

**City of Leawood
Planning Commission Meeting
October 27, 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, Coleman, Block, Stevens, Hunter, Belzer, Hoyt, Elkins - Absent: Peterson

MEETING STATEMENT:

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 pcpubliccomments@leawood.org. Written public comments received at least 24 hours prior to the meeting will be distributed to members of the Planning Commission. Those wishing to appear remotely using the Zoom format media, should register at pcpubliccoments@leawood.org on or before Friday, October 23rd at 5:00 pm 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.

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

A motion to suspend certain rules of the Planning Commission due to the pandemic was made by Coleman; seconded by Block. Motion carried with a unanimous roll-call vote of 7-0. For: McGurren, Coleman, Block, Stevens, Hunter, Belzer, Hoyt.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Chairman Elkins: A revised agenda was placed on the dais. Does staff have any other modifications?

Ms. Geist: We do not. We want to bring to your attention that Case 89-20 – State Line MX-D has been continued to a separate December 8th meeting.

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Approval of minutes from the October 13, 2020 Planning Commission meeting.

Chairman Elkins: Are there revisions or corrections?

A motion to approve the minutes from the October 13, 2020 Planning Commission meeting was made by Coleman; seconded by Block. Motion carried with a unanimous roll-call vote of 7-0. For: McGurren, Coleman, Block, Stevens, Hunter, Belzer, Hoyt.

CONTINUED TO THE NOVEMBER 24, 2020 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING: CASE 49-20 – CAMERON’S COURT – Request for approval of a Rezoning from AG (Agricultural) and SD-O (Planned Office) to RP-2 (Planned Cluster Residential Detached) and MXD (Mixed Use District), Preliminary Plan, and Preliminary Plat, located south of 133rd Street and west of State Line Road. **PUBLIC HEARING**

CASE 69-20 – HILLS OF LEAWOOD VILLAS – Request for approval of a Final Plat and Final Plan, located north of 151st Street and east of Mission Road.

CONTINUED TO THE DECEMBER 8, 2020 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING:

CASE 89-20 STATE LINE MXD – Request for approval of a Rezoning from SD-O (Planned Office) and R-1 (Planned Single Family Low Density (15,000 sq. ft. per dwelling)) to MXD (Mixed Use Development District), and Preliminary Plan, located south of W. 86th Terrace and west of State Line Road. **PUBLIC HEARING**

NEW BUSINESS:

CASE 87-20 – COCHERL ESTATES — Request for approval of a Rezoning from AG (Agricultural) to R-1 (Planned Single Family Low Density Residential (15,000 sq. ft. per

dwelling)), Preliminary Plat, Preliminary Plan, Final Plat, and Final Plan – located south of 141st Street and east of Canterbury Street. **PUBLIC HEARING**

Staff Presentation:

City Planner Katherine Geist made the following presentation:

Ms. Geist: This is Case 87-20 – Cocherl Estates – Request for approval of a Rezoning, Preliminary Plan, Preliminary Plat, Final Plan, and Final Plat. The project encompasses a total of 16.7 acres. Currently, there are five lots with the project. There are two lots that face Canterbury Street that are platted within the Charlemagne Manor subdivision and are both currently zoned R-1. In the Final Plat, the lot lines of these two parcels have shifted a small amount. The east line of the corner lot will shift west approximately 35 feet, as noted in your packet, and the northern property line of the southern parcel will shift farther north, approximately 27 feet. As a matter of housekeeping, it was noted that the lot line that was to shift north, increasing the size of Lot 2, Charlemagne Manor, was going to encroach onto the northern property's driveway. An easement access agreement was put together and is noted on the Final Plat. This will allow the residents of the property at the corner of Canterbury and 141st Street to be able to legally use the entirety of their driveway without issue. As for the three lots to the east, the largest is Lot 3 of Osage Downs, which has a home on it as well and is currently zoned R-1. The two lots to the north of Lot 3 are currently both zoned AG and are both un-platted. All of these parcels are to be zoned R-1 (Planned Single Family Low Density Residential) and will all be platted. The Final Plat shows the consolidation of these three easterly lots into one large lot, which will be approximately 13.3 acres when combined. The lots will then be renumbered into Lots 1-3 of the newly formed Cocherl Estates subdivision. This application meets all requirements of the Leawood Development Ordinance (LDO), and staff recommends approval of Case 87-20 with the stipulations listed. I would be happy to answer any questions.

