

**City of Leawood
Planning Commission Work Session
April 11, 2017
Capital Improvement Program
Sign Regulations**

Planning Commission Members in Attendance: Chairman James Pateidl, Matthew Block, Will Ramsey, Dave Coleman, Liz Hoyt, Mike Levitan,

Planning Staff in Attendance: Richard Coleman, Mark Klein, Michelle Kriks, Staci Henry

Other Staff in Attendance: Joe Johnson, Public Works; Andrew Hall, Legal; David Ley, City Engineer

Mr. Klein: Joe Johnson, Director of Public Works, is here to discuss the Capital Improvement Program. The second topic of discussion is signs, specifically within Mixed Use (MXD). With that, I'll turn it over to Joe.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (CIP)

Mr. Johnson: To begin, the plan hasn't changed much over the years. Maybe it would be easier to address specific questions regarding the CIP.

Comm. Ramsey: Is there anything different than the previous year?

Mr. Johnson: On the very first page, we have shown new elements. Right now, there is a possibility that Fire Station No. 1 will be paid for through the county with the new ¼ cent sales tax. The cities will get a percentage of that. That is how we did the Justice Center. It will be located where the old Police Station was demolished at 96th and Lee Boulevard. It will sit south of Historic City Hall.

Comm. Ramsey: What is old City Hall being used for?

Mr. Johnson: Storage.

Mr. Coleman: It is not being used for anything right now.

Mr. Johnson: Once the Fire Station is built, the north part of the property has vacant land. It will become a park, and Historic City Hall may move a little bit. They may keep part of the old Fire Station with the two-car garage and put in some sort of playground.

Mr. Coleman: The city owns the communications tower there. The leases all expire in 2019, so the plan is to remove the tower.

Mr. Johnson: It will get removed. The carrier may enter into an agreement with the city as far as whether it will be a structure. Right now, I don't think any discussions with the carriers are occurring, other than removing the tower.

Comm. Levitan: You talked about putting bike lanes on Lee and modifying that a bit. Was that in here?

Mr. Johnson: It is not in there specifically. It is in the City Arterial Street Program on Page 45. The first section shows 2019: Lee Boulevard, 103rd-95th Street. That cost includes widening Lee Boulevard to accommodate the bike lanes. Then in the following year, we will go from 95th to Somerset. I don't know if we'll take bike lanes all the way to Somerset. We'll go up to at least 83rd Street. The first phase is 2019, and then in 2020, we'll finish up at least 83rd Street, but our project will go to Somerset.

Comm. Levitan: I just thank god every day driving down Lee that something doesn't happen because we're getting more and more bikes, and cars are going faster. People are texting. It's pretty tight.

Mr. Johnson: Just to do the mill and overlay was \$1 million, so to actually expand the street would be almost another \$1 million. The other thing you'll see is a \$1 million program for 2018 to expand the Public Works facility and do vehicle maintenance. I think that is the biggest new project other than the Fire Station.

Mr. Coleman: You might talk a little about the stormwater projects and what is going on with Roe.

Mr. Johnson: Every odd year, we have the city's Residential Reconstruction Program. That is \$3 million every odd year. Eventually, over the next four cycles, we will be pretty much done with that. In the even number years starting in 2018 is the Accelerated Stormwater Program, which is \$3 million. It was originally expected to be \$35 million. It was going to be a 7-year, \$5 million program; now it is \$3 million every other year to replace the city's corrugated metal pipes. We started out with about 110,000 feet and are probably down to 102,000-103,000 feet. Over the next 20 years, we'll be working on replacing most of that with concrete pipe.

Chairman Pateidl: I'm presuming that pipe has a life expectancy of 25 years. Most of that pipe has been in the ground for 25 years plus. Originally, there was going to be \$5 million a year for 7 years, which would have completed it in 2024. Now, with \$3 million every other year, it extends the completion out to 2040. There are two things I really don't understand in the presentation. One is there is no allowance for inflation or increased construction cost over that period of time.

Mr. Johnson: They did pass a resolution authorizing this work, and it was \$45 million. It took into account inflation over the time period.

Chairman Pateidl: I used a 2% factor on the construction costs alone and it gets up to \$43 million. God knows what the interest rates are going to be over the course of the next 20 years.

Comm. Ramsey: Are you bonding it or cashing it?

Mr. Johnson: It will be financed.

Chairman Pateidl: There is substantial economic impact to that decision. What prompted that decision?

Mr. Johnson: The finance department could tell you better, but when we do our budget, we model out 10-15 years. When they looked at a 7-year, \$5 million program and when they got out to 2030, there was a huge increase in the mill levy to be able to cover that cost. Right now, there are two or three mills scheduled. The city has been able to push it back because sales tax and appraised values keep going up. That may all change depending on the state and other cities taking advantage of the increase in appraised value. This prompted the decision to spread it out so we wouldn't have to raise it three mills to cover what we've already programmed and then raise it another three mills to cover that.

Chairman Pateidl: Couldn't we have seen that issue in 2015 when the original proposal for 7 years was put together?

