

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

September 25, 2017

The regular meeting of the Mission Planning Commission was called to order by Chairman Mike Lee at 7:00 PM Monday, September 25, 2017. Members also present: Jim Brown, Scott Babcock, Stuart Braden, Robin Dukelow, Dana Buford, Charlie Troppito and Frank Bruce. Absent was Brad Davidson. Also in attendance: Danielle Sitzman, City Planner; Brian Scott, Assistant City Administrator, Laura Smith, City Administrator, and Nora Tripp, Secretary to the Planning Commission.

Elections

*Ashley Elmore was nominated as Planning Commission Secretary. The vote was taken (8-0). The **motion carried**.*

Approval of Minutes from the June 26, 2017, Meeting

 moved and **seconded** a motion to approve the minutes of the June 26, 2017, Planning Commission meeting.

The vote was taken (8-0). The **motion carried**.

Case # 17-08 Preliminary Site Plan-Martway Mixed Use-Clockwork Architecture + Design

Due to technical difficulties, recording started with the meeting already in progress.

Ms. Sitzman:public street, extend the width of the property with parking behind. We do have concerns about adequate room being left for the development of the street scape elements along Martway Street. In our conditions on this application, we've addressed that. At this point, I would mention that the guidelines do encourage detailed and articulated elevations to create interest in facades. They allow for diversity for architectural styles. So, in this case, the applicant is proposing a modern architectural style. The design guidelines would not prohibit that. So, again, we'll get into some of those details with final site plan review.

As I mentioned, there is a need for some revisions to the full traffic impact analysis. That is a condition that we included in the case before you tonight. There was also an analysis done of the stormwater impacts to the development. Again, our on-call engineers and Olsson & Associates have reviewed the stormwater drainage and find that it to be generally satisfied. There are potentially a few more comments that may happen with the final study, so we would reserve an opportunity to make comment on any of the final study information that's provided for stormwater.

As I've mentioned a couple times, this site does include a flood plain. There can be development in a flood plain, but there are extra regulations associated with it. Basically, this applicant would go through a flood plain permit process, and we would take a look at the design of the building where it is impacted by flood plain. There are certain flood-proofing standards that would have to be met, and Olsson & Associates

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

September 25, 2017

would help to review that. The applicant is aware of this and already thinking ahead to that stage.

If there are any off-site improvements such as the construction of sidewalks, street trees, bike racks, street lights, etc., the developer will be responsible for the construction. We do review those as the project goes along. Like I mentioned, we are somewhat concerned about the amount of land being allocated on the north side of the building to accommodate public sidewalks; in this case, the Rock Creek Trail. Because it is a multi-modal trail, it needs to have a slightly wider width than our typical commercial district sidewalk. We require that to be a 10-foot-wide, paved path because we try to work within the federal standards for trails. We do that because in the future, we like to capture federal funds to help us build future trails, and we get credit for existing trails that are compliant and build a network. So, we want to continue to be able to consider the Rock Creek Trail a part of our trail network when we make future applications. Of course, there needs to be room for the street trees and street lights, etc. We typically ask for a 5-foot-wide zone, and if there are door sweeps that open into that area, those need to be planned for, as well. Additional street right-of-way dedication will be required with the final plans and plats. We also let the applicant know that they should consider our private sign criteria. Because this is a mixed-use building, the sign code is probably not going to be a good fit as-is.

The applicant has been invited to present their plan to the Sustainability Commission, which has a scorecard that they go through with applicants and provide them with a score. There was also a neighborhood meeting hosted by the applicant at the Community Center earlier this month. We provided notice to property owners not just within the 200-foot required notice area, but to a much broader area. We had 40 to 50 people attend. Issues discussed that night included building height and the aesthetics of the project. Included in the packet is also the findings of fact included for consideration and final site plans.

I would conclude tonight with staff's recommendation. The proposed development conforms with the Comprehensive Plan as described; it meets the overall intent of the MS2 zoning district, and complies with the required findings for the planned zoned district and site plan sections of our ordinance. Therefore, staff recommends the Planning Commission recommend approval of the preliminary site development plan for Case #17-08 Martway Mixed Use to the City Council, with the following stipulations. The first eight have to do with deviations. The first one is the deferral of consideration of the deviation to onsite parking. Conditions 2 through 8 are for the approval of the requested deviations as described. I would make an amendment to the fifth one, which has to do with waiving the parking lot setbacks along the west property line. That should also include a stipulation that alternate screening of the area should be provided for consideration with the final site plan. It was mentioned in the staff report but I did not get

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

September 25, 2017

that exact language into the condition.

And then, the final three conditions have to do with getting results from the final traffic study, reserving the right to provide additional comments or stipulations based on what those say. And then, providing adequate right-of-way for the required streetscape elements. I would remind you, Mr. Chair, this is a public hearing. Also in your packet besides the density table was a summary of all of the rental property submissions that we did for City Council not too long ago. It lists the property, it's location, when it was constructed, its value over time, and the rent rates charged, as best as we could ascertain. Also included in your packet was the applicant's response and narrative, and traffic and stormwater engineering folks' memo on the proposed development; a copy of the traffic impact analysis; the stormwater drainage plans; and the site plans. That's it for the staff report.

Chairman Lee: Thank you, Danielle. Is the applicant here this evening?

Christian Arnold, Clockwork Architects, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Mr. Arnold: Danielle asked that I do a brief presentation. She did a phenomenal job of capturing the data and numbers. So, this is a version of the presentation that was made to the general public a couple of weeks ago.

One of the things that we wanted to talk about is what we feel is unique for a project like this. A lot of the housing demand that we're seeing comes from the two large population groups – the Boomers and the Millennials. It's what is commonly referred to as "renters by choice," people that really don't want to invest in a home any more, or people who are tired of the maintenance and lawn care, etc., and they want to simplify their lives. We see that being a huge population that is driving the demand for projects like this.

The second piece of it is that 50 percent of people in this study actually prefer a walkable community. That's what we love about the city of Mission. It's very authentic, it's real, it has great services that have been developed along Johnson Drive, and to be able to have a critical mass and some density to this area, that we continue to support those businesses that we feel are very critical. The investment that's been made along Johnson Drive has been phenomenal, and we are huge proponents of small business, that those continue to be viable. But, it really needs more people. It's not really feasible to think about, you know, buying an entire block of single-family homes, taking those down and coming back with a structure. So, typically in development, you look for opportunities for buildings that have kind of lived out their useful life, they need a lot of repair; that's where those opportunities happen.

I grew up in a small town. Most of our projects are in small towns, and the number one thing that I hear from business owners on the service side is that they want more

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

September 25, 2017

people, more customers, more patrons. The fact that we're right along Rock Creek Trail, we think is a huge advantage in trying to boost the walkability. If you've looked, there is a website where you can actually do a walkability score. Mission ranks higher than downtown Overland Park, which we think is phenomenal. I think it's just the scale, it's a fairly compact city, and we think that has a lot going for it. That's why it's getting great ratings, and wanting Millennials to live here, largely due to the affordability issue.

Again, just to hit the high points, we look for projects that have already started with a lot of public investment, and we look at ways to leverage the private dollars to advance those. So, the fact that we're right across from City Hall, the community center, Rock Creek Trail, the mixture of this area is very walkable along Johnson Drive, are all huge advantages. The fact that the park is to the south creates a great buffer to the single-family residences there. It's over 300 feet to the 60 residences. So, although the top floor is likely going to be visible above tree tops, there is a nice distance between those to create that buffer.

Again, as Danielle said, the site presents some challenges due to the flood plain issues. We have hopefully mediated those through this elevated design where we're parking underneath. The buildings are built up on pillions. When we first started looking at the feasibility of renovating those existing office buildings, it's very limiting because of the amount of redevelopment that can occur to anything that's in that flood zone. That's when we started to look at Option B, which was getting everything out of that flood plain.

As I mentioned, we're not including the buffer to the park. We've also tried to create a very sensitive site design where it pushes the building up towards Martway, again, giving as much buffer as possible to all of the surrounding areas. And then, tucking the parking underneath, screening it, and having it be along the south side. We are heavily landscaping the south side of the site where Rock Creek is, so, hopefully it will provide a very sensitive solution. Our plan is to build with high-quality materials. A lot of the projects that we see of this scale are being built out of wood construction. We are proposing metal construction. We think it creates a higher-quality product for our building, and hopefully it's something that will reduce our operational costs over the long term. This ends up being a very institutional-quality building, long-lasting, very sustainable because there's a lot less waste that comes off of the materials. It's highly insulated, as well as very low sound transmission between units. So, our desire is to create very high-quality products.

