

**City of Leawood
Planning Commission Meeting
January 26, 2016
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: Hoyt, Walden, Levitan, Pateidl, Williams, Elkins, Strauss, Ramsey, and Coleman.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

A motion to approve the agenda was made by Elkins; seconded by Coleman. Motion carried with a unanimous vote of 8-0. For: Hoyt, Walden, Levitan, Pateidl, Elkins, Strauss, Ramsey and Coleman.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Approval of the minutes from the November 24, 2015 Planning Commission meeting.

A motion to approve the minutes from the November 24, 2015 Planning Commission meeting was made by Elkins; seconded by Strauss. Motion carried with a unanimous vote of 8-0. For: Hoyt, Walden, Levitan, Pateidl, Elkins, Strauss, Ramsey and Coleman.

CONSENT AGENDA:

CASE 137-15 – TOMAHAWK CREEK OFFICE PARK – PHILADELPHIA INSURANCE – WALL SIGN – Request for approval of a Final Sign Plan, located north of 114th Street and west of Tomahawk Creek Parkway.

CASE 08-16 – MISSION FARMS – NOURISH RESTAURANT – Request for approval of a Final Plan for a Change to the Façade of a Tenant Space, located east of Mission Road and south of 105th Street.

CASE 10-16 – LEAWOOD HERITAGE, SECOND PLAT – Request for approval of a Revised Final Plat – Located north of Cherokee Lane and east of Ensley Lane.

CASE 13-16 – LEAWOOD HERITAGE LOT SPLIT OF LOT 26 – Request for approval of a Revised Final Plat, located north of 89th Street and west of Ensley Lane.

Comm. Strauss: I would like to pull Case 11-16 to refresh my memory on the resolution on a few questions.

A motion to approve the remaining items on the Consent Agenda was made by Elkins; seconded by Pateidl. Motion carried with a unanimous vote of 8-0. For: Hoyt, Walden, Levitan, Pateidl, Elkins, Strauss, Ramsey and Coleman.

CASE 11-16 – TOMAHAWK CREEK OFFICE PARK – KANSAS CITY ORTHOPEDIC INSTITUTE (KCOI) ROOFTOP UNIT REPLACEMENT – Request for approval of a Revised Final Plan, located south of College Boulevard and west of Tomahawk Creek Parkway.

Comm. Strauss: I remember a complaint from an adjacent property on the potential for noise with the rooftop generator. Could you just refresh my memory on the resolution?

Ms. Kriks: With the expansion of KCOI that was presented in 2014, the applicant had a sound study done, and they met the standards of the sound study. Part of the requirements was that once the extension was built, a follow-up sound study would be performed to ensure that it was, in fact, 60 db at the property line. We had an LDO amendment that addressed emergency generators. This application does not refer to the expansion. There is an existing unit on their rooftop that is a singular unit. KCOI wants to split the unit and have a separate condensing unit, which is the much louder part. It will be moved away from the residents, and it will have a sound-attenuating screen around it to reduce noise. The other unit being installed is already sound-attenuated. They will increase the height of the screens to fully conceal the rooftop utility and also add a new screen around the condensing unit. The new screen has sound attenuation included. The new unit in the old location will be sound-attenuated, and the screen will also have sound attenuation.

Comm. Strauss: KCOI will then be required to do another noise assessment after it is installed?

Ms. Kriks: I believe that was with the extension to the south.

Comm. Strauss: Thank you.

A motion to approve CASE 11-16 – TOMAHAWK CREEK OFFICE PARK – KANSAS CITY ORTHOPEDIC INSTITUTE (KCOI) ROOFTOP UNIT REPLACEMENT – Request for approval of a Revised Final Plan, located south of College Boulevard and west of Tomahawk Creek Parkway – was made by Elkins; seconded by Strauss. Motion carried with a unanimous vote of 8-0. For: Hoyt, Walden, Levitan, Pateidl, Elkins, Strauss, Ramsey and Coleman.