Chairman Elkins: Thank you. Questions?

Comm. Coleman: This may be more for the applicant, but it would seem to me that it would be easier to put the un-platted areas into Lot 3. Do you know the story behind changing the lot lines – removing Lot 1 north and the property line?

Ms. Geist: I am not completely sure about that. I'm fairly certain the land surveyor or Mr. Peterson could answer that.

Comm. Coleman: I'll ask him. During the Interact Meeting, it was stated by the applicant that the rezoning and platting is being done at the suggestion of the city. Is that correct?

Ms. Geist: That is what we were told. This would have been a bit before my time. From what we've been told by Mr. Cocherl, it is to consolidate all the property he has and make it easier to potentially pass on to his family down the road.

Comm. Coleman: Is that recent, or does it go back a ways?

Ms. Geist: I believe it goes back a while.

Comm. Block: Does Mr. Cocherl own all three parcels?

Ms. Geist: He owns five of the lots.

Comm. Stevens: Maybe this is just procedural, but I was a little puzzled with all of the elements being part of the application. It's clear there's a request for Rezoning, Preliminary Plat, and Final Plat, but the Preliminary and Final Plans are not included, even though it is stated as being part of the submission and approval. I take it maybe you have to go through a Preliminary Plan submission, and a Final Plan submission is because of the Rezoning and maybe the lot configuration change. Is that correct?

Mr. Klein: Basically, the LDO requires a Preliminary Plan with a Rezoning. This would also be a Final Plan as well. We're doing this to keep in compliance with the LDO. The plan itself is the plat. They aren't really proposing new buildings on the site. There are three houses that are on three lots. With regard to the Rezoning, we're trying to put a formal ordinance on the property that shows it as R-1.

Comm. Stevens: You're saying that a Preliminary Plan document that illustrates the current reconfiguration based on not having new development wouldn't need to be submitted.

Mr. Klein: That is correct. The plat shows the adjustment to the lot lines.

Chairman Elkins: Additional questions? I would invite the applicant's representative to step forward.

Applicant Presentation:

Curt Peterson, 900 W. 48th Place, Kansas City, MO, appeared via Zoom before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Mr. Peterson: I'm here tonight on behalf of the property owner, the Cocherl family. I wanted to say that the fundamentals were relayed to the Planning Commission by the Staff Report and presentation. We find the stipulations acceptable. If it's appropriate, I could answer the question about the un-platted land.

Chairman Elkins: Please proceed.

Mr. Peterson: The foundation is there, but to add context, the two smaller residential lots are Lots 1 and 2 on the new plat, which is how I'll refer to them. With respect to Lot 2 in the far northwest corner, the lot is going to be sold. That particular lot will have two things going on: moving the east property line to the west because of the well that we want to keep on Lot 3 and moving the southern property line to the north to accommodate Lot 1 spatially. Finally, the question was asked about the two un-platted tracts. The

Cocherl family sees Lot 3 as the overall big lot property and house. Rather than put some of that un-platted ground, which mostly runs to the north and along Lot 3 anyway, with Lot 2, they thought it made more sense to keep Lot 3 and not create an oversized Lot 2 or Lot 1. If you have more questions, I'd be happy to elaborate.

Comm. Coleman: Mr. Peterson, I find it difficult to think it would be easy to sell with the property line going through the driveway. I can't recall another property we've had in front of us where someone has moved the lot line right in the middle of someone's driveway.

