City of Leawood
Planning Commission Work Session
Sign Criteria/Design Guidelines and CIP
February 11, 2014

In attendance:
Commissioners: Mike Levitan, Ken Roberson, Kelly Jackson, Lisa Rohlf, Len Williams, Marc Elkins, Kip Strauss and William Ramsey.
Staff Members: Mark Klein, Michelle Kriks, Franki Shearer, Richard Coleman and David Ley

Mr. Klein: An issue that has come up recently is with regard to developments coming through as a unified development, be it Camelot Court, Town Center Plaza, Parkway Plaza or Cornerstone. As part of that, a certain Floor Area Ratio, Design Guidelines and Sign Criteria were approved for that overall development to create some sort of unity. What we're finding now is that a lot of these developments are selling off different parts of the project, which isn't unusual when it is pad sites. Now, however, they want to change the Sign Criteria and Design Guidelines, but they are saying that they only want to change it for themselves because they don't own all the property. Staff is trying to help maintain the integrity of the developments as they were originally approved and also to help ensure the .25 F.A.R. approved for the overall development is maintained.

Chair Rohlf: Could you give an example of where this might happen? Are these some of the properties on 135th?

Mr. Klein: Some of the properties on 135th have that possibility. Pretty much most of the developments have separate ownership. Now that Town Center Plaza has been purchased by Glimcher, a lot of the pad sites are owned by individual entities. Village of Seville has Capitol Federal Bank as a single owner. Villaggio practically has no development and still has several different ownerships.

Chair Rohlf: With respect to Villaggio, what happens to that plan that has been in place? Has it expired, or is there a plan that we would consider still in effect?

Mr. Klein: Their Final Plan has a five-year sunset clause, and the way the ordinance reads is as long as they start construction and continue in a timely fashion, the plan continues; but they have to pull their building permits for all the buildings in there. If that doesn't happen, eventually, the plan does expire.

Chair Rohlf: These individual owners of these pieces are working from what? What did they buy?

Mr. Klein: We have Cornerstone at 135th and Nall that had an overall plan and a lifestyle center with 2-story and 3-story portions as well as pad sites. If the developer wanted to continue the plan, it could happen. An example is the Charles Schwab building you recently saw. They basically took over that particular site and were placing the building in the same location with the same or less square footage as what was there before, thus continuing that plan as it was. However, we're seeing that a lot of these developments have been turned over to the banks. The banks don't want to be developers, so they are trying to find buyers for the properties. Each buyer has his own idea, and a lot of times, it's not what was approved. In this case, we would want them to go back to a Preliminary Plan because it doesn't match what was approved.

Chair Rohlf: They would have to start all over with their parcel, then?

Mr. Klein: We don't want it to develop out parcel by parcel with each doing an individual thing because the unity can get lost with driveways, connections, cross-access parking agreements, Floor Area Ratios, Design Criteria and Sign Criteria. Leawood has a requirement that developments have to be a minimum of 10 acres. Cornerstone was originally well over 10 acres, and then they broke it up into pieces that are not 10 acres. We would still want them to come in with an overall development plan for the site.

Chair Rohlf: What do you think most of these buyers were told about the possibility of developing their piece of a bigger area?

Mr. Klein: With Parkway Plaza, we had applicants who purchased property from the bank, and from what we can see, they were told they could do whatever they wanted. It wasn't until they came into the city for a pre-application meeting that we said, "We have a plan that's been approved for this overall development. You can develop out the plan as approved, but if you make changes, you're back to a Preliminary Plan." Now, some of the banks have actually talked with us and are educating the people they are selling the land to. It seems like we're getting more contact.

Mr. Coleman: We've had applications, such as Parkway Plaza, in which the developer divides it up into the little parcels, but when they look at the F.A.R., they may say, "I've got a big tenant that needs X square feet, so I'll make this lot a higher density, but my overall will still be .25 because I'm going to make these out lots lower than .25." Then later on, they get sold off, and if there is not something that ties them to it, they want to build to .25. Then the overall development becomes higher density. That is one example. We've also had people come in and want to change from office to retail and vice versa and just change the whole picture of the development. We might want to tap your knowledge. One of the things we're looking at is requiring covenant and restrictions to go with the land. It will become more and more important if we have more development on 135th Street.

