

**City of Leawood
Planning Commission Agenda
September 9, 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: Pateidl, Roberson, Jackson, Williams, Elkins, Strauss, Ramsey and Walden. Absent: Levitan

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA:

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Approval of the minutes from the August 26, 2014 Planning Commission meeting

A motion to approve the minutes from the August 26, 2014 Planning Commission meeting with minor changes mentioned to staff was made by Elkins; seconded by Roberson. Motion passed with a unanimous vote of 7-0. For: Pateidl, Roberson, Jackson, Elkins, Strauss, Ramsey and Walden.

CONTINUED TO SEPTEMBER 23, 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 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 ANTENNAS – Request for approval of a one year extension for a Special Use Permit for the continued use of wireless antennas and associated equipment, located north of 135th Street and west of Briar. **PUBLIC HEARING**

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

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

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

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

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

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.

CASE 112-14 – VILLAGE OF SEVILLE – DISCOUNT TIRE – Request for approval of a Revised Preliminary Plan and Final Plan, located north of 133rd Street and west of State Line Road. **PUBLIC HEARING**

OLD BUSINESS

CASE 113-14 – CHURCH OF THE RESURRECTION – CHURCH EXPANSION – Request for approval of a Revised Final Plat and Final Plan, located east of Nall Avenue and south of 137th Street.

Staff Presentation:

City Planner Ursula Brandt made the following presentation:

Ms. Brandt: This is Case 113-14 – Church of the Resurrection Expansion. This case was continued from the August 26th Planning Commission meeting due to lack of time. Staff would like to remind the commission of the concerns staff has with the case. The first is the service area enlargement. Staff is recommending that the concrete walls surrounding the service area be faced with stone to match the sanctuary or concrete panels that match the existing adjacent building. The second concern is the applicant is proposing leaving the open fields to the west of the new construction as grassland, and staff would like to recommend this area to be planted with the same tall grass mixture that is between the parking lots to create a cohesive landscaped area. Third, the applicant is proposing lighting the architectural features of the sanctuary, and staff would like the commission to consider the large amount of ambient light generated by this illumination.

Chairman Williams: If there are no questions for staff, I would ask the applicant to pick up where we left off at the last meeting or provide a whole new presentation, but I don't know if that is necessary.

Applicant Presentation:

Dick Cooper, 13720 Roe Avenue, Leawood, KS, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Mr. Cooper: I am the Director of Facilities in Construction for Church of the Resurrection. We have our Senior Pastor Adam Hamilton here tonight. We have John Justice, who is our architect in charge. David Reed and Robert Whitman are with Gould Evans, our landscaping expert. We have Brad Sonner with Olsson Engineering. At this time, John or Adam would like to give a quick presentation.

Adam Hamilton, Senior Pastor of Church of the Resurrection, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Mr. Hamilton: I don't have a presentation. I appreciate you giving your time to do this today. I'm going to weigh in if need be on the comments, but our aim, like yours, is to try to make sure the project is the best it can possibly be, that it looks great and serves the community well. We'll address the three concerns raised here.

John Justice appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Mr. Justice: I'd like to go through a quick summary of the project. I felt that was lacking last time we were here. We do have two stipulations that I can address, and then there is a third element that came up tonight that I can address, also.

You're aware of the broad context of the project. The neighborhood context is housing to the east, south and west. Directly across 137th is commercial property and parking lots. We know that people approach this side from all four cardinal directions, so the site has a non-directional character to it with approaches from the south and north from Nall, from the south and north from Roe and also from 137th. I will talk about traffic in a moment because it came up last time.

The Master Plan that was approved by you at Preliminary Plan was a 2013 Master Plan. Building A is the main sanctuary building. The existing children's ministry and sanctuary are in Building B. Building C is a chapel, administrative and a youth center. The items coming down the road in the future are Building D: the Campanile, which is a vertical element on the site, Building E: the 600-person chapel and Building F: administration and a gymnasium/multipurpose room to serve the youth. Our intent was to limit construction in this phase, which is shown on the documents. There is a lot of data in terms of Phase 2. Would that be helpful to summarize?

Chairman Williams: I'm not sure it would be, but if any commissioner would like it, it's fine.

Mr. Justice: Excellent. The Final Plan submission given to the city recently includes Building A, which is a new sanctuary that seats 3,500. Within that building is a Narthex area, office and back-of-house production spaces like a choir room. Building B is children and will involve the interior renovation of the existing sanctuary to a smaller sanctuary, more of a multi-purpose room for dining and that sort of thing. That will come at a later date and will not be part of this project. An existing Chapel C includes offices and youth center. There is no work anticipated in that area. Future development includes The Campanile, the future chapel and the future gym and office expansion. The new parking radiates out from Building A. The existing parking to remain is in the southeast corner of the quadrant. Then, either side of the entry that abuts Nall Avenue is part of Stipulation No. 4 that we will get into later. New landscaping is being developed along Nall with about a 50-ft. landscaped area that has an impact on the grass area. To be issued as an addendum to this Final Plan are three areas that have development: Area G, which is a children's playground and garden area; Area H, which is called a prayer walk and a memorial garden.