Comm. Ramsey: To a degree, they did. Before I came on the Planning Commission, I was on the Budgeting Committee. I think it's fair to say that when City Council and the Budget Committee got together, the primary objective was to hold the mill levy as low as possible. Everything else would build around that. Joe can walk in with a \$35 million need, but if that doesn't fit within the parameters of the revenue that they're projecting to come in, it gets pushed out further. To a degree, I don't know that it's exactly what happened, but I do know that having spent three years on that committee, the primary driver would be the revenue side first, regardless of the requirements or the projected need to hold the mill levy at what was considered to be a reasonable rate. That doesn't mean they didn't look to increase it half a mill here or there. They did not want a jump of five mills to cover a requirement.

Mr. Johnson: This is not to say that nine years from now when we start paying off some of the debt, we couldn't acquire more debt and accelerate it a bit, but there is this \$35 million program, and some are looking to accelerate the Capital Street Program with 143rd and two phases of Mission Road. That is about \$45 million, so we're trying to program that money over a very short time frame, and then we are trying to figure out how to program another \$35 million. The only way to accomplish it 10-15 years out would be with a hefty mill levy increase. For most of the Council, that is not a way to go.

Comm. Ramsey: I tried pushing for stormwater utility. They didn't want any part of that. They didn't want the extra fees. If we had a stormwater utility, a lot of this could be cash-

financed. I don't know how the current Council is, but I know in the past, they were pretty fiscally conservative.

Mr. Johnson: Another consideration is there is a finite time frame for the Residential Reconstruction Program. Once we get to a point where we're done with that, that is \$3 million in debt that gets freed up. Then we can do \$3-\$6 million a year every year, and it decreases the time to complete it by half.

Chairman Pateidl: One of the comments made in the early writings of the manual is that the Planning Commission is charged with selecting the priority projects to be done. I wasn't here last year when we talked about this change, but did we discuss the budget issues? Did we discuss how that influenced that decision? Pushing this pipe out to almost double its life expectancy begins to beg the question of public safety. What I'm saying is some of the information that comes to us comes very quickly, very late, with very little time for discussion and understanding by the Planning Commission to where we can make approval and send it on. Even on that project alone, it might just be an oversight. In the original CIP with \$5 million per year, it was proposed we were going to do 15,000 lineal feet per year. In this one, at \$3 million every other year, it is suggested we are going to do \$15,000 lineal feet for \$3 million. Maybe the price went way down.

Mr. Johnson: It should have been marked at \$7 million because we look at about \$330 a lineal foot.

Chairman Pateidl: My point is that this has long been somewhat of an issue with me. We have one meeting where we sit around and look very quickly at these projects, and the Planning Commission makes a recommendation that goes to Governing Body. Nobody on the commission ever has a seat at the table to understand what planning is going on, where it is coming from, and why the priorities are there that they could then bring the information back to a session of the commission. I would like to see the Planning Commission become much more involved in the planning process if it is our responsibility to pick the priorities and make these recommendations to Governing Body. I'm not sure we're really doing our job.

Mr. Coleman: You can make recommendations to City Council, and they pick the projects based on the recommendation of the Stormwater Committee, Public Works Committee and the other committees directly involved in the Capital Improvement Program. It is a 5-year situation, so if someone is interested in a project, it is talked about for quite a while. Then it might get moved to a "maybe" list. Then it gets discussed some more. Then, if there is enough support for it from members of the Governing Body, it might start to get put into a funding program. The city has limited resources, so a lot of them that are on the wish list remain on that list for a long time. If the Planning Commission sees something as a priority that isn't being addressed in the Capital Improvement Program, you can always bring it up. We can discuss it, and if everybody agrees, we can make a recommendation to forward it on to City Council.

Mr. Johnson: A lot of these are recommendations from staff. For Leawood, we don't have undeveloped ground we are trying to program. We did have some 15 years ago, and the CIP probably was a different tool to use to guide things. We had a lot of Special Benefit Districts for Town Center, Park Place, and 135th Street. As we were programming developments and they were coming through, they were being programmed into the CIP because they were projects administered by the city. Well, most of our infrastructure is developed where we have a need for development. A lot of what you see in there is maintenance. We had to rebuild Fire Station No. 1. We have Mission Road and 151st Street as 2-lane streets that we need to make into 4-lane streets. We are really not looking at a vacant area that we need to figure out how to program and what infrastructure is needed. We are land-locked and basically developed out. A lot of what you see in the Capital Improvement Program is maintenance and not new development. I don't know that we will see another Special Development District for a roadway project. We may use it for 135th Street, but that will be up to adding an additional lane in each direction where it is not already three lanes and also a TDD for burying power lines. Outside of that, most of what you see is maintenance. We got to a point where we need to expand the streets, or things are old enough that we need to rebuild some things.

Comm. Hoyt: I can't speak for Jim and what he means, but I'm looking at this one sentence, "The Planning Commission is responsible for viewing and recommending project priority from a professional planning perspective." I think it hinges on your interpretation of what that means. What you are seeking is a more active engagement that fulfills that statement, and honestly, when I read this before tonight's meeting, I thought, "I don't remember doing that." It doesn't feel like we're as engaged as that statement might imply. If, on the other hand, reviewing and recommending means taking a list of things that are fully prepared and just having exceptions we might make to some of them, then I guess we are reviewing and recommending but maybe not without the depth of engagement that you're talking about. Is that a fair assessment?

