

# **MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

**March 28, 2022**

## **Call to Order**

The regular meeting of the Mission Planning Commission was called to order by Chairman Mike Lee at 7:00 PM Monday, March 28, 2022. Members also present: Brian Schmid, Charlie Troppito, Amy Richards, Robin Dukelow, Stuart Braden, Megan Cullinane, and Cynthia Smith and Wayne Snyder. Also in attendance: Brian Scott, Deputy City Administrator, Kimberly Steffens, Recording Secretary, Karie Kneller, City Planner, and Audrey McClanahan, City Clerk.

## **Approval of Minutes from the February 28, 2022 Meeting**

**Chairman Lee:** The first item on the item on the agenda will be approval of the minutes from our February 28<sup>th</sup> meeting.

**Comm. Dukelow moved and Comm. Braden seconded a motion to approve the minutes of the February 28, 2022, Planning Commission meeting.**

The vote was taken (9-0) **The motion carried.**

## **New Business**

### **1. Public Hearing – Case #22-05 – Approval of a Special Use Permit for Bickford at Mission Springs**

**Chairman Lee:** [We have three items under New Business, the first is Case #22-05 which is a Special Use Permit for Bickford at Mission Springs. At this time, I would like to open the public hearing.

**Ms. Kneller:** This is Case #22-05, approval of a Special use Permit for Bickford at Mission Springs. The subject property is an assisted living and memory care facility. It is located at 5350 West 61<sup>st</sup> Place, north of Shawnee Mission Parkway, between 61<sup>st</sup> Place and Rock Creek Lane, just east of Nall Avenue. Primary vehicular ingress and egress is on 61<sup>st</sup> Place, with a fire access road and gate on the east at Rock Creek Lane, right in this area. There is a utility access road that connects to the northwest corner right here. The parking lot leads to the back of the property and City-owned property for utility access. The total land area of the property is 165,881 square feet, about 3.8 acres. There are two buildings on the site, connected by an elevated walkway right here. Building One, a two-story structure erected in 1996, has a footprint of approximately 16,000 square feet. Building Two here is a three-story structure erected in 1997 and has a footprint of approximately 12,000 square feet, for a total of approximately 28,000 square feet of land area, which consists of about 17 percent of the total property.

Surface parking for about 50 vehicles. The parking lot consists of approximately 17,777 square feet of the property area, or about 11 percent, and contains a landscape island. Surface access is located on the west side of the property, behind Building One here. A small, channeled creek that runs under 61<sup>st</sup> Place and empties into Rock Creek to the north encroaches onto the western edge of the property by about 60 feet in the southwest corner during a 100-year flood event, which comes within about 26 feet of the most southern edge of Building Two, according to FEMA flood insurance rate maps. Habitable

## MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

March 28, 2022

structures are not in the 100-year flood plain. A stormwater inlet captures runoff from the stream on the southern area of the subject property, and the entire south and west side of the property is heavily treed with a variety of deciduous species, which buffers the stream and provides additional protection against flood risk for the property. The eastern portion of the property is also heavily treed and contains a short walking path adjacent to the fire access road.

The subject property is zoned CPO – Planned Office Building District. It is adjacent to zone CPO, CP-1 and R-1, which includes Countryside Christian Church and office buildings on the west and is bordered by residential neighborhood to the north and the east. The property is well-maintained, and the facility is a well-established operation that is an asset to the community and surrounding area. It is screened from adjacent residential, office and religious institutions by extensive tree cover. It is currently Mission's only assisted living facility with skilled nursing capacity.

In November and December of 1995, prior to the construction of the first building, the Planning Commission and City Council approved a Special Use Permit under Ordinance 927 for the property to be used as an assisted living facility. Assisted living facilities are not listed as a permitted use in CPO. However, assisted living and memory care facilities or nursing homes may operate in any zoning district with a Special Use Permit. The future land use map and the Comprehensive Plan designates this property as medium density residential, which this fits.

In January of 2022, a Bickford employee contacted City staff and requested verification that the property did not have any zoning or code violations as the property was being sold. Employees shared a letter drafted by Planning staff in November of 2011, which confirmed that the CPO zoning code and Special use Permit granted by Ordinance 927 was for the assisted living facility. Current Planning staff reviewed the ordinance and discovered that the Special Use Permit had expired in November of 2020, and neither the current property owners nor the City were aware that it had expired. Staff also discovered that the property had not been platted at the time of construction. The property has remained unplatted since before it was developed, and we will review the Preliminary Plat and Final Plat with Case No. 22-06 next.

Under Article 3, Special Use Permits in the City of Mission Municipal Code, the following stipulations apply:

Nursing homes are allowed in all districts, and under Section 440.140 subsection E, the following criteria are considered for applications:

- The character of the neighborhood
- The extent to which the approval would detrimentally affect nearby properties
- Relative benefit to the public welfare compared to destruction of value of property or hardship to the owner by denying the request
- Consideration for the Comprehensive Plan

## MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

March 28, 2022

- The extent to which utilities and public services are available, extent to which uses create excessive pollution or environmental harm
- The extent to which there is need for the use in the community
- The economic impact of the use on the community along with the ability of the applicant to satisfy any requirements imposed
- The recommendation of professional staff

It is staff's interpretation that a Special Use Permit renewal for the continued use of the property as assisted living facility meets all applicable criteria in Article 3, Section 440.140. The facility and its surrounding property is harmonious with nearby properties and does not detrimentally affect public health or property values. The use is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan as medium density residential adjacent to office, low density residential and public uses are part of encouraged mixed use and has adequate access to utilities and public services. Excessive pollution and environmental harm have not been reported, to staff's knowledge, and the operation has not negatively impacted the community economically. The applicant has thus far met all requirements imposed by the City and other regulatory bodies. The assisted living facility is a benefit to public welfare, and denying the applicant could imposed a hardship to the property owner.

