

**City of Leawood  
Planning Commission Work Session  
CIP and Comprehensive Plan  
February 12, 2013**

**In attendance:**

**Commissioners:** Lisa Rohlf, Ken Roberson, Jim Pateidl, Bill Ramsey, Marc Elkins, Mike Levitan, Len Williams, Kelly Jackson, Kip Strauss.

**Staff Members:** Mark Klein, Planning; Joe Rexwinkle, Planning; Justin Peterson, Planning; David Ley, Franki Shearer, Legal; Debbie Brenner, Planning; Richard Coleman, Planning; Joe Johnson, Public Works.

**CIP:**

Mr. Johnson: This really hasn't changed a lot. We are still on target for 2015 to improve 143<sup>rd</sup> Street from Nall going east to Windsor, just past the school. As a part of that, we will do the intersection of Mission Road, too, going 400 feet north and south of 143<sup>rd</sup> Street. The next phase takes it down to Kenneth, showing to 2019. It may be moved up a year or two, but we'll just wait and see what the economy does and make sure everything bounces back right. Mission and Kenneth Roads and 143<sup>rd</sup> and 151<sup>st</sup> are out in 2020 and beyond, but it would be further out than that if our next project is 2019, most likely to 2023 or 2024 for the next road project.

Comm. Ramsey: Can you speak to the issue with the expansion to the Ironhorse Golf Club?

Mr. Johnson: They talked about it, and they are supposed to come back.

Comm. Ramsey: What is the issue?

Mr. Johnson: The issue is when they host a large tournament out there, they don't have a room big enough to accommodate the tournament. Then those players are playing at the tournament, and they all get comingled in the eating area. They've done a study that we will present to the Governing Body just to show what tournaments were lost because of the limitations. They don't have the ability to provide a cool environment in the summer.

The first page highlights new things that got added to the CIP. There are street projects that are generally found in our arterial programs. This year, we will work on 119<sup>th</sup> between State Line and Roe, but then we have Roe Avenue that we'll be doing from the bridge, going south to 135<sup>th</sup> Street. We will overlay that and do some work on the bridge. Overland Park is doing a project this year that will start at Tomahawk Creek Bridge and overlay the street going north to 119<sup>th</sup> Street. On Lee Boulevard from 103<sup>rd</sup> Street to 83<sup>rd</sup> Street, we're putting bike lanes in on both sides from 2016-2017. You have probably seen the Complete Street Policy and the map that goes with it. As it gets more refined, we're using it as we do our overlay program, and the streets highlighted on the map are the ones that will go to Governing Body with the additional cost to widen or sign it or whatever we need to do to accommodate cyclists. We look at traffic and speed to determine whether we're going to add designated bike lanes or just signage. As we go through our CIP process and our arterial program, we'll bring that before Governing Body for this additional experience so we can add these things to it and be in compliance. That is how we're using the Complete Streets Program. Then you have trail extension and Brook Beatty Park improvements. We are under construction with the Justice Center.

Comm. Ramsey: I understand it is a little bit ahead of schedule.

Mr. Johnson: They have shortened it by one month, saying that they think by July 1<sup>st</sup>, it should be ready to be occupied. There will still be landscaping that will go on until the end of the year. I'm somewhat guarded with that. The end of July would probably be a better date, but the plan now is to have it completely enclosed by March 4<sup>th</sup>. They have all the studs on the third floor, and they hope to have sheet rock on the third floor and also heat. Then they'll do the third floor and the lower level and then finish with the main level, coming outside the building. Hopefully within the next two weeks, they should be done with the rotunda area at the corner of Town Center and Tomahawk Creek Parkway. They started putting in frames for the windows today. They've been working on the police entrance, and they had some steel framing and will move over to court and complete that.

Comm. Pateidl: Is Mission Road from 135<sup>th</sup> to 143<sup>rd</sup> on anybody's radar?

Mr. Johnson: It's in the CIP. The project that is the section from 143<sup>rd</sup> and Nall to Windsor is in 2015. In 2019, they are looking at completing that phase. After that, Mission and 151<sup>st</sup> are out there, but it has not been programmed yet. My guess is we'll probably look at doing Mission Road first, and then it will be whether we start at 135<sup>th</sup> and go to 143<sup>rd</sup> or start at 151<sup>st</sup> and go to 143<sup>rd</sup>. I think a lot will depend on what's happening along 135<sup>th</sup> Street and then whatever happens at Ironhorse Park, which will somewhat dictate whether we start north and go south or south and go north.

Comm. Pateidl: We do have the inclusion of the multi-family housing going in there at 135<sup>th</sup> and Mission, which is going to add 272 families and who knows how much traffic; that is why I asked if it's on the radar screen. It's busy enough now, plus you can anticipate a number of those apartments being rented to younger families, and that is a lot of traffic along Mission Road going down to the school at 143<sup>rd</sup>. I really question whether we ought to look five or six years down the road before we even think about it, let alone do it.

Mr. Johnson: The 143<sup>rd</sup> section we're doing in 2015 has a total project cost of \$13.8 million. Of that, we have \$1.5 million in federal aid. The bulk of it, the city is paying for.

Comm. Pateidl: Do you think the traffic on 143<sup>rd</sup> in that section will be more detrimental to public safety than 135<sup>th</sup> to 143<sup>rd</sup> on Mission Road?

Mr. Johnson: Well, I think once 143<sup>rd</sup> is constructed, you're going to see a lot of people who currently go to 135<sup>th</sup> Street now begin to use 143<sup>rd</sup>.

