

**City of Leawood  
Planning Commission Meeting  
March 22, 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, Levitan, Elkins, Strauss, Ramsey, and Coleman. Absent: Walden, Pateidl, Williams

**APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

**A motion to approve the agenda was made by Ramsey; seconded by Coleman. Motion carried with a unanimous vote of 5-0. For: Hoyt, Levitan, Strauss, Ramsey and Coleman.**

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** Approval of the minutes from the February 23, 2016 Planning Commission meeting.

**A motion to approve the minutes from the February 23, 2016 Planning Commission meeting was made by Coleman; seconded by Hoyt. Motion carried with a unanimous vote of 5-0. For: Hoyt, Levitan, Strauss, Ramsey and Coleman.**

**CONSENT AGENDA:**

CASE 27-16 – LEAWOOD SUBDIVISION – LOT 629 EMERGENCY GENERATOR – Request for approval of a Final Landscape Plan, located north of 88<sup>th</sup> Street and east of Meadow Lane.

CASE 30-16 – PARK PLACE – THE RESIDENCES – Request for approval of a Revised Final Plan, located south of Town Center Drive and east of Nall Avenue.

CASE 31-16 – LEABROOKE 13<sup>TH</sup> PLAT – Request for approval of a Revised Final Plat, located north of 148<sup>th</sup> Street and west of Kenneth Road.

**A motion to approve the Consent Agenda was made by Ramsey; seconded by Hoyt. Motion carried with a unanimous vote of 5-0. For: Hoyt, Levitan, Strauss, Ramsey and Coleman.**

**NEW BUSINESS:**

CASE 35-16 – CITY OF LEAWOOD 2017 – 2021 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM – Request for approval of the 2017-2021 Capital Improvement Program. **PUBLIC HEARING**

**Staff Presentation:**

Assistant Director Mark Klein made the following presentation:

Mr. Klein: This is the Capital Improvement Program for 2017-2021. The summary sheet shows the different projects. Director of Finance Dawn Long and Director of Public Works Joe Johnson can answer any questions you may have. Staff is recommending approval of Case 35-16, and we would be happy to answer any questions.

Chairman Elkins: Thank you. Questions for staff?

Comm. Strauss: I had a question for Mr. Johnson. In past years, we have talked about a need for Mission Road improvements. I noticed it got pushed back another year. Could you just talk about that?

Mr. Johnson: That project, our reconstruction project and accelerated stormwater program all were pushed back one year. We were trying to be a little aggressive, and in the odd years, we ran into issues as far as maintaining debt service without a large increase in the mill levy. We had to stretch out these projects as a result.

Comm. Strauss: I know that Mid-America Regional Council has a call for projects right now. Do you know the match on those projects? Do we ever participate in those?

Mr. Johnson: We made application for this next phase of 143<sup>rd</sup>. Right now, the projects are 2019-2020. The next phase is 143<sup>rd</sup> going from Windsor east, which is scheduled for construction in 2019. It is an 80/20 split. I don't remember the last time the city had 80% of the funding. We have requested \$5 million. If we get funding, it will be somewhat less than that. We would do the same thing for the next projects, and Mission Road falls in that category.

Chairman Elkins: Other questions for Mr. Johnson? Thank you. 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 Strauss; seconded by Coleman. Motion carried with a unanimous vote of 5-0. For: Hoyt, Levitan, Strauss, Ramsey and Coleman.**

Chairman Elkins: That leads us to comments, hopefully leading to a motion.

**A motion to recommend approval of CASE 35-16 – CITY OF LEAWOOD 2017 – 2021 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM – Request for approval of the 2017-2021 Capital Improvement Program – was made by Ramsey; seconded by Hoyt. Motion carried with a unanimous vote of 5-0. For: Hoyt, Levitan, Strauss, Ramsey and Coleman.**

CASE 19-16 – PARKWAY PLAZA – LOT 10 – Request for approval of a Revised Preliminary Plan and Final Plan, located north of 135<sup>th</sup> Street and east of Briar Street. **PUBLIC HEARING**

### **Staff Presentation:**

City Planner Michelle Kriks made the following presentation:

Ms. Kriks: This is Case 19-16 – Request for approval of a Preliminary Plan and Final Plan for a multi-tenant retail building, located within the Parkway Plaza development at the northeast corner of 135<sup>th</sup> Street and Briar. The project is proposed for Lot 10 of Parkway Plaza on a trapezoidal-shaped lot. The applicant proposes construction of a new 7,350 sq. ft. single-story, rectangular-shaped, multi-tenant retail building which is to be oriented east to west on the lot. Existing parking is north of the proposed building with primary access to that lot from Briar Street to the west. Two existing parallel parking spaces are located directly in front of what will be the front of the building, which was constructed at the time the parking lot was constructed for the main center. The western portion of the lot is dedicated to Parkway Plaza as an amenity space, which includes green space, pedestrian connections, landscaping and seating. The development association is responsible to maintain this amenity, and construction of the building will not encroach into the amenity. The height of the building is proposed to be 28 feet to the top of the roof. At the northeast corner of

that building, a tower element is proposed, which will be 38 feet, 9 ¾ inches in height with a pitched roof. On top of that tower element is a 17-ft. copper spire. The façade of the building shall be a combination of beige cementitious stucco and natural limestone. The entrances into the individual tenant spaces shall be on the north side of the building under a colonnade, which will be supported by columns of cast stone and glass fiber reinforced concrete. On the west elevation, a bay window with a copper pitched roof is proposed. On the south elevation, louvered doors are proposed and will be brown in color. On the east side of the building, an 8-ft. trash enclosure is proposed to be attached to the building. The trash enclosure will be cementitious stucco and natural stone. Access to this trash enclosure will be by a concrete surface drive. Across this drive, brick pavers are proposed to demarcate the pedestrian crossing, which will be consistent with other pedestrian crossings within the development. Approximately 8 feet from grade on each elevation, the applicant is proposing decorative black gas light fixtures with clear glass. Adjacent to 135<sup>th</sup> Street, existing trees are approximately 30 feet on center, which were approved as part of the Master Plan for Parkway Plaza. Around the pedestrian walk amenity to the west of the building, existing trees are also approved as part of that Master Plan for the development. The applicant is proposing new maples, oaks and serviceberries along 135<sup>th</sup> Street. Adjacent to the building, the applicant is proposing a combination of perennials, grasses, evergreen shrubs, deciduous shrubs and evergreen trees. Staff recommends approval of Case 19-16 with the stipulations outlined in the Staff Report, and I'd be happy to answer any questions.

Chairman Elkins: Thank you. Any questions for staff? Seeing none, I would invite the applicant to step forward.

#### **Applicant Presentation:**

Jeff Skidmore, Schlagel & Associates, 14920 W. 107<sup>th</sup> Street, Lenexa, KS, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following presentation:

Mr. Skidmore: I'm here on behalf of KALICO, LLC, who is the developer of the parcel. I don't have much to add to the Staff Report. For those of you familiar with Parkway Plaza, this is at the immediate corner of 135<sup>th</sup> and Briar, adjacent to the Country Club Bank, which is one of the original buildings that was built in the development. Architecturally, it is the same stucco, same stone and same roof features. We would be happy to answer any questions anybody has, and we greatly appreciate your support.

Chairman Elkins: Questions for Mr. Skidmore? Seeing none, I will note that it is good to see another building going up in that development. This application requires a Public Hearing.

#### **PUBLIC HEARING**

**As no one was present to speak, a motion to close the Public Hearing was made by Ramsey; seconded by Levitan. Motion carried with a unanimous vote of 5-0. For: Hoyt, Levitan, Strauss, Ramsey and Coleman.**

Chairman Elkins: This brings us to comments with respect to the recommendation for Case 19-16.

Comm. Ramsey: I have a question for staff. The amenities on the south side of the bank include the pedestrian sidewalks that are matched to the other side of the street. Does that all stay with this plan?

Ms. Kriks: That is correct; that amenity will remain untouched during the construction.

Chairman Elkins: Any other questions or comments?

**A motion to recommend approval of CASE 19-16 – PARKWAY PLAZA – LOT 10 – Request for approval of a Revised Preliminary Plan and Final Plan, located north of 137<sup>th</sup> Street and east of Briar**

**Street, including 26 Staff Stipulations – was made by Strauss; seconded by Ramsey. Motion carried with a unanimous vote of 5-0. For: Hoyt, Levitan, Strauss, Ramsey and Coleman.**

CASE 26-16 – CAMELOT COURT – RED DOOR GRILL – PATIO – Request for approval of a Revised Final Plan, located north of 119<sup>th</sup> Street and east of Roe Avenue.