NEW BUSINESS:

CASE 75-15 – LEABROOKE TOWN MANORS – Request for approval of a Rezoning from RP-3 (Planned Cluster Attached Residential District) to RP-2 (Planned Cluster Detached Residential District), Preliminary Plan and Preliminary Plat, located north of W. 148th Street and west of Kenneth Road. **PUBLIC HEARING**

Staff Presentation:

City Planner Ursula Brandt made the following presentation:

Ms. Brandt: This is Case 75-16 – Leabrooke Town Manors. The applicant is requesting approval of a Rezoning, Preliminary Plat and Preliminary Plan. The applicant is proposing that the undeveloped portion of the subdivision be rezoned from RP-3 [Planned Cluster Attached Residential] to RP-2 [Planned Cluster Detached Residential]. The applicant is proposing 30 single family units on 15.23 acres for a density of 1.97 dwelling units per acre. Within the subdivision, Meadow Lane is proposed to continue from the southern multi-family portion of the development to the north and culminate in cul-de-sac. Two smaller cul-de-sacs will branch off Meadow Lane, going to the northwest. The average lot size for the development is proposed to be 10,506.21 square feet with the smallest lot being 7,811 square feet, meeting the requirement for RP-2 of a minimum lot size of 6,000 square feet. With this proposal, there are also 3 common tracts included in the development. Large, high voltage overhead power transmission lines enter the site from the northeast corner and continue to the southwest. A tract is located directly under the power lines. As buildings and roads cannot be constructed under the power lines, the tract will provide open space for the development as well as walking paths and a community garden. An 8-ft. hike/bike path is also shown going through that open space connecting to other surrounding amenities, including a tennis court and pool in the subdivision. The applicant is requesting a deviation for the width of the lots on the cul-de-sacs. Leawood Development Ordinance calls for a 100-ft. lot width on lots that are in cul-de-sacs but allows for a deviation to 80 feet. Staff is supportive of this deviation, as it allows the lots to be consistent with the remaining lots within the

proposed development. The applicant is also requesting to not be required to bury the high voltage transmission lines that run through the property, as it is likely that KCP&L will not allow the power lines to be buried and also that other residential subdivisions, including The Glyn, Steeplechase and the existing portion of LeaBrooke have not been required to bury these lines. Staff is also supportive of this request. Staff is recommending approval for Case 75-15 with the stipulations stated in the Staff Report, and I'd be happy to answer any questions.

Chairman Williams: Thank you. Any questions? Seeing none, we'll hear from the applicant.

Applicant Presentation:

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

Mr. Claussen: With me tonight is Dan Taylor and Rob Hummel, who are partners with LeaBrooke Homes. I have a very brief presentation, and I'll open up for questions. We're talking about the remaining portion of LeaBrooke on the east side. That, along with the townhome area to the south, was originally zoned in 2003 with the overall rezoning of LeaBrooke, and it was all RP-3. The areas at the south end have built out, and Dan and his partner Rob are finishing out the last of the condominiums now. As we get into the proposed area, there is no infrastructure and streets are not in. There is a fresh canvas. We took a hard look at whether we wanted to continue that existing plan or try to do something different. They have elected to respond to what the market would like to see: more of the villa-style detached home. The current plan is similar to the last plan with a street that goes southwest to northeast and the connection back to the existing 148th Street. There are two new cul-de-sacs so the lots can circle around them. Ursula pointed out two deviations. The first is the power lines; the second is the lots at the end of the cul-de-sac that are required to be 100 feet at the build line, which would put the property line shared with the open space tract much farther into it. We would like to keep the lot widths consistent with the other lots. As I understand, it is a common variance. We don't see any issues as far as a substandard lot with that. We had a neighborhood meeting with about half a dozen people very much in support of the project. With that, I will stand for questions. We agree with all the stipulations.

Chairman Williams: Any questions for the applicant? Thank you very much. Any discussion on this case? 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 Elkins; seconded by Hoyt. Motion carried with a unanimous vote of 8-0. For: Hoyt, Walden, Levitan, Pateidl, Elkins, Strauss, Ramsey and Coleman.

A motion to recommend approval of CASE 75-15 – LEABROOKE TOWN MANORS – Request for approval of a Rezoning from RP-3 (Planned Cluster Attached Residential District) to RP-2 (Planned Cluster Detached Residential District), Preliminary Plan and Preliminary Plat, located north of W. 148th Street and west of Kenneth Road – with 14 Staff Stipulations - was made by Elkins; seconded by Strauss. Motion carried with a unanimous vote of 8-0. For: Hoyt, Walden, Levitan, Pateidl, Elkins, Strauss, Ramsey and Coleman.

