

**City of Leawood
Planning Commission Meeting
July 23, 2019
Dinner Session – 5:30 p.m. – No Discussion of Items
Leawood City Hall – Main Conference Room
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: McGurren, Belzer, Coleman, Block, Stevens, Peterson. Absent: Hunter, Hoyt, Elkins

Chairman Coleman: I noticed there was no new agenda, so we'll go with the one in our packets.

Mr. Klein: The current one is correct.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

A motion to approve the agenda was made by Block; seconded by Belzer. Motion carried with a unanimous vote of 5-0. For: McGurren, Belzer, Block, Stevens, Peterson.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Approval of the minutes from the June 25, 2019 Planning Commission meeting.

Chairman Coleman: Are there any changes to the draft minutes? If not, I'll entertain a motion.

A motion to approve the minutes from the June 25, 2019 Planning Commission meeting was made by Belzer; seconded by Stevens. Motion carried with a unanimous vote of 5-0. For: McGurren, Belzer, Block, Stevens, Peterson.

CONTINUED TO THE AUGUST 27, 2019 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING:

CASE 16-19 – LEAWOOD DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE AMENDMENT TO SECTION 16-4-9, FENCES AND WALLS – Request for approval of an amendment to the Leawood Development Ordinance, pertaining to fence location and fences within RP-A5 (Planned Rural Density Single Family Residential District). **PUBLIC HEARING**

CASE 74-19 – THE HILLS OF LEAWOOD VILLAS – Request for approval of a Preliminary Plan, Preliminary Plat, and Rezoning – Located north of 151st Street and east of Mission Road. **PUBLIC HEARING**

CONSENT AGENDA:

CASE 72-19 – LEAWOOD SUBDIVISION – LOT 674 – RESIDENTIAL EMERGENCY GENERATOR – Request for approval of a Final Landscape Plan – Located north of 86th Street and west of Lee Blvd.

Chairman Coleman: Does any commissioner wish to have this taken off the Consent Agenda.

A motion to approve the Consent Agenda was made by Block; seconded by McGurren. Motion carried with a unanimous vote of 5-0. For: McGurren, Belzer, Block, Stevens, Peterson.

Comm. Peterson: I'd like to ask a question of staff. I've never seen one of these before with an emergency residential generator. Because it's a residential area, how frequently does the city see these requests?

Mr. Klein: We don't see them much. We used to see them more. We had a lower standard of 20 kw, and now it is 22 kw. We found that people were fine with 22 kw but didn't want 20 kw, so more cases came to the Planning Commission. We did a Leawood development Ordinance (LDO) amendment that amended that to allow 22 kw and below without having to come to the Planning Commission. This just happened to be one of the larger ones.

Comm. Peterson: In all of Leawood, I can't imagine there are that many residential homes with emergency generators.

Mr. Coleman: There are quite a few.

NEW BUSINESS:

CASE 69-19 – RANCH MART – MCDONALD'S – Request for approval of a Special Use Permit for a fast food restaurant with drive-through, Preliminary Plan and Final Plan, located north of 95th Street and east of Mission Road. **PUBLIC HEARING**

Staff Presentation:

City Planner Jessica Schuller made the following presentation:

Ms. Schuller: This is Case 69-19 – Ranch Mart McDonald's – Request for approval of a Special Use Permit (SUP), Preliminary Plan, and Final Plan for a fast food restaurant with a drive-through. McDonald's is an existing, 4,151 sq. ft. building located at the southwest corner of the Ranch Mart development, which is at the intersection of 95th and Mission. Final Plan for the overall Ranch Mart development was approved by the Governing Body in April, 2019. This plan included revisions to the parking lot islands adjacent to the McDonald's site, sidewalk, and landscape areas along 95th and Mission.

