

**City of Leawood
Planning Commission Meeting
April 23, 2013
Dinner Session – 5:30 p.m. No Discussion of Items
Meeting - 6:00 p.m.
Leawood City Hall Council Chambers
4800 Town Center Drive
Leawood, KS 66211
913.339.6700 x 160**

CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL: Levitan, Pateidl, Roberson, Jackson, Rohlf, Williams, Elkins and Strauss.
Absent: Ramsey.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA:

A motion to approve the agenda was made by Williams; seconded by Roberson. Motion approved with a unanimous vote of 7-0. For: Levitan, Pateidl, Roberson, Jackson, Williams, Elkins and Strauss.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Approval of the minutes from the April 2, 2013 Planning Commission meeting.

A motion to approve the minutes from the April 2, 2013 Planning Commission meeting was made by Williams; seconded by Elkins. Motion approved with a unanimous vote of 7-0. For: Levitan, Pateidl, Roberson, Jackson, Williams, Elkins and Strauss.

CONTINUED TO May 28, 2013:

CASE 27-13 – LEAWOOD DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE AMENDMENT TO SECTION 16-2-9, PERFORMANCE STANDARDS – Request for approval of an amendment to the Leawood Development Ordinance, pertaining to noise from generators. **PUBLIC HEARING**

CONSENT AGENDA:

CASE 43-13 – TOMAHAWK CREEK PARKWAY – COGNIOS CAPITAL MONUMENT SIGN – Request for approval of a Final Sign Plan, located west of Tomahawk Creek Parkway and north of W. 114th Street.

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

NEW BUSINESS:

CASE 42-13 – IRONWOODS PARK – REST STATION – Request for approval of a Final Plan, located approximately at 146th Street and Mission Road.

Staff Presentation:

City Planner Justin Peterson made the following presentation:

Mr. Peterson: Members of the Planning Commission, this is Case 42-13 – Request for approval of a Final Plan. The applicant is requesting approval to construct restrooms within Ironwoods Park. The rest station is proposed to be 806 square feet and located just south of an existing parking lot, approximately 470 feet

south of the north property line of Ironwoods Park and 760 feet west of the east property line. No other structures or uses are proposed with this application. The elevations of the building are proposed to be constructed primarily of natural stone that will match the Native Center building within the park and accented with natural wood and Hardie Board siding. A canopy is proposed to extend out past the building in a circular form on the north, south, and west elevations and the entrance will be provided from the west elevation. The landscape plan has been provided which identifies a variety of landscaping, surrounding the proposed restroom building with additional landscaping to be provided to the north of the existing amphitheatre. A series of trees will be provided to help screen both the amphitheatre and the proposed rest station from the north. Staff recommends approval of Case 42-13, subject to the stipulations in the Staff Report. Members of the Parks and Rec Department are here to answer any questions.

Comm. Williams: How does this compare to the Preliminary Plan? Is it the same size facility?

Mr. Coleman: The original plan located the restroom/shelter facility to the northeast side of the amphitheatre, so it was approximately 300 feet from the residents to the north. This location is toward the trail, parking and stage area for the amphitheatre. The square footages are basically identical. The other structure was taller with a second story to be used as a lighthouse for spotlights. This is less obtrusive.

Comm. Williams: In terms of toilet facilities, this is about the same size, or is it an increase?

Mr. Coleman: There is a slight increase in the number of toilets, but the building is the same size. The number of toilets meets the code requirement for facilities of this type based on the attendance of the amphitheatre, and this facility it to be used by other park visitors as well.

Comm. Williams: Since the plan has changed from the Preliminary Plan, should this be resubmitted as a Preliminary Plan?

Mr. Coleman: No, it didn't meet the substantial requirements for a change. It is actually less obtrusive than the original plan.

Comm. Williams: Could you review some of those key ones for us?

Mr. Coleman: I don't have it in front of me.