Mr. Peterson: Honestly, maybe it's because I'm a real estate lawyer and we see everything related to real estate. It's not that unusual, especially here where it's just a slice of the driveway. Sometimes it's a shared-access easement with a shared piece of the driveway. Other times, it's like this, which you'd call kind of an encroachment. It's not unusual and runs with the land. It's a clear easement document.

Chairman Elkins: Thank you. Are there other questions? Mr. Peterson, did you have anything to add?

Mr. Peterson: I just wanted to accept the stipulations and be here for any questions.

Chairman Elkins: Additional questions for Mr. Peterson? Thank you. This case requires a Public Hearing. Is there anyone who wishes to be heard?

Public Hearing

Charles Snyder, 14122 Manor, Leawood, appeared via Zoom before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Mr. Snyder: I mostly just have questions. My property abuts some of the Cocherl Estate land. I've talked to some of the neighbors, whose property also abuts there. Obviously, we have concerns about development that abuts our back yards. I didn't fully understand the plan. It looks as if the part that abuts several property owners does not have a plan to develop it. I'm not sure I understand the plans. I just wondered what the plan was to determine if I had objections.

Chairman Elkins: Thank you. We'll give Mr. Peterson an opportunity to respond when we close the Public Hearing. Is there anyone else who wishes to speak?

As no one else was present to speak, a motion to close the Public Hearing was made by Coleman; seconded by Block. Motion carried with a unanimous roll-call vote of 7-0. For: McGurren, Coleman, Block, Stevens, Hunter, Belzer, Hoyt.

Chairman Elkins: Mr. Peterson, would you like to respond to Mr. Snyder's question?

Mr. Peterson: In short, Mr. Snyder's question as I heard it was about what the plan is. This is a little bit repetitive, but in short, it all started with the lot in the upper left-hand

corner, which will be Lot 2 at the hard corner of 141st and Canterbury. It started with wanting to slightly shift the lot lines for the reasons I said before. Once we did that, we thought it made sense to plat what wasn't platted, which was the northern part of what will be Lot 3, which led to the question about rezoning. All that came from just shifting some lot lines on the home that is to be sold. It sounds like there is a lot going on, and I understand why you would ask the question, but hopefully that allays your concerns about any sort of development.

Mr. Snyder: So, nothing changes with Lot 3, in other words?

Mr. Peterson: Nothing at all.

Mr. Snyder: That satisfies my question, and I have no objections. Thank you.

Chairman Elkins: And just as a clarification, if there was a desire at some point in the future to somehow develop Lot 3, you would be required to come back to the Planning Commission with a new plan.

Mr. Peterson: That is correct.

Chairman Elkins: That takes us to discussion.

Comm. Coleman: I'm just curious about how you can build a home on one lot and have the other lots un-platted. Is that common?

Ms. Geist: Not that I'm aware of. I'm unsure when that home was built. Currently, it is legal, nonconforming due to setbacks, so I'm assuming there was a change in the LDO. Hopefully, this will clear that all up.

Comm. Coleman: I noticed the rear setback was below the nonconforming, but obviously, everything was already built. I thought there was some kind of change in the LDO.

Ms. Geist: If anything were to change with the residence, it would need to comply with that setback.

Chairman Elkins: Other discussion or comments? Is there a motion?

A motion to recommend approval of CASE 87-20 – COCHERL ESTATES — Request for approval of a Rezoning from AG (Agricultural) to R-1 (Planned Single Family Low Density Residential (15,000 sq. ft. per dwelling)), Preliminary Plat, Preliminary Plan, Final Plat, and Final Plan – located south of 141st Street and east of Canterbury Street – was made by Coleman; seconded by Block. Motion carried with a unanimous roll-call vote of 7-0. For: McGurren, Coleman, Block, Stevens, Hunter, Belzer, Hoyt.