Commissioner Jackson asked about any changes that had occurred from Preliminary to Final Plan, and they were very minor. The seating didn't change. The building height changed by 3 inches for the high roof structure, and it changed by 2 feet, 6 inches to the top of the parapet. The total parking changed slightly by a few spaces. Accessible parking is still well within requirements, but it changed slightly. The open space is about the same. The footprint of the building has a slight change, and the overall building area increased by about 1,500 square feet as the project developed. The Floor Area Ratio stayed the exact same. Those are the key project data that deviate very little from Preliminary Plan.

There were a lot of questions about how to get on and off the site last time. There is one main entrance on Roe. There are two main entrances on 137th that serve the two driveways. There is a right-in, right-out on Nall at the midpoint of the site. At the southwest corner is an intersection where cars can go in all directions. There are four major entrances and a few minor ones. You had also asked about how to enter the building. I would say because people come from so many directions, we have seven entrances. Two minor entrances flank the new sanctuary at the north and the west. The entrance for the existing Building B will remain the same, but two major entrances will be on the new sanctuary. A lot of people park across 137th and enter the north side of the building. Another question came up about dropping someone off and where to do it without parking. We have designed what we call a main drop-off point. It would be for vehicles and is also designed to accommodate buses, such as ones used for youth trips. It also is the place for emergency responders. This is at the very center of the site. There are four secondary locations that are more for convenience as related to the parking lots. I hope that answers some of the concerns raised last

time. The main drop-off is designed to accommodate multiple vehicles. It can be accessed from Roe, from Nall and from 137th.

Shows an aerial view of the plan

Regarding the materials of the building, our intention is that the new sanctuary should have sacredness to it. Our thought was how to express it in the best possible way. We would like to have the Kansas limestone essentially be the base of the building. There are metaphors for that material. One would be that it is of this place. This is a local material, so this is part of how the building attaches to this particular spot, this land. The other thing is that it has strength to it. Because it is stone, it has a sense of permanence, a sense of protection and closure. It protects this body of Christ that is gathered or these people that are gathered in this room. The third metaphor would be that the New Testament talks about the church being built of living stones. This Kansas limestone represents the people, all that are gathered in this building. Above that line, we want this idea of how we reach up to the heavens and how the heavens and the earth meet. These elements above are clad in stainless steel and are more ethereal, more transcendent, reaching up. We have seven of them. Some people say it represents the seven days of creation. The large window represents the resurrected Christ, so you could say that there are seven days of the holy week, and the eighth day is the resurrection day, so it would represent the eight elements that are so important to the New Testament and the Christian faith. The stainless steel also is a material that has a sense of permanence like stone. It's a long-lasting material and will be there forever. I think the church is making a statement that we are here to serve our community for a long time, and the materials reflect that.

That completes my summary of the overall site and the building. Do you have any questions or comments? I'd be open to anything before we go to the stipulations.

Comm. Elkins: Back on the traffic flow and control, there is no plan for any automated traffic control at any of those entrances; is that correct?

Mr. Justice: I think the city could answer the question about new signalization at 137th and Nall, and there is one planned for Roe and 137th.

Mr. Ley: That is correct. A traffic signal is planned at 137th and Nall next spring. At the other entrances, it will be stop signs.

Comm. Elkins: So, on Sunday mornings, the parking ministry will help with the ingress and egress out of the parking areas?

Mr. Justice: I could let Mr. Cooper respond to that, but they do have a ministry that facilitates that.

Mr. Cooper: We have a parking ministry, but we have law enforcement in the public right-of-way. Every Sunday, they manage the ingress and egress, particularly during the overlapping worships.

Comm. Elkins: In the judgment of the city, it is adequate just to add the one traffic control at 137th and Roe?

Mr. Ley: The traffic signals are warranted on criteria that are nationwide standards, and because the church only has most traffic during Saturday and Sunday, it would never warrant a traffic signal. The police would be the best option for them to manage the traffic.

Chairman Williams: Are there any other questions? So far, so good.

Mr. Justice: Thank you. I'd like to segue to Stipulation No. 3. When we had this up last time, we didn't have in the existing landscape. Those are all trees that front 137th between the curb line and the sidewalk. It gives a little different impression. The other thing is that right behind the boulevard trees are ornamental trees. We left off last time with how to soften the service area. We all agreed that service needs to occur. The best

