

**City of Leawood
Planning Commission Meeting
May 12, 2020
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, Hunter, Hoyt, Coleman, Block, Stevens, Peterson, Elkins. Absent: Belzer.

APPROVAL TO SUSPEND CERTAIN RULES OF PLANNING COMMISSION DUE TO PANDEMIC:

Ms. Knight: The current bylaws of the Planning Commission only allow for telephone participation by commissioners for the purposes of continuing agenda items. The bylaws allow rules to be suspended by a majority vote for reasons stated on the record; therefore, due to the Covid-19 Pandemic and the need to conduct this meeting remotely, we will need a motion to suspend the rules as contained in the bylaws of the Planning Commission to allow for a quorum of the Planning Commission to be assembled via interactive communication (Zoom) in order to conduct business.

A motion to suspend the rules as contained in the Bylaws of the Planning Commission in order to allow for a quorum of the Planning Commission to be assembled via interactive communication (Zoom) – was made by Coleman; seconded by Peterson. Motion carried with a unanimous roll-call vote of 7-0. For: McGurren, Hunter, Hoyt, Peterson, Coleman, Block, and Stevens.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA:

Mr. Sanchez: Staff would like to make one change. With regard to Case 10-20, the description should include a Final Plan.

A motion to approve the agenda was made by Hoyt; seconded by McGurren. Motion carried with a unanimous roll-call vote of 7-0. For: McGurren, Hunter, Hoyt, Peterson, Coleman, Block, and Stevens.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Approval of the minutes from the February 25, 2020 Planning Commission meeting.

A motion to approve the minutes from the February 25, 2020 Planning Commission meeting was made by Coleman; seconded by Peterson. Motion carried with a unanimous roll-call vote of 7-0. For: McGurren, Hunter, Hoyt, Peterson, Coleman, Block, and Stevens.

CONTINUED TO THE MAY 26, 2020 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING:
CASE 23-20 – HILLS OF LEAWOOD VILLAS – Request for approval of a Rezoning, Preliminary Plat, and Preliminary Plan, located north of 151st Street and east of Mission Road. **PUBLIC HEARING**

MEETING STATEMENT:

Ms. Knight: To reduce the likelihood of the spread of COVID-19 and to comply with social distancing recommendations, this meeting of the Leawood Planning Commission is being conducted using the Zoom media format, with some of the commissioners appearing remotely. The meeting is being livestreamed on YouTube and the public can access the livestream by going to www.leawood.org for the live link. The public is strongly encouraged to access this meeting electronically; however, if you wish to comment on a public hearing item, please contact the Community Development Department to make arrangements.

Public comments will only be accepted during the public hearing portion of each agenda item where a public hearing is required. The City encourages the public to submit comments in writing prior to the public hearing by emailing comments to planning@leawood.org. Written public comments received at least 24 hours prior to the meeting will be distributed to members of the Planning Commission. Individuals who contacted the Planning Department in advance to provide public comments will be called upon by name.

Electronic copies of tonight's agenda are available on the City's website at www.Leawood.org under Government / Planning Commission / Agendas & Minutes. Because this meeting is being live-streamed, all parties must state their name and title each time they speak. This will ensure an accurate record and make it clear for those listening only. This applies to all commissioners, staff, applicants and members of the public who may speak. All motions must be stated clearly. After each motion is made and seconded, a roll call vote will be taken. The Chair or staff will announce whether the motion carried and the count of the vote. Reminder, please mute all microphones when you are not speaking. Thank you.

CONSENT AGENDA:

CASE 16-20 – HOMESTEAD OF LEAWOOD – Request for approval for a Revised Landscape Plan, located south of 127th Street and west of State Line Road.

CASE 17-20 – WELCREEK ESTATES SECOND PLAT – Request for approval of a Revised Final Plat, located north of 141st Street and west of Canterbury Street.

CASE 43-20 – CAMELOT COURT REVISED SIGN CRITERIA– Request for approval of a Revised Sign Plan, located north of 119th Street and east of Roe Avenue

A motion to approve the Consent Agenda was made by Peterson; seconded by Block. Motion carried with a unanimous roll-call vote of 7-0. For: McGurren, Hunter, Hoyt, Peterson, Coleman, Block, and Stevens.

NEW BUSINESS:

CASE 76-19 – RANCH MART REVISED SIGN CRITERIA – Request for approval of a Revised Sign Plan, located north of 95th Street and east of Mission Road.

