



MINUTES – Opening Remarks

Planning Commission Meeting: February 26, 2024

The Planning Commission convened at 7:00 p.m. to meet in regular session with **Vice Chair Taylor Breen** presiding as chair in the absence of Chair Wayne Janner. Commissioners Tony Bergida, Keith Brown, Chip Corcoran, Jeffrey Creighton, and Jim Terrones were present. Commissioners Wayne Janner, Ken Chapman, and Megan Lynn were absent.

Recited Pledge of Allegiance.

Chair Breen made introductory comments. Chair Breen directed commissioners to report if they have had ex parte communication when that item is reached in the agenda.

Chair Breen referenced the Planning Commission Consent Agenda, which includes five items. Chair Breen asked if any items need to be removed for separate discussion or additional information. Seeing none, Chair Breen asked for a motion on the consent agenda.

A motion to approve MN24-0212, Planning Commission meeting minutes of February 12, 2024, was made by **Commissioner Bergida** and seconded by **Commissioner Terrones**. The motion passed 6 to 0.



MINUTES

Planning Commission Meeting: February 26, 2024

Application:	<u>MP24-0006:</u> Request for approval of a minor plat for Wild Rose Addition, containing two (2) lots on approximately 0.89 acres, located at 314 and 317 S. Wabash Circle.
---------------------	---

A motion to approve MP24-0006 was made by **Commissioner Bergida** and seconded by **Commissioner Terrones**. The motion passed with a vote of 6 to 0 with no stipulations.



MINUTES

Planning Commission Meeting: February 26, 2024

Application:	<u>FP24-0001:</u> Request for approval of a final plat for Prairie Ridge Plaza Midland, containing one (1) lot on approximately 3.89 acres, located southeast of College Boulevard and S. Ambassador Street.
---------------------	---

A motion to approve FP24-0001 was made by **Commissioner Bergida** and seconded by **Commissioner Terrones**. The motion passed with a vote of 6 to 0 with the following stipulations:

1. Prior to issuance of a land disturbance permit or building permit, standard orange barricade fencing must be installed around all tree preservation areas in accordance with UDO 18.30.240



MINUTES

Planning Commission Meeting: February 26, 2024

Application:	<u>FP24-0002:</u> Request for approval of a final plat for Prairie Ridge Plaza Evergreen, containing one (1) lot and two (2) tracts on approximately 16.40 acres, located southeast of S. Ridgeview Road and W. 112th Street.
---------------------	--

A motion to approve FP24-0002 was made by **Commissioner Bergida** and seconded by **Commissioner Terrones**. The motion passed with a vote of 6 to 0 with the following stipulation:

1. Prior to issuance of a land disturbance permit or building permit, standard orange barricade fencing must be installed around all tree preservation areas in accordance with UDO 18.30.240.



MINUTES

Planning Commission Meeting: February 26, 2024

Application:	<u>PR23-0024:</u> Request for approval of a preliminary site development plan for Saint John Paul II Parrish on approximately 23.55 acres, located southeast of W. 168th Terrace and S. Ridgeview Road.
---------------------	--

A motion to approve PR23-0024 was made by **Commissioner Bergida** and seconded by **Commissioner Terrones**. The motion passed with a vote of 6 to 0 with the following stipulations:

1. A waiver is granted from UDO 18.15.020.G.6.b to reduce the clear glass percentage from 20% to percentages ranging from 1.8% to 16.6% on all primary facades of the church, school, and parish hall buildings as shown on the Building Elevations dated February 9, 2024.
2. A waiver is granted from UDO 18.15.020.G.6.a(2) to increase the requirement from 50-ft up to 80-ft for the west-facing facades for both the school and parish hall buildings as shown on the Building Elevations dated December 18, 2023.
3. Parking for Phase 1 of this development must be revised to meet minimum parking requirements for the proposed use with submittal of the final site development plan.
4. On-site parking will be re-evaluated with each future phase of development to verify if the parking proposed will adequately support the combined uses and anticipated visitors during peak times.
5. Prior to issuance of a land disturbance permit or building permit, standard orange barricade fencing must be installed around all tree preservation areas in accordance with UDO 18.30.240.



MINUTES

Planning Commission Meeting: February 26, 2024

Application:	<i>On December 5, 2023 the City Council remanded the following application to the Planning Commission.</i> <u>RZ23-0008:</u> Request for approval of a rezoning from the CP-2 (Planned General Business) District to the C-3 (Regional Center) District for B Street Collision Center on approximately 3.43 acres; located northeast of W. 151st Street and S. Pflumm Road.
---------------------	--

Chair Taylor Breen introduced the item of Old Business. This item is the remand of the application for the B Street Collision Center. This is currently pending rezoning case RZ23-0008. The public hearing for the rezoning was held and closed on November 13th of last year and a remand was made by the City Council on December 5th.

Chair Breen reminded attendees that the public hearing closed, and no public comments will be taken this evening. All public comments are still part of the original existing record, and any additional public comments were provided in tonight's meeting packet. Chair Breen continued that this is a discussion only of the Planning Commission regarding the proposed development plans and recommended stipulations. The action required this evening before the Commission is a motion on the acceptance or modification of the stipulations as presented by staff.

Ms. Schuller introduced the proposed site which is located northeast of 151st Street and Pflumm Road on an undeveloped lot within the Executive Plaza Commercial Center. The applicant proposes to rezone the existing CP-2 Planned General Business District to the C-3 Regional Center District to support a collision repair center. Ms. Schuller continued that Executive Plaza is in a commercial center originally approved for an anchor tenant and attached inline tenant spaces on the subject property, surrounded by pad site commercial developments along 151st Street and Pflumm Road.

Ms. Schuller presented the application's history. The rezoning application for B Street collision was originally heard by the Planning Commission on November 13th, 2023, and the Commission recommended denial. The application was then heard by the City Council on December 5th, and the City Council voted to remand the application back to the Planning Commission following a full review of the development plans and preparation of recommended stipulations.

Ms. Schuller continued that as directed, staff has collaborated with the applicant to revise the site plans and building elevations, and the applicant has agreed upon a list of recommended stipulations.