CASE 131-15 – PARKWAY PLAZA – HUBER DENTAL – Request for approval of a Preliminary Plan and Final Plan, located at the southwest corner of W. 134th Street and Roe Avenue. PUBLIC HEARING

Staff Presentation:

City Planner Michelle Kriks made the following presentation:

Ms. Kriks: This is Case 131-15 – request for approval of a Preliminary Plan and Final Plan for Huber Dental, located within the Parkway Plaza development at the southwest corner of W. 134th Street and Roe Avenue. The project was proposed for Lot 16 of Parkway Plaza on a trapezoidal-shaped lot. The project is proposed in two phases. The first phase is a new 3,600 sq. ft. single story dental office building. A future second phase is an additional 1,400 sq. feet and will require Final Plan approval prior to construction of the addition. Existing parking is located west of the proposed building and is accessible from the private drive of W. 134th Street to the north and W. 135th Street to the south. The northern portion of the lot is dedicated to Parkway Plaza as an amenity space which currently exists and includes green space, pedestrian connections, landscaping and seating amenities. The applicant's building will be located south of the pedestrian amenity. On the south side of the building, a trash enclosure is proposed to be attached to the building and will be enclosed by a 7-ft. cementitious stucco wall. Access to the trash enclosure will be by a concrete drive, and a pedestrian crossing is proposed across the service drive with brick pavers proposed to demarcate that crossing. The brick shall be red and laid in a herringbone pattern which is consistent with other pedestrian crossings within the development. At the southeast corner of the building, a patio is proposed to be covered by an 11-ft. dark bronze aluminum trellis. The height of the building is proposed to be 32.6 feet with a pitched roof of concrete tile and bronze standing seam metal roofing. The façade will be constructed of a combination of cementitious stucco and natural limestone. The stucco on the façade of the building will be beige in color with accent bands of light beige stucco under the roofline and around the windows and doors. The entrance into the building shall be on the west side under a colonnade. The colonnade will match the other colonnades which are currently within the development. A tower feature of stone columns with cast stone bases, stucco and a bronze metal standing seam roof is also proposed on the west elevation over the entry and will be incorporated into the colonnade. The windows and front doors will be a dark bronze aluminum storefront system with a light bronze tinted glass. Staff is recommending approval of Case 131-15 with the stipulations outlined in the Staff Report. I'm happy to answer any questions you may have.

Chairman Williams: Any questions for staff? We'll hear from the applicant.

Applicant Presentation

Jeff Skidmore, Schlagel & Associates, 14920 W. 107th Street, Lenexa, KS, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Mr. Skidmore: I'm here on behalf of Dr. Steven Huber, DDS. I also have with me Guy Gronberg, architect, who will be happy to stand for any questions as well. There is nothing to add. We have the next piece of the Parkway Plaza puzzle here for you this evening. The buildings are similar to what are in the development. I'd be happy to answer any questions. We are in agreement with the stipulations, and we'd greatly appreciate your support.

Chairman Williams: Any questions for the applicant? Thank you. This case requires a Public Hearing.

Public Hearing

As no one was present to close the Public Hearing was made by Elkins; seconded by Hoyt. Motion carried with a unanimous vote of 8-0. For: Hoyt, Walden, Levitan, Pateidl, Elkins, Strauss, Ramsey and Coleman.

Chairman Williams: That brings us to further discussion and a motion.

Comm. Elkins: It is great to see the next stage of Parkway Plaza taking place. I hope this is the next step of much more to come as it is built out.

A motion to recommend approval of CASE 131-15 – PARKWAY PLAZA – HUBER DENTAL – Request for approval of a Preliminary Plan and Final Plan, located at the southwest corner of W. 134th Street and Roe Avenue – with 28 Staff Stipulations – was made by Elkins; seconded by Strauss. Motion carried with a unanimous vote of 8-0. For: Hoyt, Walden, Levitan, Pateidl, Elkins, Strauss, Ramsey and Coleman.

CASE 07-16 – VILLA MILANO – GATE, ACCESS ROAD AND RETAINING WALL – Request for approval of a Revised Final Plan, located south of W. 137th Street and east of Mission Road.

