

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

April 25, 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, Robin Dukelow, Megan Cullinane, and Cynthia Smith. Stuart Braden, Amy Richards and Wayne Snyder were absent. Also in attendance: Laura Smith, City Administrator, Brian Scott, Assistant City Administrator, Kimberly Steffens, Recording Secretary, and Karie Kneller, City Planner.

Chairman Lee: It is 7:00 p.m. I'd like to call this meeting to order. The public is invited to participate. If you would like to make a comment then please raise your hand but stay seated. We will call on you to go to the lectern. Begin first by stating your full name for the record. Please make sure to be conscientious of others trying to speak, and speak slowly and clearly. If I need to confirm something that may have been difficult to hear, I will ask for clarification.

Approval of Minutes from the March 28, 2022 Meeting

Chairman Lee: The first item tonight is the approval of the minutes from our March 28, 2022, meeting. Do we have any changes that need to be made?

Motion by Comm. Troppito to approve the minutes of the March 28, 2022 meeting.

Comm. Smith: I noticed one thing in the minutes. Was the vote count on the amendment, I think the amendment on page 21, is that an accurate count? I thought there was one no.

[inaudible comments, off mic]

Ms. Steffens: 8 to 1?

Comm. Smith: Yes.

Ms. Steffens: Okay.

Comm. Smith: And the other thing, which you've already addressed was a large portion of the comments throughout the meeting are omitted, and that's not good.

Ms. Kneller: Some of the comments weren't picked up on the mic, so we're working on that to address that issue.

Comm. Smith: Okay.

Ms. Kneller: Hopefully this will be better today. All of the mics are turned up, and I think they're all fully charged, so I think we should be good.

Mr. Scott: We got the set back from the transcriber, and from there we just worked through our notes and our memory to kind of fill in a lot of the gaps. The minutes were a mess.

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

April 25, 2022

Vice Chair Dukelow: Mr. Chairman, I have a couple of comments, please. I concur with Commissioner Smith's comments, but I also have a couple specific corrections that I would like to see. Page nine, paragraph one, the word is "LEED." That's an acronym for Leadership, Energy and Environmental Design. No "A" required. Also, on page 14, as we said, some of the dialog got lost, but I do want to point out that my question regarding exterior lighting and the standard that I reference is IDA/IES. That's for International Dark Sky/Illuminating Energy Society. I requested the engineers provide the light zone that would be appropriate for the application in Mohawk Park, which I believe to be a light zone 1, perhaps 2. That would be to their judgment. That's all I have. Thank you.

Chairman Lee: With those changes do we have a second?

Comm. Troppito withdrew his original motion and moved to approve the minutes of the March 28, 2022, Planning Commission meeting, with corrections as stated. Vice Chair Dukelow seconded the motion.

The vote was taken (6-0) **The motion carried.**

New Business

Chairman Lee: We have three items under New Business. The first is Case #22-10 which is Approval of Preliminary and Final Plat of Barkley Corner. At this time, I would like to open the public hearing. Ms. Kneller, would you please provide us with your report?

1. Public Hearing – Case #22-10 – Approval of Preliminary and Final Plat of

Ms. Kneller: This is Case #22-10, Barkley Corner, Preliminary and Final Plat. The subject property is a fast food drive-through and dine-in establishment located at 6780 Johnson Drive, on the northeast corner of Johnson Drive and Barkley Street. The applicant, Flynn Restaurant Group, applied with the City for renovation to the existing building's interior and exterior façade, which will be heard subsequently in Case #22-07, following this.

The property is zoned C-1, Restricted Business District, and lies within the West Gateway Form-Based Code Overlay. The building's front façade faces Johnson Drive to the south, with a drive-through window facing west toward Barkley. Parking that consists of 31 stalls, including two ADA stalls, is situated on the west, north and east sides of the building with primary ingress and egress on Johnson Drive. Secondary access to the site is approximately 170 feet north, on Barkley Street. A non-conforming pole sign currently exists on the south side of the site, on Johnson Drive.

A water main operated by Water One runs east and west on the property approximately nine feet behind the edge of curb along Johnson Drive. Stormwater is collected at inlets on the southeast corner of the property on Johnson Drive and on the southwest, along Barkley Street, where water drains to a stormwater pipe running parallel to the water main. There is also a stormwater pipe running south along the eastern border of the property, approximately four feet from the property line. Underground and overhead electrical utilities provide power to the site.

The property was not platted during its initial development. The City requested that a preliminary and final plat be submitted with the site plan improvements request. If approved, the final plat will be recorded with the Johnson County Register of Deeds. Per

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

April 25, 2022

Municipal Code at 440.220 – Submission of Preliminary Plats – all requirements have been satisfied, and per Municipal Code at Section 440.250 – Submission of Final Plats – all requirements have been satisfied as well. Approval of the Final Plat shall require the affirmative vote of a majority of the membership of the Planning Commission.

Currently, the sidewalk along Johnson Drive and the sidewalk along Barkley Street are City-owned rights-of-way, excepting a small corner on the southwest portion of the property. The City plans to make improvements in the right-of-way along Johnson Drive in the future, and the City requested a recorded plat that identified enough additional dedication of right-of-way to allow for widening of the sidewalk at the time improvements are made. The proposed plat dedicates nine feet of public right-of-way to the City of Mission from the edge of curb to the property, for this purpose.

The easements proposed in the plat are areas dedicated for access to electrical utilities and stormwater utilities respectively. Both easements are 10 feet wide on center of the utility line. The electrical utility runs from the main line east to the building, and the stormwater pipe runs the entire length of the eastern edge of the property, approximately four feet from the property line.

Zone CP-1 of the Mission Municipal Code requires a minimum 15-foot front setback for one- and two-story buildings, and there is no side or rear yard stipulated in the Municipal Code, but buildings shall not exceed two stories in areas zoned CP-1. Generally, Section 455.100 of the Mission Municipal Code states that a typical subdivision at the time of the original plat shall exercise good design and layout, and this has been defined in this plat as well. The above dimensions and designations are in accordance. The staff recommendation is that the Planning Commission recommend approval of Case #22-10, the Final Plat of Barkley Corner, to the City Council.

Chairman Lee: Is there any member of the public who would like to speak to the Preliminary Plat for Barkley Corner? If so, please raise your hand and we will call on you to go to the lectern to speak. Please state your full name and speak clearly into the microphone. Seeing no further comment or discussion, I will close the public hearing. [inaudible]

Vice Chair Dukelow: Mr. Chairman, I have no comments.

Comm. Cullinane moved and Comm. Schmid seconded a motion to recommend to the City Council approval of Case #22-10, Preliminary and Final Plat of Barkley Corner.

The vote was taken. **The motion passed (6-0).**

2. Public hearing – Case #22-07 – Approval of Site Plan and Nonconforming Use Permit for Arby’s Restaurant

Chairman Lee: The second item is also a public hearing for #22-07, which is Approval of Site Plan and Non-conforming Use Permit for Arby’s Restaurant. Ms. Kneller, would you please provide us with your report?

Ms. Kneller: The subject property is the same property as in Case #22-10, at 6780 Johnson Drive, on the northeast corner of Johnson Drive and Barkley Street. The property

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

April 25, 2022

is zoned C-1, Restricted Business District, and lies within the West Gateway Form-Based Code Overlay District. The building's front façade faces Johnson Drive. Parking consists of 31 stalls. Primary access is on Johnson Drive and secondary access is on Barkley. Surrounding the subject property are the following zones and uses: To the west, CP-2, Planned General Business District Commercial Property lies on that parcel. To the east, CP-1, Restricted Business District. A commercial property lies in that general area, with R-1, Single-Family Residential as well. To the north, C-1, Restricted Business District, which consists of parking for another property. To the south, CP-2B, Planned Retail and Service District, across the street on Johnson Drive.