Comm. Pateidl: Is there a vehicle at all to incorporate this in the deed restrictions?

Mr. Coleman: The developer is the person who writes those and determines how they go forward. Some of them include those restrictions and they run with the land; some don't. Some include parts but not others. It depended on the developer and the original intent of the development.

Comm. Elkins: Do we have the jurisdiction to require that as part of a plan approval, going forward? Can we have the provisions of the plan get incorporated as deed restrictions in the event that parcels are sold off?

Mr. Klein: We have a standard stipulation in developments that talks about the common areas of the development being owned and maintained by the individual owners and that a funding mechanism will be in included within the deed restrictions, which, if not maintained, the city can charge the property owners the maintenance fee. Legally, I don't know what the limits are.

Mr. Coleman: I don't know why you wouldn't in the sense that if you're coming in with an overall large development of 10-20 acres, if you don't want to include those restrictions and have a unified development going forward, you should leave out some of the property in the development.

Comm. Ramsey: Is this primarily being brought about because of changing market conditions, or is it just one developer figuring it out and the rest jump on it?

Mr. Coleman: No, I think it's time. Right now, we're dealing with what's in place now. Some of the developers have restrictions that run with the land, and some don't. It makes it much more difficult for us. For example, in Parkway Plaza, some of the plot lines and development run across islands and landscaping. I'm also charged with enforcing the maintenance criteria. One guy maintains this lot, and one maintains this lot. This guy is not maintaining it and the trees die. We say, "Who owns the tree?" because it's close to the lot. Our guys can't go out and survey it. They run in weird lines for whatever reason. It's an enforcement nightmare for us, and also because most developers want the development to be maintained at a certain level by the tenants. Usually, it's a covenant restriction that says a tenant has to maintain at a certain level, or an association is created that everyone pays into based on a pro rata division of expenses for common areas until the developer decides he wants out at maybe 80% sell-out. A lot of associations have a management company that takes care of all of it. Curry Real Estate does a lot of them, and they do homes associations, too. We have developers or management companies that are dividing up the project, and nobody has responsibility for it. There are issues. That is the reason for the size requirement. If parcels develop individually, it becomes harder for staff to help coordinate the developments with driveways, connections and landscaping.

Comm. Ramsey: The solution is what?

Mr. Coleman: As Mark said, we're looking at modifying the LDO to require certain provisions of a restriction in covenants that run with the land for developments 10 acres or larger.

Comm. Elkins: That helps moving forward; it doesn't address your current issues.

Mr. Coleman: No, it doesn't address the current issues. We're struggling with those right now.

Comm. Levitan: It's all about disposition for the banks. The banks just want to unload the ground.

Mr. Coleman: Yes, but there are ones that are not bank owned. Town Center was developed as one big parcel and is owned by multiple owners. Even the main center is not owned by one entity. The property lines zigzag and look like a puzzle.

Comm. Pateidl: Isn't there an association put together that has a responsibility to maintain?

Mr. Coleman: No, and that's the problem we find ourselves in.

Chair Rohlf: They each want to do their own building and that's all?

Mr. Coleman: Yes.

Comm. Pateidl: Just to stay on that for a moment, when we approve these developments now, such as Park Place, there is a requirement for an association to maintain the property.

Mr. Coleman: There is only the requirement that Mark spoke about.

Comm. Pateidl: That's all you have to hang your hat on, isn't it?

Mr. Coleman: That's what we have to hang our hat on. We would like to get something more robust than that because Park Place is being sold off right now.

Comm. Pateidl: Again, they've got the requirement that they have that association which goes into the deed restrictions or the sale of that property, I have to assume.