Under Section 445-201 of the City's Municipal Code, Special Use Permits may be, for a specified time period or as continual, except as provided in Section 445.230, which states the following:

1. If a use is discontinued by a period of time for more than six months, this Special Use Permit shall expire; and
2. Revocation of a Special Use permit may be granted if any of the following conditions are met:
  - Any non-compliance with the applicable requirements
  - Any non-compliance with any special conditions imposed at the time of approval
  - Any violation of any of the provisions of the Code, or where conditions of the neighborhood have changed to the extent that approval would be unwarranted
  - Any violation of any state or federal law or regulation

It is staff's interpretation that a Special Use Permit renewal for the continued use of the property as an assisted living facility does not meet any of the stipulations for revocation in 445.210, and therefore would likewise not meet the stipulations for applicant denial. The property has been used continuously as an assisted living facility since it was developed in 1996, and the property has not in the past, nor is it currently in violation of any local, state or federal regulations. It is staff's recommendation that the Planning Commission recommend approval to the City Council of Case 22-05 for issuance of a Special Use Permit for the operation of a nursing home at 5350 West 61<sup>st</sup> Place, with the following conditions:

## MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

March 28, 2022

1. The Special Use Permit shall be permanent until such time as the use of the facility changes
2. The Special Use Permit shall become void if the facility is vacant for six months or more
3. The facility shall remain compliant with all local, state and federal laws and regulations, including proper licensing to operate as an assisted living facility, and provide copies of such licenses to the City of Mission
4. The applicant shall provide the City of Mission with any Inspection Reports from the State of Kansas and shall provide documentation of all license renewals
5. Fire ingress and egress access from the west at 61<sup>st</sup> Place and from the northeast at the drive access to Rock Creek Lane shall remain and be maintained in an adequate condition that fire apparatus has sufficient clearance for entry onto and throughout the property.
6. Fire department access via the northeast fire access drive gate shall be granted at all times
7. All screening and buffers to surrounding properties, including all landscaping elements, are maintained by the property owner, or owner's agent.
8. A final plat will be approved by the Planning Commission and City Council and recorded with the Johnson County Register of Deeds within three months of receiving this Special Use Permit. This item will be considered by the City Council at the April 20, 2022, meeting

That concludes staff's report. I believe there is a representative from Bickford present if they have anything to add.

**Mr. David Waters:** Good evening, Members of the Commission I am David Waters and I am with the Lathrop GPM Law Firm. I also happen to be the Mayor of Westwood, Kansas and before that I served on my Planning Commission for eight years, so thank you very much for the service you provide for our communities. I'm joined this evening by Mr. Larry Cohen with Trustwell Living, the applicant for this. Also, Richard Eby and Alan Fairbanks with Bickford, and Mr. Will Nulton with the Husch Blackwell law firm. I want to thank the staff for their work on this. Our clients understand all of the conditions and we have no suggested changes to that. We look forward to being able to continue to serve our residents that are there now, and the residents that will be in there in the future. If you have any questions, we are available to answer those.

**Commissioner Troppito:** Question. Under Conditions of Approval, can you or staff, either one, answer this? It says, "The facility shall remain compliant with all local, state and federal laws and regulations, including proper licensing to operate an assisted living facility, and provide copies of such licenses to the City of Mission." Do you have such licenses? Did you give the copies?

**Mr. Waters:** We don't have them yet, no.

# MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

March 28, 2022

**Commissioner Troppito:** No?

**Mr. Scott:** They are required with a Special Use Permit issuance to submit those to us.

**Mr. Waters:** We're happy to get those to the City as part of the approval. We'll try to get those before City Council approval. There might be some issues with changes of names that need to be updated. The property is being acquired by Trustwell Living, so those licenses will change names, but we will get them to the City.

**Commissioner Troppito:** Makes sense. Thank you.

## MOTION

**Comm. Braden moved and Comm. Cullinane seconded a motion to recommend to the City Council approval of Case No. 22-05 for issuance of a Special Use Permit for operation of a nursing home at 5350 West 61<sup>st</sup> Street with the conditions outlined in the staff report.**

The vote was taken (9-0). **The motion passed.**

**Vice Chair Dukelow:** I think Charlie and I seconded at the same time.

**Mr. Scott:** We will give you each half a credit.

**Vice Chair Dukelow:** Half credit each.

## **2. Public Hearing– Case #22-06 – Approval of Preliminary and Final Plat for Bickford at Mission Springs**

**Ms. Kneller:** I'd be happy to. Again, this is the same property as the 22-05 case number you just heard, so I won't go into the property information again for you. I'm sure you can remember that far in the past. The Code review for consideration of Preliminary Plats falls under Section 440.220 of the Municipal Code. It states that Preliminary Plats shall be approved by the Planning Commission if it determines that:

1. The proposed Preliminary Plat conforms to the requirements of this title. The applicable zoning district regulations and any other applicable provisions of this Code, subject only to acceptable rule exceptions. It is staff's determination that the proposed plat is in conformance.
2. The subdivision or platting represents an overall development pattern that is consistent with the Master Plan and the Official Street Map. It is staff's determination that the plat represents a development pattern already established and supported by the Comprehensive Plan.

## **MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

**March 28, 2022**

3. The plat contains a sound, well-conceived parcel and subdivision layout which is consistent with good land planning and site engineering design principles. It is staff's determination that the plat supports good land planning and allows for future development in compliance with adopted standards.
4. The spacing and design of proposed curb cuts and intersection locations is consistent with good traffic engineering design and public safety considerations. This being a plat that does not propose any changes to the curb cuts or intersections is staff's determination.
5. All submission requirements have been satisfied. Yes, under 440.220, Submission of Preliminary Plats, all those requirements have been satisfied.

For Final Plats, the Municipal Code at 440.260 states that Final Plat shall be approved by the Planning Commission if it determines that:

1. The final plat substantially conforms to the approved preliminary plat and rule exceptions granted thereto. Staff determined that the Final Plat matches the Preliminary Plat as submitted with this application.
2. The plat conforms to all applicable requirements of this Code, subject only to approved rule exceptions. Code requirements are described below. The proposed plat is in conformance.
3. All submission requirements have been satisfied. All the requirements of 440.250, Submission of Final Plats, have been satisfied.
4. Approval of a final plat shall require the affirmative vote of a majority of the membership of the Planning Commission.

Staff's analysis is as follows. The Preliminary and Final Plats with this application consist of one lot and two tracts. Lot area is 182,516 square feet, or 4.2 acres. Tract 1, in this total area, is the largest tract, with 180,162 square feet, or 4.14 acres, and Tract area 2, located in this area here, this little triangular tract, is only 2,133 square feet, or 0.05 acres. The existing 25-foot right-of-way on the northern portion of the property shall remain as access for road purposes if the City plans road connection from 61<sup>st</sup> Street to Rock Creek Lane in the future. The easements proposed in the plat are areas dedicated to the City and/or responsible agencies for access to construct or repair public utilities such as stormwater, sanitary sewer, electrical and other utilities.

Zone CPO of the Mission Municipal Code does not contain lot area restrictions. Generally, under Section 455.100 of the Mission Municipal Code, a typical subdivision at the time of an original plat shall exercise good design and layout, that good planning principles are followed, efficient use of land and natural assets such as trees and topography be retained wherever practical. The above dimensions and designations are in accordance with the ordinances set forth in the Mission Municipal Code.

Staff recommends the following Conditions of Approval: Access easements shall be dedicated in the Final Plat for ingress/egress at the northeast corner of the property as secondary emergency access. This should be submitted as a revision to staff as soon as

# MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

March 28, 2022

possible for final approval. This can be done immediately following this meeting. The City Council will hear the Final Plat at their April 20, 2022 meeting. Are there any questions?