CASE 90-20 - PARKWAY PLAZA - LOT 10 - UMSTATTD MEDICAL OFFICE,
Request for approval of a Preliminary Plan and Final Plan, located north of 135th Street
and east of Briar. **PUBLIC HEARING**

Commissioner Hunter recused herself

Staff Presentation:

City Planner Grant Lang made the following presentation:

Mr. Lang: This is Case 90-20 – Umstattd Medical Office, Request for approval of a Preliminary Plan and Final Plan for an office building on Lot 10 of the Parkway Plaza development, zoned MX-D. The building will be constructed primarily of natural stone and stucco facades, including a tower and front porch element, adhering to the development’s Design Guidelines. The project will remove two existing parallel parking spaces, allowing for the construction of three head-in parking spaces. The application meets all requirements of the LDO. Staff recommends approval of Case 90-20 with the stipulations listed in the Staff Report. I’ll answer any questions.

Chairman Elkins: Are there questions?

Comm. Block: I think there might be a typo on Page 3. I don’t know if it would impact future cases, but it is 978 now, removing two spaces and putting in three, which would increase to 979. I don’t know that I understood Stipulation No. 3. Where would this shift the building to gain that 2.5 feet? It’s showing the buffer on the north side of the building as 7.6, and it needs to be 10. Can you help me understand where that is on this plan?

Mr. Lang: The north side of the building is going to be closest to the parking lot. That landscape buffer would need to be 10 feet.

Comm. Block: So, they have to make the building smaller or move the building?

Mr. Lang: I believe they would have to shift it south, depending on the 40’ buffer.

Comm. Block: How is that going to impact the setback on the south side? It seems like it’s going to make a lot of changes. It seems like it’s going to make a lot of changes potentially.

Mr. Lang: It could potentially change the setback a little bit; whereas, they still have to maintain 40 feet.

Comm. Block: They can shift the existing building with the current dimensions, or will the buildings have to shrink?

Mr. Lang: I think they had enough room in there to do so, but I could be wrong. It looks like the setback is 44.42, so there is enough to shift back a little bit.

Comm. Block: In Stipulation No. 27, they have to set up a funding mechanism. Wouldn't that already exist in the overall development? Do they have to set up their own?

Mr. Lang: Yes, that would exist in the current development, so it would just be maintaining that agreement with the property owners because they have their own share where all the property owners pay into a fund.

Comm. Coleman: Can you show me how the configuration close to the drive through is going to work? It's concerning with potential traffic flow incidents.

Mr. Lang: We have requested them to add additional stop signs at that location at the exit of the drive-through. They're only proposing three head-in parking spaces; it was initially six. They have a stop sign in front of the bank going north-south, one at the corner, exiting the drive aisle, and one east-west as they get to the head-in parking spaces.

Comm. Coleman: Are those three parking spaces in front of the building handicapped or regular spots?

Mr. Lang: I believe all three are ADA; at least two of them are.

Comm. Coleman: Are there currently stop signs coming out of the drive-through?

Mr. Lang: They would be installed with this application.

Comm. Coleman: Is there any direction on which way to turn?

Mr. Lang: It would just be the stop signs because both of the drive aisles are double traffic.

Comm. Coleman: My other question is about the east side of the building, where the Weber Carpet people said they would allow the sidewalk circle to be reconfigured to accommodate the building owner to the west if it doesn't impact the construction of their building. Is there currently a sidewalk between the buildings? Will the sidewalk be there after construction of the two buildings?

Mr. Lang: Currently, there is nothing. With both of the proposed applications, they go back to the Master Plan and share a sidewalk that is an oval element that will be cross access between the two buildings and 135th Street. The issue with the Weber Carpet building is they pushed more of it onto this property, so it had to shift back with the agreement.

Chairman Elkins: Other questions? We will call the applicant.