Comm. Pateidl: There is a lot to be said for that.

Mr. Johnson: With the apartment complex, its main access is to 137<sup>th</sup> Street. Do they have a right-in, right-out?

Mr. Levitan: It won't be constructed until Mission is widened, and then it will be right-in, right-out.

Comm. Pateidl: The right-in, right-out won't be constructed until Mission is widened? That is not what I recall.

Mr. Klein: It is emergency access now until that point.

Mr. Johnson: The access for the apartment complex is going to be off 137<sup>th</sup> Street. You have options coming out. Going south, people will probably come out to Mission Road and turn left. Going east or west,

Pawnee is right there and is signalized. Traffic will divide. For now, it's not going to directly dump out onto Mission Road.

Comm. Ramsey: I think one other way to look at this to answer the questions is really the network study and the traffic volumes that are on there. You have peak issues with the school, but other than that, there's not that much traffic on it.

Comm. Pateidl: There's not that much traffic on 143<sup>rd</sup>, either.

Mr. Johnson: When we improve 143<sup>rd</sup> Street, we're going to improve 400 feet of Mission Road. You'll be able to make a left turn off Mission at 143<sup>rd</sup> Street without having to stack in the middle of the road like what occurs now. The school is looking at better ways to route their traffic so that they decrease how much stacking occurs on the public road.

Comm. Ramsey: It's been a couple years since I had a kid at the middle school, and they've totally changed that. It used to stack up on Mission, but at both schools now, they bring them in and wind them through with a lot more internal stacking

Mr. Johnson: As the economy improves, those projects will get moved back instead of being pushed out there now. Everybody is aware that we have Mission Road to 151<sup>st</sup> Street, and my guess is Mission Road is going to be the one they look at first once 143<sup>rd</sup> is complete.

Chair Rohlf: How do things move along in this book? Are there things from last year that have not been accomplished that get moved up? Do we ever drop things out of the book?

Mr. Johnson: We can. Probably the two biggest projects that got pushed back were the improvements to 143<sup>rd</sup> Street, which were originally scheduled for 2010-2012; now, they are 2015-2019. For the most part, what is in the CIP in each specific year gets built in that year. Streets in the Arterial Street Program can change because we do those on an annual basis within a five-year program. We get CARS funding on a five-year basis, but if a street comes up, we may prioritize to accommodate Overland Park or Kansas City, MO. Generally, the dollar amount stays pretty consistent from year to year even if the streets change.

Chair Rohlf: Is it typical that CIPs contain a lot of information about streets?

Mr. Johnson: Without doing a large public building or something like that, streets are generally the most expensive portion. Construction costs on 143<sup>rd</sup> Street are \$7 million; the rest of the \$13 million is utility, right-of-way design and inspection costs. We will probably spend close to \$2.5 million relocating utilities and probably a little over \$1 million in buying right-of-way and easements.

Mr. Coleman: Leawood doesn't build a lot of buildings.

Mr. Johnson: Generally, the road projects drive a lot of the CIPs.

Comm. Jackson: If you decide to put something off a couple years, what is the process for that? You must have to take that before Governing Body, then.

Mr. Johnson: For the CIP to move back a big street project, it is looking at the economy and seeing what revenues we will generate. We look at what the finance department forecasts over a 15-20 year period with all of our bonded debt. They look at assumptions that we're going to maintain the same rate or increase or decrease in revenues. Then they decide what needs to get pushed out to be sure we maintain our debt limit

and maintain enough funds. They make sure we have money to sustain the debt, and if there is an issue, either it gets pushed out or a levy gets raised. We have tried to avoid doing that.

Comm. Jackson: With all these changes in state tax collection, is the city worried some of the moneys received will go away? Are you starting to plan for that?

Mr. Johnson: I think we're planning for that. We used to assume we would get 2-3%, and now we're looking at 1-1 ½% or that it will be taken away. Some of that impacts road projects. A lot of that probably impacts park projects like alcohol and park projects. We are constantly talking with the state to see what they're going to do so it doesn't take us by surprise.

Comm. Jackson: Where did the Brook Beatty Park come from? It seemed to come out of nowhere.

Mr. Johnson: It was interest up north. North Leawood doesn't have a whole lot of parks. City Park is central, as are the other parks. Really, there is not a lot of land up north. They are looking at the old police station site. Once they move out, they will have a work session to figure out what to do with that. My guess is they will look at the possibility of a park. They looked at Gezzer, to make it more of an interactive park with an area for small kids. They are looking at adding a playground for kids from 3-10. Councilmembers up north listened to residents and tried to come up with a sensible plan for use of the park. Really, they are looking at it to be a park folks will walk to.

Comm. Jackson: So this is really just a guidepost; there is nothing that mandates that the city has to do what is in here in a certain order.

Mr. Johnson: Correct; it is a guide. The projects in here are theoretically planned. You will see projects that are funded and unfunded. With funded projects, the expectation is that the city will build it, but City Council could say at any time, "We're not going to do it now or not at all." The goal is to put construction projects in here for the community that the city does want to move forward with. It has been budgeted and forecasted that way.

Comm. Strauss: This must allow for flexibility. We have talked about new traffic signals when we talked about Mission Farms expansion. Is there a planned traffic signal on Tomahawk Creek parkway for the Justice Center?