[inaudible]

**Commissioner Troppito**: I've always been reluctant voting to approve plats where the surveyor hasn't signed it. I notice this time that it has been certified by a registered surveyor. I appreciate staff's attention to that. I have no reluctance at this point in approval. Thank you.

**Commissioner Cullinane**: Mr. Chair if I may, I noticed in the staff report that the square footage for each of the tracts does not add up to the total for the lot. Is supposed to or is there some reason it does not.

**Mr. Scott**: So, you're saying her (Ms. Kneller) math is bad?

**Ms. Kneller**: That must have been a typo. I can correct those for the record.

**Mr. Scott**: We'll double check on that before we submit it to the City Council Thank you for bringing it to our attention.

**Vice Chair Dukelow**: Mr. Chairman, if there is no further discussion, I'll make a motion.

**Vice Chair Dukelow moved and Comm. Troppito seconded a motion to recommendation to City Council approval of Case #22-06, Preliminary and Final Plat for Bickford at Mission Springs, with the condition that an access easement shall be dedicated in the Final Plat for ingress/egress at the northeast corner of the property as a secondary emergency access. This should be submitted as a revision to staff as soon as possible for final approval.**

**Commissioner Troppito**: Second.

The vote was taken (9-0). **The motion passed.**

### **3. Site Improvements – Case #22-08 – Mohawk Park Site Improvements**

**Ms. Kneller**: The subject property, Mohawk Park, is owned by the City of Mission and managed by the Parks and Recreation Department. It is located at 6649 Lamar Avenue in the northeast corner of 67<sup>th</sup> Street and Lamar. The parcel is also bounded by Horton Drive on the east and residential properties on the north. It is located at the southmost border of Mission, with the boundary of Overland Park across 67<sup>th</sup> Street to the south and Lamar to the west. The subject property is the site of the former Mohawk Elementary School, which you see there on the right, an aerial from 1996. The school closed in 1979, due to declining enrollment. It was utilized by the Shawnee Mission School District for administrative offices, and then the Center for International Studies until the early 2000's, when the building was demolished and the property was sold to the City of Mission for a park.

## **MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

**March 28, 2022**

The property and surrounding neighborhood is zoned R1, Single-Family Residential District, and Mohawk Park is enveloped by residential single-family homes. The Milhaven neighborhood in Mission is adjacent to the property on the northeast. The Walmer, Southmoor Gardens and Highland Plains neighborhoods in Overland Park are adjacent to the west and south of the property. The terrain is relatively flat, with the highest point in the northwest, and water runoff generally draining to the west and south. There is a gradual ten-foot elevation change across the just about 8-acre site. Currently, some minor pooling during heavy rain events occurs at the northwest corner of the property in the open, grassy area. Existing stormwater inlets at the northwest and southern borders of the property capture stormwater runoff from the site as well. The site has access to water, sewer and electrical utilities.

Here on this map you can see the stormwater inlets as the blue circles, or dots, on the maps. Those are where the stormwater inlets are. The site is currently developed with an exiting parking lot on the west. Walking trails and a playground are located generally to the north and northeast quadrant, adjacent to a circle drive located here. Approximately 16 percent of the site is impervious surface, and 84 percent of the parcel is open space. Total land area is approximately 340,708 square feet, or 7.8 acres. There are no existing buildings constructed on the site currently. Two soccer fields exist in the northwest and southeast quadrants respectively, approximately 21,000 square feet of surface parking on the western edge of the property remains from when the school existed and can accommodate about 50 cars. Playground equipment adjacent to the circle drive in the northeast quadrant of the property connects with a network of walking paths throughout the site. However, ADA access to the trail network from parking areas is currently limited.

The City adopted the Mission Parks and Recreation Master Plan in 2018. The Plan recommends several improvements for Mission's parks, including new signage for all parks, which were installed in 2020, and new facility improvements in each of the parks. Mission Parks and Rec Department contracted SFS Architects to begin Master Planning improvements for each of the City's primary parks, including Mohawk, Broadmoor and Waterworks. Mohawk Park is the first of the three to move from plan to implementation. Improvements are funded by a three-eighths-cent sales tax for Parks and Recreation and a land/water conservation grant the Mission received late last year.

Proposed improvements include a public use shelter and public restrooms to encourage efficient use of the playing fields and current programs, with new sidewalks connections from the proposed facilities to the existing park trails. The Plan also calls for storage facility as part of the shelter, water fountains, irrigation and furnishings. Demolition of the existing parking lot on the west side of the property and construction of a new parking lot on the south, along 67<sup>th</sup> Street with existing additional parallel parking in the half circle is proposed as an alternative bid if the budget for the project allows. Otherwise, the existing parking lot will remain as it is.

The future land use map and the Comprehensive Plan recommend preserving the open green spaces in Mission and maintaining existing Parks and Recreation facilities. These amenities promote neighborhood stability, public health and safety and provide outdoor recreation opportunities as well as visual enjoyment and promote environmental benefits



## **MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

**March 28, 2022**

such as carbon capture, air and water purification and wildlife habitat. The City has committed to the maintenance and enhancement of its existing parklands. The Plan also calls for sustainability practices and building standards for facilities that align with leadership in energy and environmental design, or LEED, principles and practices.

The Parks and Recreation Master Plan recommends implementing the following improvements for Mohawk Park that are included in this proposal. The redesign of Mohawk Park in a way that configures the playing fields to allow for the same programs but in a more efficient manner is a high priority. The design and construction of a permanent shelter that includes restrooms, a storage facility and water fountain stations are medium-level priorities. Replacement and expansion of existing site furnishing is also a medium-level priority, and incorporation of irrigation for field improvements is a low priority. These are all included with the plan.

The base bid retains the existing parking lot in this area here, and adds a new restroom facility and public shelter pavilion at a central location on the site, right here, with connections to the existing trail and sidewalk network. The base bid does not include improvements to the existing parking lot, except that there will be two parking stalls that are ADA compliant as new striping and a concrete sidewalk that connects from the parking to the existing walking trail will be constructed in this area.

Additional ADA ramps will be constructed, one here from the circle drive to the existing walking trail, and two ADA ramps at the lower corners on the southwest and southeast corners of the property as well that connect to the street network. Restroom facility is a 683-square-foot structure. It consists of three unisex units. You can see that here in the site plan. It consists of unisex units, which contain toilet facilities, sinks and changing tables, an additional handwashing station, and water fountains are proposed on the exterior wall at this location. Low flow water fixtures and countertops with recycled content will be included. The structure is designed with a metal seamed shed roof and wood-look batten details, CMU walls and pre-finished steel vertical structural posts. The north side of the structure features an enclosed storage room for park maintenance equipment. New LED lighting with occupancy sensors is proposed for the interior and exterior of both the restroom and shelter facilities. Both structures will also be constructed using insulated CMU sourced within a 100-mile radius.