Applicant Presentation:

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

Ms. Claxton: I have Brian Anderson, Superintendent of Parks; Brett Haugland with Consulting Engineers; Greg Haselwander with Kevin Cowan Architects all here tonight. Each of them will give a small presentation. We'll start with the overall park Site Plan and then a specific Site Plan as it relates to the restroom, followed by the footprint of the building, the elevations and the materials. Then Brian will summarize the last segment, which will be the landscape plan. Then I'll do a short summary and stand for questions.

Brett Haugland, Continental Engineers, 9000 State Line Road, Leawood, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following presentation:

Mr. Haugland: (*Refers to Site Plan display throughout*) This is about 470 feet from the north property line, 760 feet from the east property line and probably around 600 feet to the closest residence. The restroom location was chosen because it serves a parking facility and the existing amphitheatre. We are about 5 feet out of the floodplain. It is also served by a fairly close sanitary sewer, and we have water and power not that

far from the facility to help get the utilities to it. We also have an extension of the drive for access to the amphitheatre and connections to the existing trail around the pond and also the trail that goes north toward the residential area.

Greg Haselwander, Kevin Cowan Architects, 8512 Lee Boulevard, Leawood, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Mr. Haselwander: *(Refers to Site Plan throughout)* The entrances are off the west side. We have a circular canopy surrounding the entire facility. We have seven toilets for the ladies' facility and two toilets and two urinals for the men's. We have three lavatories for each. We also have baby changing tables and trash facilities. It is going to be mostly concrete block, built for durability as well as longevity. The canopy will be supported by glulam beams naturally finished with natural stone around the exterior base. For durability and longevity, we will use stone around those areas. We are also using natural wood in the gable forms. We will have an asphalt shingle roof to match everything else out there right now. On the east elevation, we will use a Hardie Board panel system that has reveals in it and also is painted and will be a natural beige finish. The side elevations are basically identical to each other with a trapezoidal shape on the north and south sides, and we have the natural limestone with the circular overhang. A concrete column will serve as structural support with some black painted structural steel connections for the glulam beams. The gable shapes will be reddish-brown. The overhang with the glulam beams under the soffit will be the natural finish wood. The wood is looking to be either cypress or cedar. The stone is a natural stone, not the cultured stone. We'll have some the dark bronze aluminum color. The doors will be the dark bronze paint to match.

Brian Anderson, Parks Superintendant for Leawood, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Mr. Anderson: *(Refers to Site Plan display throughout)* Greg talked about the overhang area. One of the requests from the set builders is shade, so an asset to this design is a shaded area under the deck to use for building sets and woodworking. Because of that, we needed to leave the path clear of trees and shrubbery so they can carry things out through there. The other side would have a shaded area to sell refreshments. We added elm trees to give shade to people making a purchase. We would have a couple ornamental Serbian Spruce trees to frame the side with some Sweet spire as well. We wanted to add some trees to provide screening, and we are going with more of a natural theme with trees native to Kansas.

Ms. Claxton: To summarize what we are presenting tonight, we attempted to work with the architect to design something that would fit well in the park with the current amenities. A stream runs along the west property line. We have used elements similar to the Nature Center and restroom for the cabin. On the other side with the cabins, it becomes a bit more natural looking, which is what we tried to do with this design. The roof is the same composite as every other building, with the exception of the school. We also tried to orient the building so the entrances would be away from the residential on the north and really to provide as little intrusion between the two screenings. We worked with our engineers and architects to really tuck it back into those trees as far as we could, while keeping in mind where the sanitary lines and flood plain were. I'd be happy to answer any questions.

Comm. Pateidl: In the Preliminary Plan, was the canopy included?

Mr. Coleman: There was an overhang that was a different shape.

Comm. Pateidl: How does it compare in size?

Mr. Coleman: I would say they are roughly the same size.