Flynn Restaurant Group submitted plans to the City for interior and exterior renovations in March. The franchise is rebranding its restaurants across the country, which involves new signage and overall updates to the interior and exterior of its operations. The total estimated cost is expected to exceed 10 percent of the total appraised value of the property, and the exterior improvements are significant. The City requested that the improvements include additional site improvements, such as parking lot screening, color choices consistent with other developments in the area and the Johnson Drive Design Guidelines, and signage updates that all meet elements of the Form-Based Code, the Municipal Code, and the Johnson Drive Design Guidelines. The City also requested the exterior site improvements include enough space to meet the City's intent to widen the sidewalk from six feet to eight feet along Johnson Drive during future street improvements. In accordance with the Mission Comprehensive Plan 2007, the goals and objectives include sidewalk improvements as part of infrastructure, maintenance and enhancement when programming for public infrastructure investments. The Plan also classifies the land use for the property as mixed use, medium density. Staff recommended that proposed site improvements allow for future sidewalk improvements, and redevelopment of the site is not proposed at this time.

Per the Johnson Drive Design Guidelines, they recommend that paint colors and exterior materials are consistent with other structures along Johnson Drive, which include natural yellow, tan, beige, brick and brown tones. The proposal specifies neutral colors of this variety and will keep the existing brick around the base of the building. The proposal also includes added landscaping in accordance with the Johnson Drive Design Guidelines. Since the proposal does not include improvements to the existing parking lot, staff did not require additional parking lot landscaping. If the parking lot is improved at a later date, the plan should include additional landscaping and parking lot islands.

Johnson Drive Design Guidelines include a recommendation for an eight-foot sidewalk to enhance the pedestrian environment. The proposed landscaping and additional right-of-way dedicated in the plat for Case #22-10 will allow for the existing sidewalk to be widened with streetscape improvements in the future.

Per the West Gateway Vision Plan and Form-Based Code Overlay District, the Overlay District regulations supersede the Municipal Code in all cases. Generally, if a property is built prior to the adoption of the Form-Based Code, it may be considered a legal, non-conforming use. If a property undergoes renovations that exceed 10 percent of the appraised value, the development shall meet all requirements of the Form-Based Code. If the property owner or owner's agent cannot meet the regulations of the Form-Based

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

April 25, 2022

Code during its proposed site improvements, the applicant shall also apply for a non-conforming use permit. The West Gateway Vision Plan and Form-Based Code envisions a mixed use development pattern in the western portion of Mission. In the area where Arby's currently exists, the Plan recommends meeting density buildings an average of four stories high. As the transition occurs from the residential zone to the urban core, embedded parking structure positioned away major arterials and thoroughfares built with minimal building setbacks shall include residential and retail uses. The original build-out of the Arby's restaurant does not meet these criteria, and the proposed improvements will not change the building footprint or parking areas at this time. Therefore, a non-conforming use permit is included with this proposal.

Per the Municipal Code, Section 430.060 restricts the use of pole signs when sign improvements are made; Section 415.060 requires landscaping to screen parking lots from view; and per Section 505.300, requires that rooftop mechanical equipment is screened from pedestrian view. The City requires a Non-conforming Use Permit as the site improvements will likely exceed 10 percent of the appraised value. Although the existing site is a legal non-conforming use, the applicant has made attempts to provide some elements of the Form-Based Code and Johnson Drive Design Guidelines at staff's request. Namely, the proposal provides for screened views of the parking lots facing Johnson Drive and Barkley, an added bike rack, and colors that are consistent with the Johnson Drive Design Guidelines. The screening and allowance for future widening of the sidewalk on Johnson Drive provides a more inviting pedestrian experience. Trees and other shrubbery along Johnson Drive is not recommended due to the existing water main that runs parallel to Johnson Drive on the property. Therefore, staff recommended a low-sitting wall and/or ornamental grasses to screen the parking lot from view from Johnson Drive. Staff has determined that these elements of the proposal significantly improve the site.

The proposal meets the Mission Municipal Code at 430.060, which requires the removal of the existing pole sign during the renovation. The proposal replaces the pole sign with a monument sign approximately 35 feet to the west of its currently location. The proposal also adds landscaping onsite in accordance with Section 415.060 that will provide parking lot screening and ornamental grasses that grow to 36 inches at maturity. Additionally, rooftop mechanical equipment will be screened from pedestrian view in accordance with Section 505.300.

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission recommend approval to the City Council of Case #22-07 for site improvements at the Arby's restaurant at 6780 Johnson Drive. Actually, once this is approved, they will make any revisions and then bring it back to us.

Chairman Lee: Is there any member of the public that would like to speak to the Preliminary Site Plan or the Non-conforming Use Permit for Arby's? Not seeing anyone, I will formally close the meeting and bring it to discussion here.

Comm. Smith: I noticed that on sheet A-201, which is page 23 of the packet, the elevations call out for E.I.F.S. with brick stencil pattern, and that doesn't seem to align with the Form-Based Code for the West Gateway study area, or the Amended Mission, Kansas Design Guidelines. In the first one, it states, "Walls may be finished in stone,

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

April 25, 2022

natural or cultured that mimics local stone, brick, stucco, wood siding, fiber cement siding, metal or lightweight concrete panels.” An E.I.F.S. stencil does not seem to align with those recommendations.

Ms. Kneller: I believe, John, that was not E.I.F.S. It’s stucco that you specified. Is that correct?

[inaudible comment, off mic]

Comm. Smith: Okay, in the drawings it says E.I.F.S. with the stencil several times.

Ms. Kneller: Okay, we’ll have those revisions.

Chairman Lee: Robin?

Vice Chair Dukelow: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. So, the planting, I’m really glad to see that we have taken the initiative to see to it that that parking lot is screened appropriately. However, the materials for screening, I believe, should be in line with the plant materials palette, and fountain grass is not going to be...I don’t envision fountain grass being an effective screening 12 months out of the year, and I would like to see that changed, that plant material, changed to one of the shrubs from the materials palette per Johnson Drive Design Guidelines.

Ms. Kneller: John, would you like to come to the podium to address that comment?

Mr. John Braunsdorf, Construction Project Manager, Flynn Restaurant Group, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Mr. Braunsdorf: When we first submitted our proposal for the renovation on this project, we got a number of comments back from the City. We scheduled a meeting with Karie and Brian, and I apologize, a third person at that meeting. His name is escaping me, but at that time we went through all the comments from the previous submittal and came to an agreement on what we would be providing and what was okay to – just based on the scope of work we’re doing – to not follow. At that time, the grasses were what was selected, but if that is something that is not acceptable, we can certainly look into it.

Vice Chair Dukelow: Thank you.

[inaudible, mic not picking up]

Ms. Kneller: That’s true.

Mr. Braunsdorf: There’s an existing water line along Johnson Drive, and the green space there is very narrow, and with the additional right-of-way to future plans of widening the sidewalk, it created even lesser space to plant anything substantial there.

Ms. Kneller: I looked at the Guidelines, too. What the engineer told us was that trees or shrubs with deep roots could interfere with the water main and disrupt service, and I did do a little research on that. It looks like if you’re within 10 feet of a water main, especially because if there’s a leak with the water main, roots will automatically grow toward that as well and maybe infiltrate that pipe, so we decided to go with something with a shallower root system and less invasive root system in this case, because there’s not enough room to allow for that 10-foot buffer between the water main and the plantings.

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

April 25, 2022

Comm. Troppito: [inaudible, mic not picking up] According to page 11 of the packet staff did not require additional parking lot [inaudible] landscaping. If the parking lot is improved at a later date, the plan should include additional landscaping and parking lot islands. What's the definition of an improvement in the parking lot that would trigger this to occur?