The parking lot lighting for the site was also approved at the time of that plan. The applicant is now requesting approval to update the façade of the McDonald's building and to add a double drive-through lane to the site. The footprint of the building will remain as existing. The façade updates include removing the mansard roof on the building and adding a parapet wall to the face of the building. The existing brick and windows will remain but will be accented with grey and taupe cementitious stucco. Aluminum canopies are located around the entrances of the building and around the drive-through. In order to accommodate the second drive-through lane, the applicant has narrowed the parking lot island to the east of the drive-through, which is east of the building, and added a median between the two lanes. Menu boards are located in the drive-through lanes, and they are screened with shrubs, which is noted on the revised plan on the dais. This meets Stipulation No. 5 in the Staff Report. The Landscape Plan for the site matches what was previously approved with the overall development with the exception of a few shrubs in those new medians and some shrubs around the base of the building as well. You'll see there are street trees along Mission Road but not along 95th Street in front of McDonald's due to space limitations of that area. In addition to the menu boards, the medians will accommodate an 11.5' tall canopy that will contain order displays. There will be one per each lane. There is also one double-armed gateway at the entrance of the drive-through that marks the clearance height for the drive-through. Ranch Mart is in the process of updating their Sign Criteria for the overall development, so no signage is approved tonight with this application but will be approved at a later date. Staff recommends approval of Case 69-19 with the stipulations in the Staff Report, and I'm happy to answer any questions.

Chairman Coleman: Thank you. To clarify, you mentioned this piece of paper addresses Stipulation No. 5 and we can remove it then.

Ms. Schuller: As the stipulation is written, the plan meets the requirement, so it would not need to be stricken necessarily.

Chairman Coleman: The comment on Page 5 is specifically addressed.

Ms. Schuller: Correct.

Chairman Coleman: Are there questions for staff?

Comm. McGurren: This may not be the easiest question to answer, but in the grand scheme of things, is the size, positioning, and width of the drive-through similar or standard with all McDonald's locations? Is it the same or narrower than what we would be used to at other locations in town?

Mr. Klein: That might be a better question for the applicant. We applied the LDO standards, and we made sure they met those. I'm not sure how they do it in other cities.

Chairman Coleman: Are there other questions? I have a few. The drive-through has two lanes, and there is an exit on the northeast side that says, "Do not enter." I'm trying to

figure out the traffic flow for that particular area. If a driver goes through the drive-through, he goes completely around.

Ms. Schuller: The site circulates. Coming off Mission Road, drivers will enter, turn right, and go around the south side of the building to enter the drive-through. The Do Not Enter sign north of the drive-through is for any southbound traffic that might be parked in the islands to the north of the drive-through so that they're not entering the drive-through from the incorrect direction. The traffic flow is pretty much what is onsite. It was determined that it would be difficult, if not impossible, to make it different. It's very similar to what's existing.

Chairman Coleman: Right now, if someone is in the drive-through, they could go around the drive-through and exit from that point.

Mr. Klein: There is still a bailout lane. After the crescent island between, the driver can continue north and exit. That was the reason for that as well.

Chairman Coleman: So, two cars can fit in the outer lane?

Mr. Klein: We might be able to point it out on the plan.

Ms. Schuller: (*Refers to plan*) This is the bailout lane.

Chairman Coleman: Can the outer drive-through lane fit one or two cars?

Ms. Schuller: Just one.

Chairman Coleman: Today, there is an inner drive-through and an outer bypass.

Mr. Klein: That is correct. This one would only have the one lane that would continue up north, but it would allow the car to bail out if it needed to.

Chairman Coleman: Thank you. I think that's the only question I have. I would invite the applicant to come forward.

Applicant Presentation:

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

Mr. Evan: I'll run through this quickly. (*Shows plan on monitor throughout*) As Ms. Schuller mentioned, we are at the northeast corner of 95th and Mission, the southwest portion of the overall Ranch Mart development. I've highlighted the area that McDonald's leases from Ranch Mart. You saw the overall plan earlier this year. We have marked the area of change, and nothing else changes within the overall development. You can see that not much changes. The drive-through obviously changes, but the parking on the north and south is the same. Traffic circulation doesn't change. We had to

take some of that island east of the side-by-side drive-through in order to fit this in. We added the island between the two drive-through lanes for some additional landscaping. We are doing some asphalt work. One of the big reasons McDonald's is doing these remodels is to address any ADA issues. That is why the ADA stalls in the southwest corner of the lot are out of concrete. They are also updating the building façade to give it a more modern look. This has a side-by-side drive-through because they see the opportunity to generate more revenue with an additional lane.

I'll go through the building elevations quickly. On the top of all the elevations, you'll see the existing elevation with the mansard roof; on the bottom, you'll see the more modern look with a new roof, flat front with arcade. They are holding all the existing glass, and the brick is staying. The roofline updates are the big update with the stucco instead of the mansard roof. There is no signage on the building; it will be added later. To give it color, the bricks remain, and grey-tone stucco will go on the rest of the building. There is more brick on the shopping center side of the building with less glass than the other sides. The architect did renderings to show the different views. That end my presentation. I'd be happy to answer questions. I have Vicky Stadther with McDonald's to answer any questions as well.