Comm. Pateidl: Has there been a good comparison made of that architectural feature? I see this as an extension of the building, the footprint and the roof. I'm curious as to how this may or may not influence the definition of a minor change.

Mr. Coleman: I don't think it has any impact on whether it is a minor or major change. They both had sheltered areas. The other had columns and a gabled roof that extended out from the building. This simply has a curved canopy that slightly extends. It probably would extend a bit less because it is cantilevered. It doesn't have any columns as the other one did.

Comm. Williams: The concessions are temporary setups, so will it be knock-down tables?

Ms. Claxton: Yes, we would use tables that would be put away.

Comm. Williams: There are cut sheets for lighting, but I don't see where it is located. Could you elaborate a bit on the cast of the light? Where is it going? Who will be affected by it?

Mr. Haselwander: The majority of the lighting is under the soffit as can lights in the space of the canopy all the way around. The light is pointing directly down on the facility and to the sidewalks around.

Comm. Williams: Will it be shining on the sides of the building as well?

Mr. Haselwander: It will shine on the sides of the building. We were looking at putting a cove light around the trapezoidal shapes on the building. The light would not be exposed; it would just give a gentle glow.

Comm. Williams: So no lighting would be cast outward past the building?

Mr. Haselwander: No.

Comm. Williams: Since the use of this area is seasonal to an extent, will the lighting on the building operate twelve months out the year?

Mr. Haselwander: I don't know from a maintenance standpoint, but I would think it would need some security lighting.

Mr. Anderson: Yes, we would need lighting for security. An operational standard is all our doors on restrooms in our parks are on timed automatic locking systems which coordinate with the park operating hours.

Comm. Williams: Do you need all of the lighting proposed? What we didn't get a description of is how many recessed can lights are allowed and if it is possible to reduce the number of lights on when the facility is not in use in the off season.

Mr. Haselwander: There are two can lights on the south side, two on the north side and four on the west side. The west side is where the trees are. The north side is where the landscaping was on the north side, and then the south side is toward the pond area. We don't specifically have an overhang on the east side, and we don't have any lighting on the east side, either.

Comm. Williams: Have you evaluated reducing the lighting in the off season and still maintaining the necessary security?

Mr. Anderson: We could research and check for standards of light levels for a security purpose. At Leawood City Park, we have a lot of street lights in the parking lot. At a certain hour, two out of every three are shut off to save energy. There is not a lot of light in this area. The light on this building is the only light; I don't believe we have light in the parking lot. Having some minor light is a good idea.

Comm. Williams: The use of can lights where most of the light is directed toward the pavement is less obtrusive than if you had a wall-mounted light cast out into the surrounding area. I'm just looking at ways to de-emphasize the amount of light that neighboring properties would contend with in the off season.

Ms. Claxton: To that point, in talking with the architect, we think we could look at, perhaps, every other one. That would cut it by 50% and would provide at least one can light on one side of the building. To me, that may end up being sufficient. I don't think it would be a major change or expense in terms of construction.

Comm. Strauss: I don't have a good understanding of the amphitheatre and the history. Can you explain the types of events and the attendance the last few years and what is expected? Are there other future plans other than this rest facility?

Ms. Claxton: The main user of that space is the Leawood Stage Company, and they are out there seven nights plus rehearsals from the beginning of June through the third week of July. Those performances would draw the biggest crowds. I would say on average, there are about 500 people attend those. We also have our Fall Concert Series on Sunday evenings; those bring a couple hundred people on average. We also have children's music programs on Tuesdays through June. The only restroom in the park that is open for general use right now is the one by the playground. While we do have a restroom by the cabins, it is not open during operating hours; it is only open when the cabins are used because it has restrooms and showers. The restroom at the Nature center is available if it's open. We have our special events through the year. Some we do by ourselves; others, we partner with others. We have also had large groups of lacrosse using the space as well. This restroom is designed for 500-600 people, so we feel it is at the minimum. We have had crowds upward of 1,000 or more people. For this parcel, we have done nothing more with the additional 45 acres. We feel this will meet the current needs in this area.