Mr. Johnson: Not right now; we anticipate that once everything is in, we will look at it. It is like the one at Mission Road and 435. We've talked with Overland Park, and they are waiting until summer gets here with the apartments open. There is a stipulation on Leawood and Overland Park to both pay half if there is a need. We're trying to get warrants here to put a signal at the south entrance into City Hall at 117<sup>th</sup> Street.

Comm. Strauss: You have allotted \$400,000 every other year, correct?

Mr. Johnson: We decided a long time ago that we needed to replace the signals along State Line Road because they are the original signals and are antiquated. We plugged in a dollar amount in advance so it would be considered a funded item. Then we would make application through MARC and work with KCMO to get federal aid. The \$400,000 will be able to do two intersections if we get federal aid. The funding in the CIP is to look at signals from 103<sup>rd</sup> to our north city limits on State Line.

Comm. Strauss: Is there a time when the public has any input on prioritization? If the public citizens want to come with an idea like Brook Beatty, is there a process in which the public can suggest ideas before it gets to approval? I assume it is a Public Hearing at approval, and it is open for comment.

Mr. Johnson: Once it gets to Planning Commission, it is open for public comment.

Comm. Strauss: I just wonder if, hypothetically, there is outcry for some capital improvement, if there is allowance for that.

Mr. Coleman: There is. Some of these projects have been somewhat initiated by citizens, like the storm water project at 89<sup>th</sup> Street. The citizens see a problem and call their councilmember, who brings it up to the appropriate committee. The committee comes with a recommendation to move it forward to Joe to study and come up with a cost, and then there is a back and forth process. At some point, they decide it is something they want to do, and it might get put on the unfunded list and then get moved up to the funded list.

Comm. Strauss: I think that's good. If there is a big public outcry to improve Mission Road, it helps to understand the prioritization.

Mr. Johnson: A lot of the storm water projects are done just that way. At any time, citizens can express their desire to do something with a street, and during the CIP process is when the Council debates if it can be done, when it can be done and how much it will cost. On the bigger projects, it's more of a challenge.

Chair Rohlf: What was the outcome of the purchase of the Leabrooke land?

Mr. Coleman: We purchased the land, and it has been added to Ironwoods.

Chair Rohlf: Has anything happened in deciding that? Does it show up in here?

Mr. Johnson: No, it doesn't. There are some projects in there that are unfunded. One is to overlay existing roads and streets out there, and another unfunded project is an expansion to take the road out all the way to Leabrooke and put streetlights in.

Comm. Elkins: Isn't there a pay-as-you-go project for a park master plan? The \$85,000 seems like an amazing amount of money to me; it is too much because it seems like we do our overall Comprehensive Plan for less than \$85,000.

Mr. Coleman: We do.

Comm. Elkins: Isn't that where the public needs will feed into that master park plan?

Mr. Johnson: Yes, and that is out. I think the parks department got approval at the last council meeting to put the RFQ out. That will be something they'll do this year. Basically, we'll look at all of our parks and at what we provide and don't provide to see if there are any deficiencies or needs. Then one of the big components is looking at folks want to see and what we want to do with all of Ironwoods Park. The hope is they'll come out with some sort of master plan that they can take pieces of and expand on. It shows up on the CIP, and then it goes out back to the voters for approval for bonds to do park improvements.

Comm. Elkins: I have a couple questions on process, like some of the others. Last year, on the unfunded projects on the CIP, we had the improvements on 143<sup>rd</sup> Street from Windsor to Kenneth Road tentatively scheduled in 2017. It has fallen completely off the list, which I don't disagree with, but I am just curious. I know that Jim made the same comments last year about the concern about Mission Road from 135<sup>th</sup> to 143<sup>rd</sup>. From a process standpoint, how do you go through this process in which projects drop off? We had the conversation last year about Mission, and it doesn't seem to be here. How does the process work?

Mr. Johnson: On some of these bigger projects, there is always a debate at City Council. If it's in here and is not really funded, then we get it out of here. There is a page that shows Mission Road, 151<sup>st</sup> and 143<sup>rd</sup> Street. It shows cost, and it has years by them. Don't pay attention to the years. They're just out there as a placeholder. It doesn't have binding on anything to be done in that year. They are out there, but it's not within the five-year CIP. Right now, it's always a good thing to try to get federal aid; although, there is not much out there, and I debate whether it's useful or not when you get down to doing a \$13 million project and you have \$1.5 million. By the time it's all said and done, you may save \$800,000. The problem is I have to start five years before the project. I have to get it approved by KDOT. MARC has to approve it. It takes me two years to design it, and then I have a year for utilities and a year to construct. To build Mission Road in 2016, I have to start in 2011 and go through that process to get federal aid. If we want to pay for it ourselves, I could start tomorrow.

Comm. Ramsey: Does it work in Leawood that the only year that really matters is the current year?

Mr. Johnson: For the most part, yes, but these bigger projects need to be planned out. We're only obligated for the first year, but Kansas statute requires five years.

Comm. Ramsey: Let me ask another way: we have already identified this as a planning tool, but until City Council passes a resolution creating the project and authorizes it, even if it's one of your major ones, nothing is going to happen until that goes forward.

Mr. Johnson: Right, because you look at 143<sup>rd</sup> Street, and we've already spent money. We started back in 2009. City Council will have to do a resolution because we'll have to issue temporary notes.