Ms. Kneller: If they're doing any re-stripping or parking lot improvements in any way – re-paving or re-stripping – that's when we would ask for additional landscaping in the islands.

Comm. Troppito: And will that come back to the Planning Commission to review those improvements?

Ms. Kneller: It should for permitting, right? No?

Mr. Scott: Typically with parking lot improvements, just like the wall, we don't bring that back to the Planning Commission. What we're looking for is if they're changing access points into the parking lot, re-configuring the traffic layout in the parking, that's when we would ask them for landscaping.

Comm. Troppito: Thank you.

Vice Chair Dukelow: Mr. Chairman, I have one more comment regarding the trash enclosure, which appears to need a good scraping, repainting, perhaps sealing.

Mr. Braunsdorf: Yes.

Vice Chair Dukelow: I didn't note that in the document, so I just wanted to address it here. It could be there, and I missed it.

Mr. Braunsdorf: I believe it is called out on the civil drawing, but if it is not, that is the plan is to repaint and repair as necessary.

Vice Chair Dukelow: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, that's all I have. Thank you.

Chairman Lee: Additional comments? Questions?

Mr. Braunsdorf: Thank you.

Chairman Lee: Thank you.

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

Vice Chair Dukelow moved and Comm. Troppito seconded a motion that the Planning Commission approve Case #22-07 for site improvements at the Arby's restaurant, 6780 Johnson Drive.

The vote was taken (6-0). **The motion passed.**

3. Case #22-09 – Mission Mart Final Plat of the Third Plat

Chairman Lee: The last item on our New Business is Case #22-09. This is the Mission Mart Final Plat of the Third Plat.

Ms. Kneller: The subject property here is the site of the multi-family development located at 5399 Martway Street, between Nall Avenue and Roeland Drive on the former site of the Mission Bowl facility. This case is the Final, Third Plat for Mission Mart, Lots 7 and 8.

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

April 25, 2022

The total plat area is 165,644.6 square feet. Lot 7 is 27,497.19 square feet and Lot 8 is 138,147.41 square feet. Adjacent properties to the west and east are currently undeveloped with overflow parking access for commercial property zoned MS-2, Main Street 2 District 2 lying on the north side of Martway Street. R1 single-family residential properties lie adjacent to the subject property to the south.

The property lies in a floodway with the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) flood designation "AE," one-percent annual flood risk, which must remain free of encroachment and development, along three sides of its borders – west, south and east. An additional area along the property at its northwest corner with flood designation "X" lies in the one-percent flood risk zone, but it is protected by a levee system.

The Second Plat was approved by the Planning Commission in November 2020, and the City Council approved the Second Plat in December 2020. This case is the Final Plat for the Mission Mart development, which establishes additional easements following approval of the Second Final Plat for Mission Mart, and realigns or vacates easements according to necessary access for maintenance and repair of public utilities.

A water main runs east and west on the northwest corner of the property along Martway Street and stormwater conveyance at the northwest and northeast corners exists at the northern property line. An additional 5-foot utility and stormwater easement along with an 8.5-foot pedestrian and bicycle easement for the extension of the Rock Creek Trail, combined with a 15-foot gas utility easement create a total 23.5-foot right-of-way easement along the north property line. Sewer mains on the westernmost and easternmost quadrants of the property also have 10-foot easements, and the easternmost sanitary sewer easements are partially vacated in this Third Final Plat to realign with existing infrastructure. Underground and overhead electrical utilities also serve the site with a 10-foot easement, and a wireless cell tower on-site with an approximate area of 3,570 square-feet is designated as Lot 1.

The adjacent property to the west, Lot 7, is currently used for overflow parking by the commercial properties on the north side of Martway Street. To maintain access via the driveway on Lot 8, the property owner requested an additional 20-foot easement roughly centered over the property line between Lot 7 and Lot 8. An additional sanitary sewer easement is vacated with this proposed plat, as the utility access is no longer necessary.

All of the requirements of Municipal Code Section 440.220 have been satisfied. All of the requirements for Section 440.250 of the Mission Municipal Code for Final Plats have also been satisfied. The rights-of-way and easements included in this Third Final Plat of Mission Mart are sufficient to grant pedestrian, bicycle, and automobile access on site and to grant access to designated utility agencies for repairs and maintenance. Generally, Section 455.100 of the Mission Municipal Code states that 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.

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

April 25, 2022

The above dimensions and designations are in accordance with the ordinances set forth in the Mission Municipal Code and requirements set forth by City Staff. Staff recommends that the Planning Commission approve Case #22-09, Mission Mart Final Plat of the Third Plat.

Chairman Lee: Thank you, Karie. Any comments? Questions? Charlie?

Comm. Troppito: I have a question. On page 32, it says, "Staff recommendation: Staff recommends that the Planning Commission approve Case #22-09 the Mission Mart Final Plat of the Third Plat." The plat doesn't have the stamp of the surveyor [audio lost] on the plat attached here.

Ms. Kneller: This one is. The one that will be signed.

Comm. Troppito: Okay, so you are in possession of one that is.

Ms. Kneller: I got it.

Comm. Troppito: Okay, very good. And it's your opinion that that is accurate and is a representation of what we're looking at to vote on?

Ms. Kneller: Yes, sir.

Comm. Troppito: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Scott: They submitted a stamped and signed plat to us, and I said, "Just wait. Don't get it signed until it's approved, because we have changes to make." So they got a little bit ahead of themselves. The digital copy they submitted after our revisions was not sealed, but that one matches the final one in your packet that is being approved tonight, and is signed and sealed.

Comm. Troppito: Okay, well that's what I wanted to be sure of, because any changes made to the plat after tonight would not be an accurate representation of what the Planning Commission approved tonight.

Ms. Kneller: Sorry, this one is actually for the Barkley Corner. The other one will be a hard copy that they will send and have in our office by tomorrow, because we added a note on that for the vacation of the easement that is the sanitary sewer easement. For the record, this right here, this sanitary sewer easement here, they just added a simple note on the document, on the drawing itself, to clarify that that sewer easement would be vacated. So, the one that they sent us that was signed didn't have that note on it, so in order to have the note recorded in the Register of Deeds, that one will be with us tomorrow, and we will have Mr. Chairman and the Mayor sign that one when it comes in. It will be stamped. We will make sure.

Comm. Troppito: Okay, thank you.

Vice Chair Dukelow: Mr. Chairman, I have a question, please.

Chairman Lee: Robin?

Vice Chair Dukelow: Regarding Lot 7, is there any – I probably should have looked it up – but is there any construction planned for Lot 7, and who is the owner of Lot 7?

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

April 25, 2022

Ms. Kneller: The same owner that owned Lot 8 is also the owner of Lot 7. I don't know what their intention for that is, but for now they wanted to keep it as overflow parking for The Peanut across the street. So, this easement also, you can see here, shows a drive without having an easement here for access to that lot, which was, I believe, in the Second Final Plat, which was approved. There was no easement there for access to that lot, so this one includes that easement, along with this 20-foot easement here for access to the parking lot.

Vice Chair Dukelow: And how does that impact the green space that was previously, or that – I don't know, maybe it still is – that was previously shown on the west side of the property?

Banks Floodman, Sunflower Development Group, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Mr. Floodman: I can touch on that. This has definitely been a complicated site. There's a lot going on. The green place, the park, is staying. That whole area is going to be the park. It will maintain –

Ms. Kneller: Can you show that again?

Mr. Floodman: This whole area will be the park right here. Johnson County Wastewater needed to be able to turn around with their trucks, so we had to give them proper access in order to come back in here and back in from Steve Choikhit who is the lot owner of Lot 7's lot. That's what you'll see on the plat, but the park is going to be open for anybody using the trail, that stays.

Vice Chair Dukelow: Thank you for that clarification.

Mr. Floodman: You're welcome.