Comm. Strauss: Are there any master plans for expansion of the amphitheatre, or is this the ultimate build?

Ms. Claxton: There was a master plan that showed the amphitheatre. I can't answer that because we have not gone any further on that. This is all we are charged to do right now, and this is all the funding we have. This is the last of the \$12.5 million bond issue from 1998.

Comm. Strauss: The only thing I was confused about is the process to determine how many restroom facilities were needed. Historically, I read that the city was requesting portable restrooms out there for events. Could you talk about that?

Ms. Claxton: We are looking at between 500 and 600 people because that is the overall average of what we see at our biggest times. We are building for the minimums in some cases, particularly with the Leawood Stage Company, and not for the maximum of 1,500 people. It is also difficult to compare the portable restrooms. We have a lot of seniors who attend our events, and they are hard to get in and out of. When we started working on this restroom, which we've been working on for several years now, we had gone from 1,500 square feet down to 990, so we had been reducing those down to what you see now. Comparatively speaking, we feel we are designing for the minimum of our average group.

Comm. Strauss: The difference in square footage between a facility with eleven restrooms and one with seven restrooms might be a reduction from 11% to 7%. Talking 806 square feet for the proposed facility, do you have a rough idea of what it would be going down to 7%?

Mr. Haselwander: We looked at 550 people for the size, which is average in some of the events. Looking at the building code, it calls for seven water closets with 40 people per water closet for the ladies, serving 280 people. There are four water closets and urinals for the men, which is 300, and that gets us to 580 people.

Comm. Strauss: I'm not talking about ratios. What is the size of the water closet? If we reduce from 11% down to 7%, the size of the building would change from 806 square feet down to what?

Mr. Haselwander: Brett is suggesting to me that it is about 93 square feet.

Comm. Strauss: It would be roughly 700 square feet.

Mr. Haselwander: We can't just take out a toilet. Usually, you would have your lavatory and circulation space as well.

Comm. Strauss: If you take out the extra space that goes with each water closet, are we talking 150 square feet maybe?

Mr. Haselwander: It's hard to get a precise number on this, but you're looking at about 100 square feet.

Chair Rohlf: Mr. Coleman, it is my understanding we are going to have a Public Hearing

Mr. Coleman: You can allow comment.

Public Hearing

Kari Phillips, 14616 Chadwick Street, Leawood, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Ms. Phillips: I am adjacent to the park, so I will be looking at this building. I am happy with the location; I think it is a really good place for a restroom facility. I think the exterior changes are an improvement over the last plan that has come through. We still have concerns about exterior lighting because again, this is an illuminated building, and there really isn't that much screening from where our residences are because we sit on a hill and overlook this area. My other concern is about the changes of this since the Preliminary Plan in 2001. I just saw that plan a week ago. I've seen five different schematics for this area, including this building and others. I don't think we have a really clear plan of what is going to happen here. I think it's going to be very difficult for any new resident that wants to move here to know what's next. I'm concerned about the growth and seeding numbers. I've seen anything from zero to 2,000, and I'm just not sure this piece of land can really handle that. I think we like a scaled-down version of this and maybe start moving some event to other locations around the city, particularly since not everybody who lives way up north wants to drive all the way down to South Park. I think we are getting in the right direction here, but I don't think we are quite there yet. Thank you. I appreciate the fact that you are taking public comment.