Ms. Schuller stated that the task of the Planning Commission this evening is narrowed to only a review of the plans and stipulations and to make a recommendation on them. She continued that the Planning Commission will not be considering a vote to approve or deny the zoning application as a whole, as that recommendation has already been made. When the application returns to City

Council on March 19th, the Council will be considering both the rezoning and the preliminary site development plans.

Ms. Schuller presented the site plans: The collision center includes over 28,000 square feet of building area with a front facade facing west and 152 parking stalls which wrap the building on all sides. The stalls are designated for customer, employee, storage, and parking uses. Storage areas are on the east and north ends of the site. The composite wood fence with masonry columns is proposed along the north and part of the east property lines to screen those storage parking areas. The applicant has noted that salvage vehicles will be parked along the east until they are taken from the site and as such, staff has included a stipulation that that eastern fence be extended along the south to further screen that storage parking area. Staff has also stipulated that vehicles being brought to the site on transport vehicles would be unloaded and stored on the east side and if delivered overnight, which the applicant has indicated occurs on occasion, that those vehicles would be relocated the next day. This is to prevent any long-term storage of vehicles outside.

Staff also recommends a stipulation that all other vehicles awaiting repair would be would not be stored outside overnight; instead, they would be brought indoors. The applicant has communicated that is already their standard business practice to bring those vehicles in overnight.

The site is over-parked per UDO requirements by 67 parking stalls. The applicant is requesting a waiver to this maximum parking requirement of the C-3 District to allow 152 parking stalls to accommodate 50 employees as well as customer parking and the vehicle storage areas.

A landscape plan provides buffers around the perimeter of the site. On the north, east and south, the applicant's proposed landscaping exceeds the minimum 10-foot width to provide 25-feet of landscape areas. The applicant proposes a staggered row of evergreens to the east for screening, landscaping on the north side of the proposed fence to soften the fence row, and off-site landscaping along the larger perimeter of the Executive Plaza area. This landscaping is to be installed by the property owner, but it is stipulated to be installed prior to certificate of occupancy for this building.

The elevations meet UDO requirements for commercial and retail buildings, and no waivers are being requested. The building also meets additional requirements of Ordinance 99-109, which governs the larger Executive Plaza; it requires the building to be faced with brick in color tones that blend with the neighboring buildings. The buildings also include awnings and pedestrian scale elements as required.

Ms. Schuller summarized that the applicant is requesting one waiver for consideration to allow the parking to be increased from 85 stalls to 152 stalls.

Ms. Schuller indicated that staff's recommendation to deny the rezoning application remains unchanged. However, if the rezoning application is approved, staff recommends eight stipulations for the rezoning to the C-3 District, which Ms. Schuller reviewed:

1. The following uses are prohibited:
 - a. Recycling Centers and Drop-Off; and
 - b. Mini-Warehouse; and

- c. Cemetery; and
 - d. Parking Lots, Surface, as Principal Use.
2. This property is subject to the site design, building material, and building design criteria of Ordinance 99-109 (Sections e, f, and g).
 3. The rezoning to the C-3 District must be approved by the Johnson County Airport Commission and Board of County Commissioners prior to the publication of the zoning ordinance.
 4. Installation of the offsite landscape buffer, along the northern limits of the Executive Plaza commercial center, shall be approved and installed prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for any buildings on the subject lot.
 5. Hours of operation for the Vehicle Painting and Body Shop use are limited to Monday-Friday from 7:00 am to 5:00 pm.
 6. No outdoor overnight storage of vehicles awaiting repair is permitted, except for vehicles delivered after business hours, which must be stored on the east side of the building and relocated the following day.
 7. Salvage vehicles must be stored along the east property line, and may not be stored beyond the northern or southern limits of the building.
 8. Unloading of vehicles from transport vehicles must occur on the east side of the building.

Similarly, if the Council votes to approve the preliminary site development plan for B Street Collision Center, staff recommends the following stipulations for the preliminary site development plan, which Ms. Schuller reviewed:

1. Proposed fencing must be a durable composite material with decorative masonry columns. Wood and chain link fencing are not permitted.
2. The proposed fence on the east side of the site must be extended south to the "Limits of Vehicle Storage Area" as identified on the site development plans dated February 14, 2024. In addition, the proposed double row of evergreens must be retained.
3. Building mounted signage is not permitted on the north façade.
4. All new on-site wiring and cables must be placed underground.
5. Exterior ground-mounted or building mounted equipment including but not limited to, mechanical equipment, utilities' meter banks and coolers must be screened from public view with three (3) sided landscaping or an architectural treatment compatible with the building architecture.

Ms. Schuller stated staff has discussed all stipulations at length with the applicant, and they are amenable to these stipulations.

In summary, the rezoning recommendation of denial made by staff and the Planning Commission on November 13th remains unchanged. The Planning Commission is tasked with accepting or amending the project stipulations as recommended by staff.

Commissioner Creighton stated he understands the Commission is not looking at the rezoning tonight. He stated, instead he understands that if Council were to choose to reverse what the Commission's recommendation is, tonight's task is how to ensure that this project remains as high quality as possible. Commissioner Creighton asked, related to the fence, what the height would be and what the City would require. He also asked about the quality of the composite because he would want to make sure it meets the highest standard.

Ms. Schuller answered the renderings show a six-foot tall site-obscuring fence. The Executive Plaza requires decorative fencing types. Ms. Schuller continued that for a site obscuring composite material, it would be a Trex-like material that's very durable and weather resistant. Paired with masonry columns, staff believed this was a good compromise to enhance the look of that fence while still making sure the storage areas are screened.

Commissioner Creighton asked if the applicant was amenable to extend the fence further along the eastern part, and Ms. Schuller confirmed.

Commissioner Creighton asked, regarding outside storage of vehicles, how that would be enforced with drop-offs occurring after hours. Ms. Schuller answered staff maintains regular communication with our Community Enhancement group (ie City staff who drive the city every day to monitor compliance). When there are sites with specific requirements like this, Planning staff communicates those stipulations to Community Enhancement staff. Further, City staff can also use internal software to place a flag on this property, and whenever Planning staff is out, can and do also note site compliance. Finally, City staff is very responsive to any residents who report stipulation violations.

