Plan, but it is more of a pre-Final Plan with another Final Plan coming to us again down the road. Is that correct?

Mr. Rexwinkle: It is just the signage. Everything else about the storefront is being approved as part of a Final Plan. My understanding is that the name of the tenant has not been chosen, which is why the sign designs have not been finalized.

Comm. Elkins: What is behind the need to get it done in two parts, even with the signs being separate?

Mr. Rexwinkle: The applicant may be able to elaborate on the timing.

Comm. Elkins: Assuming we do approve this, it goes to City Council. Will the Sign Plan come through us as well?

Mr. Rexwinkle: Yes.

Comm. Roberson: In Stipulation No. 4, you talk about a revision of the Final Plan to show the location of the proposed fire pit. We will have a revision to the Final Plan before we have a Final Plan?

Mr. Rexwinkle: Often, in the week before the Planning Commission meeting when we are preparing the report, we notice something has been left off the plan and we don't have enough time to ask the applicant to revise the plan prior to the meeting. This will lead us to a stipulation such as this.

Comm. Roberson: So the fire pit shown there may not be in that location?

Mr. Rexwinkle: It will be in that location; they will have to revise the plan to show it in that location. There is a circular area in the outdoor dining space with a tree.

Chair Rohlf: So the fire pit is in the center of the plan?

Mr. Roberson: That is my understanding.

Comm. Roberson: So we don't have the fire pit on here.

Mr. Rexwinkle: There are two fire pits on the rooftop and one on the patio.

Comm. Roberson: Can you show me where they fire pits are on the rooftop?

Mr. Rexwinkle: *(Places a plan on the overhead and shows locations of the fire pits)*

Comm. Roberson: Are these fire pits or fireplaces?

Chair Rohlf: Are they in the ground, or are they portable?

Mr. Rexwinkle: The applicant may be able to specify more.

Comm. Roberson: Can you show the one on the ground floor?

Mr. Rexwinkle: *(Shows a plan on the overhead)* My understanding is it is in the middle of the circular feature.

Comm. Williams: The last page shows a built-in rooftop fire feature.

Mr. Rexwinkle: Yes, the final page of the plans shows specifications for the roof and patio fire features. When we reviewed this, we noticed a patio feature for the patio, but we didn't see it on the Site Plan. That is the reason for the fourth stipulation.

Applicant Presentation:

Jeffery Alpert, Park Place, LLC, 11551 Ash Street, Leawood, KS, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Mr. Alpert: With me this evening is Melanie Mann, who is my partner in Park Place Village, and Brandon Gibson, who is with the architectural firm of Spangenberg, Phillips, Tice out of Wichita, Kansas. We are excited to present this concept to you this evening. AS Bistro is a concept that has been developed by a Food Network chef by the name of Aaron Sanchez, who appears on Chopped and Chef vs. City. In addition, he owns two restaurants in New York City that are very popular. We are very excited that he and his development team have chosen Park Place as the flagship location for this new concept, which he intends to make national. You asked about the signage delay. The development team discovered a conflict while doing a national trademark search. They can't use the AS Bistro name exactly, so they are working on an alternative, causing a delay. They are anxious to get the concept going and are well into construction drawings for the interior, so they didn't want to delay the process. The concept here is Latin cuisine with all fresh ingredients, most all of which is prepared on-site. When we conceived this particular space, we built the roof deck and felt it would be a high-energy spot overlooking Barkley square and really required a certain kind of restaurant to operate it. We think this concept is uniquely qualified to be in this location, and we think it will be a fun, high-energy spot. Mr. Gibson can give you more detail on the architecture.

Brandon Gibson, Spangenberg Phillips Tice Architecture, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Mr. Gibson: The main-level plan shows the patio area adjacent to the ice rink. We have now located the fire pit that was in question on this plan, and I would be glad to get new plans out as quickly as possible. (*Shows the plans for the restaurant*) We intend to have stackable glass doors along much of the west elevation to open the interior to the exterior and engage that patio area along this area and at the bar. The main bar feature for the restaurant will serve as the patio area and the interior of the restaurant. The secondary façade is the south façade on the main level, and it will be primarily an exit. Do you have any specific questions related to the main level?