location is on the 137th side. It is an existing condition, and the service yard consists of a poured-in-place concrete wall in the foreground. To the far right where the van is, it is about 12-15 feet tall. Then, grade slopes up to the 90-degree intersection of the wall, and it is about 7 feet tall there. As it goes farther east and as grade continues to slope and it engages the B Building, it diminishes to about 3 feet tall and then goes beyond, all the way down the foundation line to meet grade. This wall is freestanding from Building B, out about 6 feet. Behind the wall is a cooling tower that serves the existing B Building. When we designed the new sanctuary building, it was determined to use the same chillers and mechanical system, but the cooling tower wasn't adequate in size. The cooling tower will be removed, and a taller system with the same footprint will be placed behind the wall. The need to screen it became apparent. The service yard also needs to be expanded to accommodate additional electrical equipment. The idea is to extend the concrete wall parallel to 137th at the same height and then to cover the wall with cementitious stucco, which is a coating that would marry the existing concrete wall with a new wall. It will look like the same wall. Its finish would be the very same finish as the Building B precast concrete. It will blend in, in the best way possible in terms of its texture and color. Our idea, which is different than what staff was suggesting, would be that the service area tie into Building B and not into the new sanctuary. It is between the two. We would rather have it be related and be an extension of this Building B than to be an extension of the sanctuary, the sacred building. Because the cooling tower has grown in vertical height, we also intend to place a louvered screen above the yellow portion of the wall. The screen is about 14-15 feet tall, and it would be aluminum prefinished in bone white to match Building B, and it would have concealed structure behind it. It will be continuous in appearance from the 137th Street side. It will sit on top of the wall and then return back to Building B. Our request is that you consider striking or modifying No. 3. We feel this is the very best option to give the best appearance to the area. The service area will be behind boulevard and ornamental trees. The eye will be led to the new sanctuary building with its beautiful stonework and stainless steel work and the window. The service area will be something you will pass by in your car quickly, and the landscaping will help to soften the impact on the site. There are no neighbors to this location. The closest neighbor is about 500 feet away, and it is a commercial building. There are parking lots and a tremendous grade change between the two. That would be the presentation for the summary of the whole site and for No. 3. We would be willing to stand for comments on this if you would like.

Chairman Williams: I think No. 3 would be a good place to start since it is the most controversial and has the major effect on your overall design. To clarify, the concrete would have a cement coating on it and color and finish to match the adjacent building.

Mr. Justice: We'd like to blend in with the existing B Building in off-white.

Chairman Williams: In staff's introductory comments, they make reference to concrete panels to match that building. What is your goal with concrete panels besides matching color and finish?

Mr. Klein: We heard what the applicant said at the last meeting with regard to trying to keep the sanctuary a unique component. We thought if the building is truly an extension of Building B, it is precast panels with a horizontal striation, so it would be an opportunity to blend it with that building. Right now, the wall that exists is a concrete wall with no covering.

Chairman Williams: You're looking to get the horizontal characteristics of the existing precast concrete?

Mr. Klein: Correct.

Chairman Williams: Is that something that you could undertake with your cement coating and coloration?

Mr. Justice: We're dealing with an existing concrete wall that is sandblasted, so someone at some point made an attempt to change the character from poured-in-place concrete. It has a bit of a stucco feeling to it.

Because we're abutting it with a brand new concrete wall, the concrete will look different from the first moment. There has been patina and curing over the last 11 years. Our thought was to cover it with a cementitious coating. The idea of creating the horizontal striations is something we could consider. I would be more than happy to look into that. Precast panels applied to an existing concrete wall would be another step beyond that. It is a much better solution than putting the Kansas limestone. If we had some flexibility with staff to work on a solution that would be acceptable to blend in with the existing building, we would be open to that. We'd have to study it and see how it would actually work technically to add precast panels to the existing concrete wall. We feel it's a great change to go from the limestone, which is precious, to a concrete material. I hope that helps.

Chairman Williams: I know you need to study this further, but could you create the horizontal detail with the cementitious material?

Mr. Justice: We definitely could. I think that was the idea. We would need to do a coating, and the way it's applied could be raked. I think from a distance, you probably would not be able to tell a difference between the cementitious coating finish and the precast finish on the existing building.

Chairman Williams: Would something like that be agreeable to staff?

Mr. Klein: I think it would be preferable to the concrete that was proposed.

Chairman Williams: You made comments about new trees. They were all deciduous trees that will soften during the growing season. Have you given thought to evergreen trees or shrubbery with the walls? You have some around the existing Building B. Could you extend that down?

Mr. Justice: If we could work with staff to substitute ornamental with something else evergreen and some shrubbery, if we could trade one for one, I think it would be agreeable to us. If you feel it would mitigate the massing of the screen wall, we would certainly be willing to explore those ideas.

Chairman Williams: Any other questions from my colleagues on this issue?

Comm. Pateidl: Admittedly, I'm not up to the architectural terms that have been presented, but what bothered me the last time we met was the concept of a 40-ft. metal panel wall with louvers. Are they gone, or are those panels still involved?

Mr. Justice: Maybe there was some misunderstanding. There is a control joint line 15 feet above the top of the concrete wall that lines up with the windowsills. That is the height of the metal louvers that would be above the wall. The corner of the concrete wall is 7 feet tall. There would be a 15-ft.-high louvered screen wall, so it would be 22 feet at that location. As the hill ascends toward the east, it probably is about 4 feet tall plus 15, so about 19 feet tall at that location. As you get down to the curb line farther west on 137th, the wall would be 15 feet tall at that location. The highest screen wall would be about 22 feet from grade. The very top of Building B is 35 feet above grade, so the screen wall would be down 15 feet from that.

Comm. Pateidl: I think where I got the 40 feet was off your plans down by the existing entrance to the service area. I could be wrong, but my real question is if there are white metal louvered panels involved in this proposal, and you do. It extends essentially from Building B to the sanctuary.