Commissioner Brown stated he had questions about the stipulations: Stipulations #6 and #7 seem conflicting. Stipulation #6 says no outdoor overnight storage, and then Stipulation #7 says salvage vehicles must be stored in a certain location.

Ms. Schuller confirmed there are salvage vehicles and explained the distinction is vehicles that will be repaired by the business (vehicles awaiting repair) versus the salvage vehicles (vehicles that are too far gone to be repaired and are going to be picked up by a transport vehicle and taken off the site). Ms. Schuller confirmed staff is aware the applicant would have salvage vehicles parked on the east property line, which are not considered as part of those vehicles awaiting repair.

Commissioner Brown asked if there was a time limit on the salvage vehicles, and Ms. Schuller answered staff did not place the time limit on those.

Commissioner Brown stated regarding parking places, that if the applicant has 50 employees, then 152 parking places seems to be a lot to ask for and he requested further explanation. Ms. Schuller stated the applicant may also need to answer during their presentation, however, staff categorized parking by what the applicant anticipated for customer parking, employee parking, storage areas, and vehicles that are being dropped off or brought into the building at various times

of the day. Since the applicant has other existing locations, they know their operations pretty well and what their needs are.

Mr. Curt Peterson, Polsinelli, on behalf of the applicant, presented their application. He stated on November 13th, the Commission discussed the rezoning, but not the plan because of the way Olathe procedures happen. Thus, this is the first time the Commission is seeing this plan. The applicant appreciates that the Council has provided the opportunity to present a plan and specifically a robust set of stipulations that were worked out collaboratively with staff to ensure that the operations, if this project is able to move forward, happen in a positive way for the community. Since the comments and recommendation of the Council are about the plan and the stipulations, Mr. Peterson stated he would refrain from getting into the broader use topic but was happy to answer any questions regarding that at the end.

Mr. Peterson began with the development plan and presented two images. He pointed out the northern privacy fence and the south façade. Setting aside the parking waiver, Mr. Peterson directed the Commission to note that there is not a single critique of the development plan in the staff report. Mr. Peterson stated that staff did their job, and B Street and their architect tried hard to accommodate all code requirements and every suggestion staff made. Whether it's building materials, building designs, setbacks, or landscaping, Mr. Peterson stated the applicant has either met or exceeded the code requirements. He gave the example of the landscaping which they exceeded in quantity, size, width on three sides of the building.

Mr. Peterson continued that the applicant is asking for one waiver, to parking, and offered justification for why the amount of parking is necessary. The applicant proposes 152 parking stalls in the entire lot, which makes a waiver necessary because that exceeds the 85 stalls that the code would allow. However, Mr. Peterson stated that 70 of the parking stalls are needed for storage of cars, which means 82 true parking stalls are for regular parking. Those 82 stalls – for employees, customers, etc – are less than the 85 maximum.

Mr. Peterson continued that the excess stalls are used for storage that is not visible. The storage stalls are oriented so they're either blocked by the building on the east side or they're blocked on the north side and northwest corner by a fence with landscaping. Mr. Peterson expanded that on the master development to the north, there is landscaping, and on the east side, there is landscaping and the fence. Staff recommended and applicant agreed to extend the fence with extra landscaping in the southeast corner. The goal is to ensure the storage was not viewable to the public. Mr. Peterson restated that yes, they are requesting a parking waiver which will require Commission feedback and Council approval, but it's not "parking" per se, but rather storage and to that end, only B Street employees will interface with that storage area.

Mr. Peterson answered Commissioner Brown's concern by adding that true retail parking and employee parking is within the code allowance (85 stalls); the storage stalls are the ones that cause the number to jump so a waiver is required. Mr. Peterson added that the owner of B Street (a second generation family business) has explained to him it takes a long time presently to receive parts. From the time they take in the car, diagnose the problem, order the parts, receive the parts, complete the repair and ship it out, several weeks may pass depending on the type of car parts. Thus, that requires B Street to constantly keep cars moving through with inventory and the storage lot. B Street has approximately seven facilities, with decades' experience in operation. The applicant knows exactly what they need without having a situation where they wouldn't have enough space for the employees or for a retail person. This waiver request was very calculated and not in excess for their business.

Mr. Peterson continued that in addition to the development plan, tonight's task includes the stipulations. From first meeting with neighbors and with staff, the applicant has been asking for stipulations and very willing to keep the stipulations, knowing the site will always be restricted by those stipulations. Mr. Peterson provided that Ms. Schuller covered the stipulations well, so he would not replicate. However, he added there are four additional items he wanted to touch on and why there aren't particular stipulations for those items.

First, regarding the concern that traffic will be increased, Mr. Peterson stated B Street is a very low traffic generator. Thus, inserting a stipulation about traffic doesn't make sense because the proposed collision center is objectively a really low generator of traffic.

Second, regarding pollution, there are zero emissions. Mr. Peterson said nothing comes out of the business that doesn't come out of your house or any other building. There are triple, different scrubbers and cleaners from the paint booth as they go out at the top of the building, which are included at all B Street facilities. B Street complies with all regulations.

Third, regarding noise, B Street has to comply with the city's noise ordinance and certainly will. In addition, from the property line in the north to the residential property line to the north is over a football field. From their building to buildings on the north is even farther, and they will have a privacy fence with two layers of landscaping.

Fourth and finally, regarding the size of the building, there's nothing the applicant could do to create a stipulation around that. Compared to the depth and dimensions of a strip retail building, this building isn't different per se than a normal shopping center. Taking into considerations their operation, Mr. Peterson stated they didn't see a way they could make adjustments to address this complaint.

Mr. Peterson summarized that the plan before the Commission was a collaborative effort that was well thought out, and – other than the hopefully justified parking exception – meets or exceeds all of what Olathe expects and requires of its great developments. The applicant worked hard on the stipulations and Mr. Peterson hoped he provided clarity on the reasons certain items didn't make it into the stipulations.

Mr. Peterson asked Commissioner Brown if he could answer the question about salvage.

Commissioner Brown answered that Ms. Schuller had answered, but he had another question and asked the applicant to confirm that of the 150 stalls, 70 of those stalls are for vehicles that are in process. Mr. Peterson confirmed.