The challenge with that is the rents, obviously. We want to be an affordable solution that not only works for fixed income individuals later in their life, but also professionals that are getting out of school and have student loans, etc. So, it is a bit of a balancing game between the aesthetics and quality, but we feel like putting it into the structure and the core systems is where to invest. Overall, we're looking at 156 residences at an

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

September 25, 2017

approximate cost of about \$30.1 million. That building is in the existing Rock Creek TIF, so the plan is to do a lot of the flood zone mediation as planned through the master planning process.

We did some sight line studies. This is a view looking south across the small park to the north of our parcel. You do see the building topping up over the tree tops at a couple locations. This is a composite view looking northwest, so you see the aquatics center in the foreground. You can see a little bit of the building popping up there. One of the things that's a little misleading is it's really down in the valley, about 20 feet below 61st Street, and Johnson Drive, as well.

This is a view looking along Rock Creek, the floodway, with the chain link being the tennis courts. This is the area that is most visible due to the minimal tree cover existing there. Sometimes it's hard to understand the scale of a building until you compare it to what's out there. The top diagram shows the Mission Trails project on Johnson Drive. The middle diagram shows Mission Square in the middle. The last building is the proposed Martway structure. So, you can see how the slope to the ground tapers down. It ends up being about the same height as Mission Square and a little bit shorter than Mission Trails. The bottom two elevations show the comparable massing, which is consistent with the project that is going through the approval process right now. It is also consistent with the intent of the zoning board because it would allow for a project of this size. Again, if the flood plain weren't there, the whole thing would probably be sitting on the ground and more similar to the Mission Trails project. Once we started elevating it out of the flood plain, and in order to keep with the fire department on the clearances, we started to push it a little higher.

This is a view looking southeast along the trail and Martway Street. This is a view looking southwest. And then, some of the architectural examples of buildings and projects that we're referencing that would be comparable in nature and size and quality. Any questions that I might answer?

Mr. Babcock: What are you looking for, for dollar per square foot cost?

Mr. Arnold: We are interviewing property management companies right now. Our goal is to charge around \$1.50. So, we're collecting comps. Some of the neighboring projects like – the idea that, some of the other projects coming on line, you know, in downtown Overland Park, as well as some of the proposed projects.

Mr. Babcock: Are you guys set on a, like a modern architecture for this building?

Mr. Arnold: We're trying to respond to the market. We looked at the area to see, you know, you look at vacancy rates, occupancy rates, and see what is desirable. Sometimes design is subjective, and it's hard for us to anticipate what the user or the renter of this building is looking for. Through our research, we are finding that they are

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

September 25, 2017

attracted to a more progressive architecture. I don't think it has to be. I think some of these projects are a bit transitional. Some have a variety of materials. If I looked at the project that's proposed in Gateway, it's probably more progressive. And, the project that's proposed at Mission Trails is maybe less progressive. So, we're trying to hit the middle where it maybe would appeal to a wide spectrum of people.

Mr. Babcock: On the bottom floor, what is the planned use for that?

Mr. Arnold: I think the most viable solution there is office. We're somewhat open at this point, but if I put on my small-business-owner hat, I would probably want to be on Johnson Drive if I was a strong retail business, just because of the foot traffic and the car traffic. So, the likelihood is it probably makes more sense as office space. But, I think it's a little early to tell. The parking study that we did, we looked at it both ways.

Mr. Babcock: That's the reason I was asking.

Mr. Arnold: Yeah. It's probably more of a demand from the retail point of view, less from the office point of view. So, you put those two things together and I would speculate that office makes the most sense.

Ms. Dukelow: I have a couple comments and questions. It's great to bring more people in, and I appreciate the resilience of the approach, because being in the flood plain, we understand that cars could actually get a little wet. So, that's all great. And the proximity to pool and park are excellent. I have a couple of comments, though. I'm wondering if it's possible to consider pedestrian connectivity between – Just looking at the site plan, it looks like it would be a possibility at the east end of the site where there is a sidewalk. The west end looks like it would be a little tighter, although you don't have the grade challenges there. So, that's something I think would really enhance the project, would be connectivity for the community, if there was a foot trail –

Mr. Arnold: I'm glad you pointed that out. We have visited with staff about that possibility and what needs to be done in terms of, whether it's a small pedestrian bridge, or completing some of the Rock Creek TIF remediation work as a part of that, as a section of it. So, I like the idea of connecting, and hopefully we can work through that, of how that would work to connect off-property.

Ms. Dukelow: That would really enhance the area, I believe.

Unidentified: Danielle, could you put the site plan up on the screen so we can follow along with this discussion?

Ms. Sitzman: Sure.

Ms. Dukelow: I was actually looking at C200 because it does show the grading, and it shows more of the site than the landscaping. The landscaping plan shows, is really well-developed for this specific area, but I'd like to talk about the areas that are south of

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

September 25, 2017

Rock Creek. I understand that the site is very tight, and the south side of the parking would be really, really hard to screen on the north side of Rock Creek. However, I think that we could do some landscape screening, if possible, in Anderson Park. So, we would basically have the same screening requirements, but maybe put those outside of the property line, so to speak. That would help the neighborhood and the park. Because it's going to be quite a change. And Rock Creek currently has quite a bit of vegetation in it, but it's coming out of the, you know, the concrete and everything south, and more than half of it is on the north side. There are a few really nice trees in Anderson Park that I think if we would enhance that edge, add some landscaping trees along that edge, it would make the park much more desirable. So, those are my thoughts on stipulations number 6 and 7. So, I don't know how we would work with that. Like, if we said, okay, we're not actually going to waive the [inaudible] requirements, we're just going to ask you to put them somewhere else, or exactly how all that will work, I'm not sure. But I'm pretty sure it would make it more palatable.

Mr. Arnold: Yeah. Thank you.

Mr. Troppito: I have a number of questions for you, Christian, and staff, as well. The number of deviations concern me, the sheer number. In the past, we've recommended projects to City Council, and City Council has questioned whether it still meets the intent of the zoning code. So, if you obtain a legal opinion from Pete specifically addressing this, how soon can you get it?

Ms. Sitzman: We consulted with Pete before these cases came to you. So, as you'll recall, we made some changes to the planned zoning district in anticipation of having deviations come before us for consideration. So, we did our homework ahead of time. Pete is satisfied with the types of analysis that would happen if those deviations, that they would probably change the findings of fact to be more specific to development, rather than being based on the findings of fact that we would use for a variance, which was an inappropriate set of criteria to be using on these kinds of projects. I think the number of deviations that you're seeing here are partly due to more diligence on staff to point out exactly what's going on in your applications, and also on the applicant wanting to get everything out front, instead of doing a little bit at the preliminary and maybe asking for a few more changes when they get to final site plan. They were very thorough in their analysis of our ordinances and letting us know exactly what they anticipated needing to have additional flexibility with. I think staff is satisfied. A lot of the deviations were the same thing, so several of them have to do with landscaping. They go back to parking lot design and things like that. So, I don't think this is an unreasonable number of deviations to request for this type of complex redevelopment.

Mr. Troppito: So, you have discussed this with Pete, so I would presume there would be no problem getting something in writing from Pete before the final site plan.

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

September 25, 2017

Ms. Sitzman: We could certainly have a legal opinion memo with the final site plan.

Mr. Troppito: Thank you. On parking, on page 34 of the report, where it says it's been graded such that no parking stall would pond over 7 inches based on FEMA flood plain depths. And that's based on a 100-year flood?

Mr. Arnold: Yes, that's correct.

Mr. Troppito: Do you think that's adequate?

Mr. Arnold: That's what our consulting engineers are telling us, yes.

Mr. Troppito: Well, the reason I raise the question is it seems like it would [inaudible]. What about flood insurance?

Mr. Arnold: We have not reached out to any insurance agencies yet. Most of the buildings, by elevating them out of the flood plain, and then, all the finished spaces are out of the flood plain, our hope is - .

Mr. Troppito: That's based on a 100-year flood, correct?

Mr. Arnold: That's right. The only thing that will be in the flood plain will be in surface parking. We're optimistic that there won't be a premium associated with the insurance, but if there is, it will be carried by the developer.

Mr. Troppito: You will have that determined by your final plan and present to us what the options are?

Mr. Arnold: Sure. We can do that.

Mr. Troppito: Thank you.

Mr. Arnold: And you're just wanting to know what the insurance plan would be?

Mr. Troppito: Yes. What mechanism is going to protect the cars. On page 44, it discusses the hazardousness from Nichiha Fiber Cement. Is that correct?

Mr. Arnold: That's correct.