Mr. Justice: It almost touches the sanctuary. There is a rooftop unit above and beyond.

Comm. Pateidl: Staff is amenable to that?

Mr. Klein: We tried to work with the applicant early on to address the panels. We had a concern with the first tier above the wall. We came to the conclusion where we focused on the wall to try to tie it together. There didn't seem to be another way to address the screening to allow for air flow. The applicant indicated an attempt to tie in the metal louvers.

Comm. Jackson: Last time, you had a better picture of the area without the trees, which is what I would like to see.

Mr. Justice: I'm sorry; I don't have it. (*shows another picture*) You can kind of see it here; this tells a good story. You can see the concrete wall in the foreground. It maxes out about 15 feet tall. Then, the screen wall that surrounds the cooling tower goes up to about the midpoint of Building B.

Comm. Roberson: You're going to surround the cooling tower in the foreground, and then you will have a set of louvers on the back wall?

Mr. Justice: Yes, there is a mechanical unit on the roof between Building B and the Sanctuary. We're screening that.

Comm. Roberson: How does that look from the front side?

Mr. Justice: It is not visible from any location but 137th. (*Scrolls through photos*)

Comm. Roberson: It is actually tucked in and not screened in from the front side.

Comm. Jackson: A piece of this wall is almost like fencing around the service area?

Mr. Justice: Yes, concrete fencing.

Comm. Jackson: And staff wants that entire piece changed to the limestone.

Mr. Klein: Correct; to match the other building.

Comm. Jackson: It looks like there is a little overhang on the side that would be the Roe side.

Mr. Justice: Yes, we talked about the two minor entrances from 137th. There are pairs of doors there.

Comm. Jackson: As you come in that entrance, the right-hand side will be limestone, and the left-hand side will be concrete.

Mr. Justice: Yes, on the right-hand side will be a 35-ft.-high limestone wall, and on the left-hand side is about 5 feet of concrete wall with a railing. It's a much different scale.

Comm. Jackson: It would make sense you would want those two sides to match up if that's an entrance.

Mr. Justice: No, we really want the form of the church to be unique. We don't want to mix those metaphors right there.

Comm. Jackson: To me, if you're going into an entrance, it feels like the left-hand side wouldn't seem like it's another building.

Mr. Justice: The left-hand side is like a railing, so it is a totally different scale of architecture. The building on the right will feel like a building.

Comm. Jackson: So, are you actually walking around the railing side?

Mr. Justice: The railing is coming up at an acute angle, and there is landscaping. There is some accommodation and experience as you're walking along that pathway. From the long walkway, you are almost parallel with the sanctuary, but the service yard is perpendicular.

Comm. Roberson: Even with all the additional parking that is now being put in, are people really still going to park across the street? Is that going to be allowed?

Mr. Cooper: The church has a permanent easement to that parking lot. We fully expect people to continue to park there.

Comm. Jackson: Again, how high is the wall on the left-hand side of the entrance?

Mr. Justice: It is at least 4 feet tall because the railing had to be 42 inches.

Chairman Williams: The railing you're referring to is on top of the wall?

Mr. Justice: Yes, I would say that by code, we would have to have at least 42 inches of railing.

Comm. Ramsey: Mark, what you are proposing is the limestone along that wall?

Mr. Klein: Correct.

Comm. Ramsey: How far would it go?

Mr. Klein: It would continue on around.

Chairman Williams: So, when it comes to Building B, the stone comes to a stop.

Comm. Roberson: I guess I got the impression you were in agreement with the coating.

Mr. Coleman: We are fine with the coating and striation all the way around.

Chairman Williams: I have to agree with the applicant in keeping the character of the sacred space of the unique stone. Otherwise, if it starts to bleed across the site, it undermines the message of the architecture.

Comm. Ramsey: I understand what staff was trying to do, but the more I've seen of this, I think the sanctuary needs to stand by itself. I think it's professional differences as to whether you extend the stone over or you don't. If you're going to make the sanctuary stand on its own, what they are proposing is reasonable, I think.

Comm. Elkins: Mr. Justice, there is a wall that I presume is a concrete wall that is interior to the service courtyard. On Sheet 403, it appears to be a different, lighter color than the color that's shown in the elevation for what I would describe as a retaining wall. Is that intended, or is the intent that those colors would be roughly the same?

Mr. Justice: The intent is they would be relatively the same. I think it is just the shadowing on the rendering. Everything away from the sanctuary would be related to Building B.

Comm. Elkins: Mark, is staff asking then for that wall to be limestone as well, or would you leave it the same cast concrete?

Mr. Coleman: We weren't suggesting that wall would be limestone. It is a poured concrete wall with the same stucco finish as proposed on the other one.

Chairman Williams: In the notes in the packet, it notes precast concrete.

Mr. Justice: The screen wall is poured-in-place, and the wall beyond is precast to match the existing. It has horizontal striations in it.

Mr. Coleman: Could you check on that wall? One is APC1, and one is APC2. APC1 is precast to match the existing building, and APC2 is concrete with stucco finish.