Commissioner Brown continued, that Stipulation #6 says those cars can't be stored outside at night which **Mr. Peterson** confirmed. **Commissioner Brown** asked to confirm that if the 70 stalls are all full, B Street will bring 70 cars indoors at night and then take them back out in the morning.

Mr. Peterson confirmed, yes, with one exception: The 70 stalls on the north and down the east includes roughly 10 salvage vehicles, which are vehicles that need to be picked up roughly every three days. Other than the salvage vehicles (which don't get put in every night), everything else does go indoors at night.

Commissioner Brown objected that the parking space seems to be larger than the size of the building. Mr. Peterson confirmed “100% positive” that all those cars will be pulled in. He stated emphatically that he has seen it and has photographs of other facilities where they do that. It’s unbelievable and B Street does it every single day.

Commissioner Brown asked about the vehicles that aren’t drivable but aren’t salvage.

Mr. Peterson stated that if there are any of those, they have a forklift that they could pull it in. He agreed that the stipulation says is if it’s something awaiting repair and it’s not salvage, they would put it in the building. He stated he doesn’t think it’s very typical, but they would because that’s what the stipulation says.

Commissioner Bergida asked to confirm his understanding of the concessions that the applicant made since the application was remanded back: The applicant is adding the fence and additional buffering, and the applicant was very proactive on the stipulations that staff and applicant collaborated on.

Mr. Peterson confirmed and added they also worked on building undulations where there are doors.

Commissioner Bergida asked if any other B Street locations are in residential areas or not. **Mr. Peterson** answered that the Lenexa location is next to residential properties and by Commanche Elementary School. The Legends location is across the street to the east to single family and a little farther to the north. The downtown Omaha location has an elementary school across from it and is close to residential homes. The Lincoln facility is across the street from residential. This is not new for B Street, and they have no ongoing issues.

Commissioner Bergida asked whether any line-of-sight studies were conducted whether someone from their home in the neighborhood would look out and see salvage cars in the parking lot. **Mr. Peterson** answered, yes, he believes a line-of-sight drawing was conducted. He added that due to the elevation change, fence, and landscaping, a person could not see the storage. He stated he believed his professional staff could answer further. Mr. Peterson restated again, that no one can see it unless they go to the back of the building, because it is tucked behind the building, backed by the airport area, behind a fence and against the trash enclosure.

Commissioner Bergida asked to confirm that if he were to drive to Lenexa this evening, whether he would see tires out and cars in the parking lot. **Mr. Peterson** answered perhaps an employee may be there late to clean up. Otherwise, you would see Lenexa has a fenced area in the back, and if you went back there you would see they park their salvage vehicles. B Street in Lenexa isn’t required to move the cars the same way Olathe’s stipulations are directing so there could be an exception. However, B Street still lines up their salvage vehicles and generally moves all the other cars inside their building in Lenexa. On the front of the building, the only way you would see a car after hours is if an employee was there or if there was a car dropped off after hours. If there was an ice storm (ie a “big” night) there may be three cars dropped off. When you pull in, off to your right is where the tow trucks would place a car that was dropped off overnight. The very first thing, an employee gets there at 6:30, before they open at 7:00 AM, they immediately take those cars into the building and do something with it.

Commissioner Bergida asked, if on a Sunday morning, there would be a reason for 20 cars to be parked outside there. **Mr. Peterson** answered that there’s zero possibility of that.

Commissioner Bergida, asked to confirm again there is 100% absolutely no possibility, and **Mr. Peterson** agreed.

Commissioner Terrones asked for clarification whether the row of proposed evergreens, looking east to the airport approach, is three rows or just one row or staggered. **Mr. Peterson** referenced the landscape plan that would definitely say, but he believes it's two staggered or one row zigzagging, as evergreens are often planted.

Commissioner Creighton referenced the fence that staff stipulated be required on the east side extend to the end of the building on the south and asked whether it was going to be gated or open. Mr. Peterson answered it would be open to allow tow trucks to drop off.

Commissioner Bergida asked staff when Council remanded the application back to Commission, what rationale the Council provided for the remand.

Ms. Schuller answered, that first and foremost, the remand was to have staff do a full site plan review and work with the applicant to draft stipulations since staff had not done so previously [When staff recommends denial, staff does not review the associated site plan]. Second, **Ms. Schuller** believes the intent was also to narrowly tailor the application to make this use work on this site or to be a better neighbor.

Commissioner Bergida stated that last time an application was remanded back to the Commission, it seemed it was a pretty split vote. This application was remanded by a vote of six to one. Commissioner Bergida stated, he didn't recall the reason the other application was sent back. Commissioner Bergida asked staff whether the impression was that the Commission was supposed to, with the site plan, come up with something that would best work? Or whether the Council wanted more information so that they could decide whether they wanted to proceed against the Commission's recommendation? Or to better evaluate it?

Ms. Schuller answered, she believed it was to obtain more information so the application can be better evaluated.

Commissioner Brown asked, since the Planning Commission previously recommended denial of this application 8 to 0, when this goes back to City Council, whether it would take a supermajority to pass it.

Ms. Schuller deferred to Ms. Hollingsworth.

Ms. Kim Hollingsworth, Planning and Development Manager clarified that Commissioner Brown was referencing the supermajority vote that's typically required to overturn the Planning Commission's recommendation. She continued that after the remand process, it switched back to just a simple majority (ie four members of the City Council approving the development) which is consistent with UDO and state statute requirements.

Commissioner Bergida asked Ms. Hollingsworth, if the Commission were to deny the site development plan, whether it would then require a supermajority by the Council to approve.

Ms. Hollingsworth answered that that's linked to the rezoning decision, the supermajority. Thus, the Commission's task this evening is just to recommend acceptance of the stipulation as

provided by staff. She clarified, the task is not an approval or denial, it's acceptance of the stipulations or any amendments to them.

Chair Breen stated the Commission's initial recommendation is unchanged, which Ms. Hollingsworth confirmed.

Commissioner Bergida asked, if the stipulations fail to pass, two to four or something like that, whether the threshold for five votes still remains.

Ms. Hollingsworth answered, that she is not aware of that; that has already happened in the process. With the remand, it switched back to a simple majority. Staff is looking for feedback from the Commission and action tonight to give feedback to the Council.