Chairman Pateidl: Yes, that pretty well summarizes it. Richard may have summarized it as well. The real nuts and bolts come down to who on the Governing Body wants what and what the budget is and what our debt level it going to be. Regardless of what we say, it's not going to make any difference.

Mr. Coleman: I think if there is something the Planning Commission thinks is not in here and should be in here, the Planning Commission would point out a need for it. Part of it has to do with what Joe is talking about with the transformation of Leawood with a lot of growth and subdivisions and developments. That process will slow down. Eventually, the city will be built out. It will be like Prairie Village. It is land-locked. At that point, there will be a citywide maintenance project for streets, curbs, walks, and all the infrastructure the city takes care of. Then, there will be redevelopment projects, not unlike the teardown/rebuilds for the single family going on in North Leawood. Some of that will happen in the commercial sector. From a planning standpoint, we will be looking at what commercial properties are currently underutilized. Maybe it's a 10,000 sq. ft. office building on 4 acres or something like that, where they could raze that old office building and build a much larger office building to max out the ground area, similar to the one on

College Boulevard. The old office was functionally obsolete, and they built a new office building. It had more square footage than the old one, and functionally, it worked much better. In the future, that is what planners will be doing.

Chairman Pateidl: Something that really came to mind after going to the Implementation Meeting the other night is the emphasis put on green space was not unrecognized. We've got terrific green space at Ironwoods Park, and yet, the most dangerous thoroughfare in the whole city for somebody to be on a bike is on Mission Road from 143rd to 151st. For the first time this year, I think we see those improvements on the wish list. Mission Road from 135th to 143rd was on the wish list for the city 12 years ago. It keeps getting pushed out. If we do the same to that next section of Mission Road, we have all that green space that we have invested time and money into and will continue to do so to invite people to use, and yet, the sidewalk that leads to it is pathetic. There are no bike trails or anything that can get them into that green space. We lose the benefit of even having this stuff, not to mention the golf course farther south. It's the same story: more green space; can't get there. I know we can't do Mission Road from 143rd to 151st any sooner than what it is already set up, and who knows when it will get done. I'm wondering if, with some planning, there could be some bike paths or better pedestrian walkways put into the park from 143rd to just down to the park? They don't have to go all the way to 151st.

Mr. Johnson: Right now, we have sidewalks south of 143rd to 151st along Mission Road.

Chairman Pateidl: They're pathetic.

Mr. Ley: There is access to the park through Steeplechase. You go Windsor all the way down, and then there is a trail that connects Windsor to the park. Maybe better signage would help. Once we get the bike trail map and bike signs out, it might help.

Chairman Pateidl: There might be 15 households in the City of Leawood that know about that walkway.

Mr. Ley: I think it might be more a matter of signage.

Chairman Pateidl: That's the discourse I'm talking about. There are projects around that people see and could be done and maybe thinking outside the box.

Mr. Johnson: There is concrete from 143rd south, and then it turns into asphalt to the entrance into Steeplechase. It is a nice asphalt trail down to about 146th. The worst section is 148th, north because south of 148th is concrete.

Comm. Ramsey: I turn into 148th. I see people walking on it all the time.

Mr. Johnson: Economy has a lot to do with it. 143rd was supposed to be done 2010-2012. We should be working on Mission Road, but the economy did what it did. Everybody put everything on hold. From 2010-2016, we finished the first phase of 143rd. In 2019, we'll

finish the next phase of 143rd, and then we'll go into Mission Road from 135th to 143rd Street.

Chairman Pateidl: I've expressed myself as to where I find frustration in some of this.

Mr. Johnson: I know. The bottom line is how to finance these and do it in such a way that we don't have a 4-5 mill increase to accomplish all this.

Mr. Coleman: I don't think you're alone in that. I think a lot of people have been frustrated and would like to do more, but there are certain financial constraints the city has. One of those things, like Joe was talking about, is trying to maintain that mill levy. The city has been pretty good with not raising the mill levy in maybe 10 years.

Comm. Block: I have a question on the major reconstruction projects. What is the timing? Is it because of the financing of it? Why is the order the way it is? Is it just going south? It seems like 151st Street and Mission is the worst intersection. I understand there is more pressure now because 159th is down. That intersection is really bad; whereas, there is a signal at least at Kenneth and 143rd, so that traffic moves pretty good. That is the next one in line: 143rd from Windsor to Kenneth. That is the closest one, but for someone who travels that area frequently, there was a major accident just down from the fire station last year. I think it was maybe late in the year before. I'm curious if the order of completion for the projects is based on traffic counts or on the ability to bond them.

Mr. Johnson: They're all bonded. We look at traffic. At the time when the city looked at 143rd, Mission Road didn't have that much traffic. When we looked at 143rd Street, it was improved from Nall going west. Before we improved 143rd Street, in the PM rush hour, traffic would back up from 143rd and Mission to almost Roe. That was before we did anything to it. People are already using 143rd. Most of these are in the same boat. By the time we get to a point where we need or want to improve a street to four lanes, the traffic is already there. Years ago, we considered whether to do 151st Street first or 143rd. The study was a flip of the coin, and the Governing Body picked 143rd. The highest volume of traffic is east-west. State Line and Nall are the two highest north-south volume traffic streets. The highest east-west were 143rd, 151st, 135th, 119th, and 95th Street. We have more volume of traffic moving east-west than we do north-south. We did a study, and City Council said 143rd was the priority. There was development along Mission Road. Traffic was increasing along Mission Road, so the priority changed with 151st Street to somewhere out in the future once we get done with 143rd. The next stage will be Mission Road.