Vice Chair Dukelow: That's all I have, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Lee: Additional questions? Comments?

Comm. Schmid: No question, but a comment, Mr. Chairman. Just that I really love seeing the reallocation of the parking to literally anything else, but a park is particularly great.

Vice Chair Dukelow moved and Comm. Cullinane seconded a motion to recommend approval to the City Council of Case #22-09 the Mission Mart Final Plat of the Third Plat.

The vote was taken (6-0). **The motion passed.**

Old Business

Chairman Lee: Under Old Business we have our City Administrator, Laura Smith, who would like to give us an update on the Mohawk Project.

Ms. Smith: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It's not very often that I get to come visit you on a Monday night, but appreciate the opportunity to be here to, in part, give you a presentation, which probably should have been presented to you at your last Planning Commission meeting. I think in your packet there was a memo from Mr. Scott, advising of the action that the City Council took at their April 20th meeting. It was important, both

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

April 25, 2022

to the Mayor, the City Council and to me, to come back. I think an override of a Planning Commission recommendation doesn't occur very often, and it's certainly not something that we take lightly, but wanted to make sure that we came back, gave you the full picture view this evening and shared with you some of the rationale as to the Council's decision last week at their meeting.

I do have just a quick PowerPoint presentation. Before we start into this, I think most of you who have been around for any period of time know that investment in our outdoor park systems has been something that we have not made a significant investment in as a community for many, many years. As we approach renewal of our dedicated Parks and Recreation sales tax, which will sunset in March of 2023, we had a lot of conversations surrounding what are the next priorities? This evening we'll talk about what were the top priorities in the first ten years of the Parks and Recreation sales tax, and then, where do we think we might want to go in the next ten years?

Conceptual park planning is process that we actually kicked off right about the time that COVID hit, in early 2020. In fact, we had authorized a contract with Confluence to enter into a conceptual park planning process, for Mohawk Park, specifically, at the end of 2019, and I believe we had our first meeting of the stakeholder group in February of 2020, and then the world changed dramatically and we had to alter timelines and priorities. But our goal – and some of you may be familiar with Park Master Plan that was completed several years ago, and a long time coming, quite honestly, for the City of Mission – but it was a tremendously large document, with a number of implementation strategies. The goal really has been to try to boil that down to the individual park level, so that we could really look at fleshing out conceptual designs, order of magnitude costs, and public, Council and community goals and objectives, to align that Master Plan with where we stand today. Because a lot of the data for the Master Plan was collected back in 2015. The world we live in is a different place, and we wanted to make sure that as we move forward and make these investments that we make sure that we were still current and relevant with the priorities of those in our community.

Also, the conceptual park planning documents and that process gives us a wonderful opportunity to pursue grants, and we are able to go to a funding agency and show, not only the short term investment, but potentially the long-term plan for build-out of a park. It allows for flexibility for phased implementation. Knowing that resources are limited, and knowing the level of investment that this Council and the community wants to see in our outdoor park system, we have to give some consideration to phased implementation and, quite honestly, to prepare for renewal of the Parks and Recreation sales tax, which has to be done in 2022 if there is to be no lapse in the collection of that from the existing sales tax.

How did we approach this? As I said, we engaged Confluence to review the Master Plan. Confluence had prepared the original Park Master Plan, so they were familiar with each of those parks and the amenities. Through that master planning process we actually had significant public input about specific amenities to be evaluated and reviewed in each park. We've worked with Confluence to create renderings for each park. We've created a stakeholder committee for each park that provided feedback on the park needs and the concepts. We have solicited feedback from the Parks, Recreation and Tree Commission.

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

April 25, 2022

We've taken the concepts to larger public meetings for feedback. We've gone back to the stakeholder group and the consultants to review and adjust, based on that public input and feedback, and then, at least in the case of Mohawk, we've taken that forward for specific Council review and approval.

As I mentioned, COVID-19 really slowed the process. We had hoped to be through conceptual park planning for all of our five major parks – Mohawk, Broadmoor, Waterworks, Streamway and Anderson Parks. In about a six-month timeframe, it has taken us closer to almost two years to get through that process. We chose those parks, Anderson really being at the bottom of the list, because it is our park with the most significant investment, currently, so we wanted to focus that attention in other places. Why did we start with Mohawk? Because coming out of the Park Master Plan and a priority of the Parks, Recreation and Tree Commission, Mohawk Park was the number one priority. We purchased that park in the early 2000's. We've essentially made no investments, other than to tear down an existing elementary school. That is why we started with Mohawk and worked our way through.

One of the things that we did do, as I mentioned, we've had not only, through the Master Plan, the Conceptual Park planning process, a lot of public input, but also in our community-wide Direction-Finder survey that was conducted in 2021, we asked the residents what their priorities were in terms of the Parks and Recreation services that should receive the most emphasis over the next two years. You'll see, the top two answers were the condition of the park amenities – which was no surprise – and then, maintenance of our city parks and green spaces.

We also asked, as we were going through the process, "Which five amenities would you most like to see included in Mission's outdoor parks?" Permanent restroom facilities was at the top of the list, followed pretty closely by a dog park, upgraded shelter houses, native plantings, trees, upgraded playground equipment, and then you'll see these other factors fall off. Again, this is information that was collected in the summer of 2021 through our Direction-Finder survey process.

Mohawk Park, what is there today? I think most of you are familiar with the site. It was purchased from the Shawnee Mission School District in 2003. The City demolished the building, and the only improvements that really have been made since that time has been one resurfacing of the trails. That was about a \$75,000 investment to resurface the existing trail. As I mentioned, installation of restrooms in Mohawk Park has been a top priority for the Parks, Recreation and Tree Commission since adoption of the Parks Master Plan. The largest user group consistently in Mohawk Park, has been Northeast United Soccer for their spring and fall soccer seasons for their younger children. Other amenities that exist currently in the park – the playground, the fence, the backstop, et cetera – remain from when the site was Mohawk Elementary School and needed to be re-evaluated as part of this process.

Through both the stakeholder and the public improvement process, typically what we've done in this conceptual planning process is we've gone into a public meeting with feedback from the stakeholder group and presented the public with two options for the park, based on the feedback that we've heard. So what do the residents and the

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

April 25, 2022

stakeholders want in Mohawk Park? Again, restroom facility, a new shelter, upgraded playground amenities, including universal design, allowing the soccer for younger children, but not to specifically stripe or maintain turf for fields for any particular group, to maintain flexibility of the site overall. Expanding the walking trail to the entire perimeter of the park, and incorporating more native plantings and trees. Those were the things that were reflected through the stakeholder and public input processes, and then really resulted in a final design concept.

I will say here, you'll notice that in the options that were presented, there was a relocation of the parking lot from its current location. We'll touch on that a little bit more, but that has been anticipated from the outset of this conceptual planning process.

Final concept for Mohawk Park is the one that you see here. I understand this was not shared with you at the meeting when you made your recommendation to the City Council. But as you can see, this incorporates many of the things that were priorities for the resident and the stakeholder groups. You'll see that walking trail extended around the entire perimeter of the park. We have used this concept drawing to secure currently about \$400,000 in land and water conservation grant funds. This concept was approved by the City Council with a commitment to re-evaluate the parking along Horton Street.

Generally, the other pieces of this concept plan, in fact the Council actually allocated additional funding in the 2022 budget process to complete the project through Phase 1B. Originally, we were looking at that for just the restroom facility, and as we moved through the conversations coming out of the Direction-Finder survey and through the budget process with the Council, they really wanted to have a significant and very visible, large investment in the outdoor parks system as we move toward renewal of the Parks and Recreation sales tax. So they actually added money in the 2022 budget to try to get us through the addition of both the new shelter and the new restroom facilities. Again, looking to have that large-scale impact and something that they could point to when we look at renewal of the sales tax, which they are planning conduct through a mail ballot election in September of this year. September 20th will be the mail ballot election on the Parks and Recreation sales tax.