Cheryl Schaumberg, 14824 Fairway Court, Leawood, KS, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Mr. Schaumberg: My husband and I are property owners in the Leabrooke subdivision, and our property abuts the land that was purchased by the addition to Ironwoods. For transparency, I am also the board vice president of the Leawood Stage Company, the non-profit 501(c)3, which is a volunteer group under the Parks and Rec Department. Our mission is to offer residents of Leawood and the surrounding area the experience of community theater as participants, spectators and patrons. The Stage Company enhances

the quality of life for all through theatrical productions, educational programming and community engagement. I point out that we report to Parks and Rec because I recently discovered that many people in Leawood inaccurately believe that The Stage Company is an independent non-city group. We can't do a single thing without getting Parks and Rec approval. I believe it is time for the City of Leawood to move forward on the project. Hundreds, if not thousands, of people, attend events in Ironwoods Park each year, from the kid events such as Mr. Stinky Feet to the Jazz in the Park to the Stage Company productions and to outside organizations that come in and have events there as well. There are inadequate facilities there now. The portable potties don't cut it. They're not good for little kids, and they're horrible for elderly people. As a Stage Company officer, I have helped elderly people get to the restrooms by the kids' playground because they can't use the portable potties, and these are residents of Leawood who can't come out because there are no facilities there for them. My neighbors' kids have peed down their legs trying to get from where the amphitheatre is over to the current facility because they can't use portable potties because they're too small to use them. For fifteen years, since the original taxpayer vote, this project has been in limbo. It seems to me that part of the delay is the loudest voices, those that are against any project in Ironwoods Park, are the only voices being heard. It is time for the city leaders to recognize that all of the people attending the events are in need of being heard. Their attendance at the event is their voice; that's what they want. They want the park utilized as voted on in 1998. They aren't sending emails or letters because they believed the issue was decided when the bond was voted on. Please move forward. It is time. Thank you.

As no one else was present to speak, a motion to close the Public Hearing was made by Roberson; seconded by Williams. Motion approved with a unanimous vote of 7-0. For: Levitan, Pateidl, Roberson, Jackson, Williams, Elkins and Strauss.

Comm. Pateidl: In your reference to the emails and the written communication we've had regarding this case, I presume it becomes public record. To that end, I'd like to get some clarification from staff on the point raised by Mr. St. Dennis regarding the expiration of the Preliminary Plan for this project that had been originally approved in 2001 and how we can bring this forward to a Revised Final Plan at this stage. My concern is not as much with this project as it is with our process because as I have sat on this board, I have found that what we do for the city also has an impact to what private developers may or may not do as they come before this board. We had questions about the signage used in our library and that it is not in accordance with the ordinance as a developer was trying to make some pretty reasonable requests. I can appreciate those. If we are going to have a process, I want to be certain we are careful about the precedent we set so it doesn't come back and bite us in the future. To that end, who would like to address the question of this plan being in accordance with the rules of our ordinances?

Mr. Coleman: This plan is absolutely in accordance with all of our rules and regulations. It meets every one of them. Parks has gone the extra mile to address the neighbors' concerns on the project. They held an Interact Meeting when everyone could discuss the project. The project follows the same path that any other building plan of this type would follow in the city.

Comm. Pateidl: Explain the influence or impact of a five-year term on a Preliminary Plan.

Mr. Coleman: The Preliminary Plan, Final Plan and Rezoning were all conducted in 2001. Construction on that plan started at that time. If the bond had never been issued and construction had not started and then five years elapsed, it would expire. That is not the case here.

Comm. Pateidl: Please understand that I'm not trying to be argumentative. I am concerned about clarification for public record. To that end, that makes sense and supports your position. I can accept that as the position of the city.

A motion to recommend approval of CASE 42-13 – IRONWOODS PARK – REST STATION – Request for a Final Plan for a Rest Station, located approximately at 146th Street and Mission Road – with nine staff stipulations and an additional stipulation that consideration be given to the lighting and how it is handled during the evening hours in terms of a reduction – was made by Roberson; seconded by Williams.

Mr. Coleman: Could you get more specific about the reduction?

Mr. Roberson: From a security standpoint, I can't make that decision. I would suggest that there are only half a dozen can lights, so doing every other one is three.

Comm. Williams: There should be two lights in each side, so taking one out is 50% reduction with the sides of the building illuminated for security purposes.