Mr. Coleman: Right, but that could be modified at any time by the developer. All they have to do is go out to the county and file a revision to it, and they can do whatever they want. They could sell off the parking garages for that matter.

Comm. Pateidl: I'd look to the legal counsel and say to help us put some more teeth into this, particularly going forward. There isn't much you can do about it going back.

Ms. Shearer: We discussed stipulations that can be added to especially Preliminary Plans. I have an issue going on right now with a development with this exact situation. I have 200 pages of covenant restrictions I'm sorting through to find out if the developer, on its own, can change the Sign Criteria for all the subtenants. I shouldn't be doing that. We, as a city, should not be enforcing private covenant restrictions, which is why I would hope we would have similar teeth here.

Comm. Pateidl: That's what I'm saying. Bring us some language that we can put into an ordinance to establish this and get it done because I think that's what you're going to have to do. You have a lot of ground left to develop along 135th Street, and you can address that properly.

Comm. Elkins: Richard, I assume if we take Park Place and the bank sells of a chunk to someone who comes to us and says, "Here's what I want to do with this now. I'm not part of the old Park Place; I'm my own thing," we have the authority to still not recommend approval of their plan until it's consistent with what the old plan was, right?

Mr. Coleman: I would hope so.

Comm. Elkins: We have to step up. We'd get a lot of pushback from a developer who says, "That's not fair; I wasn't here," even to the point where, "That idea failed, and I'm picking up the pieces, trying to make something out of it." They could make a pretty sympathetic argument about it.

Mr. Coleman: And they do.

Comm. Elkins: We'd have to take the tough stand in that event.

Mr. Coleman: All right. We wanted to bring that up so you wouldn't be surprised.

Chair Rohlf: Where do you think it will start? Will it be Design Guidelines?

Mr. Klein: Actually, we're looking at it and trying to find a solution. Again, we just wanted to make you aware that this is an issue that is coming up increasingly and may be something you will want to change in the LDO. We don't have the exact answer at this point, but we're trying to find that.

Chair Rohlf: I haven't read the 135th Street Plan draft yet. Did the consultant look at it?

Mr. Coleman: It's not that detailed. That would be more an implementation situation.

Chair Rohlf: I didn't know if they would take into account what might happen on some of those developments.

Mr. Coleman: Not in that sense.

Capital Improvement Program

Mr. Klein: You each received a copy of this a couple weeks ago. Michelle handed out some replacement pages to that. Every year, the Planning Commission has an opportunity to look at the Capital Improvement Program and see if there is anything they feel should be in there. This will be here tonight and then will go to

Planning Commission at the February 25th meeting. Joe Johnson is here as well to answer any questions with regard to the projects.

Mr. Coleman: On the first page, it has projects that have been added to the program. Section 6 in the Pay As You Go program has the Arterial Street Program and the Storm Water project, but it also has other projects you might want to look at on Page 53.

Chair Rohlf: Richard, I know you weren't here when I first came on twelve years ago. It seemed to me that this document did incorporate specific plans for development by developers and not just city projects. There seemed to be more reason for us to review the document back then, and over the years, it's really changed in format and content. It seems over the last couple years, the majority has been taken up with streets and curbs. Now, we have the replacement of the storm metal pipe and all that. Where do you think our focus is now with this document? Why do we review?

Mr. Coleman: If we had, for example, a major development on 135th Street with additional streets the developer would build, it might be something that was in the CIP.

Chair Rohlf: It would even show what they were going to pay the city for various components of their development.