Mr. Troppito: Now, on page 44, there is a material safety data sheet for that. And it says it contains hexavalent chromium. And also on page 46, it says that the amount [0:28:40] is a small amount. Now, in my memory, hexavalent chromium is toxic and [inaudible] meets the definition of parts per billion. So, what's "small?" I'd like that clarified. I'd also like to clarify from somebody who is credible to make the opinion, such as an industrial hygienist, or professional environmental engineer. I'm concerned about the ability for hexavalent chromium to leech out over time [inaudible]. I'd like to see that addressed.

Mr. Arnold: Okay. Because the materials and the exact manufacturer of them is usually something that would be submitted at final, it limits our options prior to that submission.

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

September 25, 2017

Honestly, there may be a switch in manufacturer, or something.

Mr. Troppito: If there is, I would like to see it.

Mr. Arnold: Okay. I appreciate your thoroughness. That's impressive.

Mr. Babcock: I'm going to talk about parking areas. This is also a comment for staff. We've got a guideline as far as units, and I see you say we're going to have a 5 percent vacancy rate, so we don't need as many. Okay, so, 5 percent, if I don't include those, that should be 10 spaces. Well, we don't need it for retail. Okay, I'll buy that. That's 24, and you're asking to short it by 34. I mean, I don't necessarily see the logic behind going over your own logic. So, how do you justify that?

Mr. Arnold: One of the things that we try to do in fill developments, most people don't find it very enjoyable to walk across or next to large surface lots. When we zoomed out of this parcel, you know, we're surrounded by largely empty surface lot. So, we reached out to our neighbors and property owners all around us. There's over 200 privately-owned surface spaces, so the thought was to not build more of what we try to screen. So, by tucking the parking under the building, behind, landscaping around it, we're trying to conceal that parking. In doing so, we don't want to create more parking somewhere else, or create more of a demand. That was the thought process, was to not over-park it. And also, you know, use it based on industry standards that we've seen, and other projects in the area that we've seen, and how they perform. Just because highest and best use in a great community is not surface parking, in our opinion.

Mr. Babcock: Okay. The other comment is for staff. I'm seeing a consistency of five stories, and basically our code is for three. So, we're doing variances each time. And I think when Mission Trails put forth their plan, I mean, I get the fact that there is a precedent set. We've got Mission Bank at one end; we've got Mission Bank at the other end. We've got Scripp Pro. We have precedence for [*Inaudible, background noise, coughing.*] And I generally can accept that. But, if we're going to allow to build to that height, then we should change our code to allow to build to that height, instead of doing variances each time. We're supposed to be the keepers of the code, and we're breaking our code each time.

Ms. Sitzman: For clarity, it's not a variance, it's a deviation. I understand your concern about --.

Mr. Babcock: Excuse me. Lack of use of the appropriate term.

Ms. Sitzman: I know you're concerned about the number of them. I would point out that simply building into one zoning district doesn't give you the flexibility to look at design. So, I'm not sure that's saying a higher number of stories would always be appropriate everywhere, by every design. So, if staff sees value in the planned district and the deviation process, that you can look at specific projects in specific context. We can

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

September 25, 2017

certainly, at any point, if the Planning Commission wants to consider changing zoning code standards, engage in that process. But so far, I'm not sure that the planned district is necessarily broken. It does make for a longer staff report. I'm sorry. *[Laughter.]*

Mr. Babcock: That has nothing to do with it. It's just I tend to be a rule-follower, and it's making me break the rules every time someone comes in and wants to build a five-story building.

Mr. Braden: Mr. Chairman, I have a question on the glazing. You were asking to build a bulkhead, which I see accounts for 5 percent of what you could have done. But, even with that, you would have only been at 60 percent total -.

Mr. Arnold: Oh, yeah. The first floor here, you're referring to?

Mr. Braden: Yes. I'm just wondering, why can't we reach that number?

Mr. Arnold: Yeah, the bulkhead does reduce the percentage. We're open to as much glass along that side as possible. If you look at the drawing, it's kind of deceiving. It looks like it would be so much more, percentage-wise. We do think we can potentially give more of a continuous strip. We were also just trying to introduce some kind of interest, whether it's a mass to give the building a little bit of weight. If not, I mean, I don't think it's going to be overly strong without it. If you said you wanted all of that to be solid glass -.

Mr. Braden: Does the parking lot open to --?

Mr. Arnold: Yes. It screens down below, so that the planter and vegetation there. It's open-air above.

Mr. Braden: I think the only other thing I would say is, it's just my personal opinion that *[inaudible]* with that being such a long *[inaudible...]* narrow strip that still looks pretty monolithic to me. It would help if there was maybe more interest or something to kind of break up that long building in the middle. That's just a personal opinion.

Mr. Brown: I have a couple questions. I notice that in this plan, and addressed in the staff report, that the building is not currently shown as being set back

Unidentified: *[Inaudible comment.]*

Mr. Brown: And your response to that would be some sort of concern about massing and the neighborhood to the south, which I don't understand because you're asking for a two-story deviation, and yet, you're using massing as your excuse for not stepping the building back. So, I'm having a hard time with that math.

Mr. Arnold: If I understand your question, I think it was a building zone of each side, and then, well, all the buildings along Martway seem to have that stepping. So, we were just trying to be more consistent with those buildings. Mission Square doesn't have the

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

September 25, 2017

stepping, you know, the smaller office buildings don't have the stepping. It creates some, obviously from a [0:37:18], that's where usually [inaudible] where water gets in, so we try to avoid it, where possible. And because of our tight site, obviously. We're trying to get a lot in here without pushing all the way back towards the park and residential properties. So we're trying to kind of hold a lot of building massing, too, to Martway Street.

Mr. Brown: I'm concerned about the height and the surrounding neighbors to the south. I know there was an explanation given that there is a park as a buffer there, but that park is just a wider space. I mean, those houses are elevated from near projects, so they're getting the full view, unless there is something planted there, like Robin was talking about. To create the appearance of the building from those, you know, homes [inaudible]. So, I'm concerned about that, and I'd like to see something like that materialize before we see it again.

Mr. Arnold: Okay.

Mr. Brown: The parking on the left side and on the lower part there on Martway, I'd like to see that look like the rest of the office space, or the business space on the other side of the building. I don't want to look out there and see the cars. I want it to look like it's part of the building. Just on the Martway side. The rest of the, you know, parking from the back and stuff, I don't know if that's going to be an issue. But for where pedestrians are walking down the front of the building, I don't want to be walking along a building front and having a nice look at, you know, engagement with the public way, and all of a sudden, I have an opening, I see all these colors. I prefer not to experience that. And, I would like to see that street scape lined, as was addressed in the staff report.

And then, a question. Along the creek, are we doing anything back there to make improvements to the floodway? Is there a new retaining system in place?

Ms. Sitzman: As Mr. Arnold indicated, this is in an already-designated TIF district because of the anticipation of flood plain impacts. Several years ago, the City engaged in a study to look at what would be required to take properties out of the flood plain along the Rock Creek corridor. We've made some of those improvements. This particular segment of the channel is not in any of our immediate capital improvement plans to be resolved. So, I believe the best alternative at the time we last did the study was to, to put it into a channel like we've done elsewhere. So, along where the farmer's market is, to the east of there, to the Gateway site, a similar treatment to that. So, it is something that the City has in their long, long-term plans, but nothing immediate to resolve this at the time this project would be happening. So, unless it's part of – as Mr. Arnold indicated – some part of their proposal, some sort of development agreement to step up those flood plain improvements, it's not something we have planned

Mr. Brown: Thank you. The intention of your design as it relates to the 100-year flood

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

September 25, 2017

elevation, are you planning a flow-through design on the parking? Or, are you putting a wall there to try and keep the water out? I know you've said no ponding over seven inches, but is the water free to move in and out, so it's not restricted and not going to damage the building -?

Mr. Arnold: Tom can you speak to that part of it?

Tom: [CFS Engineer] We have the seven-inch [inaudible] ponding.

Mr. Arnold: Yes, but I think the idea is to allow the water to move in and out, right?

Tom: Yes.

Mr. Arnold: No barriers, free flows. I think the intent is that if there was a barrier, that creates the ponding.

Mr. Brown: My last question regards something I didn't understand, which was the alignment of the streets in the traffic study. Can you explain where we landed with that? Which one is getting aligned, which one is not, and what is the significance and importance of doing so or not doing so?

Mr. Arnold: We have aligned the drive access to –

Mr. Brown: Beverly?