Chairman Coleman: I'll start with questions from the left.

Comm. Stevens: I have a question about some of the changes with the roofline and roof screening area. A real challenge with a pad site like this is all four sides of the building are fronts; there is not a rear. I'm concerned with the rendering from the 95th Street entry where what looks like the east side is left with a different condition for the roof screening and the rendering from the internal parking lot rendering as well. Can you explain the reason the new improvements for the parapet and screening have not addressed this east façade?

Mr. Evan: I believe that the architects added the metal screening to screen the units on top. I know they looked into the heights of those because they even went back to the old plans from when the building was first put in or any additional units were put in to get the dimensions of it to make sure the screening was adequate for the units on top. I thought the architect looked into that and provided the screening accordingly.

Comm. Stevens: It does look like, toward the west side of the units, they were taller, and three sides of the new parapet were added to screen that height. This east end seems odd that it's not carrying through.

Mr. Evan: We can definitely take a look at it.

Comm. McGurren: Is it possible that the east end is removable and temporary, where all the other stucco walls are not, and that could be removed to enable the placement of new items on the top?

Comm. Stevens: It could be.

Chairman Coleman: Before you speak, please tell us your name and address.

Vicky Stadther, 2127 Vermillion Curve, Woodbury, MN, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Ms. Stadther: They usually make the screens as high as they can. In most situations, we're able to put it the same height as the parapet all the way around. There might be a structural reason, such as the way that original building was built, that they couldn't go up that high because those aren't structural walls like the rest of it will be. Once they take the mansard off, they can usually build it straight up from the building. I don't know all the details of why they did that, but it has been common in some other buildings that they screen it up as high as they can structurally without rebuilding the whole roof on the building. Then that little area is so they can get on the roof for maintenance of all the rooftop units. Usually, if they get a new one, they have to crane them in.

Comm. Stevens: If it is a removable screen, it may give access to the roof.

Ms. Stadther: I doubt they'd be removed for any reason, but they're not a structural part of the building as much as the rest of it is.

Comm. Block: I just had a question about the stipulations. Three were called out. No. 5 was taken care of; were there any concerns with Nos. 6 and 7?

Mr. Evan: We are agreeable with No. 6. The reason we had hesitation is that McDonald's as a corporation has been trying to get away with any texture in crosswalks because they tend to be a target for ADA compliance. They would like to go with colored concrete with a stamped pattern, but we understand that is a big thing here in Leawood. We agree to it. No. 7 deals with photometrics, and I'm dealing with the Ranch Mart shopping center photometric designer to get all that incorporated. We'll have that resolved before City Council, so we have no issues with that either.

Comm. Block: I assume you're fine with the rest of them as well?

Mr. Evan: Yes, we agree with all the stipulations.

Comm. McGurren: Is there an easy answer to the question I asked earlier?

Mr. Evan: The width of the drive-through is standard at 12 feet, which is what we typically do in all of them.

Comm. McGurren: The width, turn, and shape are consistent with every McDonald's?

Mr. Evan: Yes, we have standards we have to meet. This meets those standards.

Chairman Coleman: To expand the drive-through lane, I noticed there were some existing trees on the eastern border. To make the second lane, do you have to take the trees out?

Mr. Evan: We do. We're at bare minimum. We have the trash enclosure on the east side of the building that sets everything, and the first drive-through lane is after that. Then, we have a 6' island, which is the minimum width for McDonald's, and the other drive-through lane. By the time that all pushes east, we have to go that far to get the other lane in. I can't pull it farther west with the way the trash enclosure is sitting here.

Chairman Coleman: Can you go over a bit of the traffic flow? I remember when this whole development came in, there was a concern about traffic flow off Mission Road into the McDonald's and how that was all going to work.

Mr. Evan: I can try to walk you through it. Off Mission, drivers come into the lot just like McDonald's would like, and they either get into the drive-through or park to come in the front door. Off 95th, the city wanted to move it to the east to get it away from the intersection at 95th and Mission and to prevent people from coming in and shooting into the drive-through, bypassing the line. Moving that over solves those issues. Coming in off 95th, drivers come up the drive aisle around the front and enter toward Mission. At that point, they will go around the building counterclockwise. Because of the way Ranch Mart is set up, we are stuck with the traffic flow as it is. McDonald's likes that one-way traffic flow counterclockwise around their sites.