Mr. Johnson: The CIP did show that when we were developing. Before I got here, I think the city consciously thought that the 135th Street Corridor was going to be a major retail commercial development. Then with all the cities working with the state, we got 135th Street built to the four lanes. Then it was decided that ultimately, it would be three lanes in each direction. As development occurred along 135th Street, that is how remaining permits would get done. There for about 8-9 years with Parkway Plaza, Park Place, Church of the Resurrection and Villaggio came in, all the public improvements of street widening showed up in the CIP. Pretty much, there's not a whole lot left to do. You're looking at Mission Road from 143rd to 151st Street to finish out the city's infrastructure. For the most part, it's either all developed or 85% developed. It's just a matter of traffic volume and where it fits best within the city's budget when considering all the other projects the city wants to do. In the CIP, it has reconstructing Fire Station No. 1, adding a fourth station next to the Justice Center that would house a big platform truck. They start throwing those projects in. Those won't take precedence, but they'll start weighing the building of those facilities compared to when we improve Mission Road and 151st Street and how to marry those together. It could probably all be done with a mill levy.

Mr. Coleman: One of the efforts is not to raise the mill levy to keep it where it is. I think part of it is that a lot of the development going on is in-fill development, where the public infrastructure has already been built. Like I said, you may see some things added if there was a large development down on 135th Street, but most of the Capital Improvement Program now is strictly public projects like storm water, streets and curbs, sidewalks, park facilities and fire safety facilities. That is what the CIP really is about. In 25-30 years, and the CIP probably would shift to a lot of maintenance and less building. You'll see more overlay for streets rather than building streets, and you'll see more pipe replacement than laying new pipe. You'll see refurbishment of facilities: public works, parks, etc.

Chair Rohlf: It seems to me that if our job is to look at that from a planning perspective, the kinds of projects we would be looking at are more of the wish list projects than the to-do projects. Maybe it's just changed.

Mr. Johnson: Think if there was the potential for a big development. Let's say we had a lot of land left along –

Chair Rohlf: 135th Street.

Mr. Johnson: Well, 135th Street has the infrastructure built and can accommodate development right now. Mission Road, 151st Street or 143rd Street has a vacant tract with a two-lane road. That may raise a need to focus on improving the street because of the potential for a big development, and where does that show up on the CIP?

Comm. Williams: In essence, as far as this CIP is concerned, there's not really a lot related to the Planning Commission that we need to provide input on?

Mr. Coleman: I don't know. People who live in the new area may see a need for the acceleration of one road versus another road. That might be brought up.

Comm. Williams: But is that really our call versus Public Works?

Mr. Coleman: Public Works has their plan laid out based on available capital for doing it.

Comm. Ramsey: The other reason we do it is it's a statutory requirement.

Mr. Coleman: That's true, too.

Comm. Pateidl: I stumbled across the powers and duties of the Planning Commission today. It's a lot of things, but it has nothing to do with the CIP.

Comm. Ramsey: Again, there is a statutory requirement for us to review the CIP before it goes to the City Council. We have no approval process.

Comm. Pateidl: By what authority?

Mr. Coleman: Kansas statute.

Comm. Pateidl: If that's the case, then I think we should have more input into it. What if we have a big development coming along and we ought to do something with the street? We're going to put 285 apartments on Mission Road, and it's not even in the CIP anymore. For three years, I've brought the subject up, and it's now been pushed out to 2021. I'm not seeing where we're having a lot of influence in this, and I have a little bit of a problem saying, as a member of this commission to Governing Body, "We think this is great." We don't know anything about this.

Mr. Coleman: I think this is an opportunity for the Planning Commission. If everyone agreed that XY Street or whatever project is important, then the Planning Commission has the wherewithal to tell the Governing Body that it's important and merits a closer look to see if funds should be shifted to take care of it sooner than later. That is why we are having this meeting.

Comm. Pateidl: By way of the Kansas Statute, I'd like to know what our responsibilities are as a Planning Commission and the recommendations to Governing Body. Just to do it blindly doesn't meet our obligations, in my opinion.

Mr. Coleman: I don't think we're doing it blindly. Everybody should read it and understand it. If there are issues in here you don't agree with, you should bring them up.

Chair Rohlf: I think it's hard for me to read this because I don't have a finance background. For me to understand what gets appropriated for different years and what's done by bonds is a little overwhelming.

Comm. Jackson: Yes.

Chair Rohlf: With respect to input on some planning issues, for me, the emphasis should be on Mission Road and not 143rd. Are we at 137th and Nall on the back side of the church?