Mr. Arnold: It wasn't previously. We were going to re-use the existing one, and it was five or 10 feet, too. The consulting engineer suggested that we align that so we have another access point to align to Dearborn. That's off our property, so we're not able to align that one. So, we've aligned one but not the other.

Mr. Babcock: Along the lines of Ms. Dukelow's suggestion, what permissions need to be in place for them to do landscaping across the creek on the City's property? I mean, you can't answer right now, but I'm asking the question out loud, in public. How would they go about getting permissions to do that, and how would that be navigated? And then, who is going to be responsible for the maintenance of those agreements that would need to be in place?

Ms. Sitzman: That would typically be something a development agreement might cover. So, it's like any other offsite improvement that a developer would have to make. If for some reason they were being required to make traffic improvements at an intersection, same kind of mechanism. So, an offsite landscaping buffer improvement would be something we would capture there. And, we would want to make sure that it is tied into the final site plan approval. That's something the Planning Commission felt needed to be a condition. That's where we would place it as a condition. It sounds like he is amenable to discussing that.

Mr. Babcock: Is that also something that the tree board should have a say in?

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

September 25, 2017

Ms. Sitzman: Absolutely. The tree board would be involved in that decision. Parks & Recreation and the tree board is all combined now. Site plans are circulated to those groups as they come along. We would make sure they were okay with that specific condition.

Mr. Babcock: Danielle, I don't remember, what's the current say about the, is this considered -? This is central, isn't it?

Ms. Sitzman: This is in the downtown district.

Mr. Babcock: Downtown. That's what I was asking. So, what's the style of architecture supposed to be? I know, like, down in the Gateway, we're saying it's supposed to be modern.

Ms. Sitzman: It's all covered by the same Johnson Drive design guidelines. So, they have flexibility built into them. It's not going to say it must be Southwest mission style -.

Mr. Babcock: I know it's not a must-be, but in encouraging-type language -?

Ms. Sitzman: It does encourage a certain color palette, certain materials that are long-lasting. I think it actually says we don't want it to be really stylized because then you get a not-quite-genuine development, where everything is the same, even though it's occurred a hundred years apart. So, the design guidelines have flexibility. They have standards in there for quality of materials, and visual interest, and things like that. But I don't think there's anything that says it has to be one way or the other in the downtown area, or in the east Gateway or west Gateway.

Ms. Dukelow: Just a clarification on Mr. Brown's comment about the open parking on the Martway side. We don't need that to be, like, glass or hard material, but perhaps some type of screen, maybe a perforated panel, or something like that --?

Mr. Brown: I'd be okay with glass or another hard material. I'm not trying to be obscure at all. I want it to look like the rest of the building.

Ms. Dukelow: To be able to, I guess, you know, provide a gap, so you can count on the air flow, and the water flow through there, too.

[Overlapping dialog.]

Unidentified: The water wouldn't flood through at that point. That's out of the 100-year flood plain, that corner of the building, and they only need airflow on two sides of the building and still call it a parking structure.

Mr. Arnold: I like the idea of something that's a little softer, landscaped, or screened, or something along those lines. We have seen glass used on parking, and it does present [inaudible] very hard surface. It's a little artificial because people know that there's not a business behind it, or a built space. We're trying to keep it as authentic as possible.

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

September 25, 2017

We're open to some ideas. We can maybe propose some things. I don't know. One of the reasons we like this location is because Rock Creek Trail is right there, so we want this to be as nice as possible. And I like the idea of the landscaping lining that area, softening that. So, I was hoping we could find something that incorporates those, perhaps.

Ms. Dukelow: The other thing I was going to mention was Rock Creek, and my question has to do with the railing on each side of that creek, or a fence, or -? Because the one that is there isn't in very good condition.

[Overlapping dialog.]

Ms. Dukelow: So, I don't know where that falls under this.

Ms. Sitzman: That will be under the final site plan review. I know we've already had it come up in discussions.

Mr. Arnold: Yeah, I think we all want a safe solution there, one that looks better than it does currently.

Mr. Troppito: Could you address the external lighting? The parking, and on the building, generating from the building.

Mr. Arnold: The project will adhere to all lighting codes, which generally does not allow any light bleed up into the sky. Just downward facing. Fortunately, a good portion of the parking is covered, so the lighting fixture will be recessed up into the bottom of the building.

The Chairman opened the public hearing.

Bill Nichols, 6019 West 61st Street, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Mr. Nichols: I understand emotions should not get involved with this. What I'm hearing from Danielle and your questions – and some of the answers – my biggest concern is parking. I figured [0:51:44] per bid is not enough. It looks like you all have figured that out, and hopefully will address it.

The other thing is our lights. You're told that it's 300 feet from their property to my house. Okay? The headlights of cars goes further than 300 feet. So, I'm hoping it will be screened in some way, but I have no idea how. I was over there today and I cannot figure out how to do it, particularly to keep the water flowing.

The other thing is the metal construction. This is the first time I've been involved with that, so I had to look up some information on the internet. According to Stockholm report on metal construction, it is cheaper, faster, but it takes more technical people to fasten everything together. So, please keep that in mind.

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

September 25, 2017

That's really about all I have, other than the lights, the noise, and what-not. Thank you.

Adam Dearing, 5711 West 61st Street, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Mr. Dearing: The first thing I'd like to say is the staff's statement about a public meeting lacks the sentiment of the attendees. Most people had considerably more concerns, including but not limited to the overall aesthetics, height, smell of trash, use of amenities, noise pollution, increased traffic, potential impact of increased flooding downstream, and overhead power supply. I think that was very understated.

Also, we have gone to the south side of the Aquatics Center, and we feel that the pictures of the proposed building are not to scale, and there are huge misrepresentations of the approximation of the size of this building. We took that from two or three of the pictures that they showed, and we saw those exact spots, compared the trees, and can see where a two-level building, which the top of their current building is, versus a five-level building. Those are not a good representation, whatsoever.

I just wanted to reiterate what I mentioned at the last public meeting, which is the fact that we have limited amenities in such a small neighborhood, right next to the Countryside area and the Rock Creek area. We feel that if there are another 150 to 200 people living there, especially with the use of a footbridge going across the creek, that what we are able to enjoy right now as a small community is going to be lost. Just the simple use of the park, the Aquatics Center, and the tennis courts would no longer be available for a small community with the population that we currently have. Thank you.

Dan Aldrich, 6001 West 61st Street, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Mr. Aldrich: I live in the gray house across from the park. We've been there 26 years. Love that pool. Put up with all that reconstruction. Understand the importance of light and noise pollution, and building barriers. That retaining wall to stop the headlights from getting into my front living room. Right? It's kind of shocking to hear that we're considering building something that goes beyond, literally 40 spaces of parking beyond our guidelines. If we build a foot bridge to the pool, I'll bet any money in the room what's going to happen. Folks are going to park at the pool at night when there are no cars there, and they're going to walk across that foot bridge to this place. So, there are going to be probably 40 cars parked across from my house, and everybody that lives on 61st Street. I can bet that that's going to happen because we've seen that impact in the past through our experience of 27 years here. Number one.

Number two. This guideline of reducing the feet, between the square feet or the footage between property lines, or what-not. Consolidating the space is going to do nothing for us, from a light perspective, a pollution perspective, a sound perspective. You guys

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

September 25, 2017

realize, when you build an object shaped like a megaphone, or like any reflective disc for communications, the shape of this complex – a U-shape, if you will – with the park on the other side. Do you know where all that noise is going to go? It's going to go into the park where people go with their kids to have quiet time. So, that pretty much ticks off everybody in the neighborhood. Right? Sorry, but it just does.

The down-lighting. We worked with the pool folks on downlighting. The problem is, even with down-lighting, if we put these on posts and they down-light, you still get the light in your house. So, going five stories in this area, two stories beyond our guidelines, for this particular situation -. Yes, it's 300 feet to Bill's house, and my house, and other folks. But, the folks that, that's their back yard, how would you like it if I told you I was going to build a five-story building next to your house and shine lights in your bedroom windows? I mean, you've got to realize. We're depending on you guys to defend the rights of the people that live on 61st Street, that have been there for 20-some years.

Christian, great plan, great design. Not a hater. Just think we're going too big, too much here, for this little neighborhood. Does everyone in this room who lives in this area agree with what I'm saying?

[Several voices responded affirmatively.]

Mr. Aldrich: It would absolutely destroy the neighborhood we worked 27 years to create. Do you guys get that? I hope you do. And, you know, less all the folks with a pool, because we've dealt with that. And, you know, we did what was right for the kids. We've dealt with this. And the thought of this size and scope, out of character with our community, is unacceptable.