Chairman Coleman: I'm still concerned about the exit on the northwest corner. I think the only people that can use that are in that second outside drive-through lane. I'm a little concerned that people in the first drive-through lane may want to use it as well if they don't want to order or for whatever reason. I could see issues with traffic flow in that area. I guess it's a bailout portion. Is that normal for your drive-throughs in this tight enclosure?

Mr. Evan: They would prefer to have a full bypass lane if there was an opportunity, where someone could just circle the site and keep circling. I've seen it before with a tight situation like this and we had to add something like a bailout lane to provide an opportunity to get out of the drive-through.

Chairman Coleman: I was mentioning to everyone in this room that we were car shopping this weekend, and we went to the closest Chik Fil A, and we had to make a decision. If we went in the lane, we were stuck. It's different in here. Their situation, you have to go through the whole process. Here, I'm just concerned about the cars trying to get out from that first lane.

Mr. Evan: We're just trying to make the best of the situation with the bailout lane as an option. Ideally, they'd like to be able to circulate all the way around the back, but with the conditions, this is the best we can do.

Chairman Coleman: I understand it's a tight sight.

Ms. Stadther: Normally, when we add a side-by-side, we're doing it to service existing traffic. It services existing traffic quicker. Hopefully, if you are in the inside lane and decide to leave for whatever reason, you're not waiting long to do it. When you're at that point, it shouldn't take long except during peak times. We would love to have a bypass lane around the whole building, but it is a matter of servicing existing traffic quicker or having a bypass lane.

Chairman Coleman: Are there other questions?

Mr. Coleman: Are you going to look at wrapping the rear with the stucco, as Commissioner Stevens indicated?

Ms. Stadther: That is metal on the upper part.

Mr. Coleman: I know it's metal, but he talked about it being the only place that there is metal on the building.

Ms. Stadther: It is not removable.

Mr. Coleman: I'm just asking if you would look at wrapping the rear portion where the metal is with stucco.

Ms. Stadther: We don't normally do metal back there, so it is probably a structural issue with the weight.

Mr. Coleman: It previously had a mansard roof all along there. I'm just wondering. I don't think the weight would be different.

Mr. Evan: He's talking about the back side.

Mr. Coleman: I'm sure the mansard roof weighs more than a single wall. Could you have them look at that?

Ms. Stadther: Normally, we have metal all the way around.

Chairman Coleman: This case requires a Public Hearing. Is there anyone in the audience who would like to speak?

Public Hearing

Kevin Jeffries, 13451 Briar Drive, Leawood, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Mr. Jeffries: I wanted to speak to what I believe was Stipulation No. 5, which was about the screening of the back of the menu boards. Staff was very nice to call me back and

explain that it was part of the LDO. I would just like to throw out for consideration the practicality of that. I'm very concerned that these plants will continually be dying from the cars being there. It is a small island. The development where my business is has trees dying all the time because the planting areas are not big enough to support the plant life, and they're not in an appropriate spot. I think we might want to consider that this is facing a commercial area on all four sides. I could see if it was facing a residential area that it would be appropriate to screen something like that, that might be unsightly from a residential perspective, but I just think it's something I would like you to consider when looking at changes to the ordinance. We make them all the time, and you might want to look at not just the landscaping but if the trees will survive and the purpose of the screening. Thank you.

Chairman Coleman: Does staff have any comment on that? I thought it was kind of unique that we had it in there. I will say that I went by the existing McDonald's at that location, and the screening behind has plants that are thriving.

Mr. Klein: When we had the menu boards come in, we were under the realization that the backs of those boards aren't the most aesthetically pleasing. We have no idea what they will look like. The city has the screening requirement that has been applied to other menu boards. It could be other types of screening as well. For instance, the Starbucks at Parkway Plaza did a stone wall around the back of the menu board and then accented it with landscaping. If things get really tight, there might be other opportunities such as architectural ways to do it if plant material doesn't survive. We talked to the parks superintendent to get ideas of what would survive there. They proposed upright junipers. He thought that would probably be fine. The menu board isn't overly wide, so it should screen it well. It is there for aesthetic reasons. In this case, it is a drive-through, but there will be other cases where it would be much more visible from a public right of way.