Applicant Presentation:

Martin Arling, Kaw Valley Engineering, 8040 North Oak Trafficway, Kansas City, MO, appeared via Zoom before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Mr. Arling: I wanted to talk about the stipulations. We are in agreement with all of them other than the stop signs. We need to have some further discussion on that because the way the lot is configured, there are only two stop signs by the applicant. I also have Dr. Laura Umstatt, owner, and the architects Brian Hamerick and Jeff Kloch with Hufft. The signs are currently on the owner's property on the island to the north and the bank exit. The proposed stop sign in front of the bank is beyond her control. The stipulation basically says we need a letter from the development and/or the bank to move forward to City Council. I just wanted to clarify that we are going to be in discussion with them and can't guarantee that third sign. Also, as a clarification on the stalls and why they were reconfigured like that, we have one accessible stall and two stalls for patient loading and unloading since this is a medical facility. We need access for patient loading after surgery. Other than that, we agree with all stipulations. If you have questions for me, the architect, or the owner, or further discussion on the signs, we'd be happy to participate.

Chairman Elkins: Thank you. Can you refer me to the specific stipulation that gives you pause for concern about the stop sign?

Mr. Arling: No. 6.

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

Comm. Block: The same question I had for staff: what happens to the building? Does it move?

Mr. Arling: Yes, we're just going to move it south. We have plenty of room with the building setback. We have several feet to spare, so we're just going to move it south.

Comm. Block: I don't understand where the stop signs are going. I understand where they go; I just don't understand your concern.

Comm. Stevens: It's C8.0.

Mr. Arling: There's a parking lot island directly north, and basically, that would stop southbound traffic. The other one would be the exit from the bank drive-through. Then, there's one in front of the bank that we don't show because it's off our property.

Comm. Block: Both would be off your property or just one?

Mr. Arling: Just the one that's directly in front of the bank. Some of the drawings show it; some don't.

Comm. Stevens: It's No. 19 on the exhibit. They show both signs.

Mr. Arling: Yes, we have one in the island on the northwest corner of the lot. Then, to the north and west of the building, there is a sign there. There is currently a Do Not Enter sign there for people coming westbound. Basically, we would just add a sign on the back side for exiting.

Comm. Block: The plan I'm looking at shows 19 within the property.

Mr. Arling: Two of them are within the property. There was a request to have one directly in front of the bank. You don't see the bank on this plan. It is north and west of the building. It faces east, and there was a proposed sign to be placed right in front of the bank.

Chairman Elkins: Are there any other questions? We note that this requires a Public Hearing.

Public Hearing

As no one was present to speak, a motion to close the Public Hearing was made by Coleman; seconded by Block. Motion carried with a unanimous roll-call vote of 6-0. For: McGurren, Coleman, Block, Stevens, Belzer, Hoyt. Recused: Hunter

Chairman Elkins: That takes us to a discussion.

Comm. Coleman: Mr. Lang, can you speak to No. 6 and the stop signs?

Mr. Lang: The concern came from the removal of the parallel parking spaces and the belief that the head-in parking with cars backing out of those locations could create some accidents. The applicant had a separate conversation with Richard Coleman about the addition of the stop signs. That's where this stemmed from. They wanted six head-in parking spaces, which we trimmed down to three. The other compromise was that they would add the stop signs to reduce traffic accidents.

Comm. Coleman: Was the compromise agreed to prior to the meeting?

Mr. Klein: I talked with Richard, and he said there was an agreement. As Grant was saying that was a condition staff was working out. They wanted perpendicular parking, and in order to try to make it safer and make sure people were paying attention and stopping, the stop signs would be a part of it. Richard indicated that they understood that the bank would be a part of that and that we would still want the letter and the stipulation.

Chairman Elkins: The question this raises for me is if it's the city's position that, absent the letter, the plan cannot go forward?

Mr. Klein: I don't think we would be supportive of the perpendicular parking. That was part of the agreement. As Grant indicated, now the parking is backing out into the drive aisle and the drive-through going through the bank. Then, the north-south traffic goes just

to the north. There are a lot of turning movements. The thought was that we could add the stop signs so people would pay more attention.

Chairman Elkins: It all makes sense from that perspective, but the concern that the applicant raised was the fact that the plan was to put the sign on a property that they don't control. I don't suppose there is a reason to believe the bank will resist, but in the event that the bank does resist, does it bring the plan to a halt?