Mr. Coleman: Yes.

Chair Rohlf: I know it's in here because I saw it, but I can't remember where the signalization is for 137th and Nall.

Mr. Johnson: It gets built this year.

Chair Rohlf: Good because that's a problem. I've been hearing a lot about this.

Mr. Johnson: We've been trying to get signals coming out of City Hall, and every time a new development comes in, we do a warrant. We still haven't met the warrant yet. The warrants at 137th and Nall and Indian Parkway and Mission were finally met. This year, we'll get signals at both locations. Some is just a matter of waiting until the congestion warrants a signal before being able to move forward. You talked about road improvements. We started on 143rd Street. The first phase should have been built back in 2010. We'd be done with all of 143rd Street had the economy not seen a downturn, and it got pushed back five years. We try to go after federal funds, and we do the application 3-4 years in advance of when a project will be done because it takes that long to get the funds. For 143rd this year, we'll be doing utility relocation. We'll bury all the power, relocate water, relocate gas and bury other utilities. That's what will happen between Windsor and Nall this year on 143rd Street. That alone is $13 million.

Chair Rohlf: You and your department have the knowledge of how these things should be prioritized based on dollars, need or something.

Mr. Johnson: At one time, the need was 143rd to 151st Street; we're talking ten years ago. That's when all the programming and application for federal aid went in. Since then, things have changed. We weren't in a position to start going after federal aid for Mission Road. You look at 143rd Street from Kenneth to Nall, and it's about a $23 million road improvement project when you consider easements, utility burying and construction. It's an expensive project. Probably what should be considered is that those projects that are programmed in the five-year CIP with the projects that are submitted but unfunded. Probably the feedback City Council would want is of the projects that are funded or unfunded, do you see projects that ought to be moved up for prioritization. All we're going to fund is 2014. When we look at funding next year's budget, we project it out ten years because we try to look at all the costs associated with all the other costs the city has to make sure we don't hit a spike in the middle. They're trying to level all the costs out based on all the projects that should happen in the city. Like at your house, you're just trying to play the money game and say, "Well, we can do this now; we have to wait a year to do this." City Council is looking at priorities of the city and trying to get the roadways and infrastructure done. We have 106,000 feet of steel pipe; most of it is eroding and some is collapsed. If you get a heavy rain, the pipe might collapse; someone could get flooded or hurt. They're trying to address that as soon as they can. Mission Road, 143rd and 151st Street all need to be improved to four lanes.

Chair Rohlf: I'm concerned about what will happen with traffic once Corbin Park and Prairie Fire get built. It's already getting busy.

Comm. Jackson: Where are the Oddo apartments?

Chair Rohlf: On 137th and Mission Road.

Comm. Jackson: When are those supposed to be done?

Mr. Coleman: They'll start occupying this year.

Comm. Jackson: That's a lot of families in there. To Lisa's point, we did have the developments in here.

Mr. Johnson: The developments in there were those that were doing capital improvement programs because that's a bonded project. When Park Place and Villaggio came in and were improving 135th Street or doing 137th Street or Pawnee or Fontana, Those were all public projects being funded by the city and paid back through a benefits administrator.

Comm. Jackson: If I had my wish list, though, we would have this; we would have the Comprehensive Plan sitting there and all the developments and whether they've started yet and when they will expire so that you could compare them all and know what was probably going to be built, what was planned and then what we're looking at paying for, for the next few years. Then I think we could all give a better analysis.

Comm. Strauss: Joe, what is the budget projected out? You said you're only funded for the next year. I see $16 million in projects in 2015, and then it drops off. Is that what you're projecting?

Mr. Johnson: If things didn't change, what you see under Tab 4 are the projects that will be built in 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018 and 2019. All we're focusing on right now is 2015. If nothing changed, you're looking at debt projects and $16 million in 2015.

Comm. Strauss: Then in 2016, you've only got $8 million in projects.