Mr. Justice: The APC1 matches the south side as it surrounds the Narthex and the Worship Garden. I think the only location of APC2 is the location that is married in.

Mr. Coleman: It says it is a raked finish. You will finish the precast? It just seems unusual because it's such a small area for precast.

Mr. Justice: It is as if that was part of the existing building and had been there for a while.

Mr. Coleman: Does it have the striations of the existing building?

Mr. Justice: Yes, it has horizontal striations.

Mr. Coleman: It matches the existing building's north façade?

Mr. Justice: Yes.

Comm. Elkins: Just to make sure I'm clear, the barrier wall for the service area and the back wall right up against the entrance would match?

Mr. Justice: They would look very similar.

Comm. Elkins: Then to Commissioner Pateidl's question, I think I know that underneath the window feature are louvers as well. What are those louvers screening? To this concept of distinguishing from the sacred space versus a utilitarian space, the concept picks up in your sacred space.

Mr. Justice: You're talking about the ones in the foreground by the large window. The mechanical room that serves the entire complex is indoors and is behind those louvers. There is a tremendous amount of fresh air requirement to serve the 3,500 people in the building. We're working at very low velocities, so we're taking a lot of air. That is not a 100% functional louver. Some of it is blanked off, but the vast majority of it is for free air to get into the mechanical space. We're exhausting on the two sites up above.

Chairman Williams: Any other questions? Then that issue is covered for the time being. Let's talk about the grasses.

Mr. Justice: We have added about 355 trees and shrubs along the 1,100 linear feet along Nall. Our intent from the very beginning was to leave undisturbed the land which is from the driveway that bisects 137th. Eleven years ago, a grass mixture was planted. Robert can talk about the technical aspects of its evolution. We felt that the area didn't need to be disturbed. It is a really well established piece of ground. To me, I can't see a lot of difference between what exists there now and what the grasses would be like in the future. We spent a substantial amount of funds to establish a boulevard setting along Nall, and in doing so, it will mask or partially screen this 11-acre piece of the property. We felt it would be better to leave it in its natural state, undisturbed, not unlike what your ordinance calls for in not disturbing land that doesn't need to be disturbed if it is in a natural environment.

Robert Whitman, landscape architect, 4041 Mill Street, KC, MO, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Mr. Whitman: As was noted, the ground has been left alone for 11 years now and is fully established. Through review of what is existing, it has evolved. It has about 25% native infill of what would be used in a native grass planting. It is fully established as it is now, and it does provide habitat as it is in its current condition. There would be concern if we would completely plow it under and start over that there would be substantial time in order to reestablish the new planting. We currently have an established planting, so that is a serious concern for us. It would be my judgment that it would be a good option to leave it as it is because it is currently moving into more of a native-type habitat as it is.

Chairman Williams: How does this area differ from the new plantings around the parking lots?

Mr. Whitman: The areas that have been planted in native grasses aesthetically look very similar to this. They are a little bit different, and they have 80-90% native planting in those areas, where this is more like 25% native plant material. Aesthetically, I would say the typical observer would hardly notice a difference.

Chairman Williams: The coloring and the height of the grasses will be very similar?

Mr. Whitman: Yes.

Chairman Williams: These areas don't get mowed?

Mr. Whitman: They mow it once a year.

Chairman Williams: When does that take place?

Mr. Cooper: As soon as the seed drops, so in another month or so.

Chairman Williams: Would you anticipate in the new areas would get the yellow plants as well as the grasses?

Mr. Whitman: Yes, there is currently sunflower in this area. It currently has prairie drop seed in it and a fair amount of switch grass. It has a fair amount of sunflower in it as well.

Chairman Williams: Approximately how tall are the grasses as people walk down the sidewalks?

Mr. Whitman: In the native plantings that are established, they are typically chest height. There are plants in a few areas that are up to 6 feet tall right now. In the new areas that are proposed on the plan, it would be chest height as well.

Comm. Pateidl: You're saying within the existing plantings, there is 25% native material. What is the other 75%?

Mr. Whitman: It would be the grasses originally planted 11 years ago, which is typical grassland.

Comm. Pateidl: You're saying that this has evolved over the fullness of time of and by itself?

Mr. Whitman: It has, partly because in such close proximity, we've got a full-blown native planting on the site already from the previous work 11 years ago. Those seeds are so near that it is self-established into the area. It is not fully established, but it is getting there.

Comm. Pateidl: I can see the evolution of that plot, and it's not going to be the same year after year. That begs the question of the materials or landscaping scheme between the parking lots and if there will be the same evolution taking place in those areas as well.

Mr. Whitman: Absolutely; I would say that we've seen it in the native grass areas that exist on the site, and in the areas that are native that we're proposing on the property, it will evolve because upper portions of the landscape have certain seed types that will prefer those locations. They will evolve to whatever the preferred species is for that portion of the site. Currently, all the areas of native plantings change throughout, depending on soil type, moisture and exposure to sun and wind.

Comm. Pateidl: In the new areas that will be seeded, it has been my understanding that the native grasses can take 3-4 years to get themselves established, and if you're doing that with a blended mixture of grasses and organic material with the seeding, what we would anticipate early on is an emphasis on brome and fescue, waiting for the native grasses to come forth?