Chair Breen added the Commission needs to give feedback to the Council. If the Commission isn't agreeing, then alternatives should be proposed as replacements. Chair Breen continued he'd like to remind the Commission that both staff and the applicant have reached stipulations that both are amenable to. Based on that, Chair Breen asked for any additional discussion or opened the floor for a motion.

Ms. Hollingsworth added, she would like to defer to Deputy City Attorney, for any additional guidance.

Mr. Chris Grunewald, Deputy City Attorney stated he wanted to echo and maybe clarify for Commissioner Bergida what Planning Manager Kim Hollingsworth was saying. Mr. Grunewald continued that as this matter returns to City Council, it will not require a supermajority regardless of the action the Commission takes tonight. Mr. Grunewald stated the action in front of the Commission is acceptance of the stipulations; he restated that regardless of what the outcome of that decision on those stipulations as recommended by staff will not require a supermajority to do something different on that particular stipulation request. Mr. Grunewald stated he hoped that clarified the Commissioner's question.

Commissioner Creighton asked to confirm that, under proposed Stipulation A(1), staff is not making a recommendation on the parking waiver and so the Commission would need to take an action to accept that waiver or recommend it or not. **Ms. Schuller** confirmed that was correct.

Commissioner Creighton asked if a similar situation was for letter C(1) and (2), referencing fencing material and the quality, the height, the storage area, limit of site or limit of vehicle storage. **Ms. Schuller** confirmed that all stipulations under Sections B & C would be need to be included in a motion as well.

Chair Breen called for any final discussion.

Commissioner Brown indicated he had concerns and would like to propose amendments. First, Commissioner Brown stated he had pulled up an aerial shot from the Johnson County Assessor's Office dated February 19th, which is a Sunday morning. He stated there are 17 cars parked in the parking lot. The business was closed, but yet there were 17 cars out despite being told B Street does not leave cars out – zero percent of that ever happening. Commissioner Brown said he was concerned about that.

Commissioner Brown continued that he also had a Google photo pulled up also which showed on one side, B Street has a 22x12 foot salvage bin full of fenders, hoods, doors and other metal parts. There's a stack of tires and a stack of wooden pallets, in addition to a 40 foot long compacting unit in the parking lot.

Based on these factors, **Commissioner Brown** said he had additional stipulations he wanted to suggest by a motion:

1. Prohibit the short term outside storage of all salvage metal parts, including but not limited to vehicle doors, fenders, hoods and trunks.
2. Prohibit the short term outside storage of any shipping pallets.
3. Prohibit short term outside temporary storage of tires
4. Prohibit the compacting equipment from being outside in the parking lot

Commissioner Bergida seconded the motion.

Chair Breen acknowledged the motion and second. Chair Breen asked Commissioner Brown to reiterate whether he was recommending approval of the stipulations that are presented by staff plus his modifications this evening.

Commissioner Brown answered he was not ready to move that the stipulations [the staff's recommended stipulations] be passed. Instead, he said he wanted the amendments to be added on to what might be voted on.

Ms. Hollingsworth stated to Commissioner Brown that she understood that the discussion now was about these two specific additions right now. First, Ms. Hollingsworth stated Commissioner Brown listed several items that would be prohibited from being stored outside and asked whether it were possible to capture those under topics that relate to the UDO. She continued, if the Planning Commission desired to make that recommendation about those items being stored outside, perhaps it could be captured by something like "outdoor storage of material supplies and equipment are not permitted," to use wording that is typical out of the UDO. Second, Ms. Hollingsworth stated she needed more clarification about what compacting equipment means. There is a compactor proposed behind the building, tucked up close to it that would have screening and be completely behind the building. Ms. Hollingsworth asked if Commissioner Brown was concerned about something different than that.

Commissioner Brown answered that in the aerial photos from Google and from the County, there is a 40-foot compactor outside, set up at an angle to make it easy for whoever is that comes to pick it up, which is what he was referring to.

Ms. Hollingsworth stated she would defer to **Ms. Schuller** who could provide more clarity about what is proposed, and Ms. Hollingsworth added that, according to staff's understanding, the compactor is an essential piece of the business for the applicant.

Commissioner Brown stated he wanted to add that he first believed the compactor was a tractor trailer rig due to its size. It was only by zooming in at different angles that he was able to determine it was instead a compactor.

Ms. Jessica Schuller, Senior Planner answered the applicant does have a compactor proposed on their site plan at the northeast corner. It is fully enclosed with a masonry screen wall as is required by the code. **Ms. Schuller** asked if Commissioner Brown was trying to prohibit that enclosure on the site or instead saying anything in addition to that would not be permitted.

Commissioner Brown answered he personally would not object if it was totally enclosed by masonry. He confirmed he was still concerned about the other three categories he had listed in his motion.

Mr. Chris Grunewald, Deputy City Attorney, proposed a short recess for process. He acknowledged the Commissioners were very focused on stipulations. A short recess would allow him to confer with planning staff on what the UDO might already require at a minimum, in case that addressed some of the concerns raised by Commissioner Brown and then to present to the Commission the staff's recommendation of wording that might best accomplish what the Commissioners are trying to do, before a final vote is taken on the stipulations.

Chair Breen agreed.

Ms. Hollingsworth interjected that although she appreciated Mr. Grunewald's suggestion, she believed the planning staff could provide that feedback immediately without a recess.

Ms. Schuller answered that municipal code 6.06.040 currently regulates against the storage of any nuisance items, which would include tires and debris.

Ms. Hollingsworth added that pallets or other equipment are not specifically regulated under that nuisance requirement of the municipal code, so if Commissioner Brown wants more a encompassing amendment to the stipulations, she suggested the addition along the lines of "outdoor storage and material supplies and equipment are not permitted" whereas the municipal code would capture tires and similar items.

Commissioner Brown asked who would enforce that.

Ms. Hollingsworth answered the City's Community Enhancement team handles violations or resident complaints, in addition to staff's standard observations around the city, to enforce regulations.

Commissioner Bergida asked whether Commissioner Brown wished to include the parking waiver issue or not.

Commissioner Brown said he was personally objecting to 150 spaces, but that would take a different proposal. He didn't wish to include the parking waiver in his stipulation amendments.