Staff Presentation:

City Planner Ursula Brandt made the following presentation:

Ms. Brandt: This is Case 07-16 – Villa Milano – Gate, Access Road and Retaining Wall located south of 137th Street and east of Mission Road. I'd like to remind the Planning Commission that you did hear this case in October of last year, and since then, staff has worked with the applicant to resolve a lot of the issues that were previously recommended denial on. With that, the applicant is requesting approval of a Revised Final Plan. The applicant is proposing the addition of square mesh to the moving entrance gates to meet current safety standards. The mesh will be PVC-coated black and oriented in a square pattern rather than a diamond pattern. The applicant is proposing the removal of a future right-in, right-out off Mission Road to be replaced by an open dog area. I'd like to direct your attention to the letter on the dais that is in support for the removal of the right-in, right-out from the Leawood Meadows Homeowners Association. Finally, the applicant is proposing to build a limestone retaining wall to be placed at the front edge of the reinforced concrete box as was originally approved and extend over the top. This will tie in with the naturally occurring existing limestone ledge located south of the box and connect back to the existing retaining wall to the northwest. The existing fence will be moved from the existing retaining wall and will be placed just behind the proposed retaining wall. The fence will also tie in to a fence that is adjacent to the apartment units to the northeast. Staff is recommending approval for Case 07-16 with the stipulations stated in the Staff Report, and I would be happy to answer any questions you may have.

Chairman Williams: There was reference made to ASTM, which is a testing standard. Is that particular provision for the safety issues relating to this gate or to the materials itself?

Ms. Brandt: It is a safety standard that requires a sphere that is 2 ½ inches cannot fit through. This is to keep a child from getting stuck.

Chairman Williams: Any other questions for staff?

Comm. Pateidl: In the comments from staff, it references the access drive as part of the currently approved plan for this development, and it is to construct a right-in, right-out on Mission Road for emergency vehicles only until Mission Road is reconstructed to four lanes. We discussed the fact that using the type of surface that was going to be used would be inappropriate as far as emergency access is concerned. The Fire Department was fine with its removal, correct?

Ms. Brandt: Yes.

Comm. Pateidl: That leaves the issue of the expansion of Mission Road. To be clear, there is no pressure at this particular point in time that an access road be constructed at that location. Is that correct?

Ms. Brandt: Correct.

Comm. Pateidl: Accordingly, as far as emergency access is concerned, any requirement of this nature would be deferred until such time as Mission Road is improved. Would that be a fair statement?

Mr. Ley: On the original approval, there is supposed to be a temporary access drive between now and when Mission Road will be widened, which should be in 2023. After it was approved, the Fire Department said they would not drive on that type of surface. We have instructed the developer that if he wants to get rid of the driveway, he needs to come back to the Planning Commission, but between now and 2023, the question is if the developer should build it anyway out of the grass pavers.

Comm. Pateidl: The city is not taking any position that they must build the driveway at this point.

Mr. Ley: It is part of the original stipulations that the temporary driveway be constructed.

Chairman Williams: Even though it was in the original stipulations, we are taking it out?

Mr. Ley: That is correct. He is requesting to remove the temporary and permanent drive.

Chairman Williams: Is there going to be a requirement in 2023 for them to then put in an access drive?

Mr. Ley: If you vote it down and require the permanent drive to be constructed, at the time the city widens Mission Road, the city would construct that access.

Mr. Coleman: The applicant is requesting to remove the access completely from the plan so that in 2023 when the city widens Mission Road, there would be no right-in, right-out at this location.

Chairman Williams: Is it the city's position that the access should be required in 2023 even though the Fire Marshal says they don't need it?

Mr. Coleman: In the original plan approval, it was required that they build a temporary access until 2023 and then build a permanent access. The applicant is asking to remove all the stipulations. The Fire Department has indicated that they don't feel it is necessary, and I don't believe Public Works feels it is necessary, either.

Chairman Williams: Since it has staff's recommendations that it all come out, they won't be required to do this in the future.

Mr. Coleman: If it is approved as presented, yes.

Chairman Williams: Thank you. Any other questions?

Comm. Strauss: I think in October, Commissioner Pateidl asked about providing access for pedestrians and bicyclists. With the school on Mission Road, is there an opportunity to give students access into the development without having to go all the way up to 137th and around? I could see an access point with a sidewalk to lead to the public street. I didn't know if that discussion had continued with the applicant.