Chair Rohlf: Other than the addition of the fire pit, the configuration is the same?

Mr. Gibson: The configuration has stayed the same.

Chair Rohlf: How many people will that area seat?

Mr. Gibson: It will seat 60 on the main-level patio.

Chair Rohlf: If no one else has questions on this plan, we can take a look at the roof plan.

Mr. Gibson: (*Refers to roof plan*) There are two areas of seating: open seating and covered seating. The upper level has two fire pits, and the roof has two stairway exits. This is about as remote as we can get from exiting that level. This area will look onto the ice rink. The seating count is 160. We are showing two private cabanas on this end for private dining. These elevations are all in the packet. This shows natural stone and ceramic tile with a canvas awning and wood-stained doors. The northwest elevation is where you can see we're filling in all the storefront. This area would be the glass panels to open that section. In this one, we're showing new lighting on top of the existing piers, along with a natural stone wall and some pottery.

Comm. Williams: You were talking about the stackable glass panels. The concept of having a connection between the indoor and the outdoor is great. If you are opening those glass panels to the outside, how does

the owner plan to address air movement and air conditioning? Would the air conditioning be on, causing energy inefficiency, or will it be turned off?

Mr. Gibson: Either that, or we anticipated an air curtain like you see at grocery stores with doors that open in a similar manner. It has not been determined yet.

Comm. Williams: Going upstairs to the rooftop dining, how high are the walls that separate the dining area from the rest of the roof area?

Mr. Gibson: Yes, these are full-height, existing walls. The only portion that would be a new wall would separate the back-of-house area from the patio.

Comm. Williams: On your roof plan, are you showing rooftop units?

Mr. Gibson: We received a request to show where we had planned for the rooftop units because of screening. This was our intended location. This also notes a four-foot difference between the roof level at that point and the parapet. The rooftop units should be screened.

Comm. Williams: How tall are the walls that you say separate the dining area from the roof?

Mr. Gibson: These are full-height, 8- or 9-foot walls.

Comm. Williams: How much noise do you anticipate with the three rooftop units?

Mr. Gibson: There may be some noise, but we can acoustically treat these walls.

Comm. Williams: How would you acoustically treat them?

Mr. Gibson: (*Referring to the plan*) There is a roof over this entire portion; I would assume it would be insulated. Insulating this wall and acoustically treating it and then doing acoustic treatment inside should help.

Comm. Williams: This is not much of an issue for us as a Planning Commission, but it certainly is an issue for the operator and the success of the restaurant, which we certainly want.

Chair Rohlf: Anything else for Mr. Gibson? Thank you. Mr. Alpert, it looks as if there are three other spaces available in the building, as well as the existing gelato shop.

Mr. Alpert: Yes, the gelato shop exists, and 2,220 – 2,300 square feet of space are left on the east end of that building. In the near future, we hope to bring in another building that will connect to that and complete the façade of that side of the street all the way down to where the Generali building is now being built. That is retail space that we intend to lease to other retailers.

Chair Rohlf: Does that include the small piece on the north side?

Mr. Alpert: This is where our Zamboni lives, and then we have a mechanical garage. The balance of the leasable space is the area I mentioned previously.

Comm. Roberson: What is the proposed opening date?

Mr. Alpert: They would like to open by the end of August.

Comm. Jackson: With the Latin design going in there and other things near the corner such as Adirondack chairs and planters, are you anticipating changing those out, or are you going to keep more of an eclectic look?

Mr. Alpert: We're all about being eclectic. We think the Adirondack chairs are terrific, and we'll keep those. This was always intended to be a high-energy restaurant to complement the square, and we think it will work extremely well.

Chair Rohlf: Thank you. This takes us up to further discussion and hopefully a motion.

A motion to recommend approval of CASE 26-11 – PARK PLACE AS BISTRO – Request for approval of a Final Plan for a Tenant Finish, located at 11652 Ash Street, with all eight staff stipulations – was made by Williams; seconded by Roberson. Motion approved with a unanimous vote of 7-0. For: Pateidl, Roberson, Jackson, Williams, Elkins, Heiman and Ramsey.