Staff Presentation:

City Planner Ricky Sanchez made the following presentation:

Mr. Sanchez: This is Case 76-19 – Ranch Mart – Revised Sign Criteria – Request for approval of a Revised Sign Plan, located north of 95th Street and east of Mission Road. This particular case was recommended for approval by the Planning Commission in August, 2019. Since the approval of the Sign Criteria, the development came back with changes to the facades of the main center with material changes, and tenant changes. Since the Sign Criteria is closely related to the tenant facades, this application was put on hold by city staff until Ranch Mart Revised Final Plan was resolved and gained approval by the Governing Body. The application in front of you has been updated to show the new tenant facades and also includes a section regarding digital menu boards and preorder menu boards, keeping in line with the update to the Leawood Development Ordinance (LDO). Since major changes occurred since the previous approval by the Planning Commission, the case needed to return to request approval with the changes. The application meets all requirements per the LDO, and staff recommends approval of Case 76-19 with the stipulations listed in the Staff Report. I'd be happy to answer questions.

Chairman Elkins: Do any commissioners have questions for Mr. Sanchez? Seeing none, I would invite the applicant to speak.

Applicant Presentation:

Chris Haefner, Davidson Architecture and Engineering, 4301 Indian Creek Parkway, Overland Park, KS, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Mr. Haefner: I have no presentation, just a quick update. Based on the approvals of the Revised Final Plan, all permit documents have been submitted to the city for the Site Plan for the Mixed-Use building and for the façade renovation. Streetlighting plans have been approved. Johnson County Wastewater main extensions are nearly done and approved. Johnson County Water One is also done with their review. You might notice the building on the northeast corner of the property has been demolished as part of the initial phase. Work will begin soon to bring the pad up. This sign package was closely coordinated with staff. With the addition of the McDonald's digital screen, our sign package follows the LDO very closely and provides specific opportunities for our clients and tenants within the center to provide signage for their buildings. We're in agreement with the stipulations, and we'll provide staff with a cut sheet of the ground-mounted lighting.

Chairman Elkins: Thank you. If there are no questions, I would ask for any comments. If there are none, I would entertain a motion.

A motion to recommend approval of CASE 76-19 – RANCH MART REVISED SIGN CRITERIA – Request for approval of a Revised Sign Plan, located north of 95th Street and east of Mission Road – was made by Coleman; seconded by McGurren. Motion carried with a unanimous roll-call vote of 7-0. For: McGurren, Hunter, Hoyt, Peterson, Coleman, Block, and Stevens.

CASE 01-20 – CORNERSTONE OF LEAWOOD – ONSPRING HEADQUARTERS – Request for approval of a Preliminary Plan and Final Plan, located north of 137th Street and east of Nall Avenue. **PUBLIC HEARING**

Staff Presentation:

City Planner Ricky Sanchez made the following presentation:

Mr. Sanchez: This is Case 01-20 – Cornerstone of Leawood – Onspring Headquarters – request for approval of a Preliminary Plan and Final Plan, located north of 137th Street and east of Nall Avenue. The proposed project is in the southwest corner of the Cornerstone development and will consist of two phases. The first phase will include the northern building at 24,000 square feet, the parking area, and the landscaping. The second phase will just include the second building to the south, which will also be 24,000 square feet. The Final Plan application for this project just includes the first phase of the project. A plaza area is proposed to be located between the two buildings, totaling a square footage slightly over 12,000 square feet. The original development was first constructed with a maximum parking allowance of five spaces per 1,000 square feet of building space with a total allowable parking number of 1,857 spaces. With the proposed project, a total of 1,665 spaces will be provided. This number includes the parking that has yet to be constructed within the development. This project was heard before the Board of Zoning appeals on February 26th of this year and has gained a variance with regard to a design standard in the LDO that staff refers to as the 60/40 Rule, where frontage along a public right-of-way must either be a building or landscaping for at least 60% of the frontage at a depth of 90 feet. This application was granted a variance for the portion of the site that fronts 137th Street. Staff also wanted to comment on the building materials. As it stands, the proposed application does not meet the LDO, as the majority of the exterior materials are not listed as approved materials. City staff has an LDO amendment that will go forward to Governing Body in a short period of time that would allow for these materials in the proposed application. The application will meet the requirements of the LDO at the time of Governing Body review. Staff recommends approval of Case 01-20 with the stipulations listed in the Staff Report. I'm happy to answer questions.