Chair Breen asked Ms. Hollingsworth to summarizing the motion on the floor and subsequent discussion thus far.

Ms. Hollingsworth summarized she was not sure there was a formal motion yet, but through discussion there were several items listed by Commissioner Brown which staff recommended could be captured in one stipulation (although staff understands any of those items would be in the compactor unit themselves). If the Commission wants extra reassurance, then it could suggest the following stipulation:

1. Outdoor storage and material supplies and equipment are not permitted.

Ms. Hollingsworth confirmed there was an understanding the compactor unit would be screened by masonry, which Commissioner Brown deemed acceptable, so there would not need to be a stipulation to prohibit the compactor unit. Ms. Hollingsworth added more feedback was still needed on the waiver and the remainder of the stipulations recommended by staff.

Commissioner Creighton stated he would be supportive of the waiver as requested by the applicant as he believed the numbers in the UDO would not be adequate.

Commissioner Creighton continued that he would not be supportive of the additional prohibited items suggested by his fellow Commissioner because the UDO already captures the majority of those items. Further, he believes it would set an excess burden on the business.

Chair Breen echoed Commissioner Creighton's thoughts. He continued that based on the proposed use and project, the waiver makes sense. Further, he stated he was comfortable the UDO as outlined would be sufficient and enforcement through the city would be adequate to address the other issues.

Commissioner Bergida expressed concern. He recounted that the Commission had already recommended denial of this rezoning application, because the Commission did not believe it complied with the Comprehensive Plan. He recalled that at the time of that vote to recommend denial, he was personally about 50-50. However, after further due diligence, he is now 75-25 in congruence with the prior Commission's decision [to recommend denial].

Commissioner Bergida further stated that at the last joint meeting with the City Council, clarity was brought up. Commissioner Bergida recounted he was reminded of the last case the Commission had remanded back from Council, where the Planning Commission recommended denial of that case. It went to City Council, and the Council has the full right to send it back to the Commission. Once the Commission provided recommendations, the Council decided to go a different route. However, Commissioner Bergida stated that when it was presented to City Council it was mentioned that in the past the Planning Commission had voted against this, but when it came down to summary of what the Council was voting on, it was presented that the Council had the option to approve it with these stipulations as recommended by the Planning Commission.

In summary, Commissioner Bergida stated it's his concern in terms of clarity that even though the Commission has recommended against this project, by voting on the stipulations then it could be sending a mixed message in terms of what the Commission believes is actually best and in alignment with the comprehensive plan.

In closing, Commissioner Bergida urged staff, regardless of what stipulations resulted from tonight's meeting, that when it's summarized and presented to City Council that it is clearly outlined, the Planning Commission does not recommend the rezoning of this project. And if the Council does rezone the property, this is the way the Commission would go about it.

Chair Breen stated if there were no further comments, he would entertain a motion on RZ23-0008.

Commissioner Creighton began to make a motion.

Ms. Anna Gourley, Administrative Assistant interrupted that she believed a motion on the amendment was required first.

Mr. Chris Grunewald, Deputy City Attorney clarified there was a motion on the floor by Commissioner Brown to add stipulations, which was seconded by Commissioner Bergida. Ms. Hollingsworth had clarified that one stipulation would be sufficient. One additional stipulation is being moved to amend, before considering the full package. A vote is required first to determine whether the additional stipulation should be considered. Then, consideration of a final motion on the matter would proceed next.

Chair Breen called for a roll call vote on Commissioner Brown's motion, seconded by Commissioner Bergida, with modification by Ms. Hollingsworth to add the following amended stipulation:

1. Outdoor storage and material supplies and equipment are not permitted.

The motion failed by a vote of 3 to 3.

Commissioner Creighton then moved to accept (referencing the staff report's Conclusion) Section A, the waiver, and further moved to accept Items B through C (again referencing the staff report's Conclusion):

- A. In summary, the applicant is requesting the following waiver for consideration by the Planning Commission and City Council:
 1. UDO 18.20.150.C, requiring that no more than 150% of the required parking for a use may be provided on site.
- B. If approved, Staff recommends the following stipulations for the rezoning to the C-3 District:
 1. The following uses are prohibited:
 - e. Recycling Centers and Drop-Off; and
 - f. Mini-Warehouse; and
 - g. Cemetery; and
 - h. Parking Lots, Surface, as Principal Use.
 2. This property is subject to the site design, building material, and building design criteria of Ordinance 99-109 (Sections e, f, and g).

3. The rezoning to the C-3 District must be approved by the Johnson County Airport Commission and Board of County Commissioners prior to the publication of the zoning ordinance.
 4. Installation of the offsite landscape buffer, along the northern limits of the Executive Plaza commercial center, shall be approved and installed prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for any buildings on the subject lot.
 5. Hours of operation for the Vehicle Painting and Body Shop use are limited to Monday-Friday from 7:00 am to 5:00 pm.
 6. No outdoor overnight storage of vehicles awaiting repair is permitted, except for vehicles delivered after business hours, which must be stored on the east side of the building and relocated the following day.
 7. Salvage vehicles must be stored along the east property line, and may not be stored beyond the northern or southern limits of the building.
 8. Unloading of vehicles from transport vehicles must occur on the east side of the building.
- C. If approved, Staff recommends the following stipulations for the preliminary site development plan:
6. Proposed fencing must be a durable composite material with decorative masonry columns. Wood and chain link fencing are not permitted.
 7. The proposed fence on the east side of the site must be extended south to the "Limits of Vehicle Storage Area" as identified on the site development plans dated February 14, 2024. In addition, the proposed double row of evergreens must be retained.
 8. Building mounted signage is not permitted on the north façade.
 9. All new on-site wiring and cables must be placed underground.
 10. Exterior ground-mounted or building mounted equipment including but not limited to, mechanical equipment, utilities' meter banks and coolers must be screened from public view with three (3) sided landscaping or an architectural treatment compatible with the building architecture.

Chair Breen seconded the motion:

The motion failed with a vote of 3 to 3.

Ms. Hollingsworth asked for clarification on what feedback the Commission desires to be presented to the City Council as a result of those motions. Ms. Hollingsworth asked if the Commission had any further clarification they could provide or if staff can answer any further questions.