**Staff Presentation:**

Assistant Director Mark Klein made the following presentation:

Mr. Klein: This is Case 26-16 – Camelot Court – Red Door Grill – Patio. This is with regard to a tenant space located at the southeast corner of the Camelot Court main center. The applicant is not proposing changes to the number of seats outdoors. That number was taken into account when a parking study was done for the overall development. In addition, there are no changes to the amount of open space or landscaping as well. The applicant is proposing to replace an existing trellis located on the north side of the tenant space with a new trellis. The new trellis will be wood with metal tracks that will allow the trellis to be fully enclosed. The tracks will have two screens. One is a windbreak constructed of black vinyl with clear plastic windows that will allow patio utilization in colder months. The current heating system will be utilized as well. Another track will contain a sunshade which will not have windows but rather perforated vinyl to allow air circulation. Additionally, a seasonal vestibule will be located on the south side of the trellis underneath the existing portico in front of the building. Staff recommends approval of this application, and I would be happy to answer any questions.

Chairman Elkins: Questions for Mr. Klein?

Comm. Hoyt: Is the seasonal portico a permanent structure, or is it something they put up and take down?

Mr. Klein: It is something they'll put up and take down. Stipulation No. 4 clarifies this information.

Chairman Elkins: Are there additional questions for staff? Seeing none, I would invite the applicant to step forward.

**Applicant Presentation:**

Paul Minto, Urban Prairie, 2511 W. 47<sup>th</sup> Terrace, Westwood, KS, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Mr. Minto: I am the architect on the project. I thought the report the staff gave was thorough. The replacing of the trellis is really only because when it was originally designed, we did not anticipate how hot it gets in the hole. The hope is to use the outdoor space, and it has not functioned as such. We have to change the structure so it can be closed off and provide some tempered conditions. The pieces that are not operable will be there over a limited period of time, and everything else is retractable and only used in inclement weather.

Chairman Elkins: Thank you. Additional questions? Mr. Minto, once the vestibule is installed can the walls be raised and lowered? If so, is that done manually or mechanically?

Mr. Minto: (*Shows photo*) The panels on the seasonal vestibule are put in place and are not retractable, but the entire apparatus is all removed at the end of the season. That is the piece that is allowed for a certain number of days.

Chairman Elkins: Will the sunshade cover the sidewalk as well, or does it stop before that?

Mr. Minto: It all stops at the fascia. There is a retaining wall, and the patio is recessed. Everything we are doing stays inside the retaining wall.

Chairman Elkins: Does the applicant have any concerns or objections to the five stipulations staff has proposed?

Mr. Minto: No, they all seem very reasonable.

Chairman Elkins: Thank you. Any additional questions? Seeing none, I would entertain a motion.

**A motion to recommend approval of CASE 26-16 – CAMELOT COURT – RED DOOR GRILL – PATIO – Request for approval of a Revised Final Plan, located north of 119<sup>th</sup> Street and east of Roe Avenue – with five Staff Stipulations - was made by Ramsey; seconded by Coleman. Motion carried with a unanimous vote of 5-0. For: Hoyt, Levitan, Strauss, Ramsey and Coleman.**

Chairman Elkins: As a point of order, I noticed in Case 19-16, which was recommended to the Governing Body for approval, there were 26 stipulations attached to that case.

CASE 28-16 – ENCLAVE AT HIGHLAND VILLAS – Request for approval of a Revised Preliminary Plan and Final Plan, located south of 143<sup>rd</sup> Street and east of Nall Avenue. **PUBLIC HEARING**

**Staff Presentation:**

City Planner Michelle Kriks made the following presentation:

Ms. Kriks: This is Case 28-16 – Request for approval of a Revised Preliminary Plan and Final Plan for Enclave at Highland Villas for 14 new dwelling units on 3.12 acres for a density of 4.49 dwelling units per acre, located south of 143<sup>rd</sup> Street and east of Nall Avenue. This development was originally approved as Grace Gardens by the Governing Body on August 2, 1999 for a Preliminary Plan, Preliminary Plat and Special Use Permit for a 76-bed assisted living facility, church facility and 16-four-plex retirement village. On April 21, 2014, the Governing Body approved a Rezoning to RP-3, Preliminary Plat, Final Plat and Final Plan for Grace Gardens, which affected the residential portion of this development only. The residential portion was then separated from the assisted living facility to the north. The former church location has since been approved for rehabilitation and skilled nursing facility and is currently under construction. The residential development changed the name from Grace Gardens to Highland Villas after the Final Plat was recorded on June 12, 2014. Highlands Villas is a maintenance-provided community by the homes association which include but is not limited to lawn care, exterior painting and snow clearing of the private drive and driveways. The development is also age-restricted to age 55 and older. Currently, the development includes 11 four-plex dwelling units, a centrally located clubhouse and a vacant tract of land which has been previously approved for an additional 5 four-plexes. The applicant is proposing 7 twin villas on the vacant tract of land for a total of 14 dwelling units, which is a reduction of density from the previously approved plan. The new twin villas will also be maintenance provided by the homes association and will be age-restricted. The vacant tract where the project is proposed is an inverted L-shape bordered by the private drive, Grace Gardens assisted living facility to the north, 2 additional four-plex units within Highland Villas to the south and a single-family residential subdivision of Highlands Creek to the east. East of the proposed villas is an existing bio-swale, which addresses the stormwater concerns for the development. No changes are proposed to this bio-swale. A 4-ft. sidewalk is proposed along the private drive in front of the twin villas, which will connect to an existing sidewalk to the north within the Grace Gardens lot and will connect to the south where the existing four-plexes are. Also, new 5-ft. sidewalk connections are proposed from Nall Avenue into the development along the private drive. A pedestrian plaza is also proposed with landscaping and seating amenities. The applicant has provided typical elevations of single-story twin villas, proposed to be constructed within the development. The villas are proposed to be constructed primarily of

cementitious stucco with cultured stone elements primarily around the entrances and under windows. The elevations provided also show covered recessed entries, screened patios in the rear yard, basements and pitched roof with dark brown concrete tile shingles. The colors of the villas will be varying shades of brown, and each unit will be provided at minimum of 2 totally enclosed parking spaces. Northern red oaks have been provided at 35 feet on center along that private drive. Within the rear yards of the villas between the structure and the bio-swale, a combination of deciduous trees and evergreen trees is provided to serve as buffering between the villas and the homes to the east. Adjacent to the twin villas is a combination of ornamental grasses, evergreen shrubs, deciduous shrubs and ornamental trees. Around that pedestrian plaza, a combination of deciduous trees, shade trees and ornamental trees and shrubs is proposed. The applicant has requested a deviation to Section 16-2-6.4 of the Leawood Development Ordinance, reducing the side yard setbacks of 15 feet. Section 16-3-9(a)5(d) of the Leawood Development Ordinance allows interior property lines to be reduced to zero when the city approves adequate open space for the project. The applicant, as stated, is requesting a deviation to allow 15-ft. side yard setbacks for the plan to provide flexibility of the varying unit types. Staff is supportive of the reduced side yard setback deviation requested since sufficient common open space has been provided to compensate for the reduced interior side yard setback. Staff recommends approval of Case 28-16 with the stipulations outlined in the Staff Report, and I'd be happy to answer any questions.

Chairman Elkins: Thank you. Questions for staff?

Comm. Strauss: Can you point out where the pedestrian plaza is?

Ms. Kriks: (*Refers to plans*) The Grace Gardens assisted living facility is on the north border. The pedestrian plaza will be at the corner. The sidewalk would connect along the front of the villas. There is a circular area with proposed benches, and then the sidewalk connection would continue north to the existing sidewalk for Grace Gardens.

Comm. Strauss: Do I understand correctly that the whole parcel is public space?

Ms. Kriks: It is all common area for the development.

Chairman Elkins: Additional questions for staff? Thank you. At this point, I would invite the applicant to step forward.

**Applicant Presentation:**

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

Mr. Phelps: I will talk briefly about the Site Plan, and I will turn it over to Patrick to talk about the building elevation and his plan for the specific units. He will be the developer and the builder on the project. With that, I would just point out that the approved plan is the area outlined in blue. As staff adequately pointed out, there were 5 buildings approved in that area for a total of 20 units. Our plan adds diversity and variety to the project by adding a twin villa product and a transition to the single-family to the east with 7 units. We are actually reducing the building footprint by nearly 25% from the previous plan. It is a reduction in footprint and units. As pointed out, we do have the pedestrian area, and you can see it better in the colored rendering. We have landscaping, a sidewalk and seating in that area. We also have adequate street trees in the front, and we have landscaped the area in the back between us and the single-family residences. This will be similar to what was previously approved in terms of landscaping requirements. We had driveways that you may remember in 2014. They went up, and the headlights could shine into the properties to the east. With this plan, the lights are shielded better with fewer disturbances to the property owners to the east. With that, I will turn it over to Patrick and let him address the building elevations.