Chairman Elkins: Thank you. Are there questions for Mr. Sanchez?

Comm. Coleman: Can you go over the building materials? We passed something that is on City Council's docket right now.

Mr. Sanchez: As you may remember, we brought forward a change to the materials list within the LDO 3-4 months ago. Since it has been heard by the Planning Commission, we have added a few more materials to that list. Some of the materials the applicant is requesting will be approved once that item is approved by Governing Body. The Covid-19 issue caused delays, but the case will be heard soon.

Comm. Coleman: To confirm, City Council is going to take it up to approve materials, and then by the time we get to it, it will be in a subsequent meeting once we approve this application.

Mr. Sanchez: That is correct. The materials have to be approved by Governing Body prior to this case being heard by Governing Body.

Comm. Block: Do you know the timing of the second building, by chance?

Mr. Sanchez: I do not. That might be a better question for the applicant.

Chairman Elkins: If I understood correctly, the Planning Commission reviewed and recommended for approval an amendment related to building materials, but I thought I heard you say that staff has added additional building materials to that recommended change. Will those building materials come back to the Planning Commission for recommendation?

Mr. Sanchez: We will be taking it directly forward to Governing Body. The changes that were made have to do with the cast stone requirements. Staff conducted research and interviews with these cast stone and manufactured stone makers. Staff added more requirements for manufactured stone into the LDO.

Chairman Elkins: Can you share those requirements?

Mr. Sanchez: It had to do with meeting certain requirements for different manufactured stone businesses in order to stand up to the quality that a real stone would. Staff was hoping to increase the quality expectations, including water intake level and stone strength.

Chairman Elkins: Are they all technical specifications?

Mr. Sanchez: Yes.

Chairman Elkins: Is the recommendation from staff this evening that we recommend this project for approval, subject to ultimate approval to the change in allowed materials?

Mr. Sanchez: That is correct. We have talked extensively with the applicant, and has been made clear that the materials list must be approved prior to this case being approved by Governing Body.

Chairman Elkins: Is that set forth as one of the 25 stipulations?

Mr. Sanchez: It is listed in No. 8.

Chairman Elkins: Are there other questions for Mr. Sanchez? If not, I would invite the applicant to speak.

Applicant Presentation:

Kelsey Sundet, Project Architect, BRR Architecture, 8131 Metcalf Avenue, Overland Park, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Ms. Sundet: I'll share my screen. We are seeking approval for the Preliminary Plan for the entire project and Final Plan approval for Phase 1. Staff is allowing us to concurrently apply for both because of the delays caused by the Covid-19 issues. We appreciate that flexibility. Our client is Onspring, which was founded in 2010. They offer cloud-based software services to businesses and industries of all sizes to help automate their audit risk compliance IT service management functions. They also provide training and implementation services in local areas. They have about 40 employees. Since its conception in 2010, Onspring has grown exponentially by at least 50% each year. They also anticipate continued exponential growth. Onspring is currently located in Overland Park as part of the Corporate Woods campus. Approximately 80% of their staff at their company live in Johnson County, and they're excited to be moving over to Leawood with the potential approval of this project. Onspring's culture is based not only on their clients, but their employees as well. The health of both is what makes them successful. They contribute a lot to the community. They participate with Harvesters, Christmas in October, Lead to Read, Don Bosco, and No Kid Hungry. Their staff are excited about coming to Leawood, and they look forward to getting involved in the local Leawood community.

Nall Avenue is along the west side of the development; 135th Street is along the north side, and 137th Street is at the south end of the project site. Church of the Resurrection is a neighbor to the southwest. Across Nall to the west in Overland Park is Prairie Fire. The project is a part of the Cornerstone of Leawood development. As Mr. Sanchez stated, this is a two-building project. The first building on the north would be a part of Phase 1, and the other building will be part of Phase 2. Building 1 will include all of the parking, the landscaping, and most of the plaza. The second building will include the plaza that surrounds the second building and the construction of the second building. To answer the commissioner's question, the second building will currently go right after the first building, but we are designing it separately to ensure we can accommodate Onspring staffing needs when we move into the design of the second building. Olsson is the civil engineer, and they have worked closely with staff to develop the plans. We applied for a variance, which was approved in February. That affected the area along 137th Street. The parking and entries along the east side enter along Birch Street on the

east. Olsson has worked with city staff to provide a Landscape Plan that meets Leawood requirements for shade trees, ornamental tree spacing, plants, and shrubs to screen the property.