By the way, let me just close. I propose that you guys consider reducing this thing down to three stories. At least one story off. That would give you 40 less units. There's your car-parking problem. It's going to reduce the light pollution, the sound pollution. If we do make access to the park available, I'd move it as far to the east as I can. Don't make it easy to park and walk across Everett. Don't do that. For us. For the people that you're representing. We're utterly paralyzed. We [inaudible] said, "You can't plant trees there." I'm walking my dogs, various dogs there over the years, every morning. There's power lines there. So, we need to plan, if you're going to do that, to bury these power lines. I'd bury them on the north side. If possible. For these guys. Thank you for the opportunity to talk to you guys.

Mary Ann Martens, 6200 West 61st Street, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Ms. Martens: I live on the north side, and have for 24 years. Reading through the 90-some pages of proposal tonight. In addition, starting within one-half mile radius, we already have 520 apartments, from my house. And then you add Mission Trails, which

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

September 25, 2017

has just been approved. That brings us to 714 apartments in a half-mile radius. And then, if you add the Martway, or perhaps go out seven-tenths of a mile with Mission Gateway, we're over 1,090. Within two or three miles, with Overland Park and Westwood, we have another 849. When we go out to Lamar and Foxridge, we've got 1,693. How many do we need in Mission?

Getting back to the codes, standards of development, 405.090: *The granting of the deviation will not adversely affect the rights of adjacent property owners.* Neighborhoods to the north and south. *To impact public health, safety, morals, order, convenience, prosperity or general welfare.* That includes the power lines that would run behind my house, and all the trees that would have to be cut to put into this park. I think Mission needs to grow, and I agree with that. But, wouldn't it be wonderful if we could put this in a different place, rather than adjacent to a residential area that is going to detract from our property value. Thank you.

Kathleen VanBecelaere, 6101 Martway, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Ms. VanBecelaere: I am the property owner to the west of this proposed development. My concerns are mostly in the amount of deviations they're asking for. We purchased the property about three years ago, and we did purchase it because we like the neighborhood. And the massing. And we're concerned with the deviation of the massing. We're not concerned so much with development because change is good. But, the zero setback and the proposed screening on our west end is not something we feel is a good thing for our property directly, but also, it is already in your code [inaudible]. Also, the parking requirement. With an influx of that many units, I would see it growing further than what they are proposing. And addressing the height and the parking deviation, the parking setbacks, I think all of this needs to be addressed. That's really all I have to say.

Chuck Malachek, 5539 Barkley Street, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Mr. Malachek: I'm not family, ex-employee, or anything like that. I enjoy my retirement. I took care of the Martway Office Buildings from May 1977 until January of this year. I was the building manager, the maintenance man, engineer, painter, plumber, electrician – you name it, I did it. Yes, they do need to be demolished, and something needs to be put there, better than what's there. But, there's a lot of changes that have to be made in order to make it work.

First, the way it stands, with what's going into the sewer lines over there, you've only got 53 waste lines. With the new additions, you're hooking up 600-and-some. And a 24-inch line will not take that. That's what it is underneath Martway. I was there when they

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

September 25, 2017

rebuilt it.

Your electrical needs. Basically, they're figuring a 100-amp panel per unit. That's 15,600 amps. The way the building stands, you've got 7,200. There are three three-faced lines with 300 amps each, going into each building. So, you have 2,400 amps going into each building. The amount of cable you'd have to run for that is going to be incredible, plus it's already a load on it the way it is now. I don't know how many times over the years the power went off. Not all of it. Like, one levy. Because it was just too much of a load on it. That's another reason they need to be replaced. But, the wiring is going to be a problem because you can't go under the creek.

Also, the creek wall needs to be replaced. I don't know how many tons of concrete and stone and everything else I poured in between the slope and that, the dirt, to keep it in one spot. That will have to be replaced, because the way it is right now, they're already moving during a good flood.

Secondly, none of the buildings in the 39 years, eight months I was there ever got flooded. The crawlspaces did, but it never got up to where the tenants are. It came within six inches of the floors. So, your going up astronomical heights is ridiculous. There's no reason for that. They could lower that height a bunch. I was there during the Plaza flood, and I know what flood waters look like. But, the creek has been done a few times since then, and a lot of it's taken care of.

The only other thing I've got is the boxed culvert that runs the entire west side of 6005. That drains all the parking lots north into that area. I've seen it where it comes out so massive water, it actually stops the creek until it breaks free and overtakes it. That's when you get the flooding. Like I said, it's never made it in where the tenants were. It just came across the parking lots, basically. That's it. So, going up astronomically is not going to help. It's a waste of time. That's all I have to say.

Jim Caulet, 5921 West 61st Street, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Mr. Caulet: I live on 61st Street, right across here. I don't think I have anything to add. I think everyone has pretty much said it. I just have a question. I mean, I look at the Wal-Mart thing, too. If we're going to have all these rules but not follow any of them, from now on, maybe we should just have the architects come in and say, "Well, there are 15 different rules, and we're probably only going to follow one of them. So, why don't we just deviate and say it's all right?" I mean, why bother with all this? If you're going to have the rules - You want to change them. Let's have a community discussion on what we think really ought to be there. As far as I know, none of you live on 61st Street. I haven't seen anyone on 61st Street that's going to have to look at this monstrosity, who thinks this is a good deal. So, I hope there will be at least a couple

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

September 25, 2017

people on this Planning Commission that will say, "I don't think this is a good deal."

Melanie Monson, 6056 Juniper Drive, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Ms. Monson: I do not live in this direct area; I live on the other side of Shawnee Mission Parkway. This would not directly impact the value of my home, but I go to the community center all the time. I grew up in Overland Park, moved away for 30 years, and came back. And I can't believe the changes that have happened in Mission. Some are good; some are not. The location of this development I think will be detrimental to Countryside. I don't live there, but I know it's going to impact the area. We lived in Albuquerque, NM, for 35 years, and we watched the things that are going to be happening now if you pass this big, tall building next to all of these little ones, change the area. That's exactly what they did in the Southwest. They had residential areas next to commercial, and so on, and there's no continuity. So, this won't affect my property value directly, but I think it's going to change the traffic on Martway. You're going to have 156 units, each will have one or two cars, in and out, twice a day. That's 600 cars up and down Martway. It's going to turn into a boulevard. So, they're going to have to change that. At least slow the traffic down. Maybe with speed bumps. Anyway, I don't want to see it go five stories. I think it will change the area too much. Thank you.

Vickie Aldrich, 6001 West 61st Street, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Ms. Aldrich: I live across the street. All of our concerns that were addressed at the original meeting have been pretty much repeated here, except for one. It's not only that the landscaping [inaudible] to soften and camouflage the building and help with sound and noise pollution, but also, we completely lose the horizon of trees that we've enjoyed for so many years. Because as someone else said, the 61st Street houses do sit up considerably higher than the park, and we've always enjoyed, when we look out on the horizon where the sky meets the earth, there's a nice row of trees that soften and camouflage the commercial to the north. With five stories, we would lose that.

There being no one else who wished to speak, the Chairman closed the public hearing.

Mr. Braden: Would there be any consideration of maybe going to four stories? Or is that not feasible at all?

Mr. Arnold: Reducing the project by 25 percent is a huge impact to revenue. The maintenance, the operations – all the things that go into it. That's why you're seeing a lot of five-story buildings because at a certain threshold, it makes it financially viable.

Mr. Babcock: You know, my inclination is, personally, I don't mind five-story buildings on the main Johnson Drive. There is a precedence for that. I think rules are set for a reason, and I have a hard time, as we go away from that core, going with five stories. I

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

September 25, 2017

think it needs to be graduated down to what our guideline is. It's actually more than that. I don't like all these deviations from the code. I don't like the idea that we're, I believe the way I read this, they are looking at wanting to cut the amount of trees in the parking lot. To me, it's too much. But, the main thing to me is the design and parking.

Ms. Buford: As someone who manages an apartment complex in Mission, and is also part of a company that manages over 1,200 apartments in downtown Kansas City, those are standard numbers we use. We don't have a problem at any of our properties. I own 224 units in the city of Mission. One bedroom, two bedroom. It's kind of standard. One car, one bedroom; two cars, two bedrooms.

[Overlapping dialog.]

Unidentified: That's the guideline, one car –

[Overlapping dialog.]

Ms. Buford: But that many residents aren't going to bring that many cars.

Unidentified: What's the workable ratio for a two bedroom? Because I know a lot of people who have a two-bedroom apartment and they have one person. Or there is a person and a child.

Ms. Buford: Two-bedroom apartments often have [inaudible].

[Overlapping dialog.]