Mr. Johnson: $13 million of that $16 million is 143rd Street.

Comm. Strauss: Does it have federal funds tied to it?

Mr. Johnson: It has $1.5 million, so not a lot.

Comm. Strauss: What's the annual budget that you have to spend on the CIP?

Mr. Johnson: It really changes. When you look at the capital projects or the debt-financed projects compared to the pay-as-you-go projects or the park projects, you'll see in Tabs 4 and 6, it shows all the projects. Some are debt-financed, and that's what is under Tabs 4 and 5. Page 49 shows the city's arterial program through 2019. You can see what the project cost is. This year, $2.5 million is the total cost. Our cost is $1.1 million. We've got funding from CARS and from other cities. In 2015, we're looking at $3.1 million, of which the city shared $972,000 because we have CARS and other partnering cities. Then you throw in the curb program and the storm sewer program and get an up and down.

Comm. Strauss: Is there any table in there that brings it all together with outside funding sources included?

Mr. Johnson: Page 22 for 2015 breaks it out for that year, showing 79% funded by Leawood, 9% by Johnson County, 9% federal and 3% others. This could be other cities or subdivisions that had to pay a street fee along 143rd Street. Generally, it will show it by year.

Mr. Coleman: Total project costs by construction year are on Page 18.

Comm. Strauss: I guess I just didn't know what the program budget was.

Mr. Johnson: There's not a set budget.

Mr. Coleman: You get an idea in the summary.

Mr. Johnson: The pay-as-you-go cash has a certain dollar amount each year, like when we do the arterial program, I try to get it right at $1 million city cost every year. That will depend on how much CARS funding we get, how many projects involve other cities. We may do $1 million one year and $3 million another year. We try to keep our cost at $1 million, taking into account other participating organizations. Generally, what happens is we'll have 143rd Street, which is a $16 million project, so the next couple years will be fairly light because we're not going to do $16 million each year. We would probably have to raise the mill levy to do that. The capital program is a small piece of the total budget. They take that dollar amount and look at it with the other expenses of the city and then try to flatten things out so we don't have a big spike and so we minimize the potential for a mill levy five years down the road. This CIP does include a mill levy increase about .8 or .9 mills. When we've done all these larger projects, we're getting to where we have to increase the mill levy to pay them off because they're starting to stack up on each other.

Comm. Elkins: I have questions about process and specifics. On Page 18, the Capital Improvement Program from 2015 to 2019, you see the category of Committed Funds. Can you describe, at a high level, where you are in the process with respect to these? The context is if we were to push hard for a reprioritization in this category, what does that do to your department and to the city? How far down the road are you with respect to these projects in the 2015-2019 part?

Mr. Johnson: 2015 is being paid for, so we can't do anything with 143rd. We've started down that road, and this year, we're going to spend lots of money in utilities and will finish it up in the following year. The next phase of 143rd can always be pushed out, but you have an approved piece from Windsor all the way west through Overland Park, and you have a ¾ mile section that's still a two-lane ditch street that probably needs to be improved based on the number of people that come up on 150 that like to use 143rd Street; that's becoming a very popular route now in Leawood.

Comm. Elkins: You talk about phases that have federal assistance. Are you already committed, as an example, to Phase Two of 143rd Street?

Mr. Johnson: No, we're not committed because the call for projects for that year isn't here yet.

Comm. Elkins: How far out in advance does a call for project go?

Mr. Johnson: Right now, the call for projects is 2018. This time next year, we'll do a call for projects for funding after 2019.

Comm. Elkins: So, it's about three years in advance.

Mr. Johnson: Yes, and it takes about that long. It takes two years for a project to go through KDOT for all their approval, and then you have a year to relocate utilities before the project.

Comm. Elkins: Then on Page 38, it shows Capital Improvement Projects that are uncommitted. It seems like that's where it's more practical for us to have any impact at this point in time. At least that's my intuitive thought from what I've been hearing here. Your department does a great job of analyzing and prioritizing. It's the age old economic problem of unlimited demand and very limited resources. Can you comment about your department's thinking? You can tell around the table there is some concern about the Mission Road piece.