(Shows various views of the project). We have worked with staff with regard to acceptable materials, but the discussion of those has been delayed with Covid-19. We would like to proceed with the materials with the anticipation that they will be reviewed in the coming months. We would welcome questions. Thank you.

Chairman Elkins: Questions for Ms. Sundet?

Comm. Hoyt: I appreciate that you began your presentation by discussing your client as a community citizen.

Ms. Sundet: Thank you. They're very excited to join your community. We're happy to be a part of the local project.

Chairman Elkins: What are the materials on the columns and the decking?

Ms. Sundet: The wood-look material is the Stonewood architectural panel and is made to look like light wood. The construction of the building includes heavy timber on the inside of the building, and this wood-look siding is meant to mimic that wood.

Chairman Elkins: Is the siding manufactured stone?

Ms. Sundet: The Stonewood is composite material meant to look like wood.

Chairman Elkins: Do I see correctly that there are second-story aspects to the building?

Ms. Sundet: Yes, there is a patio.

Chairman Elkins: Do you have any objection to the 25 stipulations?

Ms. Sundet: We don't.

Chairman Elkins: Thank you for a very good presentation. We're excited about the prospect of your client joining the community. This case calls for a Public Hearing. This will be a new experience with the virtual aspect.

Public Hearing

Mr. Sanchez: Staff received no communication from the public regarding this case. We had the applicant provide a letter stating they did not receive any communication from the public regarding this project.

Chairman Elkins: I take it we have not received anything from the public during the presentation tonight?

Mr. Sanchez: Not to my knowledge.

Chairman Elkins: With that, I would entertain a motion to close the Public Hearing.

A motion to close the Public Hearing was made by Hoyt; seconded by Peterson. Motion carried with a unanimous roll-call vote of 7-0. For: McGurren, Hunter, Hoyt, Peterson, Coleman, Block, and Stevens.

Chairman Elkins: That moves us to discussion of Case 01-20. Are there comments?

Comm. Coleman: I'd like to go back to the building materials again. When we recommend approval of a case before it goes to Governing Body, does staff sometimes change things behind the scenes, such as in this case with the materials? I don't recall that happening before.

Mr. Sanchez: For the majority of the time, the details remain the same. We added knowledge to our repertoire, and we wanted to find the best way for developers to use the materials. We were then able to add new materials that the development community would like and that the city would like to see with the new standards.

Comm. Coleman: Thank you. I'm very happy to see Offspring come to Leawood; it will be a welcome addition to that area of the city.

Chairman Elkins: Are the changes on the proposed additional materials approved by the LDO are to materials or specifications?

Mr. Sanchez: I'll have to go back to see what was approved versus what we added. I believe the only change to the materials list was the different requirements that we would allow manufactured stone.

Chairman Elkins: Thank you. If there are no other comments, I would entertain a motion.

A motion to recommend approval of CASE 01-20 – CORNERSTONE OF LEAWOOD – ONSPRING HEADQUARTERS – Request for approval of a Preliminary Plan and Final Plan, located north of 137th Street and east of Nall Avenue, subject to approval of additional materials – was made by Coleman; seconded by Coleman; seconded by McGurren. Motion carried with a unanimous roll-call vote of 7-0. For: McGurren, Hunter, Hoyt, Peterson, Coleman, Block, and Stevens.

CASE 10-20 – BI-STATE/CENTENNIAL PARK - ADVANCED HORMONE THERAPY & AESTHETICS – MEDICAL SPA – Request for approval of a Preliminary Plan and Final Plan, located south of 143rd Street and east of Kenneth Road. PUBLIC HEARING

Staff Presentation:

City Planner Ricky Sanchez made the following presentation:

Mr. Sanchez: Staff would like to make one change to the stipulations listed in the Staff Report. No. 12 states that crosswalks shall match the crosswalks used in Cornerstone; it should be Bi-State/Centennial Park. This is Case 10-20 – Bi-State/Centennial Park – Advanced Hormone Therapy and Aesthetics – Medical Spa – Request for approval of a Preliminary and Final Plan. The project is at the southeast corner of 143rd and Kenneth Road. The applicant is proposing a 3,680 sq. ft. medical spa with a total building height of 22 feet, 1 inch, and will be oriented so the front door of the building will face the intersection of 143rd and Kenneth Road with the main entrance into the site off Overbrook Road. The materials proposed with this application meet the requirements of the LDO and are meant to keep the cohesive look of the Bi-State/Centennial Park development. There is a 60’ gas line easement on the west side of the property. The applicant has provided a copious amount of landscaping along all four sides of the property. To the south is the City of Leawood Maintenance Facility. Staff recommends approval of Case 10-20, and I’m happy to answer any questions.

