

**City of Leawood
Planning Commission Meeting
June 24, 2014
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, Williams, Strauss, Ramsey, and Walden. Absent: Elkins.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA:

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Approval of the minutes from the May 27, 2014 Planning Commission meeting, and the June 10, 2014 Planning Commission work session.

A motion to approve the minutes from the May 27, 2014 Planning Commission meeting and the June 10, 2014 Planning Commission work session was made by Roberson; seconded by Jackson. Motion passed with a unanimous vote of 7-0. For: Levitan, Pateidl, Roberson, Jackson, Strauss, Ramsey and Walden.

CONTINUED TO JULY 22, 2014:

CASE 135-13 – IRONHORSE GOLF COURSE CLUBHOUSE EXPANSION – Request for approval of a Revised Preliminary Plan and Revised Final Plan, located approximately at 146th Street and Mission Road.

PUBLIC HEARING

CASE 77-13 – RANCH MART – MCDONALD'S DOUBLE DRIVE-THRU – Request for approval of a Revised Preliminary Plan and Special Use Permit, located north of 95th Street and east of Mission Road.

PUBLIC HEARING

CASE 21-14 – CROWN CASTLE CELLULAR TOWER – Request for approval of a one year extension for a Special Use Permit for the continued use of a wireless communication tower and associated equipment, located north of 135th Street and west of Briar. **PUBLIC HEARING**

CASE 22-14 – AT&T MOBILITY CELLULAR ANTENNAE – Request for approval of a one year extension for a Special Use Permit for the continued use of wireless antennae and associated equipment, located north of 135th Street and west of Briar. **PUBLIC HEARING**

CASE 23-14 – CRICKET CELLULAR ANTENNAE – Request for approval of a one year extension for a Special Use Permit for the continued use of wireless antennae and associated equipment, located north of 135th Street and west of Briar. **PUBLIC HEARING**

CASE 24-14 – CLEARWIRE CELLULAR ANTENNAE – Request for approval of a one year extension for a Special Use Permit for the continued use of wireless antennae and associated equipment, located north of 135th Street and west of Briar. **PUBLIC HEARING**

CASE 25-14 – T-MOBILE CELLULAR ANTENNAE – Request for approval of a one year extension for a Special Use Permit for the continued use of wireless antennae and associated equipment, located north of 135th Street and west of Briar. **PUBLIC HEARING**

CASE 26-14 – VERIZON WIRELESS CELLULAR ANTENNAE – Request for approval of a one year extension for a Special Use Permit for the continued use of wireless antennae and associated equipment , located north of 135th Street and west of Briar. **PUBLIC HEARING**

CASE 27-14 – SPRINT-NEXTEL CELLULAR ANTENNAE – Request for approval of a one year extension for a Special Use Permit for the continued use of wireless antennae and associated equipment, located north of 135th Street and west of Briar. **PUBLIC HEARING**

CASE 73-14 – LEAWOOD SOUTH MONOPINE ANTENNAE – Request for approval of a Special Use Permit, located north of Sagamore and west of Pembroke Circle. **PUBLIC HEARING**

CONSENT AGENDA:

CASE 89-14 – COUNTRY CLUB OF LEAWOOD – ROOF REPLACEMENT – Request for a Revised Final Plan, located south of Overbrook Road and east of High Drive.

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

NEW BUSINESS:

CASE 76-14 – PARK PLACE – UMB BANK AND WORK/LIVE UNITS – Request for approval of a Final Plat and Final Plan, located north of 117th Street and east of Nall Avenue.

Staff Presentation:

City Planner Michelle Kriks made the following presentation:

Ms. Kriks: Case 76-14 is a request for approval of a Final Plat and Final Plan for Park Place UMB Banks and live/work units, located at the east end of the Park Place development. The Revised Preliminary Plan for this area was presented to the Planning Commission in November, 2013, and included the bank and office building, live/work building, surface parking and a multi-family residential building. The case presented tonight will address a bank and office building, live/work building, surface parking and a revision to the Sign Criteria for office tenants. The Final Plat proposed for Park Place is for Lots 28, 29, 30 and 31 and for Tracts P, Q and R for a total of 239,498.19 square feet of land or approximately 5 ½ acres. The lot located between Street A and Town Center Drive, which is the proposed location for future multi-family residential, is not included within this Final Plat. The retail bank and office building is planned to be located at the southwest corner of 117th St. and Town Center Drive and will be oriented parallel to 117th St. The building is proposed to be a 25,900-sq.-ft., 2-story building constructed of a combination of non-reflective high pressure laminate tiles, clear glass and fritted glass. A 3-lane drive-through for the bank is planned, which is proposed to be located below the second floor of the building. A parking lot is planned on the west side of the building with the primary ingress/egress off the A Street within the development. The live/work building is proposed to be oriented parallel to 117th St. and south of the proposed interior Street A. This building is planned to be a 3-story, 37,675-sq.-ft. building with retail space at the street level, while the 2nd and 3rd levels are designed for residential units. The north and east sides of the building are proposed to be constructed of a combination of

brick, cementitious stucco and aluminum rain screen panels. On the south side of the live/work building, a 3-story parking structure is planned to be located behind the building, which will face 117th St. and will have 239 parking spaces. The façade of the parking structure is proposed to be a combination of brick and aluminum rain screen panels. To the west of the live/work building, a surface parking lot is planned, which is called Lot K. The surface parking lot will be the access to the parking structure of the live/work building. The landscaping proposed for this phase of the project plans a double row of street trees and shrubs along 117th St. and Town Center Drive, which is consistent to the perimeter landscaping elsewhere around Park Place. Additionally, rain gardens are proposed south of the surface parking lot and the live/work building and east of the bank and office building, which all shall be adjacent to 117th St. Street trees are also provided along the interior drive within the development, and the trees proposed are consistent with the other street trees elsewhere within the development.