Comm. Block: How long ago was that? Could that be reconsidered?

Mr. Johnson: We can't change the priority. 143rd is already in progress. We have federal aid for it at \$2.6 million. We received that last year for 2019. To get federal aid, it is 2-3 years out. We are already in design, and within about 3 months, we should be at a point to get right away. When they do a call for projects for 2022 or 2023, we will make an application for federal aid for that section of Mission Road.

Comm. Block: Why is that? Is it based on what City Council decided so many years ago? You're saying it's not going to change at this point?

Mr. Johnson: It won't change unless someone wants to change the priority of Mission Road to 151st Street. Those are the only two streets left to do. We've got a section of Kenneth.

Comm. Ramsey: I don't understand. What are you suggesting?

Comm. Block: I just don't understand the priority. I think 143rd Street to Windsor was a huge improvement, and that's great because the school was a mess. I don't think the traffic is bad from Windsor to Kenneth. I think it's a lot worse on Mission. I think it's a lot worse at the intersection of 151st and Mission. I think not having any sidewalks on 151st and nothing going east-west from Nall to 151st is a problem.

Mr. Johnson: If you phase the construction, which we'll do, when I approve Mission from 143rd to 151st, 135th to 143rd, we'll have the gap south until we can approve that. You're looking at \$15 million a phase. It won't be any different than 143rd. We'll build Phase One, and four years later, we'll build the next phase.

Comm. Block: Why are these so far apart? Is it because of the bonding?

Mr. Johnson: Yes. We can't do it any sooner. We're limited to the funding request. The bulk of it is being limited to the city to bond without having to increase the mill levy.

Mr. Coleman: If we push them together, it creates a need for a mill levy increase.

Mr. Johnson: They squeeze them as close as they can to do them as quick as possible without having an impact on the mill levy.

Comm. Block: What is the distaste for TDD?

Mr. Johnson: Generally, the TDD is for KCP&L.

Mr. Coleman: An income source.

Comm. Block: They can do it on property taxes.

Mr. Johnson: You mean a Special Benefit District?

Comm. Ramsey: Either way, it's a tax increase.

Mr. Johnson: Yes, and the problem in doing that is how to do it. Are you going to assess the people who abut it? Are you going to go back ½ mile on either side of the street and assess everybody within a ½ mile?

Mr. Coleman: I think City Council philosophically has said they would like to maintain the mill levy as long as possible. They don't want to start raising the mill levy and incur more debt. It also allows more flexibility for future councils. If something comes up that they really need, they can do it then.

Comm. Block: As someone who lives south of 135th, I would say it's more benefit for me than it is for people who live north of 135th. It improves with streetlights, curbs, walkways, and trails.

Mr. Coleman: You're thinking people would accept having property tax increases to pay for it?

Comm. Block: I would. I don't know what it would be, but if it could speed things up sooner than 2030.

Mr. Johnson: The projects are spaced in the CIP based on looking up what the city brings in and how we pay off the debt. They try to accelerate as much as they can without hitting a brick wall. They're stuck and have to do a mill levy increase to pay for it. The other part of this is the pay-as-you-go project like mill and overlay, residential mill and overlay, arterial mill and overlay, stormwater projects, park projects. These are all just annual pay-as-you-go projects. A lot of this is for convenience for people to look at so they can see where their streets are. We have a list of the streets we're going to do, and we track those. It's not to say that when we update this on an annual basis and we have a street that goes bad; then we prioritize. That happens almost every year. I could spend twice as much money as what's in here on an annual basis. There's no way that's going to happen. Most of what you see in here is maintenance or road improvement that it's time for us to do.

Chairman Pateidl: Are there any other questions or discussion?

Comm. Levitan: I think you guys do a great job. It seems like you guys tackle projects and do them the right way.

Mr. Johnson: Like I said, I think everybody would like to do them sooner.

Comm. Levitan: In a perfect world, but it is a moving target.

Mr. Johnson: It is. We've had a lot of compliments on the bike lanes on 143rd. We've talked to a lot of cyclists. They go across 143rd and use the bike lane. There will be a lot that will use it on Mission Road when they go north and south.

Chairman Pateidl: If there is no further discussion, is it appropriate to have a motion to move forward?

Mr. Klein: Actually, it's a work session, so we can just go to the next subject. Thank you, Joe.

SIGN REGULATIONS

Mr. Klein: We'd like to talk with regard to a potential LDO amendment regarding signage in Mixed Use Development Districts. As you recall, Park Place came through last year with a new sign package. That came through Planning Commission and went on to City Council. Portions were approved, but there were portions that were not allowed by the LDO. They asked staff to look at some and try to come up with something that would address the concerns and needs. This is not just with regard to Park Place because, as you're aware, there are other Mixed Use Developments in the area as well and potentially in the future as well.