Chairman Elkins: Thank you. Questions for staff?

Comm. Block: On Page 5, staff comments on the cross-access easement related to the parking. With only twelve spots, if someone wants to park in the city’s facility and it takes up half the spots, it seems clumsy with how it will be enforced.

Mr. Sanchez: We carried this over from other developments that have been within the Bi-State/Centennial Park development. With regard to parking, this is a very low vehicle-generating use. We don’t see that much shared parking will occur.

Comm. McGurren: If I remember correctly, the two plots directly to the east of this development is where the future Parks and Recreation facility will be built. Is that still accurate?

Mr. Sanchez: That is correct. The two lots to the east of this are owned by the City of Leawood.

Comm. McGurren: Does this development under consideration tonight have any impact whatsoever on the future plans for the Parks and Recreation facility?

Mr. Sanchez: Staff does not believe so. We let the applicant know that the Parks Department may move across the street, and the Parks Department knows this project is going on.

Chairman Elkins: Thank you. With that I would invite the applicant to speak.

Applicant Presentation:

Ben Moore, 513 Leavenworth, Manhattan, KS, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Mr. Moore: *(Shared his screen with a presentation)* We feel this is a great fit for the community and the neighborhood. We have appreciated working with staff. The plan shows the landscaping on all four sides. The paving encourages foot and bicycle traffic coming into the site. We've tried to create landscaping that shields the parking. We have diagrammed traffic flows and fire truck access. The landscaping meets the LDO, and we feel it will be a very attractive site when the project is complete. The exterior renderings show that we have taken lots of care to develop a nice project that represents quality and will fit well in Leawood. I'm here with the owner, so if there are operational questions, we'd be happy to answer them at this time.

Chairman Elkins: Thank you. Are there questions for Mr. Moore or his client?

Comm. Hoyt: Is the applicant okay with the 27 stipulations?

Mr. Moore: We are okay with the stipulations.

Chairman Elkins: Thank you. This case requires a Public Hearing. Mr. Sanchez, are there comments or questions from the public?

Public Hearing

Mr. Sanchez: We have not received anything from the public regarding this project. Planning Commissioners should also have a letter from the developer, stating they did not receive comments, either.

A motion to close the Public Hearing was made by Hoyt; seconded by Peterson. Motion carried with a unanimous roll-call vote of 7-0. For: McGurren, Hunter, Hoyt, Peterson, Coleman, Block, and Stevens.

Chairman Elkins: I would add my welcome to your client. The proposed building appears to be very much in character with the other development that has occurred in this park. That takes us to comments about the application.

Mr. Sanchez: Staff would like to make one more edit to the stipulations. No. 1 also references the Cornerstone development, and staff would also like to strike the wording for the Cornerstone development.

Chairman Elkins: Mr. Moore, I presume you don't have any objections to that change.

Mr. Moore: We do not.

A motion to recommend approval of CASE 10-20 – BI-STATE/CENTENNIAL PARK - ADVANCED HORMONE THERAPY & AESTHETICS – MEDICAL SPA

– Request for approval of a Preliminary Plan and Final Plan, located south of 143rd Street and east of Kenneth Road, including editorial changes to stipulations made by staff – was made by Hoyt; seconded by McGurren. Motion carried with a unanimous roll-call vote of 7-0. For: McGurren, Hunter, Hoyt, Peterson, Coleman, Block, and Stevens.

Case 22-20 – PARKWAY PLAZA – WEBER CARPET – Request for approval of a Preliminary Plan, located north of 135th Street and east of Briar Street. **PUBLIC HEARING**

Comm. Hunter: I am going to recuse myself from this discussion and the vote.