The applicant is proposing minor modifications to the Park Place Sign Criteria affecting office tenants. Previous versions of the Sign Criteria did not address tenants with an office use located within street-level retail space. The change addresses this issue and proposes those office tenants be subject to the same sign standards as retail tenants. The other change proposed to the Sign Criteria will also allow office tenants directional signage. Staff has concerns regarding the following:

- The Park Place monument sign, which is proposed on the northeast corner of the UMB Bank and office building, has not been placed in a separate tract of land to be maintained by the development association. Staff has concerns the party responsible for the maintenance of the monument sign could become unclear between the property owner and the development association, should this lot be sold to a third party. Placing the sign within a separate tract of land dedicated as common space provides a clear understanding for all parties involved, including the city, as to who is responsible for its maintenance.
- The one-way drive-through lanes for UMB Bank are 9 feet, 6 inches in width. Per Section 16-4-5.3(c)2 of the Leawood Development Ordinance [LDO], driveways shall not be less than 12 feet in width for one-way traffic.

Staff is recommending denial of Case 76-14 based on the following reasons:

- It is in staff's opinion the live/work building and attached garage does not represent 4-sided architecture as defined in Section 16-2-10.1(h) of the LDO.
- When staff reviewed the Preliminary Plan, the applicant did not represent the live/work building and attached garage would be constructed of any materials other than brick or stucco.
- Staff's expectations of the live/work building and attached garage were for the applicant to accentuate the conceptual vision of the building, creating a more robust architectural design.
- The aluminum rain screen panels are a prohibited building material per Section 16-2-10.3(b)3 of the LDO.
- The color is very monochromatic and limited value range.
- The windows are flat and not punched out, as many of the other buildings in Park Place, giving little relief to the façade.
- The windows of the North Elevation are square or horizontal in configuration, while the windows on the south façade give the appearance of being vertical, exaggerated by the vertical grey and black aluminum panels.
- It is in staff's opinion the live/work building and attached garage is institutional and mundane in design and is not appropriate within the Park Place development.

However, should the Planning Commission approve this application, please consider the recommended stipulations outlined in the Staff Report. I'm happy to answer any questions.

Chairman Williams: Any questions for staff? Would you elaborate more on the 4-sided architecture issue and how this particular project does not meet the criteria?

Mr. Klein: Staff has concerns with regard to the 4-sided architecture with regard to both the architecture and the materials. On the north side of the live/work units, the materials are brick and stucco with some metal panels. The percentages of materials list 40% of metal panels on the South Elevation and 21% on the West Elevation. Additionally, it is significantly different than the other elevations in the fact that it has vertical metal panels. Staff feels it does not comply with the 4-sided architecture requirement.

Chairman Williams: Could you expand on the comment about the design being institutional and mundane as compared to the Preliminary Plan?

Mr. Klein: Typically, at Preliminary Plan, we just get a general idea of the plan. With regard to the materials used at that time, those are significantly different than what is being proposed in that much of the brick and stucco has been replaced by the metal panels, giving the look of monochromatic vertical stripes.

Chairman Williams: Is the primary issue with the monument sign the platting and maintenance, or is it the sign itself?

Mr. Klein: We wanted to point out that it changed from what they previously proposed, but the statement is in reference to the actual platting. The city has had issues with developments that aren't platted in the common tracts but rather in easements, which are great, but they have to be researched and interpreted, which can be difficult as properties are sold. The city then has to serve as negotiator to determine the responsible party. If it is on an individual tract and is listed as common area, it makes it clear.

Applicant Presentation:

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

Mr. Alpert: I wanted to take the opportunity to congratulate you, Mr. Williams, on your elevation to the chairmanship. You've been with us a long time, and it's nice to see you in the center of my vision. Mr. Walden, we look forward to working with you as well.

I'd like to introduce the members of our team who are here tonight: my partner Melanie Mann; Judd Claussen with PEI Engineering; Chris Dring with Young and Dring Landscaping. For UMB Bank, we have Kevin Harden and Andy Meyer with Gastinger Walker Harden Architects; Brad Morton, Gary Fisher and Lauren Meinershagen with UMB Bank. For the live/work building, we have Gary Schuberth and Karl Ley with Opus Design Build and Rich Muller and Leah Fitzgerald with Van Trust Real Estate.

I'd like to get right to the meat of the matter. Since these are two separate buildings with two separate architectural teams, we'll have each one come up separately and present their building. At the time they're up, we'd like to address any related issues for the building and then summarize and answer questions. We'll begin with Kevin Harden, who will present the UMB building.

Kevin Harden, Gastinger Walker Harden Architects, 817 Wyandotte, Kansas City, MO, 64105, appeared before the Planning Commission with a digital presentation and made the following comments:

Mr. Harden: I'd like to point out changes since the last presentation. We are located in the southeast corner of the development. Since the last meeting, we have included a right-in turn lane heading east on Town Center Drive and coming into the parking area. We have removed the right-out lane onto Town Center Drive. We have added a deceleration lane to alleviate some of the issues discussed during our last presentation. In addition to that, with relation to landscaping, the overall development has a double row of trees all the way around. Because of the view triangle off our private drive onto 117th Street, we have now only allowed one row of trees on the east side to prevent visibility issues with those turning left onto 117th Street and heading north. Regarding the monument signage, I'd like to have Judd Claussen speak about that.