Signage within the MXD Districts include:

- Development Monument Signs
- Development Identification Wall Signs
- Multi-tenant Wall Signs
- Parking Garage Entry Signs,
- Development Directory Monument Signs
- Pedestrian Directory Signs
- Direction signs
- Tenant Wall/Canopy Signs

The first one we would like to talk about is development monument signs. They have been approved by Governing Body for Park Place. You may have noticed two monument signs have been installed: one along 117th Street and one along Town Center Drive. They conform to what we currently have on the books. They are about 15 square feet, maximum 10 feet in length and 5 feet in height. Currently, the ordinance allows 6 feet in height. As far as lighting, only halo-illuminated is allowed.

We are also looking at development identification wall signs. These are signs that are on the parking garages. One of the comments we heard is that Park Place is very internally focused, so a lot of the businesses are on the interior. They are looking for some identification on the exterior. With regard to that, staff is recommending minimum of 25 acres. That is a decent amount of land that would have a development that could potentially be more internally focused. Park Place is about 30 acres; Parkway Plaza is about 60 acres. Most of the MXD developments will not have a problem meeting that threshold. Permitted location would be on the facades of parking garages directly adjacent to a public or arterial collector street. They would not face property that is zoned or master planned as residential. Part of the concern there is we want to make sure we don't have signage facing residential areas. I don't think that will be much of an issue. Maximum number of signs will be one per façade of the building. The maximum area of the sign would be 300 square feet. I believe Park Place had about 256 square feet. This allows some flexibility. However, it still maintains that all wall and canopy signage on the façade is no more than 5%. They had some other signage they were proposing as well. They had multi-tenant signs on the parking garage and parking garage entry signs. All of those together would have to be under 5%. The maximum length of the sign would

be 85% of the sign area. The maximum height would be 90% of the sign area or 9 feet, whichever is less. Maximum height of the characters would be 90% of the area of 6 feet, whichever is less. We are trying to make sure the sign doesn't but up to the limits of the height but still allow it to fit comfortably. If a sign has multiple lines, we didn't want to allow 9 feet for a single-line sign and then add another 9 feet for the second line. Lighting would be non-illuminated, externally illuminated or halo illuminated. One of the concerns we have is with a location they were proposing on the parking deck. That is considered a roof sign. Part of what we have is it must be below any eave or parapet of the building. We will have a definition for roof signs to clarify that. It will be a sign that is mounted on the roof of a building or is wholly dependent on the building for support that projects above the top walk, deck, or edge of a building with a flat roof, unless wholly on the face of a continuous parapet wall used to screen the roof of the building, the eave line, of a building with a gambrel, gable or hip roof, or the deck line of a building with a mansard roof. They are proposing an extension that went above the roofline. It wasn't a continuous parapet wall. Staff had concerns about that. It would be required to be located further down on the building.

Another term you might be hearing throughout this discussion is sign area. It is the area bound by building edges, architectural features such as columns, projections, recesses, and change of material. It is meant to fit comfortably within. We want to ensure if there are two columns on either side, there is not a sign going across the columns.

Park Place proposed development identification signs on Parking Garage A, which is centrally located along Nall Avenue, and then on Parking Garage B, which is along 117th Street. We would include the backer panel in the sign dimensions.

Comm. Block: Is the placement of theirs comply with what you are proposing?

Mr. Klein: Everything they are proposing would be allowed with what we are proposing here except for the location above the roofline. That would need to come down.

We also have multi-tenant wall signs. Park Place is proposing tenant logos above the entrances of the parking garages to allow people to see what businesses are within the development and also to give an idea of where to park. They are proposing these at the entrances to the parking garages.

Comm. Block: Will each parking garage have all of the tenants in Park Place or just those pertaining to that parking garage?

Mr. Klein: The way they explained it is that they would try to group them into ones that would be close to the garage. I don't think there will be enough spaces for every business in Park Place. That would be up to Park Place to determine who is on the signs.

Comm. Block: Do you have anything specific to the names itself? Is it a generic font, or can they be different?

Mr. Klein: That's a great question. Typically, the fonts are handled within the Sign Criteria. Some are fairly strict as far as what font they will allow. Others want to allow

creativity. I don't know that Park Place indicated what they would do regarding this. In the past, we haven't addressed fonts in the ordinance.

Comm. Block: I'm talking about one font for all the businesses.

Mr. Coleman: I think they're different. Each one can be individualized.

Comm. Block: I don't know how I feel about that. Uniformity versus individuality of the restaurant and allowing them to express themselves.

Mr. Coleman: I would say they will want individuality of each business on those signs.

Comm. Block: What's the one in Overland Park on 135th?

Mr. Klein: Prairie Fire.

Comm. Block: Yes, and obviously, they have huge lit signs on the side of the building along 135th. I don't know how attractive that is versus going into a building with just the actual names. I'm thinking of Oak Park Mall. It's a generic sign, and when you go in, you see what is each direction. I don't think they're individualized.

Mr. Coleman: Maybe not, but I would bet that these will be.

Comm. Ramsey: What is the purpose of the wall sign if not all of the businesses are going to be displayed on it?

Mr. Coleman: Do you mean the multi-tenant sign?

Comm. Ramsey: Yes.