Comm. Elkins: My point there is that you start someplace and, at least in my history on the commission, this serves as a road map for what the commission does. My concern, which I share with a number of folks around the table, is that we have raised this Mission Road issue, and it still has not even gotten onto what I would call the road map. For instance, 143<sup>rd</sup> from Nall to Windsor has been on the list almost as long as I have been on the commission, and it has generally been in 2015. It has moved up, and I suspect you've been doing your planning and all that stuff. I'm just anxious for the day when we see it in the queue, especially if the multi-tenant place ever comes. I have my doubts, so maybe it is moot. Additionally, talking about the important year being the current year, I don't have any disagreement with what has been done, but as an example, last year's plan had Gezzer Park's amenities in the pay-as-you-go program, scheduled for 2012. Obviously, they didn't make the cut because the same plan is for 2013. From a process standpoint, to do the improvements to Gezzer Park, for example, does it take a resolution from City Council? I am interested in the process because I think it was prudent to put off the improvements.

Mr. Johnson: Which improvements?

Comm. Elkins: In last year's plan, it was No. 76027, scheduled for 2012 under pay-as-you-go. This year, it is scheduled for 2013. It is the same cost of \$38,000. I'm not trying to make a point about that project; I'm just trying to understand the process. Kelly asked about things coming, going or jumping ahead. For example, our friends at Brook Beatty Park jumped out.

Mr. Johnson: Some of the projects have special funds that can only be used for parks. Something might happen in 2012 with a trail failure. That's probably what happened.

Comm. Elkins: That creates a need to prioritize.

Comm. Ramsey: Or the state withholds the funds.

Mr. Johnson: Yes, a lot of these smaller park projects are cash projects from the Special Parks Fund.

Mr. Coleman: Parks is usually funded with a number of different funds. A lot of them are privately donated.

Comm. Elkins: Does that indicate a delay in a gift, then?

Mr. Coleman: In this particular case, it comes down to what I just said that they had to defer funds from there to take care of the trail. It creates need to reprioritize.

Comm. Elkins: For us as a city to actually spend the \$38,000 for 76027, do you already have authority under basic circumstances to spend that \$38,000 since it is in the approved plan for 2013, or is there an appropriation that has to happen with City Council?

Mr. Coleman: It probably is going to depend on whether they have to go out and get a contract to do it.

Mr. Johnson: At some point, there is an approval process. If it is debt-finance, those projects are usually done by resolution.

Comm. Elkins: This is pay-as-you-go, so it's not going to be debt financed.

Mr. Johnson: Right, and on our street programs when we do the overlays, the approval is when they approve the contract. We have a dollar amount based on an estimate of what we will get back from CARS. There really is no more approval other than City Council approving the contract.

Chair Rohlf: If there is an emergency or you decide to move funding around, where does that show up in the next year? Is that ever reflected somewhere that there's a change?

Mr. Johnson: No, what will happen is you'll see a project in 2012 get pushed to 2013. It's a decision City Council makes.

Comm. Ramsey: I don't know of any CIP that goes into that kind of detail; that is more of a financial explanation.

Chair Rohlf: What is this really used for?

Mr. Coleman: Financial planning; it gives structure.

Mr. Johnson: This is how we set our next five years for the Street Program. When the economy took a turn for the worse, the road projects just got pushed off. It's nice to see that we'll do Mission Road in 2015. We were ready to start moving utilities when we got the axe for it. We pushed out our Arterial Program; we stretched out our Residential Reconstruction Program. We are now getting everything back and playing catch-up for the three years we really didn't do anything at all. From that perspective, things are looking better.

Comm. Elkins: On the arts issues, is the City Capital Art Fund intended as a quasi-endowment that you can spend so much out of it, but hopefully, you have it invested to continue to grow it, or is the whole \$690,000 available? I'm not suggesting you should spend it all, but I'm curious if there are restrictions on the balances in the City Capital Art Fund.

Mr. Coleman: You've got me. Their funding comes partially from the fees that we collect.

Comm. Elkins: Again, I noticed that a number of their projects got pushed from 2012 to 2013, which I personally agree with but am just curious about.

Mr. Johnson: Some are probably tied to the Justice Center and get pushed to when it gets completed. I think the money is probably available. I don't think there is an art piece the Council could agree to spend the total dollar amount at one time; I think the intent is to have art pieces spread around the city and not spend it all at once.

Comm. Elkins: A different group of people governs that process; I understand.

Mr. Coleman: I would have to check on that, but often, there is a maintenance fund as part of the operations budget and not part of the capital budget.

Mr. Johnson: They come back to City Council, who then approves or denies the cost and location.

Mr. Coleman: Do you have any more questions on the CIP? This will be on the February 26<sup>th</sup> agenda and will go to Governing Body on March 18<sup>th</sup>.

Chair Rohlf: Do you know why the Planning Commission actually takes a look at this?

Mr. Coleman: It is because the CIP is part of the city's development and planning process. Even though it's primarily in Public Works' domain, it still has to do with the street network and how that develops and serves the city. It is good practice to have the Planning Commission take a look at it.

Mr. Johnson: When we're able to add new streets for reconstruction, the first one we'll look at will be Mission Road. We've talked about it enough, and there are enough concerns being brought up about it.

Comm. Elkins: Apparently City Council looked at it in a work session a week ago. Did the issue of Mission Road come up? Are we the only ones that seem to be concerned about it?

Mr. Coleman: It's more you at this point.

Mr. Johnson: The road projects themselves are \$8-\$9 million for each mile, and we are going on ten years just to get 143<sup>rd</sup> Street done. Once that is done, we can look at the next challenge.

Comm. Elkins: Especially from 143<sup>rd</sup> south, it has to be a really cost-intensive project with the big hill.