Mr. Whitman: You're talking about in the newly planted native grass areas, and there would not be brome or any of the non-native plants.

Chairman Williams: To follow about the time of establishment, you made a statement earlier that it took approximately 3 years to establish these 11 acres. You watered it, took care of it and then you walked away.

Mr. Cooper: Those are the statements we made last time. The difference would be the level of maintenance program. In the areas that are closer into the building, I think what the church has done is had a pretty strong maintenance program, and this area, which is farther away and a little bit remote has less maintenance. I think the maintenance program could be improved on the 11 acres, and you would see a change over time.

Mr. Whitman: I would agree. That would benefit these outparcels.

Chairman Williams: I think the key here is how much difference the two areas will have to justify destroying 11 acres of current vegetation and starting over. If you're telling us there is a slight difference, then I don't know that it justifies killing current vegetation and starting over.

Comm. Jackson: It sounds like 75% is a big difference. Is it possible to start adding more natural vegetation to that site?

Mr. Whitman: Yes, if there is a little bit more maintenance, some of the plants that tend to grow faster and cover the soil more quickly and not allow the natives to germinate could be removed and the natives will continue to grow.

Comm. Jackson: That seems to be a more reasonable way of going about it. That way, it is not bare for too long. Is there some way we can stipulate to something like that?

Mr. Klein: The stipulation part might be difficult because it gets to the maintenance. In order for it to be stipulated, there would need to be a check to ensure it was being done.

Chairman Williams: Would that be something the city would undertake?

Mr. Klein: It would be the applicant reporting to the city that the property was maintained at a certain time.

Comm. Jackson: Is it possible to put a stipulation in that would say that before occupancy, the mix would have to be 75/25 with natural grasses being 75%?

Mr. Klein: I think they could probably provide some evidence that it was done. I'm not sure of the timeline for completion.

Mr. Justice: It is spring of 2017. We will start construction next spring, and it will be about two years.

Mr. Klein: The nice part is that this is far enough removed from the rest of the site that it wouldn't be disturbed with the rest of the construction.

Comm. Jackson: Would three years be long enough to get it switched over?

Mr. Whitman: Just through maintenance, it would be doubtful to get to that high of a percentile. It would probably be more like 50%. The benefit of the maintenance is it provides a stronger grass land growth. Whether it is natives or not is maybe not really what you're after, but from an aesthetics standpoint, having a stronger grass and desirable planting could be accomplished quite easily in three years.

Comm. Jackson: What would you call that at the end of the three years?

Mr. Whitman: I would call that undesirable weed removal. It would be established permanent desirable grass land plants to a level of 90%.

Comm. Strauss: The irony is that this property is zoned Agriculture. I also want to say that the layperson walking down the street probably couldn't tell the difference.

Chairman Williams: I think those are very good statements, and I think the key is it looks nice as it is.

Comm. Walden: Driving down Nall, I see tall natural grass prior to the Nall entrance drive. Then, from the Nall entrance drive to 137th Street, the grass is shorter. Why the difference in height there? Also, are there any weeds in there? Are there any noxious weeds that should be removed?

Mr. Justice: I had the same experience walking through. There is quite a bit of variability between the far southern edge and the far northern edge in terms of height and species.

Mr. Whitman: The reason for the height difference is purely because it appears there has been an additional mowing on the north half.

Comm. Walden: I might mention that the south part looks pretty ragged. I was not impressed with that at all. I think that needs attention. If nothing else, bring it to the same height as this northern part. I'm willing to eliminate No. 4 altogether as long as the petitioner continues with the proposed plantings in the parkway of

Nall Avenue. You also might look on your sheet L200, I question whether the location of the worship court should be Nall Avenue.

Mr. Justice: Thank you for that comment. We'll work with staff on that specific designation.

Mr. Hamilton: Ten years from now, we'll probably come before you with some dream of what to do with those fields out there. I didn't want you to have a sense that we are permanently saying they will be grasses forever. We have looked at that as our field of dreams for the next generation of people at Church of the Resurrection. We won't need more sanctuary space, but we have looked at it as a place to dream in the future and meet community needs. Some have said there will be a need for more senior housing as Leawood ages. We don't know. We're not proposing anything right now, but I didn't want you think we are saying it will be grass forever. The Effertz Farm folks have approached us, and said they are farming vacant fields and donating proceeds to projects benefitting the poor. I thought it could be a cool thing in Leawood. We're not proposing it right now; it was an idea. I didn't want you to feel that we set it in stone. We want this to look beautiful, but I also keep thinking about how to use those grounds to make a difference.

Comm. Elkins: Thank you. I think that's a point that is well made. I would remind the commission that we had a prior incident with a big discussion about passive park space, and then when we decided to do something with the space. Members of the public interpreted the prior discussion as suggesting that this commission always wanted that particular space to stay passive or empty. I appreciate the record shows that it was not suggested it would remain wild prairie forever. I have lost track of where we are with respect to this particular issue. For the 11 acres that currently exist, it is a mixture of native grasses and other grasses, correct?