These are some perspective drawings, again, that I think help to tell the story of the park, things that were developed that have been shared with the Parks, Recreation and Tree Commission and with the Council. What you see, kind of a bird's eye view of the overall Park Plan with the re-located parking lot along the 67th Street corridor. Then, I think one of the really important things that factored into the decision, which I will touch on in a moment, of re-locating the parking lot as a part of Phase 1, is you'll see the pad site that would be poured to accommodate the new shelter and the new restroom facilities, and those steps coming off to the west. Again, we were trying to accomplish all of this in Phase 1B.

This is, I believe, is the concept drawing that was potentially included in your packet, and I think was worked from at your meeting, which obviously doesn't show the same picture as that final concept for the park. What this does show is the parking lot in its existing location. So if you think about the perspective drawing that we just saw, and you were sitting on the steps coming down from the pavilion and the restroom, you would literally

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

April 25, 2022

almost step off of those. If you didn't relocate the parking lot as a part of Phase 1, you would be stepping right into that parking area. So phasing considerations, since we had increased the budget to accommodate the restroom and the shelter, as we worked through and at the end of last year, the Council approved a design contract with Shaughnessy Fickel Scott Architects to move this toward bidding this spring.

As they worked through those order of magnitude costs that were originally presented and the overall cost for the complete build-out of Mohawk Park it was estimated at about \$3.5 million. Phase 1 was estimated at about \$1.1 million, and as the numbers came together, it looked like we might have the potential to relocate the parking lot within that Phase 1 budget, so we asked Shaughnessy Fickel Scott to design a bid alternate to be included that would accommodate that move of the parking lot. This would also allow us to pursue other grant opportunities and incorporating the universal design considerations as a part of future decisions on playground structures and elements, which is something that will be considered in all of our park upgrades. That is a concept that is important to both the Parks, Recreation and Tree Commission, to the City Council, to the City staff, and was not specifically addressed in the presentation that you all received, because replacement of the playground was not included in this Phase 1.

A couple of things, just thinking about rationale for relocation of the parking lot. Again, if you think back to the overall concept design, the goal was to create these broader expanses of green space, particularly as it related to the orientation of the shelter and the restrooms, allowing not only for the soccer to continue in that park, but to have the potential for a movie in the park, or some other different types of programming on that west side of the park.

You may recall in one of the other options originally presented that parking lot was shifted to the southwest corner. Moving that parking lot to that corner as we went through the design process, really blocks the best view as you approach that park from the south. You don't get to take in, in its final buildout, kind of what we would hope folks would see and appreciate about the investment that is anticipated for Mohawk Park. Retaining the same number of spaces, we did talk about – which I know was a large part of the conversation that you all had at your meeting – the interaction between pedestrians or children, particularly, on bicycles on the trail, in the parking lot, when you think about this and that extension of the trail around the entire perimeter, if the parking lot were to be left in its existing location you would have that same pedestrian-vehicle interaction.

That brings us to City Council action. I do want to touch on...So following your meeting, and just in talking with our staff that was here and presented, trying to understand the concerns or the issues that were raised or reflected in the recommendation that was forwarded to the City Council, we did reach out to the City's traffic engineers at GBA. That report is included in your packet this evening. As you'll note, it doesn't say one location is better than the other for the parking lot. It just sort of does, I think, a good job of explaining the differences in the location, and I think our traffic engineer, my conversations with him, certainly appreciated and shared, and could understand the questions and concerns that the Planning Commission had felt.

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

April 25, 2022

The pedestrian and walk, or pedestrian-cyclist interaction in a park, between a park entrance and a trail crossing, is not uncommon, and there are a number of ways that that can be managed, whether that is with internal signage on the site, pavement markings and other notification systems that we can certainly look at. They did agree with if the parking lot is relocated to the south along 67th Street, the alignment of that entrance with Beverly would be something that they would recommend and support, so as not to create additional conflicts with driveways along that entrance. They did also recommend – which was reflected in your recommendation to the Council – the addition of the crosswalks at 67th and Lamar. They also recommended an additional crosswalk at the 67th and Beverly entrance, just to the east of that relocated drive.

When we got to the City Council committee meeting in early April, and had the opportunity to preview this, certainly staff took full responsibility for not bringing to you all of this full presentation at that meeting. As I said before, there is a tremendous amount of respect between the relationship that you have with the City Council. We had a lot of conversation about what were the most appropriate next steps and what were the options? Based on timing, in particular, and the report of the traffic engineers, and a look at trying to incorporate and support some of the recommendations included from you all, they felt like they wanted to – or they did make the decision – to override that recommendation and to move forward with the parking lot along the southern boundary of that park with the entrance aligning with Beverly and 67th Street intersection. They did, in overriding that decision, keep the recommendation to add the crosswalks at 67th, and even though it was a little bit unclear in some of the amendments – and I agree the minutes were a mess; I think I called them a hot mess, maybe – that the universal design, again, they wanted to reinforce that, even though that is not part of this Phase 1 proposal, that they wanted to make sure felt that they heard and understood that as a priority for you, so that was included as a consideration in the future Phase 2, and as I mentioned, that is something that will be incorporated in all of our park upgrades.

But it was a priority for them to continue to make progress. They have the option to approve a Planning Commission recommendation, remand it back with a specific reason or issue for you all to potentially reconsider, or they can override that recommendation. They did talk at length about the pros and cons of each. I can tell you they were very concerned, and it was important for them that I come back to this meeting this evening on the heels of that decision and just kind of share information or have a chance to talk with you all about that, but I did want to, as we close out tonight...Let me back up. They did feel that a delay, if remanded back, the delay puts us about two months behind the original groundbreaking schedule and where they had hoped to be with respect to having those improvements coming out of the ground, if you will, when that sales tax is up for renewal in September.

So I just wanted to share a little bit more in addition, just kind of the overall conceptual plans, because if we are successful in getting the sales tax renewed, I think you'll be seeing a lot more of these conceptual plans and site plans for our other major parks, which is a very exciting thing for all of us.

I just wanted to share with you again, we have concept plans for Waterworks, Broadmoor, Streamway, and I can share this PowerPoint presentation if anyone is interested, but

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

April 25, 2022

similar to what we did in Mohawk, with Waterworks Park we created a steering committee, looked at the stakeholder groups with folks from Rushton Elementary, and with Water One, as the City doesn't actually own this particular park. We created a couple of different options, went through a public input process that resulted in a modified final concept plan for Waterworks Park. The final layout of the improvements is based on the location of Water One's facilities. It's looking at other considerations there – ongoing maintenance, and/or repairs. Parking, we know is somewhat limited at that site, and then certainly being able to coordinate the construction of those park improvements with the Rushton Elementary rebuild.

Similar concept plans for Broadmoor Park. Again, a stakeholder group was formed that included...Typically what we did is we included a Ward Councilmember from whichever ward the park was in, members of the Park, Recreation and Tree Commission, surrounding neighborhood residents, and then if there was a specific user group, they were generally identified. These were some original concept plans presented for Broadmoor Park, based primarily on the list of amenities that were requested through the Park Master Plan process. The biggest thing we heard in the public input process with Broadmoor Park was "Keep it simple. You're overdoing it. We don't want all of those things in our park. We just want more open green space." In trying to take advantage of leaving the parking lot in its current location to help reduce some of the costs, the goal eventually...Broadmoor is our only park currently with restroom facilities. They aren't year-round but we would be looking to, at some point down the road, replace and upgrade those restroom facilities.