Motion approved with a unanimous vote of 7-0. For: Levitan, Pateidl, Roberson, Jackson, Williams, Elkins and Strauss.

CASE 46-13 – T-MOBILE WIRELESS ANTENNA – CITY PARK – Request for approval of a Special Use Permit for a wireless antennae and associated equipment, located south of I-435 and east of Mission Road.

PUBLIC HEARING

Staff Presentation:

Assistant Director Mark Klein made the following presentation:

Mr. Klein: Madame Chair and members of the Planning Commission, this is Case 46-13 – T-Mobile Wireless Antenna at City Park. The applicant is requesting approval of a Special Use Permit to allow the continued operation of existing wireless antenna and associated equipment on an existing wireless communication tower. No changes to the antenna, tower or associated equipment are proposed with this application. This is the tower adjacent to I-435. Per the stipulations, we have this SUP terminating on September 19, 2016. The reason for that is that we don't want any of the antennas to exceed the SUP issued for the tower itself. Eventually, all the antennas would come into the same time range as the tower and would all renew at the same time. Staff is recommending approval of this application with the stipulations stated in the Staff Report, and I'll be happy to answer any questions.

Chair Rohlf: Do we have staggered SUPs for the other carriers, or is it time for all of these to come up again?

Mr. Klein: We still have some staggered. A couple came in around the time the tower came; this one was approved prior to that.

Comm. Williams: I seem to recall from a previous application we had some bad landscaping that is more an issue for the operator of the tower. Has that been rectified?

Mr. Klein: They were notified last year, and they have updated the landscaping. Some more trees have died, and they have been notified.

Comm. Williams: Again, that's an issue for the tower owner and not T-Mobile.

Applicant Presentation:

Justin Anderson, SSC, 9900 W. 109th St., Suite 300, Overland Park, KS, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Mr. Anderson: I'm here to ask for an SUP renewal for the expiration date that staff has provided of September 19, 2016. I don't have any changes to the tower to give to you. All of the dimensions are the same. Nothing has changed except some antennas permitted through the city. I would stand for any questions.

Public Hearing

As no one was present to speak, a motion to close the Public Hearing was made by Jackson; seconded by Williams. Motion approved with a unanimous vote of 7-0. For: Levitan, Pateidl, Roberson, Jackson, Williams, Elkins and Strauss.

A motion to recommend approval of CASE 46-13 – T-MOBILE WIRELESS ANTENNAE – CITY PARK – Request for approval of a Special Use Permit for a wireless antennae and associated equipment, located south of I-435 and east of Mission Road – with seven staff stipulations – was made by Williams; seconded by Strauss. Motion approve with a unanimous vote of 7-0. For: Levitan, Pateidl, Roberson, Jackson, Williams, Elkins and Strauss.

CASE 31-13 – LEAWOOD DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE 9, DEFINITIONS – Request for approval of an amendment to the Leawood Development Ordinance, pertaining to the definition of building identification symbols. **PUBLIC HEARING**

Staff Presentation:

Assistant Director Mark Klein made the following presentation:

Mr. Klein: Madame Chair and members of the Planning Commission, this is Case 31-13 – Leawood Development Ordinance Amendment to Article 9 – Definitions, pertaining to building identification symbols. This particular amendment is in conjunction with the following case: 143-12. This amendment proposes to add a definition to the Leawood Development Ordinance with regard to building identification symbols. We are proposing, "A sign using a single character to identify and distinguish a building from another building within a development containing multiple buildings. A building identification symbol may consist of a single letter, number or icon." (*Shows examples*) This would allow multiple buildings within a campus to be identified. The Sprint Campus uses such an identification system. The following case deals with public and semi-public campuses. We have discussed this issue regarding locations that may be large enough to need the signage to help identify buildings, parking lots and such. We are hoping to address monument signs for the overall development, wall signs on the buildings themselves, building identification signs on the buildings themselves, directory signs (a list of locations within the campus) and also building entry signs. We have seen directional signs, such as "Do Not Enter" and signs with an arrow to direct. Another piece of signage we are trying to address with this ordinance is signage on light poles. This would allow campuses to place signage on light poles with a maximum of two per pole with a size limitation as well. Directory signs could be monument signs or post and panel. Entry door signs would be smaller signs identifying a particular entry.