Staff Presentation:

Assistant Director Mark Klein made the following presentation:

Mr. Klein: This is Case 22-20 – Parkway Plaza – Weber Carpet – Request for approval of a Preliminary Plan. This involves the construction of a 12,000 sq. ft. building on the north side of 135th Street. There is currently an existing one-story retail building to the east; to the west is a vacant piece of property. On the north side of the building site itself is a cross-access parking lot. The portion located on this site has 36 spaces, five of which are parallel parking spaces. The building will have a front porch feature, which is required by the Parkway Plaza Design Guidelines. The main entrance will face the north; the rear will be to the south. The applicant has provided connection to the public sidewalk along 135th Street as required by the LDO as well as completion of some of the design elements of Parkway Plaza. There are circular sidewalk features on the southwest and southeast corners of the project. Sidewalks also extend on either side of the east and west that will lead to the entrance of the building. The applicant has also provided street trees at a rate of 1/40 linear feet per the LDO as well as a variety of ornamental trees and bushes along the north, south, and east sides of the building. They are also providing trees in the islands. This is a Preliminary Plan, so the elevations and landscaping are not technically approved at this time. Staff has a bit of concern with regard to the building elevations. Currently, the applicant is showing two windows on either side of the main entrance on the north side of the building and three on the south side. They show two projections on the south side and one each on the east and west. There is a stucco infill area within each of the extensions to make it look like mullions of a window. Staff is recommending more windows on all the elevations at the time of Final Plan. Staff is recommending approval of this application, and I'll be happy to answer any questions.

Chairman Elkins: Is the building going into the slot at 134th and Briar, or is it farther south?

Mr. Klein: It is a bit farther south, directly along 135th Street. I wanted to make a correction in the Staff Report on Stipulation No. 2C. It talks about the impact fee of \$1.95, but it should actually be \$1.95/square foot.

Comm. Coleman: For orientation purposes, what is the building directly east of the proposed development?

Mr. Klein: It is a multi-tenant building with a variety of businesses.

Comm. Coleman: Do you know off the top of your head what's in there now?

Mr. Klein: I don't know for sure. It could be a vision place. Hunter Vision used to be there, and I think they moved.

Chairman Elkins: Wasn't Swim Quick in there at one time and Mazzaresse Jewelers?

Mr. Klein: Yes.

Comm. Block: Mark, I think you mentioned that the design characteristics are similar in some ways with the porch and drive. Do the colors and other elements need to match or be similar to the other buildings in the development?

Mr. Klein: Yes, the Parkway Plaza development has approved design guidelines. The materials they are proposing are the approved ones for the development. They've also included features such as the front porch and projections of the building. We would like to see more windows because it could start to look more closed off and like a warehouse. The stipulation also calls for a cast-stone base on the building.

Comm. Hoyt: This may be more of a question for the applicant, but did you have conversation back and forth with the applicant regarding the windows and the cast stone?

Mr. Klein: We had a discussion. The building only had two windows on either side of the north elevation, and it didn't have any on the south, east, or west sides. They put in joint patterns to give the impression of a window. We expressed concerns, and the applicant provided three windows on the back and one additional on the front.

Comm. Hoyt: But you're still looking for more windows?

Mr. Klein: Yes, staff would like to see more windows. This is a Preliminary Plan, so it is possible to look at that before Final Plan. The floor plans show it as a wide-open area, so it is possible. Part of the concern is if Weber Carpet chose to move to another location, the lack of windows could complicate the issue for a future tenant.

Comm. McGurren: I haven't been in a carpet store for some time, but I would assume that this is truly a showroom and not a warehouse of any sort....

Mr. Klein: It is my understanding that it is an open floor plan. They have a storage room on the east side of the building where the trash enclosure is, so there might be a bit of a challenge on that side. Staff still thinks there is opportunity to get those windows in.

Chairman Elkins: With that, we would welcome the applicant.

Applicant Presentation:

Matt Sligh, Engineering Solutions, 50 Southeast 30th Street, Lee's Summit, MO, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Mr. Sligh: We can go through the building elevation comments. It seems like that's what everyone is asking about. Of the 25 stipulations, the owner is fine with all of them, but we would ask that Stipulation No. 4, referring to the number of windows and cast stone, is reduced in form to simply state that the staff, development group, and owner will continue to work to make something that will be satisfactory. We're a little concerned about putting specifics on the number of windows or increasing the number of windows and the cast stone. That may limit our discussion. That would be our only comment on stipulations. We're willing to work with staff, but as was stated, this is a showroom for a carpet/flooring store, so many of those displays are taller display areas. They will be placed in front of windows, so that would potentially block that area. We're willing to work with staff completely; we just hoped for that stipulation to get reduced to say we would continue to work with staff.