Judd Claussen, Phelps Engineering, 1270 North Winchester, Olathe, KS, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Mr. Claussen: The monument sign is located at the east corner of the building. The second floor of the building slightly overhangs the monument sign. The sign has to be where it is because of setback requirements and also because of storm sewer and sanitary sewer easements. The reason the easement is important is if this gets in a tract of land that deals with overhang, the ownership gets a little confusing with the title company and finance company, but with an easement agreement, we can terminate responsibilities as faces of buildings. KCP&L does that all the time with easements that we have to grant for transformers, and it has the same accountability as far as maintenance responsibility. On the corner of 117th and Nall Avenue, the monument sign at the northeast corner is in a large landscaped tract. On the southeast corner of the intersection is a monument sign on the AMC property. It is not in a tract; it is in an easement agreement. Park Place maintains that sign. It can be done both ways.

Chairman Williams: Does that explanation suffice?

Mr. Klein: We still have concerns with the easements, and I do understand it is often done with the easements; it is just that on a number of properties along 135th Street, we have gotten into conversations with tenants who disagree with the city on who is responsible for maintenance because it is in the easement. The tracts help us better determine who is responsible. If it does have to be an easement, we would like to see it clearly indicated on the plat with text clearly indicating responsibilities.

Mr. Claussen: We would be happy to show an easement on the plat as well as a reference to the book and page of the recorded document.

Mr. Harden: We also want to address Stipulation No. 6 in relation to the drive lanes. We have modified the dimensions of the drive lanes, which were 11 feet, 6 inches cumulatively. We'll provide the drawing to staff which shows the 12-ft. aisle widths as they have requested (*Shows drawing on screen*). I'd like to add some additional information since our last meetings. We have provided additional renderings as develop the facades (*Shows examples of the renderings*). As far as our portions of the project, we agree with the recommendations except for the easement issue. Thank you.

Chairman Williams: Could you point out where the materials occur on the building?

Mr. Harden: (*Shows material example board*). The glass of the building is a fritted panel. We are working with the glass manufacturer in relation to the pattern. It will be on the entire upper floor of the building. We then have a Trespa panel, which is a high pressure laminated panel system located on the lower portion of the building. It is a combination of blue and grey that resembles the colors of UMB Bank. On the south portion of the building, we have differentiated that to provide for a separate tenant. It is a combination of two tan-colored panels. We are using a more clear glass on the south side with some shades inside the building. The architectural concrete is in the planter walls on the north, west and east sides.

Comm. Strauss: With the drive-through underneath the bank, is there special ventilation required with exhaust and any special lighting? How do you maintain that environment?

Mr. Harden: It is completely open on the east side as well as on the west. We have a series of columns and bracing underneath the building that provide ventilation on the east and west. The building ceiling will be closed off, so no exhaust comes through the ceiling. In that ceiling is LED lighting.

Comm. Strauss: Do you have any experience with increased noise with car vibrations off the ceiling?

Mr. Harden: No; it shouldn't be any different than being in a parking lot.

Chairman Williams: Thank you very much.

Gary Schuberth, Opus Architects, 4900 Main Street, Suite 300, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Mr. Schuberth: Our objective is to show you the design for the building and how it takes the three functions of the building and wraps them into a cohesive architectural statement. I'll talk about the site and the context for the building and how those functions lay out on the site. I'll go through the design concept and how we've developed it. I'll go into design details and material elements of the building. I've got 3-D views to show you, and we can get into technical aspects of the dimensions.

(Shows the Site Plan). The internal street is more residential. On 117th Street, it is more car-intensive. I'd like to talk about how we developed the building. In order to address the issue of 4-sided architecture and look at it as a comprehensive building, we took brick forms and wrapped them around all four sides of the building. The sienna-blend brick is spaced out around all four sides of the building. The parking structure is terraced on the southwest side. We have added a layer of lighter brick to provide contrast and interest to the façade and break it up visually. We have taken a ribbon of the white and grayscale elements of stucco and rain screen panels starting on the northeast side and wrapped and interspersed between the brick elements 360 degrees around the building. On the opposite side of the building with the parking function, we have wrapped the brick around the three levels and have terraced it and wrapped the ribbon around the building to help it flow together. We have the masonry elements wrapping on all four sides and the ribbon of white and grey that wraps around. The panels on the front of the building are stucco and sienna blend brick. They wrap around from the commercial side to the parking function. The ribbon of white ties it together as well. On 117th Street, we have taken the outside profile of the building and blocked the building out. We didn't want to emphasize the sloped ramp of the garage, so it transitions from one to three levels. On the internal street side, we have commercial on the first level and two levels of apartments below that, and we have articulated that façade with the light color brick, a stucco panel area and the manganese iron spot brick, which ties in with the lighter colored stucco and rain screen panels. We have four compositional elements that break the façade up into the vertical pieces. We have metal balcony railings with fascia panels in a dark grey. We are trying to tie into the grayscale ribbon running around. We have dark grey mullions, fascia trim and balconies. The first level is more of a commercial function that is not quite as intensely retail, so the storefronts will be built out from the beginning. It will have colored canvas awnings to help it look finished; then during the sign approval process, they will come off and have the name silk-screened on. At the south end of the building, we've taken the same vertical window pattern. We have some code implications with cars and parking and windows. We have put windows in where we can. The signage awnings add color and interest on the first floor level. On the northeast part of the building at the garage entrance is a dark grey canopy with a red soffit to create a signal for the entrance. I'd be happy to answer questions about the design concept. I have samples of the rain screen material, which we don't believe is aluminum siding. We also feel we have carefully considered all four sides of the building and have tried to integrate these disparate functions into a cohesive architectural statement.

Chairman Williams: What is the size of the brick?