Mr. Coleman: I think it's probably twofold. First, if you're driving around and see the business and it's the one you want to go to, you go in that parking garage. The other is that they will lease that sign space to the business.

Comm. Ramsey: So, it is more of a revenue source.

Mr. Coleman: I don't think it's more, but since they only have 12 and there are more than 12 businesses, I would assume that they want their name on the sign, they would need to pay a certain amount of money.

Comm. Levitan: The sign is a generator. It is just what you said. It is to attract tenants because they need visibility. Because it's an inward-facing development, anything that gets their message out helps. They're most likely not going to make money off that sign.

Mr. Coleman: They'll make some money, or how do they choose who gets the sign and who doesn't?

Comm. Levitan: Based on pro rata. If you've got a 5,000' tenant versus a 2,000' tenant, you're probably going to give it to the 5,000' tenant and so forth, and you go down size-wise.

Comm. Coleman: It's certainly up to the development.

Comm. Levitan: But it's usually a throw-in to sweeten the deal to the retailer. Retail right now is in the tank. They need everything they can get. Now, I thought we were going away from this.

Mr. Coleman: This is a proposal. The Planning Commission wasn't so hot on it, but Governing Body asked us to present.

Comm. Ramsey: That's fine, but I'm going on the record saying I'm opposed to this for a whole bunch of reasons. I think from where it's located on what I would consider collector-style streets, you're going to have potentially somebody pull up and stop to look at the sign. Not everybody is going to be up on that sign. Does it mean for somebody who has never been to this location that if their sign isn't up there, they're either not supposed to park in that garage and go around to park or that it's the only place they can park for that business? It just sends all kinds of silly messages that are wrong. Finally, it junks up the place. I understand that retail is in the tank and that they are doing everything that they can pull out of the hat to do. I still don't think it will make a damn bit of difference.

Comm. Levitan: I agree. I was against this from the beginning because it makes it look a little like a drive-in movie theater marquee or an airport. I was actually against this, but inherently, mixed use in Kansas City isn't ideal for retail anyway. The concept is flawed, and this isn't going to make it any better, in my opinion, but City Council doesn't seem to agree.

Comm. Ramsey: I understand that they're going to do what they're going to do. They want to placate Park Place by throwing them a bone. So be it, but I just don't think it's going to make a bit of difference.

Comm. Levitan: They're trying to appease the tenants they've got now.

Comm. Block: I don't understand the need for the 90% portion.

Mr. Klein: The 90% would force the sign to have a border. The sign companies want to make it as big as possible. If they have a clear direction as far as parameters, it makes it easier for everyone.

Mr. Coleman: They're going to be hard to read anyway from vehicular traffic.

Comm. Block: The Governing Body still wants no internal illumination?

Mr. Klein: What we are proposing would not be internally illuminated.

Mr. Coleman: They would be push through acrylic letters on an opaque background.

Comm. Block: Which is new?

Mr. Coleman: It's allowed now.

Comm. Levitan: I think for the sake of simplicity, uniformity – while I'm not a big fan, especially for retail because they put so much money into the brands – isn't a bad thing. It speeds people along.

Mr. Coleman: I'm just saying when it hits the pavement, the businesses are going to want their logo.

Chairman Pateidl: If we need to address things like that in the LDO, can't we control that?

Mr. Coleman: You can.

Chairman Pateidl: Would we not want to consider controlling that?

Comm. Hoyt: Uniformity of lettering.

Mr. Coleman: We can put that in there.

Chairman Pateidl: Someone made the point that it will look junky, and I think having all kinds of different logos on there, since it is a public parking structure, if we have the capacity to limit it, I highly recommend we do.

Comm. Block: Something like Lululemon, no one is going to recognize it. You recognize the logo. There are certain businesses that you recognize the logo more than the name.

Comm. Levitan: It is a parking garage versus the storefront, and the storefront is where they make their impression.

Chairman Pateidl: I'm thinking of high end communities in Denver and Naples, Florida, where we just spent a lot of time. They're great-looking places, and in the parking garages, they're top notch. I think that has an awful lot to do with it. It's fine to have the information.

Comm. Ramsey: Otherwise, you're going to recreate Signboard Hill.

Mr. Klein: The next one we would like to talk about is garage entry signs. Again, this is intended to identify the entrance to the garage. They also have a logo. These would be at

every garage entrance and not just the ones along an arterial or collector road. They are not quite as noticeable or quite as big. They could be on a development that is 10 acres. Maximum number of signs would be one per parking garage entrance. Maximum area of sign would be 100 square feet for any individual sign. Maximum length of the sign would be 85% of the length of the signage area. This is to ensure it doesn't encroach into architectural elements. Maximum height would be 90% of the height or 5 feet, whichever is less. Maximum height of characters would be 2 feet or 90% of the height of the signage area, whichever is less. Lighting would be non-illuminated, externally illuminated, halo illuminated, or push through acrylic letters. I'm not sure if everyone is familiar with the types of signage (*shows examples*).

Chairman Pateidl: While you're on the subject of lighting, as Park Place made their presentation, they had some new technology in lighting that they wanted to propose for sidewalk lighting. Has that been shelved?