There's a lot of conversation around inclusion of a dog park, which you'll see in that southwest corner of this park. It is still there. There was also, in addition to simplifying the improvements in our park, there was a lot of kind of evenly-split discussion around taking that green space potentially for our four-legged park users, as opposed to our two-legged park users. So, that resulted in us looking at moving into some conceptual designs for Streamway Park and the potential of moving the dog park to Streamway Park with an upgrade to the parking lot and some other facilities there. This is one that has not gone through the full process with the stakeholder group, but we've done some evaluation and maintenance and then really trying to balance any active amenities with natural features. That's kind of where we are in the process. As I mentioned, Anderson Park will come. We don't have the time to get to that point before we go out for renewal of the sales tax.

So what are the next steps? We're in the process of developing maintenance requirements and resources for all of the parks facilities – the outdoor parks, the community center, the Mission Family Aquatics Center. In fact, we have a work session this coming Wednesday evening with the Council to start talking about what does that look like? So, work session this week; a work session in May to discuss the sales tax renewal and specifically landing on a rate for renewal of that sales tax. Our goal is in early May to also take all of the conceptual park plans out for public input on the proposed improvements. We had intended to do that November-December of last year, and COVID numbers spiked again, and we didn't think it was prudent to be out inviting people to come in and talk to us in public meetings.

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

April 25, 2022

We're looking at a PRT recommendation on the sale tax renewal rate, coming out of their May meeting, going to that work session for the City Council. In order to make that September mail out election, the Council has to approve ballot language by June 15th. Then, looking at finalizing the implementation strategies following, hopefully, renewal of the Parks and Recreation sales tax. Again, as I mentioned, there is a tremendous appetite on the part of the Council to even potentially accelerate the improvements. They want to see as much as quickly as we can possibly accomplish in our outdoor parks system

I'm happy to answer any questions, to take some lashes around the head and shoulders, or help try to explain the rationale of why the Council made the decision that they did last week.

Chairman Lee: Go ahead, Charlie.

Comm. Troppito: [audio problems, mic not picking up] Regarding plantings...it is fairly well known that some plants are better at absorbing CO2. I hope that in the selection of those plantings, that the priority would be given to those plantings with the most CO2 absorption potential. That's it.

Comm. Smith: I have some comments and statements. I must say, I am disappointed in the new location of the parking lot. I have a lot of personal experience using this park, and the number one attribute, or amenity, I believe, is the walking path and the safety of the walking path for young children. By cutting through the walking path with an entrance to a parking lot, no matter what kind of devices or signs or crosswalks, you're still going to have people not looking, flying through there, and it's going to be stressful for parents, and for people who are jogging or walking a dog. So, I do disagree with that. I think the only way to fix it would be to do something outlandish, like create a tunnel drive underneath the path, or to include that expanded trail in the base bid. Otherwise, in my opinion, the number one feature of the park is gone. Also, not having it included in the base bid just because of the unpredictability of times lately, I can see it just never happening and never coming to fruition. So, then another –

Ms. Smith: I'm sorry. Let me interrupt. I just want to be clear. So not including the expanded walking trail in the base bid?

Comm. Smith: Yeah, that would be a way to remedy this issue, in my opinion. The soccer club, the NEU Soccer Club – is that their name?

Ms. Smith: Yes.

Comm. Smith: Do they bring in revenue to the City of Mission? Are they paying to use the fields? Is that why we're catering to them?

Ms. Smith: I don't think we're specifically catering to them. There have been a variety of arrangements over the years, whether it's rental of the field, or they have invested and they have purchased equipment, or they have been responsible for turf maintenance in the past, so there has been some sharing of that responsibility, but again, based on the age of the youth that are typically using this site for their practices, they're younger, and we didn't want to make that specific investment in striping a soccer...We didn't want, and the neighborhood did not want, this to become a soccer-only park and facility.

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

April 25, 2022

Comm. Smith: Yeah. Well, it just feels like it's being prioritized over...From my personal experience, it seems to be mostly a playground and jogger/walker/biker park. I know soccer happens there, but those are people not from Mission, not who live here. Also, I am afraid that the meeting minutes not being accurately written down have contributed to our concerns not being expressed to the Council, and I think...I don't know what you do in that situation, if you have to redo it before they vote. I just don't feel like we were heard, so I disagree with the decision, and I am disappointed.

Comm. Cullinane: [mic was not working, comments nearly inaudible] It really helps to have this information and have the background...so thank you for sharing the final plan of the park. There was no mention of path changes or increase of path on the previous meeting. I do have concerns with the expanded path along the traffic along Lamar. I do voice concerns around that as well as the parking lot move. With the parking lot move there is less than half the traffic along 67th street and we heard the concerns from the nearby residents. There are a lot more driveways on 67th street. There's also three lanes on Lamar which helps with the traffic control....I do have concerns around not having a fence and increased traffic along Lamar....Lamar does have quite a bit of traffic ...you're going to have...that traffic. I think you're going to have, with no fence line...through the parking lot either way. I don't know if that's...The other item was that the topography of the green space... In last month's meeting someone raised concern around moving the fields to the Northeast corner of the park because of the elevation...trail off Lamar but I think there were some around to other trails along Lamar because elevation moving from NE Corner to the SW Corner. And then, also, one of them was around the traffic. I think it helps to have the Traffic Impact report, so thank you for that. There's two kinds of traffic...a lot of that traffic...I don't know if there were...Traffic, Neighbors said...residents were concerned about the three lanes on Lamar for turning. The last question was, when were the parks meetings?

Ms. Smith: I don't have all of those dates in front of me, but we really stretched through the variety of the different parks from February of 2020 through probably June of 2021, and each one kind of was on a separate path, if you will. Waterworks Park moved pretty quickly from the stakeholder and the concept design to having a public input session. Mohawk took longer because we couldn't meet in person. Broadmoor took longer, because there was just more neighborhood input around the specific amenities that were included.

Comm. Cullinane: Are there meeting notes from those meetings?

Ms. Smith: Their Council meeting minutes, I don't believe are available, but their committee minutes, I think it was April 6th, which we can share, but they did have a very extensive discussion around that as well.

Comm. Schmid: I had a couple other comments that I wanted to add as well. I also really appreciate you coming back and kind of giving us all the context behind why the decision was made, particularly, I think, for me in the area of the level of community involvement. I think seeing the process that the community went through that they were given these options and they weighed in on them was helpful. I appreciated that background.

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

April 25, 2022

Just a couple of more specific notes based on some of the designs that we were just shown. A lot of conversation about traffic speed coming in and out of the park, and I know we heard crosswalks, some signage. I did want to emphasize that signage doesn't do anything to actually physically reduce speed. Some of the more impactful things we can do to reduce speed are physical. Speed bumps, narrower streets, sharper turns, things like that that actually require the driver to slow down. I think you will find that those will be more effective in reducing speed than signage or a crosswalk.

The other thing I wanted to note – when we actually saw the illustration, the concept for kind of that paved area with the benches and with the restrooms, it looks great. The only thing that I would note is there's large swathes of that that are going to be unshaded, it looked like. Just thinking, through the summers when it's 95 or 98 degrees outside, the more unshaded pavement you have the less it's going to get used, so just would encourage some extra thought put there. I saw there were some of those sun sails in some areas, which are great, but yeah, just wanted to highlight any of those unshaded parts probably won't really see a lot of use in the summer. But overall, yeah, really appreciate you coming back and walking us through that.

Comm. Cullinane: ...Removing green space and adding pavement is not environmentally friendly. Would it be possible to add some planters or greenery on the paved area?

Ms. Smith: I believe – and I don't have the site plan that you all looked at right here in front of me this evening – but I do believe there are actually planters incorporated in that plaza area design, if I'm remembering correctly. They're not shown on these conceptual, this kind of 30,000-foot view, but as I recall, there were specific plantings and planting areas to help break up those larger expanses of paved or impervious surface.