Mr. Schuberth: We have three different sizes of brick. The light colored brick is 8x16x4. It looks like a brick with a cut stone look. The three different sizes are based on an 8-in. module, so the modular brick includes three bricks as an 8-in. module. The iron spot brick is 4 inches high, and two of those equal an 8-in. module, and the lighter is 8 inches in itself. The bricks will be in a 1/3 running bond pattern to give it an offset look with a masonry cut stone feel. The iron spot brick is 4x16, and it has an iron mineral in the clay, so it has a grey sheen.

Chairman Williams: The light one is 8x16, so for reference purposes, it is the size of a modular concrete block without the 8-in. depth. Would you describe the garage entrance canopy material?

Mr. Schuberth: The canopy over the pedestrian entrance is an eyebrow type of metal fascia in a dark grey color with a red soffit underneath.

Chairman Williams: Is the top of it a waterproof membrane?

Mr. Schuberth: Yes.

Chairman Williams: Are there other questions?

Comm. Strauss: I was curious about the reason for changing the materials from the Preliminary Plan to the Final Plan. Was it architectural in nature?

Mr. Schuberth: There wasn't an intentional or conscious change. At the preliminary stage, we haven't fully designed the building, so it really was just further development and refinement. All the elements on all four sides were represented in the video that was our focus at that time.

Comm. Strauss: Have you used the rain screen materials in other buildings before?

Mr. Schuberth: We have many buildings all over the country on which we use that system. On the AMC building, we have metal rain screen panels that wrap around the building.

Chairman Williams: Would you elaborate on the definition of rain screen and how that actually works?

Mr. Schuberth: This is a composite panel with an aluminum skin on the outside and is bonded to a phenolic resin core roughly 1/8 inch thick. The material comes in large 4x8 sheets. A computerized routing machine cuts all the panels and folds them back to the 3/4-in. return so it has dimension. That has a clip system on the back. The aluminum rails are attached to the building, so it is a grid work of the rail support system. A waterproof membrane goes behind that, so the water weeps out behind the façade.

Comm. Pateidl: The position of the staff is that these are a prohibited material in that they are metal panels. I'd like to have staff address their conclusions regarding this.

Mr. Klein: Staff feels these are aluminum material and are therefore siding on the building itself. The spirit and intent of the ordinance refers to what is visible on the building. The difficulty is in applying the ordinance equally to everybody. We recently had an application for Church of the Resurrection with metal panels, and aluminum was not allowed for these. They found a stainless steel material to resolve the issue.

Chairman Williams: Even if it is called a rain screen, it is a siding material, and that is what relates to the LDO and the materials that are not approved.

Comm. Roberson: How did AMC differ from this?

Mr. Klein: We looked at AMC and the minutes from the Planning Commission, and Commissioner Williams said, "You went with the painted metal over the aluminum to avoid the conflict of material definition in use with the LDO." Mr. Holland responded, "Yes." Commissioner Williams then stated, "But you could achieve the same thing in aluminum or steel," and Mr. Holland stated, "Aluminum or steel." Our understanding is they were not aluminum panels; however, the applicant indicated AMC had used aluminum.

Chairman Williams: In the meeting, they stated it was a painted metal.

Mr. Klein: Yes, they used another material to avoid the conflict with the LDO, which is also what the Church of the Resurrection is doing.

Chairman Williams: If a painted metal panel would be acceptable, what is the difference here?

Mr. Klein: With regard to the church, there was discussion as to whether the aluminum would be durable in the long run. I heard arguments that the stainless steel would be more durable.

Chairman Williams: Any other questions?

Mr. Schuberth: We've been discussing this quite a bit ourselves and trying to understand what aluminum siding is. According to our research, aluminum siding was brought about to replicate wood lap siding on houses. My understanding is most ordinances were developed to prohibit aluminum siding in this manner. The ordinance talks about aluminum siding, but it also talks about metal siding. Stainless steel is a metal. This has a factory-baked finish of paint on it; it is not raw aluminum. We believe it is a high quality material.

Chairman Williams: Going back to the overall design concept of the façade, could you elaborate on how this design differs from what you presented conceptually at the Preliminary Plan?

Mr. Schuberth: I would say we have probably more of the panel system on the end of the building. We represented it as stucco, and we were close to the 25% limitation on stucco, so we had to reduce it. We felt that aesthetically, it looked better to continue the material. We changed the coursing from a running bond to an altered running bond on the brick, but I don't believe there are fundamental changes in the concept other than the quantity of the rain screen on the back.

Chairman Williams: One of staff's concerns is that the building is institutional and mundane as compared to other buildings within Park Place. I see a brick wall, windows close to the face of the brick and what appears to be a metal coping across the top with no detail and nothing similar to other buildings within Park Place. Granted, the UMB building doesn't match Park Place, either, but you're dealing with similar materials with quite a departure.

Mr. Schuberth: We had a reason for that. Part of it is the scale of this building is much smaller with competition for facades. It is geared toward professional services, so we wanted to represent that. Because of the smaller scale and lower height, we didn't feel that breaking it up with a horizontal base metal top felt appropriate. This composition breaks it up into vertical elements. Also, it is a more contemporary design with more angular lines and geometric patterns. This was meant to be a clean, geometric composition with a lack of traditional detail. The UMB building is very contemporary, and the AMC building is as well. We felt it was appropriate at that end; plus, it was problematic to continue the base metal top on the garage side with different openings and open air requirements.

Chairman Williams: Could you elaborate on the rationale for the aluminum panels on the garage side versus continuing the masonry look that would relate to the front of the building?

Mr. Schuberth: Really, that came about with constructability issues on this end with brick on the wood-frame structure. The lighter material seemed more appropriate for the cladding.