CASE 27-11 – PARK PLACE – THE GENT'S PLACE MEN'S FINE GROOMING – Request for approval of a Final Plan for a Tenant Finish, located at 11544 Ash Street.

Staff Presentation:

City Planner Melissa DeBoer made the following presentation:

Mrs. DeBoer: Madame Chair and members of the Planning Commission, this is Case 27-11. The applicant is Ben Davis with The Gent's Place Men's Fine Grooming and is requesting approval of a Final Plan for a Tenant Finish. The applicant is proposing to change the awnings from a black Sunbrella awning to a brown Sunbrella awning and also to change the door handles on the main entrance to a basic aluminum door handle. One awning sign, one awning logo and one blade sign are being proposed. The awning sign is on the middle awning directly over the entrance and reads, "Men's Fine Grooming" in 6-inch-high white letters. A large logo is also proposed on the middle awning. Per Park Place sign criteria, awning signage is limited to the tenant's name only; therefore, the logo is not allowed. A blade sign with an area of 3.75 square feet is also proposed. Staff recommends approval of this application with the stipulations stated in the Staff Report and would be happy to answer any questions.

Comm. Williams: You're supportive of the project with no logo on the awning?

Mrs. DeBoer: That is correct.

Comm. Williams: And what about the blade sign?

Mrs. DeBoer: It meets the criteria.

Applicant Presentation:

Jeffery Alpert, Park Place Village, LLC, 11551 Ash Street, Leawood, made the following comments:

Mr. Alpert: I am representing the applicant, who could not get in from Dallas. This was originally owned by a group out of Wichita called CA Men's Fine Grooming. They sold the business to The Gent's Place, which is based in Dallas. It has been operating as The Gent's Place for the last 90 days. The request was to maintain the same concept we had before. (*Shows photos on the overhead*) This exists currently. You can see the logo above the sign, and this is something we approved and found acceptable, believing it fit within the sign criteria. The request was to change the color while maintaining the same concept. We find this proposal to be perfectly acceptable. Perhaps, there is a misinterpretation of our sign criteria because the

issue regarding the logo, we believe, is based on the awning sign being the secondary sign and not a primary sign. In this case, this is the only sign we have because virtually the entire front façade is covered by the awning with no place else to put it. For those reasons, we would request approval of the sign as shown on the rendering.

Chair Rohlf: Could you show the other awning for a size comparison?

Mr. Alpert: It is virtually the same size and same location. The original door pull was actually a cast "CA," and so it is being replaced with a standard storefront door pull.

Comm. Ramsey: So the "CA" was on there twice.

Mr. Alpert: Yes.

Comm. Williams: When did the original version of this come before us?

Chair Rohlf: You would remember it if you were here, so you probably weren't.

Mr. Alpert: They have been open for a couple years.

Chair Rohlf: Would the clientele recognize a change in ownership, or is it pretty much the same on the inside?

Mr. Alpert: There were no changes to the interior of the space except for the CA logo on a piece of etched glass, which has now been replaced by the new logo. Other than that, the interior did not change at all. The business struggled as CA Men's. Since Gent's Place has taken over, it's terrific.

Chair Rohlf: Do they have a following?

Mr. Alpert: Without going into the sordid details, it was not a well-run operation; it was an absentee owner who was not watching the store and who had some issues. The current owner has a very successful operation like this in Dallas and understands the business and is doing extremely well. We're very pleased with the change, as it was very positive.

Comm. Ramsey: Is this the same group that was highlighted in one of the papers recently? Is this the \$50 haircut place?

Mr. Alpert: Yes, I didn't recall seeing them in the paper, but they might have been. It is very high-level service.

Comm. Williams: We have a lot of debate on signage over what is a store's name versus the store's offering. Is the name "The Gent's Place" or "Men's Fine Grooming"?