Vice Chair Dukelow: Of course, I have to chime in here. Laura, thank you. Thank you for bringing this to us, and thank you for all the work you've done on this over the past, what now? Three weeks at least? I appreciate the discussion, and I have viewed both the April 6th committee meeting and the April 20th Council meetings where this issue is concerned. It's out there. Just Google it. It's available to watch. I know that a lot of conversations transpired among staff and the Council and everybody trying to figure out how to do the right thing. So I appreciate all that. I want to acknowledge that there's been an immense amount of time spent, and perhaps some of it was unnecessary – staff time, Commission time, consultant time, we had the public here, and the project was done. So my question at this juncture is what is the role of the Planning Commission with these upcoming parks, and not only the parks, but the projects that are already heavily planned? Such as Rushton? I don't want to be in a position like this again, for a little while at least.

Ms. Smith: We don't ever want to be in this position again. And I think that's a good question. I know we've had, internally, some questions, particularly Karie. That was one of the first things when we sat down to kind of debrief from your Planning Commission meeting, she said, "What is this process?" I said, "The last time the Planning Commission touched a park project was probably 2013, with the redo of the Family Aquatics Center." We've not made any significant investments since that time, and so we haven't had a very specific well-defined process, and when we put together – I'll just use the street sales tax

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

April 25, 2022

renewal as an example – we put together a larger plan, and I think we came and made presentations to all of our boards and commissions.

This one, quite honestly, got out ahead of us, so that's certainly something that, I don't know what the timeframe is, so once we get through renewal of the sales tax, we'll be able to sit down with the Council and say, "Here's the implementation timeframe for the remainder of these conceptual park improvements." So, I think as we do that, and in that interim period, it may be very beneficial...And we've also talked about the fact that what we probably should have done was include, specifically, a Planning Commission member on our stakeholder committees, so that you all were connected to that process from the very beginning. That was just, quite honestly, an oversight on our part. We're thinking PRT. We're thinking Ward City Councilmember who is going to hear from the neighborhood residents if they may be upset with something, so we just missed that one. I think it's important for us to just be accountable when we make those mistakes and try to learn in the process, because it doesn't feel good.

So, I think that what we have the benefit of now is, generally, these final conceptual drawings for the other parks. We have an opportunity to sit down and do a little bit more brainstorming and thinking about where might you have concerns? What additional considerations? I think as we move through this, we're doing a lot of work with a climate action plan task force right now. I think you'll see some additional sustainability elements and goals and objectives introduced into these park elements, but I think that will be...I would imagine we won't be back for several months, or at least until after the sales tax renewal, so I think we have time to take a step back and say, "Okay, here's where we are," and maybe it's a work session for you all where we sit down before you ever have to consider them and after we've awarded a design contract and are moving on a very specific timeframe for bidding, for you to look at those kinds of things, and think about what...

We should have done a traffic engineering report. It was hard for me in reviewing the minutes because we didn't have names associated with the members of the public who came to speak. I will tell you, I did not see anything that was articulated to you all that was not previously articulated in the public meetings that had been held. So many of those same residents had come forward and expressed this, but a lot of those things, I think, had been factored into that process, and none of those same residents took the opportunity to show up last week and share any more of that with the City Council. But again, not being able to tie specifically to a particular resident, those were things that we heard. But I think we're also open to suggestions about what do we do moving forward, so that we don't end up with the time and effort and energy on everybody's part.

Ms. Kneller: I know that from my perspective, I take full responsibility for my part in what I didn't know. I didn't ask enough questions going into writing the staff report. Next time I will sit and meet with Penn and Laura if necessary to make sure that I understand fully what happened, what transpired that I wasn't a part of, so that I get the full picture, so that I can share that with you, because that's my role. That's my job, to make sure that I have the full picture. Going forward, that will be part of my process, making sure that I sit down and meet and get that full picture, so that I can write it up appropriately and talk about all

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

April 25, 2022

of the community engagement process that came before, and anything leading up to it that is relevant and needs to be shared.

Ms. Smith: The other question, just to circle back, Robin, is I don't know the answer – and maybe Brian has a better response – I know what we can do to work on City projects that come forward. What I don't know is the right answer for that for the Rushton rebuild. So that's probably...I know you've had a first look at their plans, or is that just to the City Council?

Vice Chair Dukelow: It's out there. It's not hard to find.

Mr. Scott: So, they started working, I guess probably last summer, on plans for Rushton. The plans were essentially, first step is some kind of community engagement, so they basically created two teams. One was teachers and administrators at the school. The other team was a group of representative parents. They met with both teams on a fairly frequent basis throughout the late summer and fall of 2021. We actually did not know about that. We found out about that by accident. I said, "Wait a minute. We'd like to participate in that." So the City Administrator called the Superintendent and said, "We'd like to have a staff member on one of those teams." So I was selected to be on the team with the parents. When I got there, Councilmember Kring was there as well. She had been invited to participate as a community member.

But that process really began with, if you are a parent or a teacher, and you could dream the perfect school, what would that be? From there, they started whittling it down and talking about design of spaces, criteria that parents were looking for, the teachers were looking for, LEED certifications, a lot of discussion about sustainability. There were a lot of proponents of sustainable measures in the community that wanted to see things like green roofs, solar panels. The School District has made a commitment that they will build all of their buildings to LEED certification. They're actually going to achieve LEED certification. They won't say necessarily if it's going to be bronze or silver, but that's their commitment is some sort of LEED certification. But to that degree they have pushed back a little bit on some of the notions like solar panels, green roofs and some of those things.

So there has been a lot of discussion so far around those initiatives. We asked them to present to the City Council in April because we knew this would be coming to the Planning Commission soon. The next step is to have a neighborhood meeting. We have not set that neighborhood meeting yet, but we wanted to have an opportunity for those that live in the neighborhood near the school that may not necessarily have children that go to the school to have some input on the design and site improvements. That meeting has not been set yet.

Vice Chair Dukelow: So, at the end of all of this process in creating construction documents and everything else, what is our role as a Planning Commission? That's what I'm really trying to put my brain around, because that example, along with the example of the parks, these plans have been vetted. They've been looked at by what? Fifty-plus people over the course of months? So, what I struggle a little bit with is what is our role?

Ms. Smith: I'm going to answer it this way. I don't think your role is any different than what it ever has been, and I don't think...I sense that sometimes – and I'm speaking from being married to someone who has been a Planning Commission chair in another

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

April 25, 2022

community, been on planning commissions on both sides of the state line and involved in those processes and watching, and 30-plus years on planning commissions – you have a very specific role. But I think sometimes we approach, as a Planning Commission, we'll approach a public project, whether that's a city project, or a school district project in this case, with a little bit different mindset than you do with a private developer, in some cases. I think you have to approach them all similarly.

I don't think that any of the conversation that was had, even though the minutes were a little messy from last time and if there were things that were really missing...I spent a tremendous amount of time with Brian and Karie just walking through, not just looking at the minutes, but what was said and the tone and the concerns. I think those are all legitimate. I think part of the conversation – Robin you may have heard this in the Council's discussion – was there is a reason why there's a process for councils to do something different than what a planning commission recommends. Right? And it has to be used very judiciously, and I think in the case of my 17 years in Mission, it has been used in that fashion. I don't see that changing in any way, shape or form. I think this was a great sort of maybe wake-up call. Again, we haven't planned a park in a long time. I think we've learned some things through this process, but I think you approach it the same way, and I think you don't have a City Council who is ever going to take a decision to potentially either remand back...I think in recent history they remanded back Martway Apartments, if I'm remembering correctly, which was kind of a messy project.