The reason we're here is the plan was originally approved with an 8,700 sq. ft. building to fit on the site, and essentially, we're increasing to a 12,000 sq. ft. building for this specific use. With that, we appreciate the efforts staff has made to get us to this point. We would just as that the stipulation be reduced to state that we will continue to work with it and will come back with something that complies with staff's requests.

Chairman Elkins: Thank you. Are there questions for the applicant?

Comm. Hoyt: Stipulation No. 4 discusses additional windows and a cast-stone base. Is the base something that is agreeable?

Mr. Sligh: I don't think the client has any objection to any of the elements at this time; it's just that the building elevation isn't getting approved today, so we've worked our way through it to some degree, but the owner wants to have the opportunity to work through it with staff as the building elements continue to develop. Our concern is that we're not being asked to approve an elevation at this time, but we're asked to include specific elements. We'll continue to work with staff.

Comm. Hoyt: So, it might be acceptable to change No. 4 to read something along the lines of, "The applicant and the staff will work together such that concerns about additional windows and cast-stone base will be addressed by the time of Final Plan."

Mr. Sligh: I think so. I had just written, "Prior to submission of Final Plan, the applicant shall work with Planning Staff to address the concerns regarding the exterior elevations." If we need to add specifics about windows and stone, I'm fine with that, too. We definitely want to be partners in this thing and figure out how to make sense of it.

Chairman Elkins: Thank you. I believe this case calls for a Public Hearing as well. Mr. Klein, I would be curious to hear staff's perspective on the proposed revision to Stipulation No. 4.

Mr. Klein: The applicant has been willing to work with us, and we're happy to continue to work together. Some of these are actually part of the Design Guidelines. The cast-stone base is used throughout the entire development. We would like to see more windows. My only concern is we don't want to get into a situation where other architectural features will substitute for the windows. I think we'd be fine working with them and not providing specifics.

Chairman Elkins: Did Mr. Slish's language feel comfortable to you?

Mr. Klein: Maybe if we could add, "the potential to add additional windows and keep the cast-stone" in the stipulation. It didn't seem like the cast-stone base was as objectionable, and it is used throughout the entire development. While there is still time to work on it, the windows and cast-stone base are elements we would be looking for.

Chairman Elkins: Thank you. With that, I'll open the Public Hearing.

Public Hearing

Mr. Klein: We've not received comments. There was an Interact Meeting prior to the Covid-19, but they had nobody in attendance. They have not received anything since then.

A motion to close the Public Hearing was made by Block; seconded by Peterson. Motion carried with a unanimous roll-call vote of 6-0. For: McGurren, Hoyt, Peterson, Coleman, Block, and Stevens.

Chairman Elkins: That takes us to a discussion. There's still a bit of an issue with respect to No. 4. Do any of the commissioners have comments?

Comm. Hoyt: I think it merits some change, and I would suggest that we include the specific stipulation about the cast-stone base similar in scale to other buildings within Parkway Plaza but work toward language that is a bit less specific when it comes to the windows.

Chairman Elkins: I think you had language in your question to the applicant. Do you remember what you had?

Comm. Hoyt: I'll take a rough stab: "Before the submission of a Final Plan, staff and the applicant will work together to revise building elevations to address staff's concerns for additional windows and to include a cast-stone base similar in scale to other buildings within the Parkway Plaza development, such as the Reece Nichols building."

Chairman Elkins: That sounds good to me. Mr. Slish, do you have any objections to that language? We haven't formally proposed it, but I want your thoughts.

Mr. Slish: We're fine with that. We appreciate the opportunity to work with staff and continue to figure out a building that everyone is happy with.

Chairman Elkins: Are there any comments with respect to the proposed language? If not, I would entertain a motion.

A motion to recommend approval of Case 22-20 – PARKWAY PLAZA – WEBER CARPET – Request for approval of a Preliminary Plan, located north of 135th Street and east of Briar Street – with 27 stipulations and revisions to No. 4 to read, “Before submission of the Final Plan, staff and applicant will work together to revise building elevations to address staff’s concerns for additional windows and to include a cast-stone base similar in scale to other buildings within the Parkway Plaza development, such as the Reece Nichols building” – was made by Hoyt; seconded by Peterson.