Comm. Roberson: Does City Council participate in the creation of this?

Mr. Coleman: Oh, sure; during the year, these different issues with the CIP are brought up in the different committees and discussed. Then they bring up other items in the work sessions and work with Joe to go over it. They also work with all the other components, including parks and finance.

Mr. Johnson: As soon as we approve the budget in August, we'll start the process over again. A lot of it has to do with projects City Council has brought up, like our \$20 million curb program, which has been debated for a year. It got put in as a debt-financed project in 2013. They are all pretty familiar with what's been in there for the last four years.

Mr. Coleman: Let's move on to the Comprehensive Plan, and I'll turn it over to Mark.

### **Comprehensive Plan**

Mr. Klein: Both the CIP and Comprehensive Plan are scheduled for the next meeting as two separate documents.

Comm. Roberson: Do we approve these, then?

Mr. Klein: You'll make a recommendation to City Council.

Comm. Roberson: I'm not sure why since we have no input into it.

Mr. Klein: Like Joe mentioned, since Mission Road was mentioned a number of times, he'll take that back and discuss it. It is a requirement to have the Planning Commission look at it.

Mr. Coleman: We can have more work sessions on the CIP if you want.

Comm. Roberson: I just find it interesting that we approve something we no input on.

Mr. Coleman: You do have input. You can say that you think Mission Road should be accelerated, or we can have more work sessions on this and see if you think they aren't on track and make recommendations if you think the priority should be different.

Comm. Roberson: I'm just one voice on this commission, but I find it interesting that we, as a Planning Commission, had no input in the planning process for the CIP.

Comm. Jackson: I feel where we don't have enough input is in the Comprehensive Plan.

Comm. Roberson: I hadn't gotten that far, yet.

Comm. Jackson: If you look there, you can see if something is getting built out on Mission Road and if we do need to expand it sooner than 143<sup>rd</sup>. I would like to have more input or knowledge about how the Comprehensive Plan is put together because it has a much bigger affect over what we do.

Mr. Klein: Sure, and the Planning Commission does have a lot of input into the Comprehensive Plan. We update it yearly, and what we've done over the last couple years is we have updated numbers from our census. We haven't done a major overhaul of the Comprehensive Plan because we do have a major project coming up next year to look at the 135<sup>th</sup> Street corridor. The document you were given today does not include the 135<sup>th</sup> Street corridor because we didn't change anything with the document. This coming year, it will be substantially updated. You will have much input into this. The Comprehensive Plan has a number of sections. The demographics show a profile of the city, and it is updated here as the census numbers are released. The goals and objectives section is where the Planning Commission considers what is important to the city and what we want to achieve.

Comm. Jackson: Approaching something as major as the 135<sup>th</sup> Street corridor, is there a way you can fill us in on the new trends? You brought in the consultant six months ago and we discussed where things are going. How do we get more information like that so that we can actually have helpful insight?

Mr. Klein: You will get more information. You have the consultant, Governing Body and work session at that point. We are hiring a separate consultant who will use a lot of the ideas from the consultant you heard, and then you will get updates. We will have a series of work sessions devoted to what is being talked about for this project and also the city as a whole. It has taken a little time to go from that joint work session and some

of those ideas to actually getting a grant through MARC, and we are in the process of hiring a consultant to work with those ideas. Then we will have work sessions on those issues.

Comm. Jackson: Can you give us websites where we can learn about these things or some sort of materials?

Mr. Coleman: You can go to MARC.org; that has everything.

Chair Rohlf: Is the study on the 135<sup>th</sup> Street guidelines?

Mr. Klein: It will look at 135<sup>th</sup> Street and will go back to square one because at the time the current 135<sup>th</sup> Street corridor was done, there were different goals and objectives for the city. Now, we are looking at it to be more Mixed-Use; whereas, before, it was primarily commercial between 133<sup>rd</sup> and 137<sup>th</sup> Streets with reverse frontage roads and then residential.

Mr. Coleman: Why don't you go ahead and go through the Comprehensive Plan update and then take questions from there?

Mr. Klein: Joe and Justin worked really hard on this with going through the census numbers and putting everything together, and they will show you a PowerPoint presentation to show you changes and trends.

Mr. Rexwinkle: This is pretty similar to last year's update. We pulled census data out for a citywide update; this year, the data updates are concentrated in the three evaluation areas: North, Central and South Leawood. These are not new sections; we are merely updating the data. A lot of the narrative in that section is related to the data and was therefore updated. Like Mark was saying, this is the first part of the Comprehensive Plan; it is broken into thirds: Existing Conditions and Data, Policy Goals and Objectives and 135<sup>th</sup> Street Corridor. Everyone needs to digest the data in order to make good policy decisions. As we move forward, the planning process, combined with the data updates from the past years, will help make some of those adjustments to the policy sections.

We updated the formatting of this section so we could cite it. We also updated and added new maps. The Natural Features Map was updated. We added a Watershed Map, Schools Map and Places of Worship Map. We also updated population projections for the city through 2030.

Comm. Strauss: Does the city estimate a full build-out by 2030?

Mr. Rexwinkle: It would take a pretty detailed analysis of calculating all the areas zoned Residential versus Agricultural and at what densities we can build on for the zoning districts to really get a good feel for what the actual numbers would be. Then the timing of it is going to depend on the market.