Comm. Roberson: I just don't see how this building fits in Park Place from an architectural standpoint. There is nothing else like it in Park Place. This just doesn't seem to fit, and I wonder why you wouldn't make it more in style with Park Place.

Mr. Schuberth: It is a different kind of building that is unique with the parking integrated with the building and the exposed parking on two sides with living and commercial on the other. I would probably go back to the point that it is a little different scale building. There will be no restaurants, so off the bat, the first level is a lower height. Professional services will most likely go here, so it will have a different look. Other parking garages are much taller with five floors, so the façade is approached differently on those. They also are not typically connected to a building. It is a unique building with a unique design solution.

Comm. Jackson: I'm trying to remember back to when we allowed the Floor Area Ratio [F.A.R.] to be .78. Did some of that reflect building materials? How did we get to that figure?

Mr. Alpert: I think it's a whole variety of things. It's everything from the Site Plan, the structure parking, the landscaping and a whole variety of components. I'm sure Mr. Klein would know better than I do.

Mr. Klein: When Park Place came in, the city recognized that it would be a very unique development. To a large extent, the LDO was written to allow this type of development. As part of that, the LDO offers a number of bonuses. Park Place took advantage of nearly all the different types. It includes superior architecture, superior site planning, using environmental solutions to drainage of water and building amenities. They went above what was allowed with the bonuses, so they needed a super majority vote from the Governing Body, which they received.

Comm. Pateidl: I'd like to read Section 16-2-10 of the LDO. "Architecture and Construction Standards: The character of the architecture of Leawood shall be driven by the desire to create quality buildings of lasting beauty. Precedence of style and quality within the regions should be viewed as positive models for new construction. The use of traditional materials and forms is encouraged. In all cases, buildings shall strive to be accurate and true to their particular style. These requirements shall be in addition to and in conjunction with requirements set forth in the approved development plan." In the spirit of that statement, we called the UMB building a good bookend to the AMC building. We felt it brought the continuity and spirit together. What was presented to us in the live/work buildings and parking garage was a style and architectural treatment that was very complimentary in the completion of Park Place. The building I see here would be in the style of the Bendix Plant in Belton and not with Park Place. I would like to know how this is in the spirit of the LDO.

Mr. Alpert: First of all, this building is completely true to its architectural style. It is a simple, contemporary expression of architecture with clean lines. It doesn't have a lot of gingerbread on it. Going back to the original concept of Park Place, we would offer an eclectic expression of architectural styles, certain of which were established at the beginning. The Aloft Hotel is very similar in style to this building in that it is much simpler and less ornate. AMC looks nothing like anything else at Park Place, and then even the UMB building has some similarities to the AMC building, but it is very much its own building. This building also is a true expression of a particular architectural style. Architecture is very subjective, and every person in this room could feel different about an architectural expression like this. I hear what you're saying; I also believe that the eclectic nature of what we're trying to achieve is a development that doesn't look like it was stamped out and might have been development that has been built over time. In that context, I think this building works.

Comm. Pateidl: If you truly believe that, why was this not presented with the Preliminary Plan?

Mr. Alpert: You have to understand the requirements placed upon us for Preliminary Plan approval. We're trying to work out all the site details, all the civil engineering details, the streets and drive lines, distance between the buildings and the massing of the buildings. One of the requirements is to offer a model. We now do very elaborate computer-generated flyovers and walkthroughs. In order to do those, we have to present some architecture on the building facades. We also recognize that your charge in terms of considering Preliminary Plans is not to evaluate the architecture but the Site Plan so we come back to Final Plan approval with a refined architectural design. There is so much work involved in designing a building, and if we go in for Preliminary Plan approval and you have serious issues with what we present and we have to move buildings and alter heights or change the relationships, all the money we've spent to do the exterior architecture is out the window. There is a real economic issue with what we have to go through and what it costs to develop all of the exhibits that you require, and rightfully so because you need information to make an informed decision. For us to spend the money to develop every detail of the building architecture for Preliminary Plan approval when we don't have any sense that it will be approved makes no economic sense.

Chairman Williams: I think this body is certainly sympathetic to the expense of a full design, but you go through a lot of work on the site issues and planning to get it done. As any developer comes before this body and presents a design that reflects the general feel, there is often discussion if this body sees a potential problem so those issues can be resolved. There was very little exception taken to the design presented at that point in time, and our expectation was that we would see something closer to that building that what we're seeing here today. For me and perhaps others, the concern is this may be true to its architectural style, but is this architectural style appropriate for Park Place in light of the other buildings you have done that have exhibited a higher quality design with higher quality materials. These materials are probably fine except for maybe the aluminum panel, but it seems stripped. Staff defines this as mundane; I think some of us may call it cheap. I don't think that's the goal of Park Place. You've got very good examples of the eclectic, and that's what we're hoping to see to finish this off. I get the sense that this isn't doing that.

Mr. Alpert: I think if the commission is not in favor of what we have presented, we would be very interested in hearing a little more about what you would like to see and maybe even some specific details that you think are lacking so we can make some adjustments and come back with something that you think is more appropriate.

Comm. Roberson: I'm not so sure that's our place.

Chairman Williams: It's not our place to design the buildings, and maybe there are just a few of us who have a problem with the design of the building. One of the renderings here is an adjacent building with brick and stucco and details to the façade that is lacking in what you presented. Simply giving more emphasis to the coping or the windows could help. The street front on this doesn't have the same appeal as the street fronts on your other commercial streets. It doesn't have to be wood trim and canopies. You've got quite a mix of stuff, which makes it interesting. I look at walking down this street per your renderings, and I find this rather blah and support the comment from staff that it is mundane.