Specifications for the remainder of the building materials will be sourced within a 500-mile radius, if possible, or less, if possible. The electrical configurations will be designed for future photovoltaic roof panels.

The alternative bid includes the base bid proposed improvements. The alternative bid also proposes demolition of the existing parking lot and construction of a new parking lot on the south side of the property, with a new entrance that aligns with the north/south oriented, Beverly, which is right here in this area, so it aligns with Beverly to the south, across 67<sup>th</sup>. The new parking lot could accommodate approximately 40 vehicles with two ADA spaces. The alternative bid also includes additional landscaping that would encourage stormwater runoff capture and containment from existing and new impervious surface. Accommodation of new trees and ground cover landscaping could contribute to

## MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

March 28, 2022

the environmental and economic sustainability of the improvements by mitigating increased runoff and impact to stormwater infrastructure. The alternative bid is dependent upon available funding.

Staff's general assessment is that both alternatives will increase impervious surface from the existing condition by approximately 8,500 to 9,200 square feet respectively, but will largely preserve green space to minimize stormwater runoff and preserve open space. The proposed improvements will decrease impervious area by 1.7 acres from the conditions before 2003 when the school and parking services existed on the site.

The proposed structure conform with the Comprehensive Plan, Parks and Recreation Master Plan and Citywide Design Guidelines and will provide a modern architectural design aesthetic using durable, low maintenance materials.

Size and location of the structures will have minimal impact on surrounding neighborhoods. The scale and design are consistent with single family neighborhoods and encourage pedestrian activity with a pleasing visual aesthetic. The relocation of the parking lot, should that occur, will not significantly affect traffic patterns in and around the site as the alternative lot size would be marginally smaller, and the entrance would be on a similar collector street. The available funds limit the scope of the improvements in this base bid. If more funding becomes available for improvements at Mohawk Park in the future, a more in-depth plan for universal design features including ADA accessible features should be evaluated. Addition sustainable and environmentally sound design systems, such as photovoltaic roof panels and electric vehicle charging stations may be a consideration in the future as well.

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission recommend approval to the City Council of Case 22-08 for site improvements at Mohawk Park, with the following conditions of approval:

1. The base bid approval is contingent upon ADA compliance in the existing parking lot, circle drive and at pedestrian connections.
2. A right-of-way permit will be required from the Cities of both Mission and Overland Park during the time construction drawings are submitted.
3. Details of grading plan that adequately address runoff issues shall be submitted with the final site plan
4. Prior to the final site plan submittal, consultant shall submit plans to the Sustainability Commission for review against the Sustainability Scorecard.

**Chairman Lee:** Thank you, Karie. Are there any questions that Planning Commission has?

**Commissioner Richards:** I do have some questions. You said the new parking lot proposals or alternative bid would accommodate 40 spaces. Do you know how many spaces, approximately, of the current parking lot?

**Ms. Kneller:** I counted the space for about 50, so maybe a few more than what the –

## MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

March 28, 2022

**Commissioner Richards:** And the base bid, you said you'll mark the ADA spots. Will it be marked for other spots?

**Ms. Kneller:** It's not included at this time.

**Commissioner Richards:** Okay. The other question I have to piggyback on this is [inaudible].

**Ms. Kneller:** And maybe Penn could answer some of the questions. He's probably got a better idea of what's going on with the site.

**Commissioner Richards:** The other question I have is, so the alternative bid moves around a little bit the green space. I know you said that it increases green space. I think that was part of your report.

**Ms. Kneller:** From the 2003 existing conditions with the school onsite and the additional parking, the impervious surfaces at the time with it being developed as a site.

**Commissioner Richards:** So not as it is now.

**Ms. Kneller:** Not as it is now, no.

**Commissioner Richards:** So, does it decrease green space as it is now?

**Ms. Kneller:** A bit, yes, with the facilities.

**Commissioner Richards:** So, currently, I feel like...there are two soccer fields there. One where the parking lot is, a little bit, and one up in the northwest corner. I know those get a lot of use and so I was wondering if there was enough space, like if that space on the right, lower southeast corner would still be enough space to be used for a soccer field. I do know that that area over on the southeast is a better surface for that kind of activity, versus the upper northwest, the field is very uneven and stuff, so I just wanted to know a little bit about the use on the alternative bid, if we were to go to that how that would look with those activities and if those green spaces would still be used for those soccer fields.

**Mr. Penn Almoney:** Good evening, Commission. The short answer to your question, yes and yes. We reviewed these plans with the soccer group, and that would accommodate this open area off to the bottom right is roughly the same area that's in the northwest, so that their little kindergarten and first and second-graders could host games at that location. And then, once this parking lot, the original parking lot, is eventually moved, that would open up the entire stretch. New infill would be brought up, so that that playing surface would be a higher standard than it is currently. The school used to be in that northwest corner, and essentially earth was just moved around to cover over the foundation and everything, so you're right, it's not very good soil.

**Commissioner Richards:** So, I think in the base bid, there is a grading plan. Will that address some of that?

**Mr. Almoney:** It will, yeah. There's roughly a ten-foot elevation slope from the north to the south, so the grading would take all of that into consideration and on the field specifically try to get a one- to two-percent grade and then obviously once the location of

## MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

March 28, 2022

the restrooms and pavilion, that's a little bit steeper grade coming into the stormwater runoff.

**Commissioner Richards:** Thank you.

**Mr. Almone**y: You're welcome.

[inaudible]

**Commissioner Troppito:** [inaudible] part of this [inaudible] available funds limit the scope of improvements to the base bid, if more funding becomes available [inaudible] more in-depth plan for universal design features, including ADA accessible features shall be added. Here's part of my concern. "Additional, sustainable and environmentally sound designed systems, such as photovoltaic roof panels and electric vehicle charging stations may be a consideration." That just really sounds a little wishy washy and nebulous, as far as intent, and I would prefer to see City Administration – I'll direct this comment to you, Brian, that environmental systems would be more than just a consideration.

**Mr. Scott:** Right, so every project is challenged with funding, and this is no exception, so some of the funding is coming from our three-eighths-cent Parks tax. Some of the funding is coming from a land and water conservation grant that we received late last year, but with that amount we can only go so far, so that is the reason why we have the alternate bid in here for the parking lot on the south side of the property. In a perfect world, if that comes in under our budget and we're able to get the south side parking lot, that would be a complete project – the shelter improvement, the restrooms and the parking lot. If there's any funding left-over, which I don't think there will be, or if there is any funding in the future that could be applied to this park, at that time we would try to take into consideration for sustainability initiatives, such as the electric charging stations and more universal design and things of that nature.

**Commissioner Troppito:** I understand the budgetary issues [inaudible]. Thinking more long-term than I think this particular paragraph, the way it's phrased, and as funds become available in the future or can be made available in the future, I think that should be a priority. Thank you.