Mr. Whitman: Yes

Comm. Elkins: The mixture is this 75/25 that I hear my colleagues talk about?

Mr. Whitman: Yes.

Comm. Elkins: The 75 is native or non-native?

Mr. Whitman: The 75 is non-native but still grasses and other plants that are not noxious weeds.

Comm. Elkins: What the church is currently proposing is that in the spaces adjacent to the parking, to plant a higher percentage of native grasses.

Mr. Whitman: That would be 100%.

Comm. Elkins: What has been suggested here is that the church will undertake maintenance such that nature, in its course, would hopefully decide that the 11 acres would get up to a higher percentage of 90%, which seems high.

Mr. Whitman: Let me clarify that: that would be 90% of desirable plants, so non-noxious plants.

Comm. Elkins: You're already at 90% non-noxious.

Mr. Whitman: It would be desirable prairie plants, not necessarily native. That would be the goal. It would take a long time to get to full native. Aesthetically, it would look very similar.

Comm. Elkins: I won't speak for the commission, but what I sense is that the concern is that they match over time. Do I correctly believe that is what the church is trying to achieve?

Mr. Justice: The goal would be that all of these parcels would look very similar, and over time, with better maintenance, these 11 acres would continue to get more and more native percentages in them to get closer to matching the planted native areas.

Comm. Pateidl: Mr. Whitman, those are pretty ambiguous terms that are hard to measure. Very simply stated, following the mowing, if there was over-seeding with native grasses over the course of three years, would we anticipate an improvement in the volume of native prairie grasses?

Mr. Whitman: Yes, you would see more natives in that area.

Comm. Pateidl: I would suggest something more quantitative for our considerations. I agree that we should not destroy the vegetation that is there. I do believe with some simple measures, it can be improved.

Chairman Williams: Any other questions or comments on this issue? The other issue that staff has addressed is the lighting question. Would you like to speak to that?

Mr. Justice: There are 7 vertical elements, 5 of which can be illuminated from the roof. The pattern illuminates each of the surfaces. The far sails, closest to 137th, we cannot illuminate from the roof, so we need a two-headed fixture that illuminates the furthest north and west sails. The foot candle readings are 2.0, 1.5 and 1.2. It is a very low light level to illuminate these stainless steel surfaces. With the lights, we are providing a device on the fixture called a snoot. It keeps the light from spilling over. We have gone to lengths to ensure we only illuminate the surfaces, that we have a consistent pattern and that the lights don't spill over. The lights really shine away from the neighborhood. That is the issue staff wanted to discuss. It is not a stipulation; they just wanted to see what the design was. We wanted to make you aware of the fact that this is the comprehensive design for the stainless steel surface illumination. I'd love to answer any questions. I don't have technical expertise, but I hope the documentation gives you enough information.

Chairman Williams: Mark, do you want to follow up on your concerns?

Mr. Klein: Staff really wanted to make sure everybody understood that it will make it attractive, but it also will create light that will go into ambient light. There are some adjacent residential areas around there as well. We have a requirement of no more than .5 foot candles at the property line; however, the ambient light will tend to glow, especially with lights shining on stainless steel.

Chairman Williams: The neighbors to the south will see it, but it will not necessarily exceed the .5 foot candle at the property line.

Mr. Klein: Correct; if you think about looking across a parking lot, and even though it is dark where you are, as you look across, you will see brighter areas in the parking lot. This will probably be one of those areas that would have the ambient light.

Chairman Williams: The height would not be much different than the ambient lights you see in a parking lot.

Mr. Coleman: The difference is that the light will bounce off the stainless steel and back up into the sky; whereas, a parking lot fixture is required to be cutoff fixtures so that all the light is directed straight down with limited spillover. We just want to make you aware that this will potentially create more light dispersion in the area.

Chairman Williams: But you're not necessarily advocating its elimination.

Mr. Coleman: No, we are bringing it to your attention.

Comm. Jackson: Mr. Justice, is the 40 x 90 stained glass window lit up at night?

Mr. Justice: We have the potential to backlight it. We have lights within the worship space that can illuminate the window when it's dark, making it visible from the outside.

Comm. Jackson: Are you planning on doing that?

Mr. Justice: I think so. That would be beautiful. They're all on dimmers. These LED lights for the exterior stainless steel can be adjusted, which I think would solve any kind of issues with light levels. These are very low light levels. We also can dim them down. The same is true of the stained glass window. The backlighting is also on the capability of dimming. We can see how the light level looks and make a change if needed.

Comm. Jackson: I would assume at 2:00 in the morning, you would turn it down to save.

Mr. Justice: They don't go all night.

Comm. Jackson: And you're planning on turning these outside lights on the sails off?

Mr. Justice: It will be on some kind of timing system. I think they do that now. I think they leave some of their lights on for security, but I don't think they illuminate their entire building at all times.

Chairman Williams: Any other questions or comments? All right - anything else that you would like to discuss?

Mr. Justice: No. I appreciate your interest and time, and I hope that we responded to your concerns adequately. We appreciate your consideration of the two stipulations. Hopefully, we have addressed the concern about the illumination of the exterior. Thank you very much.