The city will continue to grow based upon a population forecasting model we have used. Right now, it is obviously growing at a relatively slow rate compared to the last 15 years or so. This model shows it will increase a bit between 2015 and 2025, primarily due to development along the 135<sup>th</sup> Street Corridor and the remainder of South Leawood building out. This assumes existing policies remain in place, one of which states that the 135<sup>th</sup> Street Corridor is designated for Mixed-Use development. That zoning requires a minimum of 20% of the floor area to be residential.

Comm. Pateidl: Of that percentage, what do you anticipate being multi-family versus single-family?

Mr. Rexwinkle: A lot of that will depend on the 135<sup>th</sup> Street plan and how developers bring their projects in and mix them. I would assume it will be some of both.

Comm. Pateidl: One of the things I see being driven by the market is multi-family units are going to have a much bigger demand. Also, the city has shown an appetite for approval for that type of development. Have we considered the influence of multi-family as you project your population growth?

Mr. Rexwinkle: This model is a cohort projection model, so no, it doesn't consider building permits and types of residential units. It considers in-and-out migration over a five-year time period. It also takes census numbers in certain age groups and assumes how many in the 0-5 age group are born in a certain time period and how many die and also the same with migration; it does not take into account specific building permits.

Comm. Pateidl: Is any of it predicated on historical numbers as far as North and Central Leawood are concerned?

Mr. Rexwinkle: We did not do a projection for the different neighborhoods, but the overall projection we did do is based upon past trends. The model predicts the exact population of 2010, and then you know the variables going into it are probably correct.

Comm. Pateidl: The only thing I'm driving toward, I guess, is the fact that the City of Leawood has been very much a bedroom community since its inception and has been primarily single-family residences. The trends and demographics include multi-family now, and I don't know how to do it, but I suggest that this is worth looking into because it will have an influence on the total number of people we have.

Mr. Rexwinkle: I imagine next year, if we have the information available with the corridor study being concluded, we will be able to do some of that because the study might elucidate what types of residential we're going to have. Maybe we'll also learn a little about the market down the road. That should help us going forward; we just didn't want to leave something in there that had a forecast of 2014.

Comm. Pateidl: If it's Mixed-Use, it almost has to be multi-family.

Mr. Coleman: It doesn't have to be.

Comm. Pateidl: I'd say the odds are in favor of it being multi-family. Look at Mission Farms and Park Place. I don't know if we have another example available to us.

Mr. Coleman: There are other examples around the country that involve single-family development; they are just higher density.

Comm. Williams: Aren't they also much larger developments than what we have along 135<sup>th</sup>? Developments like that typically don't go on 30 acres of land.

Mr. Coleman: They could. There are hundreds of undeveloped acres of land on 135<sup>th</sup> Street. Some fairly large tracts of land are held by single ownership. A lot of it depends on the developer's experience and how they see it fitting in with the city's plan. I would assume some of it probably will be single-family and some will be higher density.

Comm. Elkins: It seems like we have an opportunity to drive that.

Mr. Coleman: We do.

Comm. Elkins: If we don't like the idea of multi-family, then we can drive that. We should be looking to drive whatever direction we think it ought to go.

Comm. Pateidl: My belief is to take the square footage cost of land along 135<sup>th</sup> Street, and it will put it outside of any reasonable value for a single family residence. We need to be prepared to recognize that we will probably be looking at more multi-family along that area, particularly in Mixed-Use.

Mr. Coleman: We just had a multi-family development converted to a single-family development in the corridor.

Comm. Levitan: You bring up a good point, though, in that the market is going to dictate what gets built. To do multi-family, you need to be at \$1-\$2 a foot, and ground is expensive there. I don't see a lot more multi-family coming along.

Comm. Elkins: Then what is left?

Mr. Coleman: I don't want to get into the actual planning, but hopefully, a lot of that will come with the plan and not really in the Comprehensive Plan because it's not the same document.

Comm. Elkins: In the existing plan, we have population projections on an annual basis, which gives more precision that is probably reasonable. Here, you do projections on five-year increments. Can you speak to that?

Mr. Rexwinkle: That is because of the model, which we think is more reliable. The projections in there now assumed a steady rate of growth every year of a little over 1%. The model actually takes into account the migration and also birth and death rates. We think it is a bit more realistic for long term. Short term, what we had been doing would be fairly reasonable, but going out to 2030, this type of model works best.

Comm. Strauss: Does this get coordinated with MARC's projections?

Mr. Rexwinkle: Not yet; going forward, we will be sharing this information.

Comm. Strauss: So we could find that MARC's projections are different than Leawood's projections and would somehow have to rectify that.

Mr. Rexwinkle: Many cities' plans have different projections from what MARC uses.

Mr. Coleman: The county has its own research group, and they send a lot of their data to MARC.

Comm. Levitan: The data is pretty good.

Comm. Elkins: Are we changing our assumptions relative to the aging of the population of the city and the size of the families in the city?

Mr. Rexwinkle: It depends on the neighborhood, and we will get to some of that down the road, but it doesn't really play too much on a detailed level into this model that we use for the projection. Going forward, we can consider that along with actual policy changes that might affect the density of residential development. This is getting to where we're talking about the population of neighborhoods. Leawood grew a little over 4,000 folks between 2000 and 2010. All of that came from growth in North and South Leawood; Central Leawood actually declined a bit. In the grand scheme of things, we would consider it stable and not really a decline because it will fluctuate up and down. In 1990, North Leawood was 8,601 and declined to 8,400 and now is back up to 8,600 again. Those are normal fluctuations in neighborhoods as they evolve over time.