Comm. Levitan: I may be in the minority on this, and I can appreciate the opinions. The thing about MX-D is the character and uniqueness. It's why people want to get out and walk. I don't want more of the same. We have that with Town Center, Camelot and HyVee on State Line. That's monolithic and mundane. I would call this restrained. It is contemporary but is not overstating itself. It's not sticking out like a sore thumb. I don't have a problem with it. I think the material choices are restrained, but I could see it fitting.

Comm. Strauss: I like the majority of this building. I like that they essentially wrapped a lot of the parking garage. I think this is great because another parking lot on the site is one I regret. My only problem is this

looks like aluminum siding to me, and it is in the LDO. If you turned it 90 degrees, it would look like household siding. That is my only concern. I'm cautious now on all sides of a garage and want to make sure it looks right from 117th Street.

Comm. Ramsey: I would concur with the previous comments here. I believe that architectural style is in the eye of the beholder. I am concerned about the aluminum piece on the back of the building. I don't think that's the right covering to use. As Mr. Strauss indicated, if it's not permitted in the LDO, I don't know how it can be used. I agree that Park Place is an eclectic type of development, and while this is pretty minimalist, it doesn't seem to shout that it's inappropriate. I think it is fine with the exception of the aluminum.

Comm. Walden: What month was this Preliminary Plan approved?

Mr. Coleman: December, 2013.

Chairman Williams: Are there any other questions? Mr. Alpert?

Mr. Alpert: What I'm hearing just solidifies my opinion that architecture is very subjective. At this point, we'll leave it in your hands. In terms of stipulations, if you are to approve it, I would request that Stipulation Nos. 2, 3 and 5 be removed. No. 2, in particular, would put changes back in the hands of the staff, and our preference would be to come back to you with some revisions and have you approve it. As far as No. 3, the aluminum rain screen is a very sophisticated architectural system. It is used in some of the finest buildings in the entire country. It is not cheap. This didn't come out of Continental Siding's warehouse. These are used in very architecturally significant applications. We do have it on AMC. It is on Crate & Barrel. There is metal on the Justice Center. It is in a lot of applications. There should probably be some ongoing consideration on the part of the Planning Commission to examine this particular part of the ordinance to see if it couldn't be adjusted to reflect what is going on in the architectural world in commercial structures. Regarding No. 5, hopefully we presented a convincing case as to why we would not be able to effectively put this sign in its own tract. We would almost have to create an air rights situation, which becomes very complicated. While I can appreciate staff's concern, and I know it is based on experience, in a development like Park Place, we are dealing with extremely sophisticated buyers and sellers who understand easements. They have attorneys who review all the issues that go along with a property. I think they would find this very much the norm. With that, we appreciate your time and consideration. As opposed to voting it down, we would like to request a continuance if that is where we're headed.

Chairman Williams: Thank you. We'll open it for discussion and see where it goes. One thing we haven't talked about to a large extent is the issue of the 4-sided architecture. The material question aside for a moment, I would concur with staff that the garage side of this looks like a totally different building. It almost looks like piano keys, and that doesn't reflect what is on the main façade of the buildings. I'll open it for comments from the panel.

Comm. Pateidl: Mr. Alpert said to give an idea of what we would like to see. I'd highly recommend he goes back and looks at the computer presentation he so diligently put forward to us in the Preliminary application. I would remind him that the approval of that application was a relatively contentious meeting. It was recommended to the Governing Body based on the understandings of continuity of the project as it is rather than the introduction of contemporary construction of architecture into this eclectic mix.

Comm. Jackson: In my mind, the building is so large that I generally like the contemporary buildings quite a bit. This one just goes on for too long and starts looking stale because of the massive size, especially along 117th Street with the black and very few windows. If you could dress up the windows a bit and give them some depth, it might help; I don't know. I'm not a designer by any means, but I agree that the 4-sided architecture is an issue.

Comm. Strauss: As another idea, wrapping around the residential onto the 117th Street side, I'm into hiding the garage at least on three of the four sides. I'm okay with the façade on Street A. It looks like the backside of something on the garage. That is my concern.

Comm. Williams: I guess we have some agreement with staff that the aluminum panels are an issue if not allowed by the current LDO. The other major issue is the 4-sided architecture. With both of those in mind, the precedent has been set by this body that if a building is going to undergo a substantial redesign, it would come back so we can see the changes. It would be a potentially difficult sell to approve the project with those two outstanding issues. I would like to touch on the issue of the aluminum panels. I think Mr. Alpert is correct in his statement about this type of product being used on a lot of high quality commercial buildings. There are a lot of things manufacturers can do with this, but it comes down to how the LDO is written and how it interprets the product. If AMC is indeed aluminum, it got by us. With that, we have a couple of options. We can take a vote or recommend continuance. I would support Mr. Alpert's request for a continuance versus a denial.

Comm. Roberson: Are you going to formally request a continuance?

Mr. Alpert: Yes, if that makes it easier. Hopefully the continuance can be for 30 days.

A motion to continue CASE 76-14 – PARK PLACE – UMB BANK AND WORK/LIVE UNITS – Request for approval of a Final Plat and Final Plan, located north of 117th Street and east of Nall Avenue – to the July 22nd Planning Commission meeting was made by Roberson; seconded by Jackson. Motion passed with a unanimous vote of 7-0. For: Levitan, Pateidl, Roberson, Jackson, Strauss, Ramsey and Walden.