Unidentified: I don't necessarily have a problem with [inaudible]. If I see someone [inaudible]... empty parking lot with [inaudible]. So, I don't have a problem with that.

Ms. Buford: The ones that are worried about the parking at the pool, you can get signs for the hours. I know we've done that.

Ms. Dukelow: I guess I have to share that I am also concerned about height, which is why I mentioned the idea of landscaping, recognizing that we can't do it right next to a building, so it could be in a park. But, I do sympathize, and I know that it's going to take a very long time before a tree is 67 feet high.

[Laughter.]

Chairman Lee: Well, if there are no more comments, I will ask for a motion.

Mr. Brown: I move for disapproval of Case No. 17-08. I just disagree with the height of the project.

Mr. Babcock: Second.

The vote on the motion was taken, (8-0). **The motion to deny this application carried.**

Ms. Sitzman: So, the motion to deny the application has passed. The applicant will likely

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

September 25, 2017

come back to you, and based on the comments that I've heard, the height was the principal concern. So, if that adequately represents what you think you just did, we will proceed on to the next case.

Case # 17-09 Final Site Plan-Mission Trails-EPC Real Estate

Ms. Sitzman: This application is a final site plan for Mission Trails, located at 6201 Johnson Drive. As you'll recall, this was reviewed for its preliminary site plan in June 2017, with four conditions. Two were to grant deviations to maximum height in ground floor uses in accordance with the Planned District regulations. You put stipulations on submission of final traffic and stormwater studies. Also, City Council approved the TIF project plan and redevelopment agreement for this development at their September meeting. That development agreement does stipulate reservation of 50 parking stalls for public use in the parking structure, and that construction must be completed by November 30th of 2020.

As you recall, this is a five-story mixed-use building containing apartments, retail space and offices on a larger site than the last one you considered. It's 2.8 acres of infill in the downtown, near the southwest corner of Johnson Drive and Beverly Avenue. Ground floor uses fronting Johnson Drive would include a restaurant and several small retail/service spaces, as well as leasing offices for the apartments. Two hundred apartments wrapping around an internal courtyard would be located on floors two through five, as well as behind the Johnson Drive frontage on the ground floor. A four-level parking garage would be located adjacent to the building to the southeast.

Included in the staff report is a table comparing what square feet you saw at the time of preliminary, and then this one. There's not a great deal of change. There has been some refinement of the number of parking stalls in the structure and on-street, how they deviate, and things like that. There's a slight change in the ground floor retail, which may be partly due to redesign, reconfiguration, or it may be better accounting for the true amount of space. In either case, the stipulation or the deviation that was placed had to do with the percentage of frontage, which has been met. As this is a final site plan, this is primarily the design review portion of the site plan process, and you do have the authority to conduct that design review.

Included in the staff report is an overview of the various components of the Johnson Drive Design Guidelines, which identifies topic areas, giving a recap of what the design guidelines say about those topic areas, and including some staff notes. I'm only going to go over the staff notes portion of that, looking for the relevant components.

The first and primary aspect is building site orientation. In this site plan, buildings are shown parallel to the public streets and extending the width of the property, with parking behind the primary façade. The building is located along the sidewalk with parking behind or to the side, and façade treatments were similar and appropriate to what you

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

September 25, 2017

saw during the preliminary site plan time. We feel the building is appropriately sited.

Regarding parking, as I said, they are providing structured parking and minimizing the amount of surface parking in their development. They do this through a combination of surface, on-street and structured parking spaces. Access to that parking garage is both from Johnson Drive and Beverly Avenue.

We also had Traffic provide a full traffic impact analysis to follow up on the trip generation assessment they submitted previously. Obviously, this redevelopment will generate more trips, and the direction and flow of those changed as an office building, existing office building. We anticipate folks will be leaving the site in the morning, whereas with offices, they would have been arriving. We required an analysis to address all the immediately-adjacent intersections and to comment on their ability to operate, and what level of service would be provided in those areas with the additional traffic. Olsson Associates helped us with that review and are satisfied with the methodology of the analysis and the results. Therefore, no roadway improvements are recommended with the final site plan.

Regarding site access, we feel that adequate room has been reserved for the street scape elements along Johnson Drive. We're looking for those to be designed to match the existing Johnson Drive street scape that the City installed several years ago. So, the plantings and the street trees and the design of the on-street parking would be similar to the pattern that's already established in the downtown area. There are service and delivery areas located inside the building. Those would be accessed interior to the site. There are other features of the street scape such as bike racks and street lights. We reviewed them with this plan and will continue to make sure that those are shown on the construction drawings to match that existing Johnson Drive street scape. They've also provided a pedestrian connection to the community center from the south side of the site. That's something we were encouraging. Additional street right-of-way may be dedicated with the final plat as necessary to accomplish all of this.

Regarding screening, they have provided details for the trash enclosures, onsite transformers and utility cabinets. As I said, the service and delivery areas are interior to the building. The loading dock area will be contained inside the building and will have an overhead door that rolls down. It is screened when not in use. Also, the surface parking lot on the east side of the building has a retaining wall and some landscaping that helps to screen it from view, and it is the appropriate distance back from the public ways.

Regarding landscaping, there is adequate public landscaping, and they have provided private landscaping of equal or greater quality to that along the project portions of their site. That includes foundation landscaping around the entire perimeter and planting a western patio area and an internal courtyard.

Walls and fences are detailed. On the south side of the site, there will be some black

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

September 25, 2017

iron fencing. Any retaining walls that are required would be as proposed, a segmental block wall with a matching color. At this time, they are anticipating a retaining wall along the east parking lot. They have made provision for possible replacement of the west edge of their property. They are not certain if they will need to replace that until they get further along in their analysis of the integrity of that wall and the impacts of construction. However, if it does need to be replaced, it will be of a similar design as the other retaining wall.

Regarding building façades, the applicant provided a description of their façade treatments. In general, wall faces are broken into solid and open spaces both horizontally and vertically using decks and tower features to accomplish that, as well as varied materials. There is a concentration of ground level features such as doors, storefronts, canopies, architectural lighting, decorative tile installations, and textured materials. Similar facade treatments are being implemented around all sides of the building. The face of the parking structure should be slightly altered, which I will discuss in a moment.

Regarding building proportion and scale, again, they provided a description of proportion and scale. In general, they are varying building heights and massing to accommodate the topography of the site. They have a sheet that shows the cut-throughs of the building in relationship to the different areas of the building, the different street scapes. They do incorporate building backs at various levels of the building, and in different ways. The building represents an acceptable level of detail and design and is in compliance with the intent of the design guidelines.

Regarding building materials, there is a materials board here tonight that you all can view, with a general Spanish Revival or Mission Revival architectural theme represented in their elevations, consisting of cast stone bases, stone veneer, pre-cast panels, stucco, clear glass, tile roofs and synthetic wood timber canopy elements. It also has a mosaic Spanish tile accent. These are generally natural color tones that offer low reflectance. They are intended to be low maintenance. There is a quantification of the proportion of stucco used, but it's not itemized in the same way that our design guidelines call out, so I'm not able to tell you if they did or didn't meet that. I think they will discuss that with you tonight. Staff feels that stucco is a common material for this architectural style, and are taking into account that the amount they are providing may be appropriate in a greater proportion.

Regarding roofs, this is a flat roof behind a parapet, which is an acceptable design. Rooftop units would be screened by that parapet. Display windows would be included on the ground floor. Again, the quantification that they provided for the amount of ground floor glazing is slightly less, 43 to 57 percent, certainly less than the design guidelines request. They can discuss this for you, but as the entire ground floor is not retail, it has

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

September 25, 2017

a slightly less amount of glazing, but is still appropriate, and certainly something you are able to review.

Regarding entrances, we feel those are appropriate. There are various entrances around all sides of the buildings. They follow the hierarchy that the design guidelines request in making primary entrances more obvious than surface entrances. There are canopies proposed along the ground floor to add interest to the façade, and they are appropriately designed. They have provided private sign criteria for your review. As we see with most private sign criteria, the applicant generally imposes more restrictions on the design aesthetic of signs than City code requires. They have done a good job of explaining what they would like to have on the building.

Regarding lighting, there are a variety of lighting techniques proposed for the site, including street lighting along Johnson Drive, which will match the corridor standard, as well as wall-mounted sconces, egress and pathway lighting, landscape accent lights, and parking lot site lighting. They provided the required photometric sheets, and we did check to make sure that adequate lighting levels are provided in pedestrian areas. They indicated the color temperature of the LEDs will be in the warm white color spectrum of 3,000 K, which is well below the level of the blue light LEDs that are oftentimes of concern for nighttime viewing. We would ask that they provide staff additional detail about specific luminaries that they are proposing. They picked a company that makes several different kinds and we were not able to verify that they were full cut-off before the staff report was published. We will check that before they are installed.