Comm. Elkins: Is the implication there that young families are coming back to North Leawood?

Mr. Rexwinkle: Yes; and there is evidence of more of that going forward. Pretty much all of the growth has been from South Leawood, except for a couple hundred people. That is primarily due to new development and migration, which is pretty obvious.

The average household size decreased slightly since 2000. As you can see, Leawood's average household size increased from 2.49 to 2.59, which is unusual today, as most neighborhoods are seeing a decline in household size. There are more houses in North Leawood as well, but the vacancy rate is a little higher than it was in 2000, so it's not necessarily because there are more households living in North Leawood; it is just that they are larger. In Central Leawood, the household size declined pretty substantially compared to the other neighborhoods, and South Leawood declined barely. That tells us the growth didn't come from increasing household size; it came from new households. As neighborhoods build out, what is common in any suburban area, a generation grows up and moves out, and the household size drops substantially. It will be interesting to see what happens to Central Leawood by 2020. I would suspect it will stabilize.

Occupancy statistics show that the occupancy rates have fallen across the board but not in a substantial manner when compared to other communities. There are more vacant homes in those areas. It will also be interesting to see how that changes by 2020, as some of it could be affected by the economy.

Comm. Strauss: I went to our annual homeowners' association meeting, and they brought up the idea of rental homes.

Mr. Coleman: We have data on that. Since 2008, rental homes have increased. I wouldn't call it substantial, though.

Mr. Rexwinkle: The city has fallen from 92.8% owner occupied to 92.4%. I would consider that to be stable, especially compared to other communities. Most of that uptick from rental rate probably did occur in the late 2000s. Leawood still has much higher owner occupancy rates than most other towns at 95% in North Leawood, which is an increase since 2000. Central and South Leawood were down by a percentage point or two.

Our age distribution trends pretty much mirror national and local trends. We have an aging population. What is interesting about Leawood is that it's not increasing quite as fast as it is in places around here. In North Leawood, our adolescent population increased from 22% of North Leawood's population to 30%, which is a 27% increase. We are using these groups because the existing Comprehensive Plan has used them, and the adolescent group includes all people age 24 and under. At a more detailed level, eight and younger increased 30%. The bulk of the increase in North Leawood is with young children. The college-age population is very low in every neighborhood because most people leave to go to college. The career-age groups from age 25-64 declined in each neighborhood. The retirement group of 65 and above increased in each neighborhood except for North Leawood, which is bucking the regional and national trends. It's becoming a younger neighborhood.

Comm. Elkins: I'm trying to think of the implications of those adolescent numbers going up that way. Should that be reversing the trends and needs for the Shawnee Mission School District?

Mr. Rexwinkle: That's a good question. It is interesting that they have closed two schools in North Leawood since 2000 with the youth population growing.

Mr. Coleman: It is not substantial enough to impact it.

Comm. Levitan: Mission Valley was operating at 50% occupancy when they closed it.

Mr. Rexwinkle: Educational attainment has increased across the board in every neighborhood since 2000. The population with a bachelor's degree is greater, which is a common metric used when talking about education attainment. It is 84% in North Leawood, up from 66% since 2000. In Central Leawood, it is up to 85% from 72%. South Leawood is up to 82% from 65%. In a couple neighborhoods, a big portion of it was people with graduate degrees. This is consistent with national trends as well. The rate of increase in Leawood is probably higher than national trends, but generally, it's increasing throughout the country.

With rates of ethnicity, one thing I thought was interesting was that in Leawood, the increase is going north to south. North Leawood has the highest population that considers itself white. We have a ways to go to be more diverse, but it is an increase from the 1990s.

Comm. Elkins: In the current plan, we presented it with overall Leawood and the division between the three areas. This is helpful to have it all together. Are you contemplating changing the presentation at all so things are more combined by subject matter area rather than being divvied up by huge chunks into three sections?

Mr. Rexwinkle: We talked about that a little bit, but we know there will be big changes to the Comprehensive Plan in the next year or two, so we thought that was maybe more in scale of the change. We might consider it next year because the comparisons between the neighborhoods are much more obvious than the distinctions. That might be something the Planning Commission should weigh in on as to whether the format should be adjusted or not.

As I alluded to earlier, we updated the information about the schools. In 2000, there were two elementary schools with attendance areas in South Leawood; now, there are four. In 2000, there were three elementary schools with attendance areas in North Leawood, and now there are just two. We also updated all the commercial development data, and a table in the Comprehensive Plan lists most of the commercial developments and their floor area. Since Justin has been here, he has been keeping track of all of the floor area numbers for every building in town. We were able to update a lot of that, and we'll be able to do it annually, I think, or maybe biannually as the developments build out. One table lists all of them, and then there are separate tables for each specific commercial development in each neighborhood with a little narrative that describes that development and its location. That is in the existing Comprehensive Plan; there is not a substantial change there.

The only other thing updated was a section on public buildings and amenities for each area. Obviously, some of that has changed. The current plan references the post office in North Leawood that is gone, so we got rid of that. There was a reference to the Justice Center, and we added one for Central Leawood.

Mr. Klein: Does anybody have any questions?

Comm. Pateidl: Since you were talking about schools and education, I'm wondering if there is anything going on, on a national basis related to communities' assisting homeschooling efforts by individuals. Is there any of that activity going? Is that something we should be considering?

Mr. Rexwinkle: I think that's an interesting question. We can look to see if there is data on that. That is something we've talked about. We don't know enrollment numbers for the school. Obviously, they're going down in North Leawood, yet we know the youth population is increasing. Where are those kids going to school? Are they going to private schools or being homeschooled?