- Monument Signs - We are proposing to allow one monument sign per frontage with the exception of a frontage that is more than 2,500 linear feet, which would be allowed a second monument sign. As an example, The Church of the Resurrection probably has the longest frontage I'm aware of in Leawood, and it is a little over 3,300 linear feet. This might be the only instance that would allow two monument signs; however, a section in the proposed ordinance would allow the applicant to give up a monument sign and allow an additional wall sign. Since the monument sigs are limited to 50 square feet in area, the wall sign would also be a maximum of 50 square feet. This ordinance only applies to public and semi-public campuses, so it wouldn't apply to commercial development such as Town Center Plaza, Camelot or One Nineteen, which is now Town Center Crossing. The campus would also have to be a minimum of 10 acres for this ordinance.

- Wall Signs – We are proposing a maximum of one per façade with no more than two per building; however, if they choose to give up one monument sign, they can get a third sign on the building that would be a maximum of 50 square feet. With regard to the building identification symbols we talked about earlier, those would not be counted against the number of wall signs they have. Basically, they could still have their name on one side and then also have the building identification symbol. However, all the signage on an individual façade would have to be a maximum of 5% of that façade.
- Light Pole Banners – We are proposing two per light pole, and they would have to be a maximum of 9 square feet, 6 feet in height and 18 inches in width and require a minimum vertical clearance of 10 feet.
- Entry Door Signs – We wanted these to be smaller at 2 square feet and can only be on the wall.
- Directory Signs – We are proposing to allow more flexibility on these but try to limit the exposure from the public's view, allowing them on the interior of the site. We would allow one directory sign per frontage within the building setback to a maximum of four. We would allow more of the directory signs in the development itself at four per building.

Staff is recommending approval of both of these ordinances, and I would be happy to answer any questions.

Comm. Williams: On the light pole signs, are banner signs allowed in commercial developments?

Mr. Klein: We don't currently have an ordinance that relates to the commercial properties. We feel they are different enough from the public and semi-public campuses that it would require another set of standards. A number of developments currently have these banners.

Comm. Williams: How did you come up with the 10 acres? Is it just a judgment call to get a development that would be of a size that would need this special treatment?

Mr. Klein: We wanted to make it large enough to host a number of buildings. In addition, the LDO currently doesn't allow a development to come in unless it has a minimum of 10 acres, unless it has a deviation through the LDO.

Comm. Williams: You presented Church of the Resurrection as an illustration. How many acres is that?

Mr. Klein: I believe it is 67 acres.

Comm. Pateidl: It seems that we are blending a couple cases, and I have no problem with your definition of a building identification symbol, so I'll set that aside and go to the schedule you have as it relates to these definitions you are proposing and look there at the building identification symbol. If the Church of the Resurrection has half a dozen buildings, how does this limitation of three per building, presumably a total for the applicant, a positive thing? Why are we limiting it to three?

Mr. Klein: We are limiting it to avoid clutter. We thought that each building would want to identify from three directions, which would make it visible from the parking lot. Many of the buildings are next to the public right-of-way, and we thought these would face the interior. When discussing this, we found that many would guide people to a parking lot and then give directions from there, and the interior signs would guide them.

Comm. Pateidl: You shouldn't have the same identification symbol, but if there are half a dozen buildings, I don't read this as three per building.

Comm. Jackson: Maybe that needs to be clarified.

Comm. Pateidl: It reads, "A limit of one per building façade with a maximum total of three."