CASE 85-14 – SPRINT WIRELESS ANTENNA AND ASSOCIATED EQUIPMENT – Request for approval of a Special Use Permit, located north of Lee Boulevard and east of Mission Road. **PUBLIC HEARING**

Staff Presentation:

City Planner Ursula Brandt made the following presentation:

Ms. Brandt: Case 85-15 is a request for approval of a Special Use Permit for Sprint Wireless Antenna and associated equipment in City Park. The purpose of the new antenna and equipment is to increase the network's capacity. The tower is currently 130 feet with Sprint being located at 65 feet. The tower is surrounded with an 8-ft. tall concrete and stucco wall which houses the ground-mounted equipment. The proposed changes to the antenna include installing three new double support arms on the existing antenna mounts. The existing antenna will be placed on one end of each of the arms with the new antenna on the other end of the arms. From the pole to the full extent of the antenna will be 2 feet. There will also be removal of three existing cabinets, while the new equipment will be installed in the remaining cabinets, which are both located on the ground within the compound. Staff is supportive of this application, and I would be happy to answer any questions you may have.

Chairman Williams: Please clarify the trees and shrubs. Are those existing or new?

Ms. Brandt: Those currently exist. We have found some discrepancies between the Landscaping Plan and what is out there, and Neighborhood Services has issued notice to the owner.

Applicant Presentation:

Trevor Wood, SSC, 9900 W. 109th Street, Suite 300, Overland Park, KS, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Mr. Wood: I am here on behalf of Sprint, and this is a modification project that is designed to increase the capacity of Sprint's network in the area, predominantly driven by all the Smartphones that most people are carrying around and absorbing more and more data off the network. We agree with the stipulations set out in the report, and I'm here for any questions.

Chairman Williams: Questions from the commissioners? If not, this case requires a Public Hearing.

Public Hearing

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

A motion to approve CASE 85-14 – SPRINT WIRELESS ANTENNA AND ASSOCIATED EQUIPMENT – Request for approval of a Special Use Permit, located north of Lee Boulevard and east of Mission Road – with Stipulations 1-7 - was made by Roberson; seconded by Strauss. Motion passed with a unanimous vote of 7-0. For: Levitan, Pateidl, Roberson, Jackson, Strauss, Ramsey and Walden.

CASE 86-14 – PINNACLE CORPORATE CENTRE – REVISED SIGN CRITERIA – Request for approval of a Revised Sign Plan, located north of 115th Street and west of Tomahawk Creek Parkway.

Staff Presentation:

City Planner Ursula Brandt made the following presentation:

Ms. Brandt: Case 86-14 is a request for approval of a Revised Sign Plan for Pinnacle Corporate Centre. On the Staff Report, under "Applicant and Property Owner," it should say, "Block Real Estate Services" instead of "Block Realty Group." The Sign Plan applies to Buildings 1, 2, 3 and 4. The current Sign Criteria state that the buildings will be allowed to have three wall signs, and if those signs are to be illuminated, they shall be halo-lit channel letters and shall not be visible from any residential area and will only be illuminated from dusk until 11:00 PM. The applicant is requesting to remove the restriction of illuminated signs not being visible from any residential area. While staff has been supportive of non-illuminated signs on facades facing residential areas, staff is not supportive of this change to the Sign Criteria due to the impact on residential single-family and multi-family located adjacent to the office buildings specifically because residential is at a minimum of 150 feet away from the office buildings, and the multi-family residential located south of Building 4 currently does not have a full buffer of trees to screen the view of the office building or signage. I'd be happy to answer questions.

Chairman Williams: Currently, there are no illuminated signs that affront the residential neighborhoods, and when you say that the signs can't be seen, are you talking about the main body of the sign or the edge of the sign with lights spilling over?

Ms. Brandt: We're specifically talking about the face of the building is directed toward the residential area.

Comm. Walden: The impact is actually explained in the staff comments; is that correct?

Ms. Brandt: Yes.

Applicant Presentation:

Bonnie Piccirilli, 700 W. 47th Street, Kansas City, MO, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Ms. Piccirilli: Due to unforeseen circumstances, Kevin Berman with Hofer Wysocki Architecture is unable to attend, so I am speaking on his behalf. I am a little unprepared, and I apologize for that. The subject is to consider either the interpretation of the current Sign Criteria and/or the revision. We are very open and flexible. The location is 4200 W. 115th Street, which is considered Pinnacle IV. We are requesting that you reevaluate the approval of the halo-lit sign for Tallgrass Energy, which is located on the south side of the building facing 115th Street. This request could be accomplished by the reinterpretation of the Pinnacle Sign Master Plan or by revising the plan to specify single-family homes. When the Pinnacle Sign Plan was prepared for approval, it was Block Real Estate's and Hofer Wysocki's understanding that all sign locations were approved to be halo-lit, and they agreed with the city's goal to keep the signage to the sides of the building as indicated on the plan, away from neighboring single-family homes. Those specific sign locations were identified, planned for and approved based on the fact that they would be lit and would therefore need to be oriented as shown on the Sign Plan. The current interpretation of the 115th Street Tallgrass Energy sign reaches beyond the original intent of the guidelines designed to be addressed the single-family homes which border Pinnacle property lines.

The previous tenant at Pinnacle IV was Wage Works and had a comparable halo-lit sign approved by the City of Leawood and installed on the building facing 115th Street at the same location as proposed by Tallgrass. We had no complaints from the tenants across the street. Other commercial buildings in the area, including Discover Vision Center and Dermatology and Skin Center both have illuminated signs facing residential areas. The height of the Tallgrass building sign is well above the roof of the condominium complex on 115th Street. The tenant Tallgrass Energy has been very accommodating regarding their signage size and positioning per the city's request. We feel we've tried to accommodate, and we feel that since an illuminated sign existed in the same spot, a change would be helpful. Kevin felt the original plan was specific to single-family homes and not multi-family homes. We would like to thank you for your time, and we just ask that you truly consider the request since the decision highly impacts the new tenant. Since they brought up the trees, I don't know if the owner would be willing, but perhaps I could ask if the owner could put up a tree barrier. I'd like to have that as a consideration.