Again, they thought long and hard about remanding this one back, but I don't think you're going to see a change. This is not a pattern. This is not a precedent that you would see from a staff perspective and/or a Council perspective. So I think you approach it the way that you have. Your questions are thoughtful. They are in line with the values and vision and priorities of the community, and you as your work as Planning Commissioners, some of you for much longer periods of time than others, so I don't know that I would say that...I understand and appreciate the disappointment or disagreement with that decision. I think this is a rarity. We're going to do everything we can to make sure that this doesn't happen again, but I think that we've got to open up some more of that dialogue so that you feel comfortable. But I don't think that's a signal that you're not looking at the right things, or that you're misinterpreting what your role should be. I think you've been very successful, from my perspective, for the last 17 years. I wouldn't change anything.

Vice Chair Dukelow: Thank you, Laura.

Comm. Smith: I have a couple more things. Despite my opinion, I do appreciate the background that you gave and the additional information, so thank you. And one other thing I feel I should mention. I am a Rushton parent, and I was part of the parent group. It was the Rushton Rebuild Vision Group. So, I do have that additional background knowledge. I caught COVID for the last meeting, so I did not see the final outcome, but I was there for the initial meetings.

Ms. Smith: And I think based on the presentation that the Council saw, the outcome now is different than the final outcome that was presented at that meeting.

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

April 25, 2022

Mr. Scott: Yeah, there are some slight modifications. Like everybody else, they're experiencing cost overruns, so they've had to go back and value engineer, scale back on a few things. It's not dramatically different, but there are some differences.

Comm. Cullinane: I am surprised that no one was there from the neighborhood at the Council meeting to voice their concerns. We had a lot of neighbors come up and speak to us. I definitely would like to know when those neighborhood and stakeholder meetings are, and then also, it is surprising that no one was there from the neighborhood for the City Council meeting to speak their concerns. I wonder if they knew that this park plan would go to City Council next or what the process was since we had approved a few changes. I don't think they (the residents) were given notice that they should speak at all of those City Council meetings as well...not just the Planning Commission, but also the City Council meetings.

Mr. Scott: One of the things that I noticed in reviewing Karie's packets, staff reports, recently, there are two lines at the very bottom of that staff report. One says, "Planning Commission consideration" and the next one says, "City Council consideration." Now tonight that was missing from one of them, because there is no City Council consideration. It's approved by the Planning Commission, and that's the final step, but if there's ever an item that moves from the Planning Commission to the City Council we'll put that in the staff report, that date, so people can be looking out for that.

Comm. Cullinane: Thank you.

Ms. Kneller: I think it would be helpful to announce that at the Planning Commission meetings when there's public that comes to speak, to remind them that the City Council will hear the same case next –

Comm. Troppito: It may also be good to...send City Council a draft copy...because it encapsulates all of your concerns, just as you mentioned them now or for the past however minutes we have been discussing this. I haven't kept track.

Ms. Smith: So the draft from this evening's minutes -

Mr. Scott: Which is another challenge because tomorrow morning we're sending this whole recording off to the transcriber, and they basically have less than a week to transcribe and get it back to us, and we have next to no time to review and fill in the gaps before it goes to the City Council.

[inaudible]

Mr. Scott: I hope so.

Ms. Smith: It seems better than what I'm imaging it was last months, based on the minutes.

Chairman Lee: What are the drawbacks of going back to having it at City Hall? If I recall, I don't recall we ever really had issues with any of this prior to coming over here, not that this is a bad facility but it just isn't really friendly to what we use it for.

Mr. Scott: It's (the Community Center) not really set up to record meetings.

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

April 25, 2022

Ms. Smith: I think we could explore that. I know we have other boards and commissions who are exploring a return to the Council Chambers. I think at least preliminarily with the City Council, at least in talking with the Mayor, probably the Council won't consider returning until we get through the budget process with anticipation of some of the larger development projects that may be coming forward in kind of rotations, whether that's the Block Project or the Gateway Project, and then the budget process this year. Typically, when we know we're going to have a large public meeting, we'll move over here anyway, but I think assuming COVID numbers hold where they have been, I would imagine that Council will probably be moving back later this fall. Again, thank you again for your time this evening.

Comm. Cullinane: And I had one more comment. It would be interesting to have two different plans showed for the park plans to show "we're listening to you," and that's kind of...and then when you show them what the final option was – the dog park was...there, but there's still a chance it might be at Streamway, so it would just be kind of nice to actually see layouts of what they would actually look like if...or if rather than small tweaks, like oh, it may not have ...on one of them, or just the different options...

Planning Commission Comments

Chairman Lee: Okay, do we have any Commissioners who have comments to make? Related to anything else? Anything from staff?

Staff Updates

Mr. Scott: So like I've been telling you, I've been kind of beating drum that we have a full agenda coming up. We received two applications for the May meeting. The first is the Block redevelopment project at 5665 Foxridge. That's the former JCPenney call center. There's a neighborhood meeting here tomorrow night at 6:30. Block will be presenting their project and just kind of answering any questions, getting some feedback from the neighbors. You're all welcome to attend if you would like. It's a public meeting. Then, we tentatively have them scheduled for the May Planning Commission meeting, so we're working through the staff report right now, getting comments back to them.

The other project is a much smaller, multi-family development at the corner of 58th Street and Nall. It's the old Sunflower medical office building. A developer has purchased that building from Script Pro, as well as some properties just around the corner, along Nall, and has put together a plan for a 77-unit apartment complex that would be three stories tall. That will be accompanying an application for rezoning. It's MS-2 right now. We're proposing that we rezone to Downtown Neighborhood District. It's more of a fit for that particular project. So those two projects will be on your agenda for May, tentatively. If we run into some hiccups, we may wind up pushing those off until June. We'll let you know.

In June, the plan right now is for Rushton, but they have not submitted anything yet, so that may or may not happen. Then I think we have an application for an historical sign permit. So, Snack Shack opened up recently. We said, "Welcome to town. You've got a non-conforming pole sign you've got to take down." They said, "No, we don't." We said, "Yes, you do." So they've made an application for an historical sign permit that you will be considering. Anything else?

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

April 25, 2022

Ms. Kneller: I think that's it.

Mr. Scott: I think that's probably it. I'm thinking if we're going to have anything in July or August. We may get a by for the summer and get a little break. I was talking with Johnson County Wastewater, had a conversation with them last week. If you recall, last summer we heard plans for the Roe pump station. Like everybody else, they're experiencing rising costs of construction and materials and they're getting very concerned that that's not going to stop anytime in the near future, so they've been doing some reshuffling of their construction project timelines and trying to figure out ways that they can kind of get things started sooner than later. So with that, they're kind of moving up the construction on the Nelson treatment plant. They're thinking right now that they'll probably have an open house sometime in September at the plant. If you remember, they did that last summer. They'll show their conceptual drawings for what they're going to do at the plant, how they're going to handle access and screening and some of those things. Of course, all of the neighbors in the area are invited. The City Council will be invited and we'll be sure that you get invitations as well. I think they're planning to submit preliminary plans for the fall, so that will probably be on our agenda, maybe in October. A very busy year. Any other questions?

Vice Chair Dukelow: If I could ask a question real quickly. What will come of the Johnson County Wastewater facility that is south of –

Mr. Scott: Behind Mission Bowl?

Vice Chair Dukelow: The Mission Bowl property, once it's decommissioned?

Mr. Scott: They've been making a number of improvements to that, just to bring it up to code, and I think that the tentative plans right now are to keep it operational for probably another ten years and then once everything is done with the Nelson Treatment Plant and the Roe pump station and any other improvements they need to make in the system, then they'll evaluate decommissioning that. So it's a few years off before they do, if they decide to go that direction, but I don't think there's anything confirmed that they will or they will not at this point.

ADJOURNMENT

Vice Chair Dukelow moved and Comm. Troppito seconded a motion to adjourn.

The motion carried unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 9:00 P.M.

Mike Lee, Chair

ATTEST:

Kimberly Steffens, Secretary