As I said, there is a parking structure included in this development, located behind the main structure and fronting Beverly Avenue. It's buffered from surrounding properties by a public street to the east and parking lots on City property to the south. Inside the parking garage there is planned covered bicycle storage. We will work with the applicant to make sure they picked the appropriate rack or locker system. The façade of the parking structure reflects similar design features of the main building, including stone and arched windows. There is pedestrian access inside the parking garage via separated walkways, which are connected to the Community Center and the surrounding street network. So, if you were to park in the parking garage, you could get to Beverly without having to traipse all the way through the parking field. You could also exit to the north and visit the development itself. An option metal garage canopy is shown on the top level. The structure provides walls that partially screen cars that are parked on various floors. There is an exhibit included that shows an outline of those vehicles and how much they would be visible in various areas. Staff suggested that the color and texture of some materials could be improved. That was our intent in the comments regarding use of stone veneer and/or similar treatments. I have discussed with the architect about other ways to meet that intent besides the specific stone veneer SV-1 and SV-2 applications. Staff feels that that would be an acceptable conversation to

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

September 25, 2017

continue to have. I'm certainly not going to design the building for them, so if they tell me those are not appropriate for that construction type and they would be able to provide similar color and texture, that's what staff's comment was oriented towards.

We reviewed stormwater on site and Olsson Associates has reviewed the final stormwater summary and found it to be satisfactory. This developer appeared before the Sustainability Commission and received a favorable opinion. We reviewed to make sure the applicant met the deviations as far as the height of the building, and they have. A majority of the street frontage along Johnson Drive is shown as retail or service uses.

Included in your staff report is the findings of fact for a final site plan. Staff does recommend approval of the final site plan for #17-09 – Mission Trails, with stipulations. First, that prior to the issuance of any buildings permits, a final plat be approved by the City. This is for the dedication of right-of-way for all of those on-street improvements. Second, prior to the approval of construction drawings by staff, they accomplish several minor details. Those include providing acceptable bike racks or lockers in the parking structure; ensuring all Johnson Drive streetscape elements match the Johnson Drive project as-built drawings; and providing full cut-off information for the pole-mounted site lighting in the parking lot.

Finally, the third condition is one that has to do with the parking structure. We'd like them to submit a revised final site plan for staff review only, basically accomplishing extension of the stone material or similar treatment along the base of the parking structure to match the main structure, and that they integrate into the tower-like walls on the south and north elevations an additional color or texture treatment.

Included in your packet was their project narrative, our Olsson Associates' opinion letter; the full traffic impact study and stormwater study; their previous preliminary site plan and sign criteria; and the site plans. Also, the sign criteria should be approved with final site plan. That concludes staff's report.

Chairman Lee: Thank you. Would the applicant like to step forward?

Steve Coon, EPC Real Estate, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Mr. Coon: As Danielle said, we have been working hard to work through all these items and provide all the information she needs to evaluate the project. I think the first time I talked about this project, I said one of our goals was to create a building that withstands the test of time, one that fits in the community architecturally, something that is significant and blends with what's going in along Johnson Drive. We feel like we have accomplished that.

I want to turn this over to Henry Klover, our architect, who is going to walk you through some of the things we did. I'll be available for any questions you might have after.

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

September 25, 2017

Thank you.

Henry Klover, Klover Architects, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Mr. Klover: It's my pleasure to be here tonight. Danielle did a magnificent job; she was very thorough. A lot of what I want to talk about are the massing of the building and how that came about. The site drops dramatically from right to left, west to east, so it gave us the opportunity to create a higher element at the corner of the project. What you see on the east side is the 2,500-square foot covered area that is going to have the ability to enclose in the wintertime. So, when it gets colder, we'll be able to extend the timeframe, and be a gathering area for the community. Wrapped around it is 5,000 square feet of retail that we're hoping is going to be either a one-user or a combination of users, coffee shops, which would make this a place to be and a place to gather. The retail on the west side is shorter, around 12 feet. As you get to the east side, those doors are about 16 feet in height.

A lot of discussion was on massing. We paid attention to how to mass the building, and the character elements. The first element that you see when you're coming from the east is a two-story element, which are set back so the units above it have 5-foot [inaudible], above it. So, the wall above is setback. The walls are articulated. Everything on the lower level is the natural stone that you see on the material board. We don't get into any of the stucco until above the second level. The arches are cast stone. We created canopy elements to provide for signage opportunities for each of those, as well, because right now, we don't know if it's going to be one; it might be two or three. But, it wraps that corner. So, the presence is not just the street presence on Johnson Drive, it's also the presence that faces north, as well. It's the same on both sides.

As you go down, obviously there's a main entrance to the residential, which is the arched element. We did a dusk view of the sunlight, you might say, so it's a little hard to see in this dusk view. We wanted to accentuate the character elements and features. The center of the building steps back, as well. What you're seeing is a combination of, the patio is stepped back five feet, and the center steps back 10 feet, and then, we pull the patios back out again. So, you have center column areas that are going up in the center, as well as a similar type thing on the other corner, where we wrapped the corner with patios again to create that back-and-forth. Retail on the first level is flush with the outside of the patio and the patio step back. So, the corners of the building articulate.

You can see where we've done the retail, and the restaurant area, you can see that it's got its own trash enclosure right below that. You can see the loading dock and trash. Those are behind the doors. They are very well hidden. We also took pains to create, instead of just a flat wall, on the west side, the building depths are only about 60 feet, and then they step back further. So, we're creating these environments. We thought that

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

September 25, 2017

would be another nice environment, too, because that's where that wall she's talking about is today, the little stone wall that we don't know if it protects the foundation. It shouldn't. Our property line goes all the way to the face of the Salvation Army building. But, we were concerned when we started working with stuff, whether – It's a really nice wall, so we want to try and save it. But, the engineers are not sure because you have to put stormwater and all kinds of things in there. We're thinking of planting that wall, creating a nice area for pocket parking there. We take great pains. Everyone has dogs, so we have places for people to walk their dogs, too.

As Danielle said, there's interconnectivity between buildings. You can see the walkway connection. The disadvantage we have is the grade. We're stepping down and [inaudible] the building a few feet. If you've looked at that site, it drops almost 10 feet from one side to the other. It should work out nicely because you drive in off of Johnson Drive, you enter the parking garage. If you take a left, you're going through a controlled gate that goes to residents' parking. If you continue and go down, you will be in the public parking area, and you exit onto Beverly.

Part of the discussion was on the percentage of material. We're not used to calculating things on building elevations based on per floor because you don't look at things per floor. But, needless to say, the entire first level across Johnson Drive is all stone, or glass, or store front. We don't have a predominant massive quantity of glass, you might say, because it's keeping with the character. When you're building things that are supposed to look like natural stone, there are certain things they want to have. If you make them too narrow, they look spindly, and they look odd. We want to create something that is classic and timeless and would last, and 20 years from now, we would be proud of. Not kitschy or cute.

The site lighting. The light fixtures are LED fixtures, and they are completely viable. I've talked to the manufacturers and we will be able to satisfy any concerns you have. We are an exception to the conditions. The clarification for us was the material. The garage is built by Coreslab, or is intended to be built by Coreslab, so it's precast slab. There's all kinds of things they can do. I've seen them build something that looks like the wall behind you. It wasn't wood, but I've seen them build it. So, we've got the capability of doing anything, but you need to build it in the material as opposed to adding something after the fact. And that was my reservation. These will show up, they'll stand up, we're done. The base is easy. Obviously, we can do whatever we need to with the base, but something that's 40 feet in the air, we want it to be part of the building. And we've done projects like that garage where it's all acid wash, so it looks like cast stone, limestone. There's a lot of fun things we can do, and we'll work with staff on that. I just want to make sure that the statement of the SB-2, we don't intent to put tile up higher, and we wouldn't do that anyway.

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

September 25, 2017

I think I've covered all of the concerns. We're here to answer any questions you may have.

Unidentified: What couldn't be done because of construction type?

Mr. Klover: The precast of the garage. It's all concrete. The comment she had, she said she wanted something similar to the material in front. We can get it look similar to that, but it's not a tile added to the building, it's integral to the building. The construction of the building.

Mr. Brown: Are these your materials?

Mr. Klover: Yes, sir.

Mr. Brown: Okay. It's hard to –

[*Overlapping dialog.*]

Mr. Klover: I had to carry it in here. This is an actual product that we've used before. It's a natural stone that's actually thin, that we'll put on the outside of the building. It's similar to the material we put onto Oak Park Mall.