**Mr. Almone**y: Council approved \$1.4 million to go to the improvements overall, so considering the order of magnitude cost we had gotten originally on the restroom and pavilion, staff was a little bit concerned that making additional improvements like the parking lot would go beyond that \$1.4, so that's why it's considered a bid alternate at this point. And there are further phases as part of Mohawk Park, but essentially the \$1.4 million we're hoping would get us the restrooms, pavilion and if everything aligns, the parking lot.

[inaudible]

**Mr. Almone**y: Correct. This is earmarked for just that project.

**Commissioner Smith:** I have a question. What is the purpose of moving the parking lot to the south?

## MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

March 28, 2022

**Mr. Almoney:** That's a great question, so early on in the process we contracted with Confluence, which is a landscape architect firm, to help us initiate the discussions and kind of taking all of the data from the 2018 Master Plan and making it come alive, engaging with the community. So, we actually have a representative from Confluence here that can speak specifically to that. While he's coming up, we did put together a stakeholder group of a Council member, a representative from Parks and Recreation and Tree Commission, a representative from the long-term rental groups, and then two neighboring residents of Milhaven, to weigh in on some of the conceptual designs. Then we took those designs to a neighborhood meeting and got some initial feedback, adjusted the layout, and then came back for a second neighborhood meeting. So, this is Hank Moyers. Hank, maybe you could speak to that.

*Hank Moyers, Confluence, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:*

**Mr. Moyers:** The parking lot configuration, as it is currently, is not as efficient as what the new proposed parking lot configuration is, and the intent of moving it further to the south was to open up that entire strip, as Penn said earlier, along the west side for the soccer fields, which allows them to rest some of those fields while they do repairs throughout the season, so they can shift them back and forth and still keep fields open fulltime for the kids to play on. The other thing that that it does is it opens up, too, for larger gatherings that we can do in the evenings, with the terraced steps coming down off of the restroom and shelter, that also opens up some opportunities to have some small gatherings on the west side of the park.

**Commissioner Smith:** Thank you.

[inaudible]

**Mr. Moyers:** The current location that we have it shown is the closest to the actual plaza space, which based on ADA guidelines, recommends the closest access points to those facilities. As part of this, the stipulation was, as well, that we have to make drainage improvements in certain zones, and that's exactly one of the zones that we're required to make improvements on, to make sure that that drains clearly.

[inaudible]

**Mr. Moyers:** That's a planting zone.

**Commissioner Richards:** The ADA designated parking for the current parking lot is in an area that collects a lot of water and mud. Can something be done with that?

**Mr. Moyers:** We will be adding an ADA accessible ramp coming off of that parking lot, but as far as striping goes, I think that's something that we would consider as well.

[inaudible]

**Mr. Moyers:** And it's also noncompliant.

**Vice Chair Dukelow:** Are there any plans to address the south entrance to the park, through the fence for ADA access?

## MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

March 28, 2022

**Mr. Moyers:** We do have it in our demolition plans to remove those sections of fence to allow for clear access points.

**Vice Chair Dukelow:** Will there be any opportunity for bio swales in the proposed parking lot on the south side of the park?

**Mr. Almoney:** I think Hank can speak to this. We did get specific feedback from neighbors on that southern edge that they would like some buildup of landscaping so they're not seeing blacktop outside of their windows, but Hank and I have talked specifically about incorporating some kind of variance in the landscaping so that there are highs and lows and it's a little bit more interesting and can break up any kind of shear winds that come across the fields.

**Vice Chair Dukelow:** I was talking more about a feature to capture the rainwater run-off and to allow it to dissipate naturally.

**Mr. Moyers:** We've looked at that. It was not a requirement by Public Works, and there was additional cost associated with that, but we can consider that further.

**Vice Chair Dukelow:** The lighting plan for the park, what Zone will that be?

**[Mr. Sadowski with SFS Architects]:** I'm not sure I know what you mean by light zone.

**Vice Chair Dukelow:** The lighting in the parking lot, what International Dark Sky/Illuminating Energy Society (IDA/IES) light zone would that be in?

**Mr. Sadowski:** I actually don't know what light zone it's in. I'd have to check with the light engineer and confirm.

**Vice Chair Dukelow:** I believe it should be specified as Zone 1 per the guidelines of the Dark-Sky association.

**Mr. Sadowski:** Okay. Yeah. I believe the fixture is all shielded and downlighted, but – I will check with the engineer and make sure that whatever he selected is appropriate for Zone 1.

[inaudible]

**Commissioner Smith:** I have a concern about the parking lot driveway in the alternate bid. That driveway cuts through that existing pedestrian path, and I was wondering if some kind of crosswalk or something to that effect is going to be addressed or put in?

**Mr. Moyers:** There will be a crosswalk across that drive, and it will be signed and marked as such.

**Commissioner Smith:** I have a follow-up question about the grading. The base bid, does it address 100 percent of the grading issues? Or a portion of it? Does the alternate bid do all of the grading issues and the base is doing 60 percent?

**Mr. Almoney:** The grading associated with the base bid will handle all of the grading issues on the south side of the existing parking lot, all the way around to the pad for the shelter and restroom. The bid alternate will address any of the other alternate items on

## MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

March 28, 2022

the southeast part of the site. Currently, we don't have any improvements on the northwest corner to handle any of that. That's outside of the initial base bid that was identified for the project.

**Ms. Kneller**: I believe from staff's perspective with the final site plan, we'll be looking at that, and our Public Works Director will be taking that and looking at it with a fine-toothed comb.

Vice Chair Dukelow: The restrooms, how will these be ventilated?

**Mr. Sadowski**: There's mechanical ventilation for that.

**Commissioner Braden**: We must be missing a sheet because I noticed that also. On the electrical plans, it shows a couple of exhaust plans, but the mechanical plans don't show anything.

**Mr. Sadowski**: Sorry. I left off the mechanical drawings.

**Commissioner Braden**: Okay.

**Commissioner Smith**: I guess I have one more comment about the parking lot and the alternate bid. As a parent of a small child, that will create some anxiety for allowing kids to use that pathway to ride bikes and such. I just wanted that to be noted.

**Mr. Almone**y: That's great feedback. We've heard that on all of our conceptual redesigns, essentially. Broadmoor Park is like that. Waterworks Park has the same situation. The conceptual design, pretty much anytime there is access coming from a feeder road into a park, there will be some need to cross over, because more often than not, the trails kind of align with the perimeter of the park. So, we've considered that, and as an alternative have created the trailway to go around the parking lot. It's a little bit longer, but it's an opportunity to kind of avoid that anxiety moment, which we completely understand.