Patrick Willis, Willis Custom Homes, 5275 W. 150<sup>th</sup> Terrace, Leawood, KS, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Mr. Willis: Bob Willis is here as well. Many of you know us. We've been building in Leawood for over 50 years. In the past couple decades, we have done many of these villa maintenance-free style homes. We just finished up the Villas of Whitehorse, and we're finishing up Tuscany Reserve Village down the street. This product is going to lend itself well to the diversity of the housing products available in Highland Villas. The deed restrictions require residents to be 55 and over. There is assisted living around the area. We are a Certified Aging in Place [CAP] builder. All these buildings will be equipped with or prepped for elevators and no-step entries from the garage into the house. It will be a universal design on the interiors. We have kept the same pitch of roof on the exteriors as the existing four-plexes to try to keep some cohesiveness throughout the area. We have the same roof tiles. We will include some stone on the units, and we will also include landscaping on all four sides. We have a couple different floor plans, but these will also have full basements, which we believe many people will opt to finish because there are elevators to access the lower levels. We also have a combination of side- and front-entry garages, which we believe will add to the aesthetics from the street. This will be integrated into the existing homes association. The benefit is that these owners are going to pay in to a master association, which will help the existing four-plexes in upkeep of the clubhouse, indoor swimming pool and all common areas.

Chairman Elkins: Are there questions for the applicants?

Mr. Phelps: We have reviewed the 20 stipulations and are in agreement. Patrick has already written a letter to staff agreeing to them.

Chairman Elkins: I have one last question. Mr. Willis, you talked about the elevators. These all seem to be single-story buildings, so I assume there must be dug-out basements.

Mr. Willis: Yes; each unit will have full 9-ft. basements. The elevator shaft will be included on all the units, but as it would only be required to access the basement, we predict that some will elect to leave it as a temporary floor.

Chairman Elkins: I guess that these basements could serve as storm shelters as well.

Mr. Willis: That is correct, and all the basements will have egress.

Chairman Elkins: Thank you. 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 Ramsey; seconded by Strauss. Motion carried with a unanimous vote of 5-0. For: Hoyt, Levitan, Strauss, Ramsey and Coleman.**

Chairman Elkins: That brings us to the time for comments, hopefully leading to a motion.

**A motion to recommend approval of CASE 28-16 – ENCLAVE AT HIGHLAND VILLAS – Request for approval of a Revised Preliminary Plan and Final Plan, located south of 143<sup>rd</sup> Street and east of Nall Avenue – with 20 Staff Stipulations – was made by Strauss; seconded by Ramsey. Motion carried with a unanimous vote of 5-0. For: Hoyt, Levitan, Strauss, Ramsey and Coleman.**

CASE 29-16 – LEABROOKE TOWN MANORS – Request for approval of a Final Plan and Final Plat, located north of 148<sup>th</sup> Street and west of Kenneth Road.

**Staff Presentation:**

City Planner Michelle Kriks made the following presentation:

Ms. Kriks: This is Case 29-16 – Request for approval of a Final Plan and Final Plat for Leabrooke Town Manors, located north of 148<sup>th</sup> Street and west of Kenneth Road. The applicant is proposing 30 single-family lots in 3 tracts of land on 15.23 acres for a density of 1.97 dwelling units per acre, meeting the maximum density permitted within an RP-2 zoning district. The average lot size for the development is 10,513.57 square feet, and the smallest lot is 7,811.36 square feet, complying with the Leawood Development Ordinance that requires lots within an RP-2 zoning district to be a minimum of 6,000 square feet. Meadow Lane is proposed to continue from the southern multi-family development to terminate in a cul-de-sac at the northeast corner of the property. Two smaller cul-de-sacs are proposed to branch off Meadow Lane going northwest. Another street off Meadow Lane will provide a connection to 148<sup>th</sup> Street to the southeast. A 5-ft. sidewalk is shown along the northern side of Meadow Lane around the full length of the 2 smaller cul-de-sacs and will connect Meadow Lane to 148<sup>th</sup> Street. Three tracts are proposed for pedestrian connections, a bio-retention and detention basins, open space, wetlands and a community garden. The largest tract of land, which is Tract C, is located directly under existing high voltage overhead power lines. An 8-ft. asphalt bike/hike path is proposed through Tract C, extending from 145<sup>th</sup> Street to the north and connecting to other surrounding amenities, which include existing tennis courts and a pool to the southwest. Also within Tract C is a 47-ft. by 32-ft. community garden, which will include 9 planting boxes and a composting bed with a centrally located water spigot. Access to the community garden will be by pedestrian path connecting the Tract C pedestrian path to 146<sup>th</sup> Street between Lots 9 and 10. A 6-ft. black, PVC-coated chain link fence is proposed to enclose a community garden, and 2 benches are proposed at the entrance of the garden. The applicant has provided typical elevations of the general type of houses proposed to be constructed within the development. The houses shown will be constructed primarily of stucco with cultured stone elements around the base, under projections such as the bay windows and on the columns. Elevations provided also show covered entries in basements, and the houses will have pitched roofs with laminated composite shingles. A variety of shade trees is proposed at 35 feet on center along the streets, and providing a buffer between Kenneth Road and the terminating Meadow Lane cul-de-sac, a combination of evergreens is proposed. Four eastern redbuds are planned for the seating area adjacent to the community garden. A deviation to Section 16-8-3.7(a)2 of the Leawood Development Ordinance, reducing lot width as measured by the build line, was granted with Case 75-15, which was approved February 15, 2016, which reduced the building line width from 100 feet down to 80 feet for lots fronting a cul-de-sac. This deviation explicitly related to Lots 3, 4, 9 and 10. Staff recommends approval of Case 29-16, and I'm happy to answer any questions you may have.

Chairman Elkins: Thank you. Questions for staff? Seeing none, I would invite the applicant to step forward.

**Applicant Presentation:**

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

Mr. Claussen: You may recall that this was before you as a Preliminary Plan in January. We changed it from RP-3 to RP-2. The plans before you tonight are Final Development Plan and Final Plat, completely consistent with what we presented back then. I will not bore you with a presentation. Michelle has done a great job summarizing the aspects of the plan. My client, Rob Hummell, is also the developer and builder along with his two partners Reed Murphy and Dan Taylor. They are in agreement with the stipulations. With that, I will stand for questions.

Chairman Elkins: Questions for Mr. Claussen? I have one question. I note in the materials that we were provided that there was a discussion by staff relative to the accessibility of the connectors with an amenity area. Could you tell us a little more about what the amenity area is and what you and your client's thoughts are around the accessibility issue?

Mr. Claussen: (*Refers to plans*) The plan shows the sidewalks and trail locations. The two areas that we pointed out were at the ends of the existing cul-de-sacs. The grade there is fairly high because the cul-de-sacs sit up in elevation from the main trail that lies along underneath the power lines. That makes it difficult to have an ADA-accessible slope. We made sure to point out that it is similar to a recreational trail, not unlike the trail behind City Hall or other trails around Johnson County. We anticipated making that connection. We are in agreement to make the connection. Obviously, we have to get permission from the Master Homes Association of Leabrooke, which our client does not control. It is something we are pursuing, and we anticipate having the trail along through underneath the power lines, along with the community garden in those areas for the enjoyment of the residents.

Chairman Elkins: I thought there was reference in the exchange with the city officials that there is some alternative access to the amenities. For instance, the community garden is still accessible.

Mr. Claussen: It actually is accessible for the residents on one side. The only problem was the accessibility off the cul-de-sac back down. If the folks who live to the northwest wanted to come down and use the trail, there are sidewalks along the public streets. I pointed out that there is an alternative route that way.

Chairman Elkins: Thank you. Additional questions for the applicant? That brings us to additional comments, hopefully leading to a motion.

**A motion to recommend approval of CASE 29-16 – LEABROOKE TOWN MANORS – Request for approval of a Final Plan and Final Plat, located north of 148<sup>th</sup> Street and west of Kenneth Road – with 22 Staff Stipulations – was made by Coleman; seconded by Strauss. Motion carried with a unanimous vote of 5-0. For: Hoyt, Levitan, Strauss, Ramsey and Coleman.**

*MEETING ADJOURNED*