A friendly amendment to Stipulation No. 2C to add the words, “square feet” after \$1.95” was made by Coleman.

Motion carried with a unanimous roll-call vote of 6-0. For: McGurren, Hoyt, Peterson, Coleman, Block, and Stevens

CASE 33-20 – 103RD STREET AND STATE LINE ROAD – D1 TRAINING FACILITY – Request for approval for a Final Plan, located south of 103rd Street and west of State Line Road.

Staff Presentation:

Assistant Director Mark Klein made the following presentation:

Mr. Klein: This is Case 33-20 – 103rd Street and State Line Road – D1 Training Facility – Request for approval for a Final Plan. This particular application is for the reuse of an existing building, formerly US Toy at 103rd and State Line Road. The applicant is proposing to make some modifications to the site as far as landscaping and restriping the parking lot to meet requirements. They will not modify the exterior of the building. The applicant is proposing to add additional landscaping primarily at the southeast corner of the building and also landscaping to screen utilities on the north and west sides of the building. There are limitations with what can be done with the site. The entire site is located in a floodplain, and the floodway is located along the southwest corner of the building. The applicant looked at the parking and does not plan on changing anything other than making them the legal dimensions. They provided a parking study, and the maximum number of spaces is 52. Staff is comfortable with that. Staff is recommending approval of this application, and I'll be happy to answer questions.

Chairman Elkins: Thank you. Questions for Mr. Klein?

Comm. Block: I noticed a housekeeping issue. On Page 3, there is a reference to Weber Carpet in the Bulk Regulations.

Mr. Klein: I've changed that for the next one, but I saw that. Thank you.

Comm. Block: I haven't seen this building in a while. Is it necessary to paint the outside? I know there were areas that needed attention with the steps and some other areas.

Mr. Klein: US Toy applied to have the building painted a couple years ago, which is probably why they aren't proposing it at this time.

Comm. McGurren: When property changes hands and someone else becomes the owner and applicant and it sits in a floodplain, is flood insurance automatic?

Mr. Klein: I believe they would be required to get flood insurance since the building sits in the floodplain. There are limitations on the number of improvements they can make without triggering other requirements. If they improve more than 50%, they would have to floodproof the building. The applicant plans on upgrading to meet ADA requirements.

Chairman Elkins: Thank you. I would invite the applicant to speak.

Applicant Presentation:

Kathleen Warman, Warman Architects, 1735 Swift, North Kansas City, MO, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Ms. Warman: We appreciate your time tonight. We know there is some effort to get this meeting underway. We are happy with staff's recommendation of approval. They have been great to work with. As Mr. Klein mentioned, this is an extremely challenging site and a challenging building, but we are in agreement with the stipulations and are here to answer any questions the commission may have.

Chairman Elkins: Thank you. Questions for the applicant?

Comm. Coleman: I notice that the original building was designed for indoor tennis courts, which makes sense. In terms of your client's business, what type of athletic training is going to be going on?

Ms. Warman: There's going to be a variety of different types of training. The main point is that the building will not be used for any type of spectator events. It will be weight, strength, agility training as well as volleyball, basketball, tennis, and baseball with batting and pitching cages.

Comm. Hoyt: It is great to see the creative repurposing of the space.

Ms. Warman: Creative is the key word; it's challenging.

Comm. Hunter: I agree that it is great to see that building being repurposed.

Chairman Elkins: Thank you. That takes us to a discussion. Are there any comments? I would agree that it is really good to see that space finding a good, solid use.

Comm. Coleman: I'd like to echo the comments. When US Toy moved to Overland Park, I wondered what in the world the building would be used for. I'm very happy the building is going back to its roots, per se. I wish them all the best.

Chairman Elkins: Are there any other comments? If not, I would entertain a motion.

A motion to recommend approval of CASE 33-20 – 103RD STREET AND STATE LINE ROAD – D1 TRAINING FACILITY – Request for approval for a Final Plan, located south of 103rd Street and west of State Line Road – with 16 stipulations - was made by Hoyt; seconded by Block. Motion carried with a unanimous roll-call vote of 7-0. For: McGurren, Hunter, Hoyt, Peterson, Coleman, Block, and Stevens.

Chairman Elkins: That brings us to the close of our business. I want to take a moment to thank staff, in particular, for their hard work to make this publicly available. Thank you to the commission as well and to the applicants, who participated willingly under these different circumstances.

MEETING ADJOURNED