Additionally, we talked about the photometric study, and there is an up-light shown that is shown to wash the building. Right now, it is shown at 5,100 kelvin. Generally, that is a fairly white, almost blue, light that tends to get harsh. The applicant is willing to consider moving that to 3,000 kelvin, which is a softer yellow light. That would be done with their application. There is a stipulation that, prior to Governing Body consideration, they would provide a revised photometric study, and that would be part of that.

Chairman Coleman: Thank you. Is there anyone else who would like to speak during the Public Hearing?

As not one else was present to speak, a motion to close the Public Hearing was made by Block; seconded by McGurren. Motion carried with a unanimous vote of 5-0. For: McGurren, Belzer, Block, Stevens, Peterson.

Chairman Coleman: That brings us to discussion. If there is none, the chair will entertain a motion.

A motion to recommend approval of CASE 69-19 – RANCH MART – MCDONALD’S – Request for approval of a Special Use Permit for a fast food restaurant with drive-through, Preliminary Plan and Final Plan, located north of 95th Street and east of Mission Road – with 36 stipulations was made by Block; seconded by Belzer. Motion carried with a unanimous vote of 5-0. For: McGurren, Belzer, Block, Stevens, Peterson.

CASE 60-19 – LEAWOOD DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE AMENDMENT TO SECTION 16-3-4, DEVELOPMENT PLAN APPROVAL PROCESS – Request for approval of an amendment to the Leawood Development Ordinance, pertaining to approvals to changes to an existing Final Development Plan. **PUBLIC HEARING**

Staff Presentation:

Assistant Director Mark Klein made the following presentation:

Mr. Klein: This is Case 60-19 – Leawood Development Ordinance Amendment to Section 16-3-4 – Development Plan Approval Process. This amendment pertains to a section of the ordinance that lays out when a preliminary and final development plan for the overall development are required. There was an amendment that added this Section G, shown on the ordinance itself, back in 2016. It attempted to lay out when these elements would be required. It turns out that it has had some unintended consequences in that it has allowed a development to bring forward an application for a change, but if there is one property owner who is part of the development, he would have the ability not to sign the application or give permission, and then Planning Commission and Governing Body would not see the application. That was not the intent of this. This particular ordinance states that a revised preliminary and final plan are still required on the piece of property; however, they would not be required for the overall development. It does still require notification sent out through return receipt mail. By state statute, they still have to notify all the property owners within 500 feet to make them aware the application is going forward. As part of that, a protest petition can be filed. That means that if there is more than 25% of the land area adjacent to within 200 feet of the property, they can file a protest petition, making it more difficult for the application to get passed. It would require a super majority as opposed to a simple majority at Governing Body. We didn't want to prevent applications from ever coming before the Planning Commission and City Council; we want to at least allow that consideration to be there.

Chairman Coleman: Any questions?

Comm Block: The last piece you mentioned about the requirement for a super majority is where?

Mr. Klein: That is part of a different part of the ordinance in Article V. It applies to all preliminary plans and rezonings. That avenue is still available for this; this would not preclude that. People would still have the ability to have input; it just allows it to get to a public forum to hear the input.

Comm. Block: Help me with an example. Since we've been talking about Ranch Mart, one of the businesses is a donut shop. If they were to change something in the future, can you run me through how that would work?

Mr. Klein: Ranch Mart is harder because it hasn't been broken out into different ownerships, but say Duck Donuts had their own piece of property, similar to Macy's with their own parcel. Say Ranch Mart wanted to add another use. If Duck Donuts didn't want that use or had any number of other reasons for not wanting it in there, they could choose to not sign the application, and Ranch Mart could not bring it forward. This would allow Ranch Mart to bring the application with a notice to Duck Donuts, who can come to the Public Hearing and voice opinions. If they can get 25% of the property owners of land area within 200 feet, they can file a protest petition. If it is valid, it would require the Governing Body to have a super majority as opposed to a simple majority in order to approve it.

Comm. Block: Has this occurred with adjoining property owners in the past?

Mr. Klein: This has come about because we had a situation that didn't seem so much a development issue as a contractual issue and dispute that was going on behind the scenes. It was a way for the one small property to keep an application from moving forward. We want to make sure the Planning Commission and Governing Body have the ability to consider the applications.