Mr. Johnson: These dates really have nothing to do with anything; these are more just placeholders because they're so far out right now. This would be where you look and see a lot of development along Mission Road and determine it should be a higher priority than 151st or Kenneth.

Comm. Elkins: That is kind of my point. I realize this doesn't bear a whole lot of resemblance to reality right now, but obviously, your team prioritized these.

Mr. Johnson: I didn't do any prioritization. These are just projects we have, and they're just throwing dates on them right now. There's nothing that makes 151st any more or less important than Mission Road. They could be flipped.

Comm. Elkins: What are the department's thoughts right now about Mission versus 151st?

Mr. Johnson: I think you could do both ways.

Comm. Elkins: You could make a case for either one.

Mr. Johnson: Exactly; of course, you have the development occurring right along 135th Street, the school at 143rd, so it would be nice to get the street, sidewalks and bike lanes from 143rd all the way up to 135th Street to connect everything north. 151st Street has traffic picking up. We get backups at 151st and Nall. We could probably do temporary signals for $60,000 and be good for the next 5-6 years controlling that intersection. We have a request to put sidewalks along 151st Street, but the ditches are so deep, to spend that much money to put in temporary sidewalks in and rip them out when we improve the road would not be a good cost.

Comm. Elkins: Where do you see the volume of traffic increasing the most as you project out? Those three seem to be the ones: 143rd, Mission and 151st.

Mr. Johnson: There is really nothing south other than the golf course, so once you get to 137th Street, it's all residential and not any change. Whether the traffic patterns for the apartment complex would be such that you see a lot of people going south or 135th Street and go north would be one thing to look at. I know right now, we already have a lot of traffic on 151st Street. A lot of people get off at 150 and 143rd and either continue across or go south to 151st and cross. We get lots of complaints about the four-way stop there. I know KC, MO, Jackson County and Overland Park are working to put a new bridge in at 151st Street by the polo fields. I know those folks and Loch Lloyd have a bit push to build that.

Comm. Ramsey: The reality is that there really aren't going to be that many traffic generators to increase it for that kind of development.

Mr. Johnson: We'll get a lot more flow-through traffic than what will be generated within the city. The 135th Street Corridor will have an impact on the north-south streets. The thought process is that hopefully we'll have most of the north-south streets improved before that whole corridor gets built out, but if that starts building out quickly, then that changes how we look at the north-south streets.

Comm. Strauss: I think when the bridge gets improved, you'll see more traffic at 151st, but also the fact that there's access at US69 draws a lot of traffic to that corridor.

Mr. Johnson: We see 151st Street being a four-lane divided, 45 MPH street, and 143rd is 35 MPH.

Comm. Ramsey: That's what it is in OP; you're just going to match that.

Mr. Johnson: It probably won't be as wide, but the developments on either side are set up for medians and not be very restrictive of their left turn limits. As far as the roadways, depending on what the city does in improvements to Ironwoods Park and the new acreage, it might be a nice traffic generator, so we'd want to do something to widen Mission Road in that area so it could have through traffic and left turn movements. All those are still in the air. These really aren't a priority as far as when we'll do the streets.

Comm. Strauss: Is Mission just planned to be an improved two-lane road?

Mr. Johnson: Mission will be a four-lane undivided road.

Chair Rohlf: In the case of Mission, does Oddo have any responsibility or contribution on his part for the roadway?

Mr. Johnson: Yes, he has a street fee of $311 per foot that's already been paid.

Chair Rohlf: What will that do for them?

Mr. Johnson: That money just sits in escrow until we approve the street, and then the city takes it to pay off the debt and then bond whatever is remaining.

Chair Rohlf: That's not even anticipated for a long time.

Mr. Johnson: Right; 2019 finishes 143rd Street.

Mr. Coleman: There are some intersection improvements at 137th.

MEETING ADJOURNED