Mr. Klein: Staff is okay if there is a single piece of glass with a light source at the bottom of the piece of glass and shining up through the piece of glass. Then, the text would be in opaque letters on the glass. We didn't want something where they created a box with sides and illumination from the middle, out. There are a couple developments where they are lighting the bottom of the glass and it extends through. I think there is flexibility there. We just had one come through as a monument sign. Bukaty was modifying a sign with that technology.

Chairman Pateidl: I would think, since we're not only talking about Park Place, it becomes uniform throughout and we've got such a big commitment to mixed use for future development, the more flexibility we can give on areas that are not obtrusive, the better. That lighting did not appear to be objectionable in my opinion that evening. Even if it were in a cube with signage on all four sides, the way it was done, I would be very open-minded. I would like to see that kind of invitation for developers for their signage opportunities be incorporated in any changes we make. The more flexibility of reasonableness that we can put in our Mixed Use, the better.

Mr. Klein: I think we're trying to provide a number of different options. We met with the sign company to talk about it. They encouraged the flexibility.

Mr. Coleman: We just want to go to a box sign because it's hard to define the aesthetics of something that may be built nice, but it could be extrapolated to ones that don't. On Wornall, all of the signs are box signs that have acrylic letters painted. The whole thing is illuminated. There could be a really nice one, but there is no way to prevent one that is not nice. I-Modules on College Boulevard has the same thing Bukaty is doing. We're fine with that. It's not internal; it's light transmittance.

Chairman Pateidl: Is that covered for the LDO?

Mr. Coleman: Box signs are prohibited in the LDO.

Chairman Pateidl: I'm talking more about the lighting treatment.

Mr. Coleman: The lighting treatment is kind of the issue with box signs. We're okay with them using an acrylic panel that is solid and illuminated like Bukaty did.

Chairman Pateidl: Is that lighting that you are fine with described in the guidelines that you have on the screen?

Mr. Klein: It is currently allowed by the LDO.

Mr. Coleman: It is allowed. We don't describe every type of lighting there is.

Chairman Pateidl: When they wanted to do it at the end of the year, we said they couldn't because it wasn't allowed.

Mr. Coleman: Because it was a box sign.

Chairman Pateidl: They weren't doing a box sign.

Mr. Coleman: It was square acrylic white illuminated boxes.

Comm. Block: How is that different than the Papa Murphy's sign? Is that not legal anymore?

Mr. Coleman: It has an opaque background.

Comm. Block: It's internally lit, though. There are fluorescent tubes in there.

Mr. Klein: Basically, it comes down to the entire face of the sign.

Comm. Block: Being opaque versus acrylic.

Mr. Coleman: Yes, versus the entire face being illuminated.

Comm. Block: I understand what you're saying now. What they presented looked a heck of a lot better than the Papa Murphy's sign. Why is it 10 acres on that? Is that the size of the actual garage?

Mr. Klein: Part of the reason for that is these would be allowed at each individual entrance. It wasn't going to be quite as limiting as 10 acres with a small parking garage. A 10-acre development would not be likely to be internally focused with the parking garages around the outside. It does meet the minimum amount of land in order to develop land. Since these were not as big and chances are the development wouldn't be internally focused. That is why it wasn't quite as restrictive.

We would also like to talk about blade signs. Park Place already has some. They are basically almost 8 feet, but they project from the wall of the building and are about 6

feet in height, including the fancy grillwork on the bracket. Staff is supportive. On these, we talked about the 5% with wall and canopy signs together. The blade signs would not count against that 5% because they are perpendicular to the façade of the building. For the most part, they are supposed to be identifying the entry to garages. They will be adjacent to entrances of parking garages with one per parking garage entrance. They could be 48 square feet, which is the size that is currently out there. Maximum height is 6 feet and 8 feet projection from the façade. Minimum height of the sign above grade would be 10 feet in order to avoid interference.

Comm. Block: Why not do the 90% thing on this one?

Mr. Klein: I guess that actually is not a bad idea because vertically with the bracket, they might run into something similar. We didn't think about it because they are perpendicular to the building. As far as lighting, it would be non-illuminated, externally illuminated, halo illuminated, or push through acrylic letters. Right now, one proposal is push through acrylic letters.

The next one we would like to talk about is development vehicular monument signs. As you remember, that's what they are actually proposing in this central island. I think there is concern with regard to traffic. Staff is proposing to allow these signs but not really allowing them within traffic circles or sight triangles. I think Commissioner Ramsey indicated one idea is to have one before the intersection, and then people could approach it and see which way the different businesses are located rather than being within the traffic circle. We thought these would be in a larger development of 25 acres or more. Permitted location would be a minimum of 100 feet from all public right-of-way. We want to make sure these are internal to the development and not just placed on the public right-of-way. Really, what they're meant to do is show the directory. Maximum number of signs would be 1 per 5 acres, not to exceed 10 total for the development. We are thinking of reducing it to 6 total. Maximum area would be 28 square feet, including the base. Maximum length of the sign would be 5 feet or 7 feet measured from grade to the tallest portion of the sign. There is a little flexibility. Park Place was proposing a height of 7 feet and a width of 4 feet. Maximum size of characters would be 4 square feet for 1 character, and all others would be a maximum of 6 inches in height. When we talked to the people at the sign company, they thought that was reasonable within the development. As far as lighting, it would be none, halo illuminated, or push through acrylic letters with an opaque background.