**Commissioner Schmid**: I actually have a follow-up to that comment as well. Looking at the entrance point to that parking lot, if the entryway is truly drawn that way, you've got a very broad curve, which is I think designed to allow traffic to quickly enter. If that is a sharper entrance point – the curves are almost perpendicular – that would discourage traffic from driving in and exiting quickly. It would cause the traffic to slow down. That could be one way to reduce the traffic speed when crossing over that sidewalk.

**Commissioner Smith**: Was there any kind of traffic or parking study done for this plan?

**Mr. Almone**y: Officially? Brian, can you speak to that?

**Mr. Scott**: No, we did not request the traffic report analysis for this. Mr. Chair, even though this was not a public hearing there are some persons in the audience who I think probably have some questions or would like to comment as well.

**Chairman Lee**: Are there any members of the public who would like to speak?

**Ms. Kneller**: Ma'am, can you come up to the lectern to the microphone? If you don't mind, I can bring the microphone to you, too.

## MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

March 28, 2022

**Unidentified Speaker:** Quite a few of the streets in Milhaven do converge, and for that reason, there are a number of “No Parking” signs on the street. So, in front of my house on Milhaven Drive, people cannot park there without the police coming. It’s good, because those streets are quite narrow, but I think the Lamar exit is good, because not that many houses face Lamar, just to the west of the park, and on the south they’ve got some really lovely homes, but I’ve heard from some of the neighbors that live along there that they would not welcome all the extra traffic that would come from having opening on 67<sup>th</sup> Street. So, what do you do? I think their current parking facility, I’ve never seen it totally full, and I live right across the street, so I just think as long as we can keep as much traffic out of Milhaven as possible, that would be a good thing. and those little paths that they built, do accommodate all kinds of children’s go-carts and baby carriages and so forth. So, they are quite adequate, but the path itself is four-tenths of a mile, so if you could do several laps, you get several miles of good exercise in, and there is no traffic that interrupts the path, so that’s a good thing, too. But it’s really become very nice. I’ve been there 20 years, and I’m really glad to be able to look at people walking in the park and see the children playing over there, too. It’s very tranquilizing to sit on your front porch. Thank you very much.

**Unidentified Speaker:** You mentioned not having done a traffic report. I would really encourage you to get a traffic report done, because soccer is one of the primary uses of the park, and on weekends – especially Saturday – it gets very busy and the parking lot does get filled. All of Horton Street gets filled. I would question that your design for the south parking lot is even adequate to cover the peak times of use. And then also, keep in mind – because I really do think that form follows function – besides soccer, the park is loaded with walkers, whether they have a dog or not, it’s loaded with walkers and a few joggers. It’s kind of like those are the two primary uses for the park. I know. They entertain me all day long, every day.

[Connie Wehmeyer, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:]

**Ms. Wehmeyer:** I live on the north side of the park. First, I want to thank you for your time. Secondly, I want to thank you for the great signs. They’ve made a real positive impact and appearance there, so thank you for that. I live on the north side, as a said, and one of the joys that I have is listening to these kids play in the park. We’re leaving a portion of our kids out of our park. That is under the universal design features. ADA parking is going to allow those in a wheelchair to park and perhaps get out and be walking around the field, but there is no feature on that playground for a student with a disability. We are leaving them out of this plan. Moreover, it isn’t even an articulated item in the alternate bid. It’s down in the general assessment – if there’s more funding, a more in-depth plan for universal design feature. That’s a huge concern that I think is part of this plan. Do I want this plan to be approved? Do I want park improvements there? Yes. I think we desperately need a restroom facility. A johnny-on-the-spot is not cutting it. So, I definitely think that we need...I also want to state that, while these things are needed, I think it’s very important that we have good oversight in the construction and follow-through. There are two cases in point that I’ll use as an example. The parking lot,



## MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

March 28, 2022

especially the one on Lamar, is also a storage lot. If you visited that park right now you would see there, on the east end of the parking lot, there's a large gravel pile that's just been dumped there. It's been there most of the winter. It's not uncommon to see road construction, the big cones, at the end of the parking lot. My point is, is it a park, or is it a temporary storage? So, where is the oversight in that?

The second example I'll give is the park recently has a new bench. It's on the east side. They took out the old bench which was facing the street, and they put in a new one, which now faces the park. The problem is if you sit on the bench it is so on top of the walking path that your head could actually be hit inadvertently by a child riding a bike or a person just walking with their elbows out. So, I think that, you know, I don't know who is in charge of the oversight, but I do think that those are just a couple of small examples that say, "We want this to be done. We know you want it to be done correctly." Those are my observations. I also want to say that in the description it reads that they want the park that reconfigures the playing fields to allow for the same programs, but in a more effective manner. I think those are kind of ambiguous. What does that efficiency look like, because it sounds to me like in the proposal that the actual playing fields are still pretty much intact location. While we enjoy the park and the kid's playing soccer, inevitably we have balls hitting the fence, coming over the fence, so however that reconfiguration occurs, hopefully they are considering the extent to which those structures for the games, whatever, are moved away from the fence and still allowing for adequate play.

The last thing I'll say is in the alternate bidding and in the available funding bidding, I notice that it says, "upon available funding," and I'm curious the extent to which there is some sort of formula or litmus if you will, that articulates in which order these things would come into play. Which is more important? Is it for in-depth, more universal design features? Or is it one or the other items, like 16 moveable picnic tables? I don't know that I've ever seen that many people over there, but I just question the extent to which, or how these priorities will be given going forward for the alternative bids. Thank you.

**Unidentified Speaker:** I'm coming kind of late to the party. We just moved in on 67<sup>th</sup> Street, on the south side there. I have just heard 16 picnic tables? That's a lot of trash. That's a lot of maintenance. That's upsetting. And moving the parking lot. The woman said that now the parking lot faces a street that doesn't have houses facing directly at it. If you move it over to 67<sup>th</sup> Street, you do. I also think it's kind of good to have parks that are just parks, that are not structured so intently. You see all sorts of activities over there now. I would hate to see it so that people feel like no, they can't go over there and throw a Frisbee and do that, because they everything is geared toward a soccer field. Anyway, the parking lots and structuring it too much are my two main concerns. Thank you very much for listening, and as a spectator, it's extremely hard to follow along with what's going on, because we cannot hear.

[inaudible]

**Unidentified Speaker:** Good evening. I'll be brief. First, as a 20-year neighbor to the south of that park, I want to express our gratitude for the investment and attention to this park. We moved in a long time ago when there was still a school. I watched it come down

## MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

March 28, 2022

and have been anxiously awaiting this investment in that park, and like a previous speaker mentioned, we love being by that park. That's why we bought that house, and many neighbors are the same way. The sound of children playing is the soundtrack of our neighborhood, and we love it, and any investment that you're making will make it even more attractive for the neighborhood and we truly appreciate that. Two small suggestions I have as a longtime neighbor to this park. One, I would like to suggest the removal of the original chain link fence as part of a Phase 1. As I've said many, many times, there's not a great park to be found, either locally, regionally or nationally, that has a rusty chain link fence around it, and I think the removal of that would make it a more aesthetically pleasing park. It would make it a more inviting park, and a more accessible park. I think that's a relatively easy win to make it a better park.