Comm. Roberson: Missouri doesn't keep track of kids who are homeschooled. I don't know about Kansas.

Comm. Ramsey: I think Kansas does. One interesting side issue is that Johnson County keeps cutting the budget for the libraries. The Johnson County Library keeps the curriculum for all the home schools. One of the unintended consequences here may be that it's going to put a squeeze on homeschoolers as they keep

dwindling down their resources to provide that. I think that's where Kansas tracks those. I think there's a state board.

Mr. Rexwinkle: We can look into that before the February 26<sup>th</sup> meeting to see if there are some numbers out there.

Comm. Ramsey: I know in my neighborhood, there are an awful lot of kids who go to parochial schools.

Comm. Pateid: I would think those numbers would be available. I can't imagine Nativity or Cure of Ars or St. Michael wouldn't provide that information.

Comm. Levitan: I'm curious about annexation and growth farther south. Is there room to continue to annex?

Mr. Klein: We are surrounded on the south by Overland Park. That happened a number of years ago.

Mr. Rexwinkle: It is interesting to look at a map of the city.

Comm. Strauss: On the Comprehensive Plan and the CIP, I would be interested in more public feedback. I didn't know if the city has ever had an open house, inviting the public in to give comments.

Mr. Klein: We have. Basically in 2000, we did a total overhaul of the Comprehensive Plan completely, and we held a number of public meetings in North, Central and South Leawood to take input and then developed the Golden Policies and Objectives off that as well as looking at demographics. I imagine there will be a public component with this 135<sup>th</sup> Street Corridor as well, so that is something we'll see more of.

Comm. Strauss: I'm glad you did it in 2000. I think thirteen years later, it should be done again. I know 135<sup>th</sup> Street is probably the vehicle to do it, but hopefully, you can open it up to the entire city as far as providing comments.

Comm. Jackson: What was Overland Park's experience because they just did it with Metcalf?

Mr. Coleman: They had a very large budget for that. We're talking about something that's never going to happen like that. We just don't have the resources.

Comm. Jackson: But did they get good information from the public?

Mr. Coleman: I think they got good information.

Comm. Strauss: They did all kinds of surveys.

Mr. Coleman: At some point, we'll have a public process with 135<sup>th</sup> Street with some kind of social media outreach to the neighborhoods. The chamber and school district will be involved. This will be a mini model in a sense for a comprehensive update that involved more people across the city. With 135<sup>th</sup> Street, there will be opportunity for that to take place.

Comm. Elkins: Is there any reason it would be inappropriate to include the parochial schools in the schools map?

Mr. Rexwinkle: No, we could add that very easily.

Comm. Elkins: It's a small matter, but it gives us a little more complete idea.

Mr. Rexwinkle: It would be the same for public schools that obviously, some schools are not mapped that serve Leawood. Corinth Elementary is just barely outside of Leawood, but they have a large attendance area in North Leawood.

Mr. Coleman: We were also concerned about the fact that we might miss other denominational schools or groups that are much smaller that we didn't include; that is why we stuck with the public schools.

Comm. Elkins: But shouldn't we know about those with zoning or planning? We deal with child care facilities.

Mr. Coleman: I think the Presbyterian church at 183<sup>rd</sup> has some kind of schooling program. I don't know if the Baptist church on 183<sup>rd</sup> has one or not.

Comm. Elkins: Is that a conforming use?

Mr. Coleman: It would still be allowed under the zoning. We didn't just want to include Catholic schools and miss all the other little schools. That is why we just stuck with the public schools. We could go out and do that; we are just acting on a cautious side because we didn't know all the other educational institutions.

Comm. Elkins: It may be a worthwhile exercise when we redo the planning total. Things as simple as traffic patterns can be affected.

Mr. Coleman: Most of them don't have a huge impact.

Comm. Elkins: Something to consider.

Mr. Coleman: Absolutely; I asked the same question. Any other questions or input? If you think of something later, just email me, Mark or Joe and let us know. We'll get back to you about adjusting.

Chair Rohlf: When we see it in two weeks, it will be bound?

Mr. Coleman: Yes, it will.

Chair Rohlf: What will be in there that's not here?

Mr. Klein: The 135<sup>th</sup> Street Corridor study is always in the back as an appendix. We didn't change anything with regard to that. It will be included with the next one as well.

Mr. Coleman: After we get the consultant on board, things will get very busy for six months after that.

Comm. Jackson: In regards to work sessions?

Mr. Coleman: Work sessions, meetings, public meetings, reviewing the plan.

Comm. Jackson: Will you just let us know what's going on so we can attend the public meeting?

Mr. Coleman: We'll have a whole schedule. We may have bimonthly meetings.

Comm. Levitan: What firm is doing the study?

Mr. Coleman: We don't know yet, but they're due next week. I don't know what kind of response we're going to get. We're going to try to get something to you as soon as possible because the project has to be completed by November 30<sup>th</sup> of this year. We have a very short time frame to get a lot done.

Chair Rohlf: Why the time frame?

Mr. Coleman: That's mandated by the grant.

Comm. Elkins: Don't forget cell towers when we're talking about 135<sup>th</sup> Street Corridor. You'll hear more from me about them.

Comm. Jackson: And utility boxes.

Mr. Coleman: I want to thank Joe, Justin and Mark for doing the Comprehensive Plan update because they've done a really good job.

*MEETING ADJOURNED*