Chairman Coleman: Any other questions? 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 Block; seconded by McGurren. Motion carried with a unanimous vote of 5-0. For: McGurren, Belzer, Block, Stevens, Peterson.

Chairman Coleman: This takes us to discussion on Case 60-19. Chair will entertain a motion.

A motion to recommend approval of CASE 60-19 – LEAWOOD DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE AMENDMENT TO SECTION 16-3-4, DEVELOPMENT PLAN APPROVAL PROCESS – Request for approval of an amendment to the Leawood Development Ordinance, pertaining to approvals to changes to an existing Final Development Plan – was made by Belzer; seconded by Stevens. Motion carried with a unanimous vote of 5-0. For: McGurren, Belzer, Block, Stevens, Peterson.

CASE 71-19 – LEAWOOD DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE AMENDMENT TO SECTION 16-4-6.3, OFFICE, COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL SIGNAGE IN PLANNED DISTRICTS – Request for approval of an amendment to the Leawood Development Ordinance, pertaining to Governing Body approval of deviations to development sign criteria. **PUBLIC HEARING**

Staff Presentation:

Assistant Director Mark Klein made the following presentation:

Mr. Klein: This is Case 71-19 – Leawood Development Ordinance Amendment to Section 16-4-6.3. This is pertaining to sign criteria. When a development comes in at the time of zoning, they put in place sign criteria for the overall development as part of a final plan. Once they do that, staff reviews the signage based on the sign criteria and the LDO. Deviations can be approved by the Governing Body. This application allows Governing Body to modify sign criteria to allow for something. The reason this is before you is that originally, when developments come in, they establish sign criteria. All the ownership is the same; everyone gets along. As developments get older, pad sites and parcels get sold off, and sometimes, it gets to the point where the sign criteria become out of date and address certain things that maybe haven't been enforced well. This would allow an applicant to ask for something that is not allowed by the sign criteria. Currently, we typically require a letter from the development saying that they have reviewed and approved the sign. Unfortunately, often times, it doesn't meet the sign criteria. Then, we tell them they need to update the sign criteria. There seems to be hesitancy or difficulty on their part to bring that through. That tenant then gets angry and indicates they have been approved by the development, but the development is signing off on something that doesn't meet their sign criteria. It gets in a locked position, and this would provide a relief valve. An example of one that is very out of date is Town Center Plaza. It was done in 1995 and hasn't been reviewed since then. They actually still require neon to illuminate the signs. Nobody uses neon anymore; it is all LED. We've talked to them about that and want them to come through and update the sign criteria, but they have not been able to get that done, either because of not wanting to or not being able to work with all the property owners. Staff is recommending this to provide more flexibility in order to address some of these issues.

Chairman Coleman: Questions for staff?

Comm. Block: Why would it go directly to Governing Body and not come through here first?

Mr. Klein: Actually, it would come through here. We state that it is approved by Governing Body, but it is always after a recommendation from the Planning Commission. You would see it. We want the Planning Commission and Governing Body to see it. We want this all out in the light.

Comm. Belzer: I had the same question. Does it need to be stated that it comes through Planning Commission first, or is it just implied?

Mr. Klein: We were thinking that it was implied, but we can definitely look at it. Final development plans have to come through Planning Commission and Governing Body.

Comm. Block: If you're looking for language, in Part B, you could add it there.

Mr. Klein: We can easily add, “recommended by the Planning Commission” to make it clear.

Mr. Coleman: It’s actually already in there. It’s just above that.

Comm. Belzer: I just saw it, too.

Comm. Block: Okay.

Chairman Coleman: Any other questions? 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 Block; seconded by Belzer. Motion carried with a unanimous vote of 5-0. For: McGurren, Belzer, Block, Stevens, Peterson.

Chairman Coleman: This brings us to discussion on the case. Is there discussion by the commissioners? Chair will entertain a motion.

A motion to recommend approval of CASE 71-19 – LEAWOOD DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE AMENDMENT TO SECTION 16-4-6.3, OFFICE, COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL SIGNAGE IN PLANNED DISTRICTS – Request for approval of an amendment to the Leawood Development Ordinance, pertaining to Governing Body approval of deviations to development sign criteria – was made by Block; seconded by Belzer. Motion carried with a unanimous vote of 5-0. For: McGurren, Belzer, Block, Stevens, Peterson.

MEETING ADJOURNED