Commissioner Bergida asked if the main objection to the amendment, was that the stipulations would be onerous to the business owner or whether there were other objections.

Commissioner Creighton answered he had two reasons: First, much of the proposed amendments are already covered in the UDO and then second, some of it, he felt was excessive.

Commissioner Corcoran and **Chair Breen** echoed Commissioner Creighton's assessment.

Commissioner Creighton answered Ms. Hollingsworth that staff may straightforwardly present to Council that there was a motion to approve and on a split vote, it was denied.

Ms. Hollingsworth confirmed she understands. She asked if there was any further feedback because this item is more an open discussion of what the Commission can provide to City Council when this is passed back to the Council. If there's not interest in further discussion, then staff will take that forward to City Council that it came out a split vote.

Chair Breen stated he was hopeful the Commission may be able to come to some terms based on discussion. He continued that the Council has remanded this back to the Commission for a reason and the Commission needs to give them some guidance. Chair Breen stated the Commission's initial recommendation to Council is unchanged, but if the Council decides to go a different route and approve this, the Commission needs to give them guidelines to help this project move forward. Chair Breen again encouraged the Commission to come to a consensus if additional dialogue may be had so that we can walk away with some sort of guidance for our Council.

Commissioner Brown stated, it is his understanding that no matter how we vote, City Council can override it.

Chair Breen directed that the Commission's only task this evening is a recommendation on the stipulations that staff has outlined. If the Commission feels there's a modification that needs to be made, Chair Breen recommended the Commission make that so that we can give the Council proper guidance.

Commissioner Bergida stated that the items that were already covered by the UDO were the trash or the tires predominantly. He asked whether the part that would be onerous on the business would be specifically regarding the crusher, with requiring the fence and the masonry. Commissioner Bergida continued he was trying to see if there was a solution to have the same effect by making a small adjustment.

Commissioner Creighton answered that understanding the business' operation, he doesn't see how B Street can avoid having something stacked by a trash container when they're going to come forward, and so he could not support the prohibitions.

Commissioner Brown answered, regarding tires, etc. that it was his opinion that if B Street can move 70 cars indoors, then they can also put spare and salvage parts or other supplies inside.

Chair Breen said he doesn't disagree, but since Ms. Hollingsworth has indicated those already covered by unified development ordinance, he doesn't believe having a stipulation repeat that is necessary. Chair Breen asked staff to correct any misstatements in his answer.

Ms. Schuller clarified that the municipal code would not allow anything to be stacked outside anyway. The applicant is already proposing a masonry wall around the entire compactor and anything that they would have in that compactor, is going to be within that wall, so they are not planning to store anything outside anyway. Regardless we're covered under the code, it's going to be screened, and the City's enforcement officers will make sure it's going to be that way.

Commissioner Terrones thanked the Commissioners for the discussion. He noted a photograph of this compactor, with more detail on the location and size, would have been helpful and asked if there was such a picture.

Ms. Schuller brought up a site plan and rendering and demonstrated where the compactor enclosure was planned on the northeast against the building with a screen wall around it and also where the trash enclosure with fencing and landscaping was located on the east side facing the airport.

Chair Breen and Commissioner Corcoran stated the enclosure would have fencing with masonry.

Ms. Schuller confirmed that at the final site development plan review, further detail would be provided. The applicant has agreed to meet code requirements with masonry and attached to the building.

Chair Breen asked if the Commission had reached a consensus on another motion tonight, pertaining to making sure the compactor is fully enclosed and that whether the Commission is satisfied that the existing UDO as it pertains to parts and equipment being left on site will be sufficient.

Commissioner Brown stated he still objected and would vote no.

Chair Breen asked to which part he objected, and **Commssioner Brown** answered he objected to the motion to advance it or not.

Chair Breen asked Commissioner Brown which part he was looking to modify or revise. After clarification, **Commissioner Brown** confirmed he had already made recommendations, which were not passed, and he was not changing his proposed amendment.

Commissioner Bergida moved that the Commission advance forward to the next application.

Chair Breen acknowledged the discussion would close, and **Ms. Hollingsworth** confirmed staff understood the motions and would pass them along to the Council.



MINUTES

Planning Commission Meeting: February 26, 2024

Application:	<u>RZ24-0003:</u> Request for approval of a rezoning from the C-2 (Community Center) District to the CC (Cedar Creek) District and a preliminary site development plan for Cedar Ridge (formerly known as Shadow Glen) Mixed Use Community on approximately 14.37 acres; located southeast of S. Cedar Creek Parkway and W. Valley Parkway.
---------------------	--

A motion to continue RZ24-0003 to a future Planning Commission meeting was made by **Commissioner Corcoran** and seconded by **Commissioner Creighton**.

The motion passed with a vote of 6 to 0.



MINUTES

Planning Commission Meeting: February 26, 2024

Application:	<u>SU24-0001:</u> Request for approval of a special use permit for a Conference and Retreat Center for Imagine This KC, LLC on approximately 2.06 acres; located at 620 N. Lindenwood Drive.
---------------------	---

Ms. Andrea Fair, Planner II, presented SU24-0001, a request to approve a special use permit for a Conference and Retreat Center for Imagine This KC, LLC, located north of Prairie Circle and east of Lindenwood Drive at 620 N. Lindenwood Drive.

Ms. Fair stated the property is zoned M-2, General Industrial, which allows for the Conference and Retreat Center with a Special Use Permit. The adjacent properties are largely zoned M-2, with the exception of the R-5 zoning to the east. The Future Land Use Map identifies the subject property as Mixed-Density Residential Neighborhood. That said, the subject property and surrounding area have historically operated similar to a business park with consumer-oriented businesses and light intensity industrial uses. The proposed use is compatible with the existing surrounding uses.

Ms. Fair provided that the building has two existing tenant spaces: an indoor athletic facility event space and the second is currently vacant. This special use permit request is for an event space to occupy the south tenant space of the building. No exterior building changes are planned or required. Additional landscaping along the west property line will bring the site to current UDO standards. The existing parking lot has 117 spaces which exceeds the required number of 57 spaces for both uses. There is sufficient parking for both uses, which will have minimal overlap.