Chairman Williams: Are there questions? Mark, there clearly was a sign there. What happened?

Mr. Klein: We had discussions initially when talking to Tallgrass and Kevin Berman. They indicated that Wage Works had just recently been taken down. I went through our records and only found a record that the sign permit was approved in 2008. At that time, typically signs went through Planning Commission and City Council, and I don't have a recollection of the history of the approval. If it did get approved, it was in violation of the Sign Criteria. Kevin indicated it was single-family. Staff has never been comfortable with distinguishing between the residents of Leawood as far as single-family versus multi-family. In many regards, single-family is farther away with a significant tree buffer. I appreciate the applicant's response with the trees, but these are right across from the condominiums. Street trees are located there, but it is not the kind of buffer we would require.

Chairman Williams: Was staff involved in this Master Plan?

Mr. Klein: I would have to research it. This is the first I have seen of this. We looked at the Sign Criteria, and they were very clear in both this and a previous version that there would be no illuminated signs facing residential.

Chairman Williams: Does the Sign Criteria eliminate signage or just the lighting?

Mr. Klein: It is the lighting. Tallgrass has a sign currently; it is just not illuminated. We were forthcoming with the applicant that we would not support a change to the Sign Criteria because we don't like elevated illuminated signs facing residential areas.

Chairman Williams: Mark, could you speak to the other examples offered, such as the one facing the assisted living facility?

Mr. Klein: Staff wasn't supportive of that sign. I believe the Planning Commission was not supportive of it, either. I believe it was approved at City Council.

Ms. Piccirilli: That sign is actually illuminated. We are asking for halo-lit, which is softer.

Chairman Williams: Other questions for the applicant? I'll open the floor for comments.

Comm. Ramsey: Is it or isn't it an approved sign?

Mr. Klein: They currently have a sign that is approved, but it is not illuminated.

Comm. Ramsey: The Sign Plan does not allow a lit sign facing the residential area?

Mr. Klein: The LDO does not have anything that speaks directly to illuminated signs facing residential. In the past, we added stipulations that no illuminated signs would face residential or that the hours of illumination would be limited.

Comm. Ramsey: What part of the code are you basing that on?

Mr. Coleman: It is part of the approved Development Plan for Pinnacle. The Planning Commission and City Council review those and approve them. Then they become part of the ordinance approved for the development.

Comm. Ramsey: It is for only the development, so some developments could have a halo sign facing a residence, and another couldn't.

Mr. Coleman: That is correct. You might have one that got approved without residences there at the time, and then the residences were built after the sign was up.

Chairman Williams: I share staff's concern about opening up the signage to the residential areas when it has existed for this time.

Mr. Klein: The Sign Criteria have always stated this restriction, even though Wage Works had an illuminated sign.

Mr. Coleman: When I first came here, one of the projects was a Pinnacle project, and they had proposed a sign that faced the residences to the west. Residents came and vehemently opposed it. I occasionally get complaints about illumination from the development by the residents.

Comm. Walden: Speaking of previous public input, why doesn't this have public input?

Mr. Coleman: It is part of a Final Plan, and Final Plans don't have Public Hearings. Revising the Sign Criteria for developments does not require a Public Hearing.

Chairman Williams: When the development was proposed and the Sign Criteria came through, it would have had a Public Hearing, and we would have gotten feedback. Since this has been in place for a number of years, it has been through the process.

Ms. Piccirilli: I just want to reiterate the understanding from Block and Hofer Wysocki that it was to be illuminated and that the signs that are located on the plan identified the side facing 115th Street to have a sign located on it. Block is saying that if we need to revise the original plan, we will do that. When lease negotiations were done for Tallgrass, they saw the sign from Wage Works and assumed they, too, could have a sign illuminated. It was very important in their decision to move there.

Mr. Klein: The exhibit does show the location of signs, but it doesn't say that they are illuminated.

Ms. Piccirilli: Kevin was planning on being here and could not; he would have to elaborate more on that.

Comm. Strauss: I thought the Wage Works sign was not illuminated.

Mr. Klein: There was a sign for Wage Works that has since come down, and now there is a sign for Tallgrass, who is requesting illumination for the sign. When Tallgrass approached the city with the halo-illuminated request, the city checked the Sign Criteria and saw they were not to be facing residential development. We informed Tallgrass of this. They then indicated that Wage Works had an illuminated sign. The Sign Permit states that it is halo-lit (non-illuminated). The whole thing has been confusing. If it was issued, it was by error. It did not fit the Sign Criteria for the development. Staff is not supportive of changing the Sign Criteria, which would allow Tallgrass to have a halo-lit illuminated sign.

Comm. Jackson: That condo association is very active. They were in here not long ago. My thought would be a continuance until they could be approached. If they're fine with it, I'm fine with it. Without knowing that, I would not approve it.

Comm. Strauss: That's what I was going to suggest. Why not have an Interact Meeting and find out if anyone objects to it?

Chairman Williams: The other component of this is there was a sign that went up however it was approved. Now, we are catching that error and trying to correct it. I think staff is right in recommending denial, but I agree with my colleagues about the continuance.

Ms. Piccirilli: That sounds good.

A motion to continue CASE 86-14 – PINNACLE CORPORATE CENTRE – REVISED SIGN CRITERIA – Request for approval of a Revised Sign Plan, located north of 115th Street and west of Tomahawk Creek Parkway – to the July 22nd Planning Commission meeting – was made by Ramsey; seconded by Roberson. Motion passed with a unanimous vote of 7-0. For: Levitan, Pateidl, Roberson, Jackson, Strauss, Ramsey and Walden.

MEETING ADJOURNED