Comm. Strauss: I have one concern related to the stained glass. Some of the images were up there with no image, and you talked about an image of a resurrected Christ. I feel like this could be anywhere from the most beautiful thing in the city or a quite large banner that is overwhelming the area. I'm caught between not having a good understanding of what this is going to look like.

Mr. Hamilton: I wish I had brought some of the initial drawings, but the firm that we're using is Judson Studios out of California, and they're an award-winning studio. They just finished the Catholic Church at University of Southern California and have done some beautiful things. We have the same concern. We don't want this to look hokey, cheesy. Our dream is that this is the kind of window that when people come to Kansas City, they say, "You have to go see the window at Church of the Resurrection." The CEO of the Nelson is on our committee, and he is helping us with this as well as several other fine people who are making sure that this window is something really special. It will be beautiful. The window captures the entirety of the scriptures, so it starts on one side with creation and the cosmos and the heavens. You won't see it from 137th and Nall but rather from inside. Each of the panels is the size of the wall here. It is a garden theme with the Garden of Eden on one side and the idea of paradise lost. The bible both begins and ends in gardens. In the end, it is a garden in the story of Revelation where there is no more suffering or pain. In the middle of that is a picture of Jesus who is suffering and raised in a garden. The images are beautiful. Right now, all we have is a cartoon, which is a mock-up. Then they begin the work of designing every piece. The

studio does both painted glass and etched glass. We looked at 40 different firms and narrowed it down to 3 from around the world and chose this firm because we felt they could most likely give us a window that people would talk about around Kansas City and in a way that says that you have to go see it. From the exterior, you'll see mostly color without actually being able to make out a lot of the images because of the distance. We hope this is what you see when you enter the city on Nall, and it doesn't look like a billboard but instead something beautiful that you have to go see. It is hard for you to take my word for it, but it is a real concern for us to do something that is beautiful and a work of art for the entire Kansas City area.

Comm. Strauss: What happens on the inside can be as bright and bold as you want. I'm just not comfortable approving this without having something to see because of its size.

Mr. Klein: The applicant indicated they would come back for final approval for the Prayer Walk, playground, stained glass window, Campanile and chapel at a future time. It might be a good idea just to add that in as a stipulation.

Mr. Hamilton: Ideally, we would love to have you come to the church to show you this. We have been able to broadcast this onto the screen in our sanctuary, and you can get a sense of what it will look like. We've tried to take into account the color so it is not obnoxious and bright.

Comm. Strauss: There are different levels of stained glass. Some are bolder; some are more faint. I'd be comfortable with pulling that out so we can review it in more detail at another time.

Chairman Williams: Mark already stated that is in the staff comments, but it could be added as a stipulation. Any other questions or discussion?

Comm. Strauss: As far as the residential adjacent properties, I'm trying to visualize if the city gets complaints now with nighttime services with headlights. Have there been any complaints with headlights?

Mr. Klein: Personally, I haven't received any.

Mr. Coleman: We haven't had any complaints in at least the last year.

Comm. Strauss: I'm not familiar with the area. Is there a berm?

Mr. Coleman: Yes, it is a native grass.

Chairman Williams: Any other questions or comments?

Comm. Pateid: I have a comment to thank the applicant. Not often do I agree with tweaking architectural treatments. I was very concerned with the staff considerations for the walls and the utility screening, and I was delighted to see that you came back with some alternatives and recognition of the needs of the city and the goal of the city to have this be arguably the most noted building in Leawood. We are concerned with its appearance, so I thank you for that and wish you Godspeed.

Chairman Williams: If there are no further comments or questions, could I get a motion?

A motion to recommend approval of CASE 113-14 – CHURCH OF THE RESURRECTION – CHURCH EXPANSION – Request for approval of a Revised Final Plat and Final Plan, located east of Nall Avenue and south of 137th Street – subject to the 29 Stipulations with the following modifications:

- **No. 3: strike as stated and replace it with the comment, “Prior to Governing Body consideration, staff and applicant shall reach an agreement on materials to be used on the entire elevation of the solid wall to screen the utilities on the north side of the sanctuary.”**
- **No. 4: modify to read, “The westernmost open fields shall be prepared and over-seeded with the same tall grass prairie mixture as proposed for the new areas for the next 3 consecutive years.”**

Chairman Williams: Are you suggesting that what is there today gets eliminated?

Comm. Pateidl: No, I believe it implies that what is there will remain, and what is proper preparation for over-seeding, I would leave to the determination of the landscaper.

- **No. 9: add, “Including landscaping along 137th Street and Nall Avenue,’ as there have been changes proposed in the landscaping in tonight’s presentation.**
- **No. 30: a new stipulation to read, “Final approval of the playground, future chapel, stained glass window and Campanile shall require a separate approval of a Final Site Plan to be recommended by the Planning Commission and approved by the Governing Body.”**

was made by Pateidl; seconded by Elkins. Motion passed with a unanimous vote of 7-0. For: Pateidl, Roberson, Jackson, Elkins, Strauss, Ramsey and Walden.

MEETING ADJOURNED