The next one we would like to discuss is pedestrian directory signs. These are already approved. We just want to make sure that we allow these in the LDO. We are proposing minimum of 100 feet from all public rights-of-way. Again, these are interior to the development. They would be within and adjacent to pedestrian areas and located outside of all structures, setbacks and sight triangles. It would allow 1 sign per 5 acres; however, in no case shall the number exceed 6. Maximum area of the sign would be 18 square feet. Maximum height of the sign would be 6 feet. They can be non-illuminated, externally illuminated, internally illuminated, halo illuminated, or push through acrylic letters within an opaque background. The Governing Body approved internally illuminated. These are shown in more pedestrian areas.

Directional signs, we just kept the same as what is in the other commercial districts. They are allowed a maximum of 2. Maximum area is 6 square feet, and lighting is not allowed. Instead of a list of businesses, these are more directional, such as an exit or drive-through sign.

With regard to tenant wall/canopy signs, this remains the same as what we currently have. We did want to clarify that currently, we allow 2, but we want to make sure everyone is aware that it is a maximum of 1 per tenant façade. Generally, that is in the Sign Criteria for the development. We just wanted it clear in the LDO. Maximum sign area would be 200 square feet. That is taken from the LDO. It is not to exceed 5% of the individual tenant façade of lease space. They never get even close to 200 square feet because most of the tenants are multi-tenant buildings and the lease space is fairly small. Maximum length of the sign would be 85% of the length of the sign area. Maximum height would be 90% of the height of the sign area. Those are new clarifications to make sure everyone is on the same page as far as comfortably fitting within the sign area. Maximum height of characters would be 90% of the height of the sign area or 6 feet, whichever is less. Lighting could be non-illuminated, externally illuminated or halo illuminated. Does anybody have any questions?

Chairman Pateidl: On the entrance of the parking garage where they can't put it up where they want and they have to put it down below, when we did the signage for Gaslight Grill, what was that situation?

Mr. Klein: That was on a parapet.

Mr. Coleman: They built the parapet to put that on. It went all the way around the façade.

Chairman Pateidl: The pergola, for lack of another description, that they've got up there doesn't qualify?

Mr. Coleman: If it's not above the roof, it's fine. It's just extended out from the wall. That one would be fine. The other one, we had a concern about because the whole sign is above the top floor of the structure.

Chairman Pateidl: It is, but it is below the pergola that is part of the structure.

Mr. Coleman: Yes, but it is like a roof sign, like the old roof signs where they built metal framework and stuck the sign on it. The only difference is this is precast concrete.

Chairman Pateidl: It's a little more architectural than that.

Mr. Coleman: The parameters are exactly the same because the sign sticks up. Now, if it was a parapet that went all the way around, it would be fine.

Chairman Pateidl: Drop that down a floor, put that sign on there and leave that space above is, to me, architecturally not pleasing.

Mr. Coleman: I don't know how to get around our roof sign definition on that. That's the only thing.

Chairman Pateidl: I guess the only thing I can say is that it's in MXD and place it within an architectural element, that may give you more flexibility.

Mr. Coleman: We're writing this for all the developments, not this one.

Chairman Pateidl: I understand. It's also all the future developments. My goal is to give as much incentive to the developers to appreciate the property, to entice them to do the mixed use development. By itself, I think everyone agrees that it is a very difficult thing. Also, I find it extremely interesting that so much time was given to parking garages during the implementation plan for this walkability project. We're a world of automobiles, and trying to fight the automobiles is going to be very difficult.

Comm. Ramsey: Does this, in effect, fix the issues?

Mr. Coleman: For the most part. Probably the one sign is the biggest sticking point, where it sticks up above. I'm not sure how to deal with that. We could get rid of the definition.

Comm. Ramsey: But otherwise, this resolves the direction from the Governing Body.

Mr. Coleman: Right.

Comm. Block: In that case, does it help that the other two walls are even with it? Does that help with your concern with it being just a big sign? Is there something we could do in the definition because of the architectural structures or whatever you want to call them?

Mr. Coleman: I'm not sure. Maybe if there was a parapet wall or something.

Comm. Block: They wouldn't have added anything. It goes straight across. It looks like it fits instead of just looking like they threw up a sign and made it kind of fancy.

Mr. Coleman: Maybe if it was all solid.

Comm. Block: You're saying they would still have to make it all the way solid across. I just wondered if that satisfied it.

Comm. Ramsey: The idea is that it's sticking up like a roof sign as if that wasn't there.

Mr. Coleman: We would always have the roof sign definition.

Comm. Levitan: I actually like that piece. I think that's a nice touch. For all the branding they do, it might help direct some eyeballs that way. It's not cheap.

Comm. Block: Like Jim said, if you pull that down.

Mr. Coleman: Maybe we could look at if they fill in the whole thing. Right now, it's only partially filled in.

Comm. Block: That's not going to be cheap. That's going to be a lot more expensive.

Mr. Coleman: Right now, the backer panel only goes so far, and the rest is open.

Comm. Levitan: You're saying to extend it the whole way.

Mr. Coleman: Yes. We might have to think about that part some more.

Mr. Klein: That was it.

MEETING ADJOURNED