Mr. Klein: Actually, the entire name is "The Gent's Place Men's Fine Grooming." This case actually came in a couple years ago with much discussion on the signage in the window. However, Melissa checked the Staff Report from that time, and staff took the same stance of not being supportive of the logo on the top of the awning. We are being consistent in applying the sign criteria. If we were to consider it a single sign, it would be over the 5% of the façade area that is currently allowed. The sign criteria we are following are under "Tenant Sign Criteria: The text content of the awning signage will be limited to the tenant's name. The awning signs will have a maximum letter height of eight inches." Below that, it reads, "When the tenant storefront design contains an exterior awning, the tenant may apply signage to the awning face in

accordance with the tenant design criteria guidelines." We are taking the face of the awning to be the actual fascia.

Chair Rohlf: Did we approve it that way?

Mr. Klein: Obviously, it did get approved that way, despite staff recommendations.

Chair Rohlf: What would the recommended sign look like?

Mr. Klein: If they want to add "The Gent's Place," as long as it is eight-inch letters along the fascia of the awning, we would approve. We understand that "Men's Fine Grooming" is only a portion of the legal name.

Chair Rohlf: Then we need to discuss that and get some feedback to see if we would like to be consistent with last time and let them have what they've asked for or modify it.

Comm. Williams: I would have to be supportive of staff. I apparently wasn't here, but to be consistent with what we've done throughout the city on signage in various places, I would support staff's recommendations in this case.

Chair Rohlf: You would prefer to have it all on one line on the awning face.

Comm. Roberson: I will take the opposite view and say the sign, as presented, is a much more visible and pleasurable sign than simple block letters across the front of an awning. This is part of their logo, and I don't think it included "Gent's Fine Grooming" all in block letters. I don't think the previous sign was overwhelming.

Comm. Heiman: Is the actual store frontage 26 feet, or is it the 65.5 feet?

Mr. Alpert: It is 65.5 feet.

Comm. Heiman: So the logo and "Men's Fine Grooming" eight-inch lettering is more than 5% of the entire 65 feet?

Mrs. DeBoer: Drawing a box around the entire sign leads to that conclusion.

Comm. Heiman: I like it as well. I think that putting block letters on the front is not appealing, and I like the logo.

Chair Rohlf: Does anyone else have a comment or a motion?

Mr. Klein: I would like to point out that if you decide to approve it with the logo, there is no deviation to approve the size of the logo. They would have to shrink it down a little to come into compliance. Also, if the applicant wishes to do this in the future, perhaps the sign criteria could be changed.

Chair Rohlf: Was the "CA" within the 5%?

Mr. Klein: It was not included in the Staff Report since staff was opposed to the logo, so I don't know.

Comm. Jackson: My thought is that we were so aghast at what they wanted to put in the windows back then, we somewhat overlooked this. I would be willing to make a motion to accept the sign as it is but to shrink it to equate to the 5% if Mr. Alpert would like us to consider it.

Chair Rohlf: Do we have a best guess on how small that would take it because it might not even be legible.

Mr. Alpert: It is 5% of the storefront including the side elevation, too?

Mr. Klein: No, it is just the side that faces the street. They actually are not that far off. It probably would not shrink it a lot. I believe they are close to 6% currently.

Chair Rohlf: So it would be proportionately smaller.

Mr. Alpert: Unfortunately, the fact that it is a diamond expands the area you are measuring versus something that would be a rectangle filling that same space. You get a lot of brown background area within the box being drawn to define the area of that sign just because it's the diamond.

Chair Rohlf: Is that something they use in their shop in Dallas?

Mr. Alpert: Yes, this is their established logo for their business.

Chair Rohlf: Then there would just be a normal door handle.

Mr. Alpert: Right.

A motion to recommend approval of CASE 27-11 – PARK PLACE – THE GENT'S PLACE MEN'S FINE GROOMING – Request for approval of a Final Plan for a Tenant Finish, located at 11544 Ash Street, including the four staff stipulations and removing from No. 3, "The logo on the awning shall be removed" and inserting instead, "The logo on the awning shall be reduced such that the entire writing on the awning is 5% or less of the storefront" was made by Jackson; seconded by Roberson. Motion approved with a unanimous vote of 5-2. For: Pateidl, Roberson, Jackson, Heiman and Ramsey. Opposed: Williams and Elkins.

MEETING ADJOURNED.