Mr. Klein: Staff would want to look at that. Again, it was part of the agreement to try to accommodate the head-in parking. This is the first that we've heard of it being an issue.

Chairman Elkins: Let's assume the worst case and the bank, for some reason, doesn't want it and you have to go back to the drawing board about the parking spaces. Would it require the whole plan to come back through?

Mr. Klein: There would be the ability to still forward it on to Governing Body, but we would want to resolve the issue first. It would be, "Prior to consideration of Governing Body . . . "

Chairman Elkins: Mr. Arling, does your client have any objection to proceeding on that basis?

Mr. Arling: I would like to point out that it was a compromise that had us taking out a lot of stalls that were regular client parking and switched out to just the accessible stall and the doctor loading. There will not be a constant movement of traffic in and out. I will also point out there are other shopping places in the development that have head-in parking. It's very common in parking lots to have such a case. The elements that we can control are the most impacting, which are the southbound movement down the drive aisle and also the exit out of the drive-through of the bank. The one coming south in front of the bank really isn't directly impactful on these. Again, patients will come out, and whoever is driving them will be careful. I think Dr. Umstatted could possibly speak more to this.

Dr. Umstatted, appeared via Zoom before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Dr. Umstatted: Thank you. We're excited to be a part of the Leawood community. The pull-in parking specifically for my practice is important because we're going to have an ambulatory surgery center. There will be patients wheeled out in wheelchairs after their procedures and loaded into a vehicle. I thought it was safer for my patients to have pull-in parking against the building rather than to wheel them across the parking lot. That's why it was important for me to change the parallel parking to pull-in parking with specifically one designated as handicapped, to be reserved for surgery patients. When I had spoken to Richard Coleman, we had a number of compromises in terms of the building and the parking. He asked that I reduce the number of parking spots from six to three, which is not ideal for my patient base, but he's in charge, so I agreed. In terms of the stop signs, he felt it was safer for the general public in terms of people getting around. It is a bit of an

unprecedented move because within the entire Parkway Plaza development, there are no stop signs. It's hard for me as a business owner to believe that we're going to have a lot more traffic flow in that corner of the development, as compared to some of the other areas, particularly by Starbucks. I have spoken to the bank initially about the 90-degree pull-in parking, and they were amenable to that. I then sent the letter of approval to Richard Coleman. He then set the stipulation that we'll need stop signs if we want our parking changed. He hadn't initially indicated that. I went back to the bank. They are in discussion about that. I also reached out to Mike Nigro, Parkway Plaza Director, and let him know that we were being asked to install three stop signs, including one on the bank's property and that the bank was still discussing that with their Board of Directors. He also had some concerns about the fact that it's not a uniform pattern throughout the development and that we would be the only ones with stop signs, even though there is other pull-in parking throughout the development. It's kind of a mess right now. I certainly want everybody to be safe. I want our project to move forward. That's kind of where we are now.

Chairman Elkins: Thank you. Comments from the commissioners?

Comm. Coleman: I look at that corner and see a future accident. I see people coming out of the drive-through, not paying attention, putting money and receipts away. I see people being wheeled out to this spot. I see people crossing into the main parking lot. At this point, I'm all for keeping No. 6 in unless staff can work before it gets to Governing Body for future discussion. I see that area as very problematic.

Comm. Block: To be clear, there would be a stop sign on this parcel we're considering tonight at the exit of the drive-through. There is another stop sign that is off this property. That's the one that's in dispute here.

Comm. Coleman: Mr. Lang, could you document where the stop signs will go on this diagram (*Puts diagram on monitor*).

Mr. Lang: The proposal is to have a stop sign at the exit from the bank, and two others (*demonstrates on diagram*).

Comm. Coleman: So, the stop signs are facing south?

Mr. Lang: The north-south one on the bank property would face away from 135th Street.

Comm. Coleman: The one in the first aisle would be the same way?

Mr. Lang: No, it would be for the east-west traffic.

Comm. Coleman: For clarification, could you point out where the east-west sign would be?