The other is, I live close to the intersection of 67<sup>th</sup> and Lamar, on the southwest corner of that park and have been witness to a lot of close calls at that intersection, with traffic and pedestrians and bike riders. The very nature of a park is to want people to come to it, and it's a dangerous intersection, and I've often suggested that a crosswalk be put in at that intersection. I've requested it from the City of Mission and the City of Overland Park because it is the confluence of the two cities. I will maintain my desire to see a crosswalk there, if only so that I don't have to be a witness to a real tragedy, but it is a dangerous intersection, and I'd hate for anybody to get hurt. But again, thank you for your attention and your investment in the park, and we look forward to seeing what you come up with. Thank you.

**Vice Chair Dukelow:** Mr. Chairman, just a couple more things, based on some of what we heard, that I'd like to address. The chain link fence. Has there been any thought to removing it?

**Mr. Almoney:** [inaudible] acres of it are to be removed, mainly to allow for the drive access in, and also at the ADA access points they will be widened out to allow for clear access.

[inaudible]

**Mr. Moyers:** They were provided to...Access points only were to be removed is the direction that we've received from previous meetings.

**Vice Chair Dukelow:** Direction from whom?

**Mr. Moyers:** City staff.

**Vice Chair Dukelow:** Why did staff not recommend removing only portions of the fence or having an alternative type of fencing that is more attractive?

**Mr. Scott:** Really, frankly, there are a lot of chain link fences there, and I'd like to see them removed, too, but I thought there was some reasoning from a Parks standpoint, maybe the Parks and Recreation Director can answer as to why the chain link fence is still there. I don't know.

**Mr. Almoney:** In Phase 2, our plan adds some additional amenities that make open field play a little bit safer. One of those is netting that goes behind any goal mouth. Right now

## MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

March 28, 2022

the fence serves as a protection from those balls going into the street, which we know, I wouldn't say frequently, but it happens throughout the course of a Saturday, so we prefer to keep that in place until the netting standards are installed.

**Unidentified Speaker:** And the fence keeps the dogs from running into the street.

**Mr. Almoney:** Right, and unfortunately some neighbors take their dogs off leash. I did anecdotally hear from a resident who said that having the fence up was a safety risk to her, because she jogs the fence, and the entrances are so far apart that she didn't feel safe. That really resonated with the Parks and Recreation team, so our plan was always to remove it and keep some portions, but not chain link. So, without having that discussion in-depth, because it was in future planning, we hear that. Nothing says you can't come her like a fence, so we want to make sure that our parks are inviting and definitely have heard the feedback, which resonates.

[inaudible]

**Mr. Almoney:** Absolutely. Its an important amenity. We've actually heard from Milhaven residents specifically who have children with disabilities. I myself have a child with disabilities so when we're trying to access different play features, obviously there are asterisks next to certain parks. So we want to be inviting to any and all families. As part of Phase 2, I believe one of the speakers shared that it was kind of farther down on the agenda. That is a priority to us. We are already reaching out to individuals who do fund raising. We've reached out to playground companies who incorporate and design specific features for disabled family members, and we're already looking at increasing the footprint, because as we know, ADA amenities have a little bit farther spacing in between them. We're aware of each and every one of those considerations and are looking forward implementing that as soon as possible.

[inaudible]

**Mr. Almoney:** Great question. That is loaded. I don't know how much I can...Essentially, we need a funding source, right? So, we try to be prudent with the resources that we've got. We've got a five-year capital improvement plan for Parks and Recreation that draws down the three-eights-cent Parks and Recreation sales tax, as well as the alcohol tax. So, we're hopeful that the community sees the value in renewing that. When that's the case, we have a whole bunch of projects that we can start prioritizing so that would clearly be one of them. We also have conceptual redesigns for each of the five major parks of Mission.

[inaudible]

**Mr. Scott:** I'll just add a little bit to that. I alluded to this earlier. The project is being funded by a three-eights-cent sales tax dedicated to Parks and Recreation. That was approved by the voters of Mission ten years ago. A lot of that funding has gone to pay off bonds that were issued for the reconstruction of the outdoor pool by City Hall. So probably eight years ago or so, maybe more recent than that, that pool was completely reconstructed and bonds were issued for that project. So, we've been paying off those bonds. And then, some of the residual funds have been going to make improvements in this building.

## MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

March 28, 2022

Unfortunately, a lot of the improvements are behind walls, like replacement of mechanical equipment that's beyond its useful life and refurbishing the pool, and currently we're sandblasting the ceiling in the auditorium and repainting that. It's a lot of just kind of continual maintenance of this building that those funds go for. That sales tax is going to be up for renewal this year. You'll be hearing a lot more this summer about that, as we prepare information, we begin educating the voters of our community about the need to redo that. We'll keep our fingers crossed. If it is renewed, those funds are going to additional improvements to this park, as well as additional improvements to the other parks we have in our city. That's the primary directive for the renewal of the sales taxes, to push that money into the parks.

[inaudible]

**Mr. Scott:** If you want to include that in a condition in your motion, you can. Just ask staff to look into that further and finding if it is feasible from an engineering standpoint, which I think it probably is, and we can find the funding for it easily enough. That would be one of your recommendations to the City Council.

**Commissioner Smith:** I still have reservations about the location of the parking or moving the location of the parking lot. I guess it's just a comment. I'm not really sure where to go from there.

[inaudible]

**Mr. Scott:** Do you want to express your reservations for the record? Do you feel like you've already done that? Okay.

**Commissioner Smith:** Is additional research or studies an avenue that's possible to take?

**Mr. Scott:** We could give it further consideration. I don't know what additional research or studies would need to be done. That's really, I think the architects have probably studied it to death already, but if you're hesitant about having the parking lot on the south side of the park, at 67<sup>th</sup> Street, and you want to make a motion to amend that the parking lot not be there, but be at its current location at Lamar, that might be the place to do that. Make a motion to recommend that the parking lot remain off of Lamar.

[inaudible]

**Comm. Schmid:** I don't have a question so much as, I guess, just a couple comments. I do generally appreciate the reduction in parking space. I think I've gone on record before that I find parking just an inefficient and expensive use of property, so pleased to see that it's being reduced. I really like the level of attention that we've heard from staff and from the public about making it more inviting and accessible park, in terms of long-term removing the fencing and developing more universally more accessible equipment. I would say...I also have just some concerns with the entrance to the parking lot overriding the sidewalk. I've not done this before, but if I would like to introduce an amendment that would say that it needs to incorporate some traffic design elements designed to slow traffic entering. When is an appropriate time to do that?

## MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

March 28, 2022

**Mr. Scott:** When the motion is made, so whoever makes the motion, seconds the motion, the motion is now on the table, and that would be time for an amendment to the motion, whether it be the relocation of the parking lot or changes to the proposed parking lot to reduce the width for traffic safety concerns. The recommendation would be to give further consideration to those design protocols. A vote would be taken on that amendment. Then a vote would be taken on the initial motion whether the amendment passes or not.

[inaudible]

**Comm. Richards:** I just want to make a comment, since we're talking about the parking. The parking lot is full, and it is very hard to find a spot. People park in the middle. They create their own row. So, they park on the perimeter, and then they park double – not just one, sometimes two rows in the middle. So, having a better plan laid out for a parking lot. The location I was questioning earlier, because it seemed like it's taking up one of the best soccer field spots, the most level playing field there. I question that placement there, and also the impact it would have on the 67<sup>th</sup> Street residents. But I do also hear Parks and Recreation talking about making it a more inviting park, drawing people in, having spaces to sit, to have birthday parties, to convene is an important part of this park, and having parking for people to come and do that is very important. And having nice parking, like not just a gravel lot that we have now. It's uneven in areas and not ADA. I think you said it accommodates 50 spots. Then, this new parking lot would be going to 40, and we don't want to reserve room for a lot of parking, but this parking lot is heavily used.

[inaudible]

**Ms. Kneller:** It's based on the square footage of that lot as it is, and since there's no striping, it's kind of an average, so I would say that probably about 50 people can park there in their vehicles. It's an estimate. It's basically kind of, the new parking lot and the alternative bid is about the same size. There were definitely 40 spots in the new proposal that I could see, but according to the square footage I could see how possibly 50 cars could fit on this lot, but it's an estimate. There may be something else you want to add to that, too.

**Mr. Almoney:** There are 48 stalls with two ADA stalls in this new lot, so it's approximately compatible with what's out there today.

**Commissioner Troppito:** Mr. Chairman, just to get the ball rolling, we've talked about a lot of different options. I'd like to recommend a motion and then people who have had amendments to make can then make amendments to this motion.

### MOTION

**Comm. Troppito moved and Chairman Lee seconded a motion that the Planning Commission recommend approval to City Council Case No. 22-08 for site improvements at Mohawk Park, along with the four recommended conditions of approval as set forth in the staff report on page 23.**

## MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

March 28, 2022

### AMENDMENT

Comm Cullinane moved, and Comm. Smith seconded a proposal to amend the motion to add that the proposed parking lot location be further studied and reconsidered, and that the existing parking lot remain at the current location with repairs.

[inaudible]

**Comm. Smith:** I'd like to propose [inaudible] to keep the parking lot where it is today but that we include a traffic study.

**Vice Chair Robin Dukelow:** I second.

**Mr. Scott:** Generally, the amendment is to have further consideration for the parking remain where it is?

**Comm. Cullinane:** Yeah, to allow for those improvements and re-working of the parking lot, but in its current location.

**Ms. Kneller:** So, does the second motion stand as well, with that? The motion to study the parking location safety considerations with the parking lot as it is, where it is?

[inaudible]

**Mr. Scott:** Generally, the amendment is to leave the parking lot where it is currently. Mr. Chair, if you want to vote, unless there are questions or discussion about that.

[inaudible]

**Comm. Schmid:** You guys, this is not a vote on the plan. It's just on this amendment.

[inaudible]

The vote was taken (9-0). **The amendment passed.**

### AMENDMENT

Vice Chair Dukelow moved and Commissioner Troppito seconded an amendment to the motion to prioritize universal design play equipment.

[inaudible]

**Mr. Scott:** Is there any discussion on that?

**Unidentified Speaker:** What was the second part? Prioritizing the universal design?

[inaudible]

The vote was taken (8-1). **The amendment passed.**

**Chair Lee:** Brian, we're voting on the original –

**Mr. Scott:** We're voting to approve the concept for Mohawk Park with the parking lot being improved at the current location [inaudible] and then consideration of crosswalks at [inaudible] Lamar and a higher prioritization of universal design features be included with the play equipment.

# MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

March 28, 2022

The vote was taken (9-0). **The motion passed.**

[inaudible]

## **Old Business**

[none]

## **Planning Commission Comments**

[none]

## **Staff Updates**

**Mr. Scott:** Okay, thank you all for attending tonight, and you can pencil the fourth Monday on your calendar for the next two months. Next month will be fairly light, but the following month is going to be pretty heavy. So, the April meeting. I don't have the date in front of me, but again, it's the fourth Monday of the month. April 25th. Thank you. It will be a nonconforming situation improvement for Arby's at 6780 Johnson Drive. They're kind of rebranding. They want to skin the building, do some landscaping and some things like that. We're also asking for a Preliminary and Final Plat for that property. It's never been platted.

Then there will be a Preliminary Plat for the Mission Bowl property. That development project is finally getting out of the mud – no pun intended. The developer is going to start working on construction here in the next month or two, and he needs to finalize his financing and he needs a plat for that.

In May, we have Rushton Elementary School at 6001 West 52nd Street. That is a Preliminary Development Plan and a Preliminary Plat. I think you all are familiar with that project. That's a bond issue that was approved by the builder a couple years ago for some significant improvements and/or reconstruction at schools in the Shawnee Mission School District. They are proposing to demolish the existing Rushton Elementary School and build a new school on that site. The scheduled start date is spring of 2023, so that's a pretty significant project for a community.

Then finally, another pretty significant project for our community is a redevelopment of the former JCPenney call center at 5665 Foxridge. We have been in conversations with the design team that's working for Block Real Estate Services, and they are planning to submit plans here in probably another month or so, and they're shooting for that May Planning Commission meeting to be considered for a Preliminary Development Plan and a Preliminary Plat.

Robin and Karie are going to be going to the American Planning Association's National Planning Conference in San Diego in April. I've asked them to take a few selfies and be prepared to give us a little report when they get back.

On April 23rd, we will be having a City Clean-Up Day. There's lots of information on our website about that. We're accepting applications for volunteers. Pretty much anybody that wants to come is welcome to come. There will be breakfast in the morning. I can't remember the meeting location, but it's one of our City parks. We're going to basically

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

**March 28, 2022**

break up in teams and be assigned different areas of the city to go clean for a few hours on Saturday morning, so if you're interested in doing that, there's more information on the website about that. I think that's it.

**ADJOURNMENT**

**Commissioner Troppito moved, and Comm. Braden seconded a motion to adjourn.**

**The motion carried unanimously.**

The meeting adjourned at 8:45 P.M.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mike Lee, Chair

**ATTEST:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Audrey McClanahan, Secretary