Mr. Klein: I don't believe we discussed that. If that is something the Planning Commission would like to do, it would require a stipulation to be added that requires a sidewalk connection from the internal drive. It would also require a gate within the fence around the perimeter.

Comm. Strauss: Maybe the applicant could talk about that.

Chairman Williams: Any further questions? We'll hear from the applicant.

Applicant Presentation:

Bill Prelogar, architect with NSPJ Architects, 3515 W. 75th Street, Suite 201, Prairie Village, KS, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Mr. Prelogar: I'm here representing the applicant tonight. Jeff Skidmore is also here, as is Rick Oddo. We have worked with staff over the last couple months, and I think we have come up with a very collegial solution to all three of the issues. The retaining wall was maybe the most controversial one, and the final result is one that will line the edge of the southeastern pond with a stacked limestone wall that will tie in very neatly with the end of the box culvert. We will bring the current fence on the wall down to that wall, and it will have a landscaped space between. It will dramatically improve the appearance of the corner of the southeastern pond. The question was asked about the gate. The mesh is there to meet the safety requirements that were put in place when the original plan was approved. To further discussion about the idea of a pedestrian entry point on to Mission Road, Rick has let me know he has no objection to doing that. We would need to add a fence and a gate, and we think that would be fine. As a side note, there are no children living in the development at the present time, even though it is almost 100% occupied. I have some pictures if anyone would like to see them, but I think the Staff Report does a very good job of describing the project. I'm happy to stop at this point and answer any questions you might have.

Chairman Williams: Any questions? Even though the complex may not have children at this point, if we're trying to encourage a walking population, it certainly would aid a lot in people traveling up and down Mission Road.

Mr. Prelogar: We have no objection whatsoever to making that connection point.

Chairman Williams: Thank you very much. Any further discussion of this case?

Comm. Pateid: I'd like to add some comments. Going back to the original approval of the Special Use Permit for Villa Milano there was extensive discussion we had about the unknown of what the traffic pattern was going to be on Mission Road. During the course of all that, the unknown of the influence of the density of this project of the traffic pattern was another issue that came into play. As a result of all those discussions, a right-in, right-out was discussed and recommended for the sake of safety. I'll defer to the Fire Marshal and his opinion at this time; however, the decision to override those considerations, discussions and agreements that were reached between the city and Mr. Oddo with respect to the access and totally dismiss that at this point in time, leaving the unknown of the traffic pattern on Mission Road when it happens to be improved is, in my opinion, imprudent as far as the city is concerned. We plan for a contingency, as this Special Use Permit was granted. We incorporated that as part of the contingency, and it was agreed to by Mr. Oddo. I don't know what the influence of the traffic on Mission Road will be. One thing I'm absolutely certain of is if we waive that requirement at this point in time, we will never again have the opportunity to have that right-in, right-out. As a result, for consideration on this, I have no reservations in modifying the stipulation as it relates to the temporary access, but I would be very opposed to removal of the requirement as it relates to the permanent or potential for the permanent access. That decision can be made when the contingencies of the unknown are behind us, not now.

Chairman Williams: Thank you. Mr. Ley, would you address Mr. Pateid's concerns, including why we would have considered it in the first place? Certainly, given that the stretch of Mission Road here doesn't have similar conditions; there are streets and intersections but not limited right-in, right-out. Why was it required in the first place, and why are we now comfortable with deleting it?

Mr. Ley: The developer provided a study for Mission Road with and without the right-in, right-out. I believe when it went through city staff, our recommendation was to have just the two access points off 137th Street and then, at Governing Body, they added the requirement for the right-in, right-out off Mission Road. The study showed that it does make a slight improvement in the morning. The delay goes down from 4.5 to 4.1 seconds per vehicle. In the PM, it makes no change to the signal at 137th and Mission. If it does get constructed, it would be an increase in cost to build the island. We would have to extend the island from 137th Street down to 138th Street to restrict that to a right-in, right-out.

Comm. Pateidl: There is no signal at 137th and Mission.

Mr. Ley: There will be a signal there when the area gets developed out.

Comm. Pateidl: We're projecting to something that isn't there now.

Mr. Ley: That is how we do the traffic studies. We look at future estimated traffic counts.