Mr. Lang: I don't believe they've determined a location, but I would guess it would be by the tower element.

Mr. Arling: The one in front of the bank is correct, but the other one is for southbound down the aisle, coming behind the parking stalls. It is not for east-west traffic. The face of the sign points north.

Mr. Lang: I believe that's correct, but I would want to refer back to Richard Coleman.

Chairman Elkins: Mr. Coleman is not here tonight. Other thoughts or comments?

Comm. Block: If the bank doesn't want to do it, I don't know. The biggest problem is people exiting the drive-through, and that will be taken care of. The island will be taken care of. One that's up around the corner isn't necessary, I don't feel.

Mr. Coleman: That was just part of what our discussions were. Because it's close to three drives that all converge at the same place, we wanted the stop signs. If the bank refuses, then the bank refuses, but there's no harm in asking. They have a drive-through and a drive lane in the front of the bank. In this development, there is a main drive lane that goes in a complete circle around the development. It goes in front of the main center and in front of all the buildings along 135th Street and the bank. The bank has four drive-through lanes that converge at the same point. Then, there's a drive aisle that some of the people at the surgi-center will use. There are three drive aisles that all come together at one point, which is why the stop sign was requested. If the bank refuses to do it, then the bank refuses, but there is no harm in asking.

Chairman Elkins: What would staff's position be on moving forward with the proposal?

Mr. Coleman: You go forward and see if the bank will do it. It's not something that would hold up the project.

Comm. Hoyt: Actually, No. 6 doesn't say that the bank has to agree; it says that the applicant simply has to provide documentation from Parkway Plaza saying that it would allow additional stop signs.

Mr. Coleman: Exactly. We're not demanding the signs. We were surprised to hear this tonight because they agreed before they would ask.

Comm. Hoyt: All I'm saying is the documentation from Parkway Plaza just has to say they're okay with it. The bank doesn't have to agree.

Chairman Elkins: For clarity, I don't think the applicant suggested they would not ask the bank. I think the applicant was anticipating the scenario of the bank saying no.

Mr. Coleman: Has the bank refused?

Chairman Elkins: They have it under consideration.

Dr. Umstatt: The bank gave approval for the pull-in parking, but you asked for the stop signs after that. I reached out this week and am waiting to hear back.

Chairman Elkins: We're just trying to anticipate what might happen. The applicant is absolutely willing to ask.

Mr. Coleman: I don't see a big issue here.

Chairman Elkins: That was what I was concerned about. Any other comments?

A motion to recommend approval of CASE 90-20 - PARKWAY PLAZA - LOT 10 - UMSTATTD MEDICAL OFFICE, Request for approval of a Preliminary Plan and Final Plan, located north of 135th Street and east of Briar – with all 32 staff stipulations – was made by Coleman; seconded by Block. Motion carried with a unanimous roll-call vote of 6-0. For: McGurran, Coleman, Block, Stevens, Belzer, Hoyt. Recused: Hunter

Comm. Coleman: I have a question for Mr. Coleman. I was reading the minutes from the October 19 City Council meeting, and under Councilmember Reports, Councilmember Cain brought up discussion of Leawood's 135th Street Community Plan. According to the Action Agenda, there would be a work session. I was wondering if Mr. Coleman or Mr. Klein would care to comment on what happened at the meeting.

Mr. Coleman: In 2021, sometime in February or March, they want to have a work session on the 135th Street Community Plan.

Comm. Coleman: There is no scheduled work session now?

Mr. Coleman: I can't remember the date exactly, but I think it was in February.

Comm. Belzer: Is that with the Planning Commission or just Governing Body?

Mr. Coleman: Just Governing Body.

Comm. Coleman: I also wanted to point out that Mr. Coleman asked Planning Commission members to represent the Planning Commission at the Johnson County Municipalities Call. Councilwoman Cain and I represented City Council of Leawood in the end of August. It was a discussion about housing in Johnson County. We, along with Overland Park, Olathe, and Prairie Village, sent representatives.

MEETING ADJOURNED