Mr. Klein: Commissioner Jackson is right; our intent is three per building.

Comm. Pateidl: This is a single letter, number or icon. Are your criteria within the schedule really appropriate? Do you want a 10 sq. ft #1?

Mr. Klein: We limited the height to 3 feet. With the area being 10 acres, it is fairly large. Some signs in Leawood are 3 feet high. Many in the commercial developments are 24 inches high.

Comm. Pateidl: If you are comfortable with your criteria, it is fine.

Comm. Williams: If they are allowed a character, number or letter, there is no background like a logo which this number or letter is placed over?

Mr. Klein: I guess we just thought it would be a character, not a character placed over a logo.

Comm. Williams: It could be something as simple as a square to help highlight it. Depending on the facility, they may want to do something as a background. Are you saying no background and strictly the character?

Mr. Coleman: There might be a background that's a neutral background; there couldn't be another symbol. The first thing you described at a logo would be another symbol. The only thing allowed would be the actual letter, number or character.

Chair Rohlf: I wasn't at the meeting earlier this month, but from the minutes, I gathered that the Governing Body has approved to have signs administratively approved. These are the kinds of things you'll be looking at, and we really won't see signage on a lot of this, then?

Mr. Klein: This is the first time this is going into the LDO. If any semi-public campus comes in, they would have to first come to you with an overall Sign Criteria for the development. In order to be approved administratively, the request has to meet both the LDO and the Sign Criteria for the development. You would see it again because I doubt anyone is addressing these in their current Sign Criteria.

Chair Rohlf: This would be for revisions down the line?

Mr. Klein: If this got approved and they come in with Sign Criteria for the overall campus and got approval from Planning Commission and Governing Body, from that point on, they could submit something and we could review it administratively.

Comm. Williams: Is Church of the Resurrection the only entity within the city limits that would be currently affected by this?

Mr. Klein: We are actually trying very hard to stay away from writing it for Church of the Resurrection.

Comm. Williams: I understand, but you talk about public being the City. The City is not on a 10-acre development here or at the courthouse.

Mr. Klein: The development there is 12 acres at this point.

Comm. Williams: But it doesn't have multiple buildings.

Mr. Klein: That is correct, but if there ever was a situation like that, it would apply to that. Schools would also qualify for this.

Public Hearing

As no one was present to speak, a motion to close the Public Hearing was made by Jackson; seconded by Williams. Motion approved with a unanimous vote of 7-0. For: Levitan, Pateidl, Roberson, Jackson, Williams, Elkins and Strauss.

A motion to recommend approval of CASE 31-13 – LEAWOOD DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE 9, DEFINITIONS – Request for approval of an amendment to the Leawood Development Ordinance, pertaining to the definition of building identification symbols – was made by Jackson; seconded by Williams. Motion approved with a unanimous vote of 7-0. For: Levitan, Pateidl, Roberson, Jackson, Williams, Elkins and Strauss.

CASE 143-12 – LEAWOOD DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE AMENDMENT TO SECTION 16-4-6.13, PERMANENT SIGN REGULATIONS – Request for approval of an amendment to the Leawood Development Ordinance, pertaining to signage for public/semi-public campuses.

PUBLIC HEARING

As no one was present, a motion to close the Public Hearing was made by Jackson; seconded by Williams. Motion approved with a unanimous vote of 7-0. For: Levitan, Pateidl, Roberson, Jackson, Williams, Elkins and Strauss.

A motion to recommend approval of CASE 143-12 – LEAWOOD DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE AMENDMENT TO SECTION 16-4-6.13, PERMANENT SIGN REGULATIONS – Request for approval of an amendment to the Leawood Development Ordinance, pertaining to signage for public/semi-public campuses – was made by Jackson. Motion approved with a unanimous vote of 7-0. For: Levitan, Pateidl, Roberson, Jackson, Williams, Elkins and Strauss.

MEETING ADJOURNED