Mr. Brown: You can make it stay on?

Mr. Klover: That's not a problem with the material. That's a problem with installation. We're also going to fully embed this, too. We're planning to do real clay, not concrete. This is the material that she was talking about trying to get closer to. The colors are very subtle. When you hear the word "faux" – and this one is actually on foam. The wood is a VPython (?) material. We do that because if something is basically a synthetic that would rot, would disintegrate, [inaudible]. I've got [inaudible] buildings where wood is disintegrating and falling apart. And I've got this in projects now. The fence, the aluminum, this is an example of the mosaic tile that we're talking about doing on the corner. And then, there is the precast. This is a sample of the precast, by the way. It's an acid wash. You would not know that this is not cast stone. The wall that Danielle mentioned is this image over here. It's very rugged-looking, looks like natural stone. We use this on projects because most of the time, you can't tell a difference.

Mr. Troppito: What kind of security is going to be provided to the east end public space you were describing?

Mr. Klover: It will have garage doors that come down and you can close it off. I imagine in the summer time it won't be because it will be internal. That will be dependent on the tenants that we get and what type of operation they are. But there will also be cameras. These communities, there's about \$60,000 in cameras and security equipment. And the doors are all electronically locked. The gates are fast-opening for residents, as well. So, it's all about security and safety.

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

September 25, 2017

Mr. Brown: One of our discussion points in the preliminary was the amount of retail space on the lower level. That seems to have taken a 1,000-square foot reduction. What was the reason for that?

Mr. Klover: It's not actually a reduction. It's just that we didn't count some of the stuff that we counted before. What we're counting now is the restaurant. We're not even counting the 2,500 square feet of the patio space. So, you could say that's 7,500 square feet. The goal is to make it more usable in the wintertime. What you see all the way to the west side of the screen, that's the same retail. The only place the square footage went down was we didn't count the leasing office. We basically got it approved without counting the leasing office. So, that's what we did. We didn't reduce any of it.

Mr. Coon: It's important to point out that the storefront along Johnson Drive is all retail storefront. So, from a visual standpoint, I mean, all the retail, but the leasing office is also in the storefront. So, if you're driving on Johnson Drive, it looks like retail.

Mr. Klover: You wouldn't know that it's a broker's office.

Mr. Brown: Good. That's what we were asking for.

Mr. Braden: You mentioned a coffee shop. Did you say it's not going to be a restaurant, or an addition to the restaurant?

Mr. Coon: It's 5,000 square feet. How it gets used or broken up is still to be determined. You could do it with a single tenant, and they're talking to people in that respect. It could also be a sub shop and a coffee shop, too.

Mr. Klover: We'd be happy if it was a sit-down restaurant. Maybe a single sit-down restaurant, or maybe two. There's already a lot of retail along Johnson Drive, so we don't know what we're going to end up with until we get it filled.

Mr. Coon: And they don't make that decision when you're twenty-some-odd months out.

Mr. Klover: But we feel like with the open space and the arches, the lighting, the visibility to the street, it's got to be primo restaurant space. It just has to be.

Chairman Lee: Any other comments or questions?

Ms. Dukelow: I have a question, and this may be for staff. Are bike racks included -? We talked about it being in the parking structure, but I mean at the street level, as part of the street scape.

Mr. Klover: Yeah, they're over here. When she's talking about the bike racks, we've got them internally here, but they're also over here in these areas. The reason she mentioned this style and type is because we picked something that the style was pretty close to what we saw there today. Basically, she'll get us exactly what you used, and we'll match it. We already tried to match it. We picked something that was close.

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

September 25, 2017

Ms. Dukelow: So, four tower-like walls on the south and north elevations. This is with regards to the parking structure, or are we talking about an extension of the stone veneer, SV-1, on the entire basement parking structure? You're telling me that the parking structure is only precast?

Mr. Klover: Yes. The stone at the base is added. Anything above that, we would like to make sure it's a [inaudible] material and color. And referring to the towers, there are arched elements that, for example –

Unidentified: Correct me if I'm wrong, but I think she is referring to these elements here.

Ms. Sitzman: Actually, it's to the left –

Unidentified: These guys.

Ms. Sitzman: Yes.

Unidentified: I didn't understand before. I thought you miscounted.

Ms. Dukelow: Those elements -?

Ms. Sitzman: The one here, the one here, two, and on the east side there are a couple more.

Ms. Dukelow: And those are precast elements?

Mr. Klover: Yes. Everything you see here is precast. Except for the base. The stone base is added on after the fact. But they do wonderful work. Texture, character. If you go to the actual plan, if you want stepping stones, there's probably hundreds on the side of the building, all the different samples.

Chairman Lee: I'll entertain a motion.

Ms. Sitzman: Mr. Chair, the motion, if you want to amend the fourth condition to read "or similar," I think that would take care of the difference in the precast construction and what I called out in the original wording.

Ms. Dukelow: Was that the third?

Ms. Sitzman: Yes, I'm sorry, the third one. The one that says, "Submit a revised final site plan for staff review and approval, showing the extension of stone veneer" or similar. It's 3-a and 3-b. Instead of calling out specific material, SB-1 and SB-2, it would be "or similar." I think that's the intent in what is being discussed tonight.

Ms. Dukelow: All right. I'll make a motion. I'd like to make a motion that we approve Case No. 17-09, final site development plan for Mission Trails, with staff's recommended conditions:

1. Prior to the issuance of any building permits, a revised final plat must be

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

September 25, 2017

approved by the City. Right-of-way should be dedicated including all on-street parking areas, sidewalks, and public infrastructure.

2. Prior to the approval of construction drawings by staff:
 - a. Provide an acceptable bike racks/locker in the parking structure
 - b. Ensure all Johnson Drive streetscape elements match the recent Johnson Drive project As-Built drawings
 - c. Provide full cut-off of parking lot/structure pole mounted site lighting.
3. Submit a revised final site plan for staff review and approval showing:
 - a. The extension of the stone veneer (SV-1), **or similar**, along the entire base of the parking structure to match the main structure.
 - b. The four tower like walls on the south and north elevations should receive a treatment (SV-2) similar to the main north facade.
- 4. Approval of the private sign criteria as presented.**

Chairman Lee: I'll second that.

The vote on the motion was taken, (8-0). **The motion carried.**

Planning Commission Comments/CIP Updates

Ms. Sitzman: I don't think there have been any CIP meetings since the last time you met. There is a bus tour that folks are going on this Wednesday evening, so there will be things to report back the next time you meet.

Ms. Dukelow: I have a couple questions. One is the issue of parking spaces. I don't know if we need to do something about that or not, but I understand that the two bedrooms with two cars is not reasonable. Again, I'm not sure what that ratio is, or what it should be. I feel like we have information, but we may need to formalize it.

Mr. Babcock: I agree.

Ms. Dukelow: That way, we don't feel like we're creating it at the time.

Mr. Babcock: I agree. The reason I agree is, I mean, like his desire to take a recommended parking criteria and drop it by 21 percent. You're saying that's okay. And I get what you're saying because that's your experience. Twenty-one percent is a big percentage. So, my point is, if our guideline's off, it shouldn't be our guideline. You know what I'm saying? I mean, we're supposed to be following these guidelines. If the guidelines aren't appropriate, maybe we should tweak them.

Ms. Dukelow: I was thinking that, as well. My next comment has to do with irrigation. I'm not sure that we should require irrigation because it's kind of wasteful. I would rather us

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

September 25, 2017

encourage indigenous plants and no irrigation after the establishment period. And I'm not sure why we require irrigation. That's one of my questions. My follow-up question is whether the Johnson Drive corridor has irrigation.

Ms. Sitzman: To the first point, we have seen severe difficulty in establishing street trees, so we were making use of the ability to require irrigation so we weren't having to replant them once we made the improvements. Street trees are kind of in a constrained, hostile environment. So, we can give them a head start. That's our interest in irrigation, is that so elements of streetscapes thrive and survive after we accept them. I don't know that we would require irrigation of their on-site landscape. So, yes, things that are hardy and can thrive without extra inputs are the desire. But the requirements for irrigation have to do with streetscape.

Ms. Dukelow: Okay. Thank you.

Staff Update

Staff provided an update on current and upcoming projects and events.

ADJOURNMENT

With no other agenda items, **Mr. moved** and **Ms. Dukelow seconded a motion to adjourn.** (Vote was unanimous). The **motion carried.** The meeting adjourned at _____ P.M.

Mike Lee, Chair

ATTEST:

Ashley Elmore, Secretary