Comm. Pateidl: Another contingency.

Chairman Williams: So, the traffic in and out of this complex will be through 137th Street, and to get on Mission Road, eventually, it will be through a controlled intersection with lights.

Mr. Ley: That is correct.

Chairman Williams: That is a more functional, safer access in and out of this complex versus a right-in, right-out access somewhere down the road.

Mr. Ley: We tried to get the access drives off the collector streets. After looking at the study with and without access out to Mission, it really didn't have much of an impact by just having the two access drives off 137th Street. There wasn't much of an improvement to add the access off Mission Road.

Chairman Williams: This was added at Governing Body when they reviewed this?

Mr. Ley: Yes.

Chairman Williams: Do you remember their particular concerns regarding this?

Mr. Ley: I don't remember.

Mr. Coleman: I think it was the slight decrease in traffic on 137th Street.

Chairman Williams: I suppose one way to look at this is it was a City Council request for the plan, and if they feel strongly that it should be there, they can address it when they review it. Any other questions or comments?

A motion to recommend approval of CASE 07-16 – VILLA MILANO – GATE, ACCESS ROAD AND RETAINING WALL – Request for approval of a Revised Final Plan, located south of W. 137th Street and east of Mission Road – with 4 Staff Stipulations and an additional stipulation requiring a pedestrian access where the street access was planned to be as well as a sidewalk connection east to the public street – was made by Strauss.

Mr. Klein: Could I suggest that the stipulation read, "Prior to Governing Body consideration . . ." so that the applicant has time to draw up the plans?

Comm. Pateidl: I'm not sure I understood what just happened.

Comm. Strauss: Prior to Governing Body approval, the applicant will add the pedestrian access and sidewalk connection to the public street in the development at the location of the planned road access.

Comm. Pateidl: To be clear, you are proposing that the permanent right-in, right-out be removed from the Special Use Permit at this point in time.

Comm. Strauss: Yes; I wasn't modifying any recommendation other than No. 1C.

Chairman Williams: And as was discussed a moment ago, the right-in, right-out was initially requested by the Governing Body and not by this body, so they can still address it when they review the plan.

Comm. Pateidl: Should that be incorporated into the motion or into the minutes?

Chairman Williams: We have it in the minutes. Your point is well taken, but at the same token, when we passed this, it wasn't included. They added it, and we don't fully have a record of their concerns. If they still want it, they can add it.

Comm. Pateidl: Would you be in favor of modifying Stipulation 1C to the point of deferring the position on the removal of permanent access to consideration of the Governing Body?

Comm. Strauss: Sure.

Ms. Bennett: Per statute, you need to make a recommendation on it one way or the other.

Chairman Williams: So, we either make a recommendation to leave it in or make a recommendation at this point of going with current staff recommendations and the applicant's request.

Comm. Pateidl: Thank you.

Comm. Strauss: I'm wondering if we need to open it up for more discussion, or is the issue resolved?

Chairman Williams: I'm willing to open it up, but we had the opportunity a moment ago for discussion and saw none, thus the motion. Before we get a second, let me put it back on the table. Does anyone else want to discuss the issue further?

Motion to recommend approval of Case 07-16 with 4 Staff Stipulations and the addition of a stipulation to read, "Prior to Governing Body approval, a pedestrian access shall be placed where the street access was planned, and a sidewalk connection shall be made east to the public street" – by Strauss remains; seconded by Ramsey. Motion carried with a vote of 6-2. For: Hoyt, Walden, Levitan, Elkins, Strauss, Ramsey and Coleman. Opposed: Elkins and Pateidl.

Mr. Coleman: There is a Governing Body work session next Monday evening at 5:30. Johnson County Wastewater is going to make a presentation on the planned expansion of the Tomahawk Creek Wastewater Plant. That will start around 5:30 and will be in the Oak Room downstairs if any of you would like to attend.

Chairman Williams: Do you need an RSVP that we will be there?

Mr. Coleman: I don't think so. We're doing it in the Oak Room because we expect and overflow.

Comm. Coleman: Does that proposal eventually have to go through this body?

Mr. Coleman: The proposal hasn't been developed yet; they are just making a presentation, but it will come before the Planning Commission and Governing Body.

Chairman Williams: Thank you very much.

MEETING ADJOURNED