The applicant intends to use the space to host corporate, public and private events. All activities and events will occur indoors, and the applicant proposes the following operating hours:

1. Monday through Thursday from 8:00 am to 9:00 pm
2. Friday through Saturday from 8:00 am to 12:00 am
3. Sunday from 8:00 am to 10:00 pm

Ms. Fair provided that all public notice requirements were met. A neighborhood meeting was held February 5th, 2024, and no residents attended. Staff has not received any correspondence.

Staff recommends approval of the special use permit with a five-year approval term, consistent with other first-time special use permits.

Chair Breen opened the public hearing, but no one was signed up to speak.

With no further comments, **Chair Breen** entertained a motion to close the public hearing.

A motion was made by **Commissioner Brown** to close the public hearing, seconded by **Commissioner Bergida**. The motion passed by a vote of 6 to 0.

With no further discussion, **Chair Breen** entertained a motion on the item.

Commissioner Bergida moved to approve SU24-0001 as stipulated by staff, and **Commissioner Brown** seconded.

The motion passed with a vote of 6 to 0 as follows:

1. The special use permit for the Conference and Retreat Center is valid for a period of five (5) years following the date of the approved Resolution.
2. Event activities may not occur in the parking lot or street right-of-way.
3. The property is subject to the noise control measures of Municipal Code 6.18, and must adhere to sound level limits as measured at the property line.
4. Exterior ground-mounted or building mounted equipment including but not limited to, mechanical equipment, utilities' meter banks and coolers must be screened from public view with three (3) sided landscaping or an architectural treatment compatible with the building architecture.



MINUTES

Planning Commission Meeting: February 26, 2024

Application:	<u>RZ23-0003:</u> Request for approval of a rezoning from the R-1 (Single-Family), R-2 (Two-Family), CTY RUR (County Rural), C-2 (Community Center), C-O (Office) and RP-4 (Planned Medium Density Multifamily) Districts to the R-3 (Low-Density Multifamily) District and a preliminary site development plan for Oddo Olathe Apartments on approximately 27.15 acres, located southwest of College Boulevard and K-7 Highway.
---------------------	---

Ms. Jessica Schuller, Senior Planner, presented RZ23-0003, a request to approve a rezoning on undeveloped property, south of College Boulevard and west of Highway K-7. In 2003, this property was approved for multifamily residential at a density of 14.4 dwelling units per acre. Currently, the property has a mix of zoning districts, with a majority zoned as the RP-4 (Planned Medium Density Multifamily) District. The applicant requests to rezone the entire property to the R-3 (Low-Density Multifamily District).

Ms. Schuller stated the PlanOlathe future land use map identifies the property as an Urban Mixed Use Center, which allows a mixture of residential uses, multistory offices, and vertically mixed uses. This development will support existing and future commercial land uses on the north and south sides of College Boulevard and the larger K-7 interchange area. Ms. Schuller stated the proposed plan also aligns with the K-7 Corridor design guidelines (focused on quality development, connectivity, and amenities) and the comprehensive plan.

Ms. Schuller presented the preliminary site development plan, which proposes 24 apartment buildings with 2 building styles – two-story flat and two-and-three-stepped buildings which are prompted by grade changes. The project consists of 314 units with a density of 11.56 dwelling units per acre which is less than permitted in the R-3 District. Two access points into the site will be provided: on Dunraven Street to the east and the other from the proposed east/west access road to the north. A right turn lane must be constructed on College Boulevard. These roadway alignments were planned in coordination with the adjacent property owner to the north, who intends to develop commercial uses along College Boulevard in the future. Amenities will include an outdoor pool and clubhouse area, common areas with seating and decorative hardscape and landscape, a dog park, sidewalk connections, and a fountain feature. There will be landscaping along all the roadways, parking lots, and building foundations. In addition, an

8-foot side path will be provided on one side of Dunraven Street, as required by the Trails and Greenways Guiding Plan.

Ms. Schuller presented renderings of the apartment styles: The two-story buildings (Style A) will have 14 units. The two-and-three story building (Style B) will have 12 units. All units in both buildings have patios or decks exceeding UDO size requirements, and tuck-under garages. All buildings meet or exceed UDO requirements for horizontal and vertical articulation.

Ms. Schuller stated the applicant is requesting one waiver for the percentage of glass proposed on the front elevation of Building Style B. The UDO requires 20% glass on primary facades, and the applicant is providing 15% glass due to the presence of garage doors. The front facades of Building B face interiorly, rather than towards public roadways. Staff supports the waiver because the applicant exceeds the glass requirement on all other facades, and exceeds the amount of Class 1 and 2 building materials required.

The applicant provided public notification and held a neighborhood meeting. The meeting was attended by 5 individuals who asked about the project phasing, roadway construction and building architecture. Staff received a phone call with general questions about the project, and another phone call with feedback about the land use, density, and character of the neighborhood.

Staff recommends approval of the rezoning to the R-3 District and of the preliminary site development plan, as stipulated.

Commissioner Bergida asked where on the development the two-story buildings were versus the three-story buildings and whether they are interior or exterior facing. **Ms. Schuller** showed a color-coded map which shows the three-story buildings are both interior and exterior-facing, according to the grade. In particular, all the buildings on the south are the three-story style to accommodate a sharper grade drop-off.

Commissioner Bergida asked whether any of the buildings are in the primary greenway. **Ms. Schuller** answered along the northwest corner, there is a small section that cuts across the primary greenway.

Commissioner Bergida asked how much commercial property is requested to be rezoned. **Ms. Schuller** demonstrated on the map and answered it is less than an acre, which is a result of aligning Dunraven Road's roundabout for connectivity with future commercial property to the north.

Commissioner Bergida asked to confirm that the proposed zoning and corresponding density would be lower than the existing zoning's density and asked staff to estimate the difference. **Ms. Schuller** confirmed that under the current approved plan, the density would be approximately 14.4 units per acre whereas the proposed new plan would be approximately 11.5 – 11.6 units per acre.

Commissioner Bergida noted there are not many single-family homes within 500 feet and asked how many residents received notification of this proposal. **Ms. Schuller** stated the 500 foot notice captured approximately 31 parcels, and demonstrated on the map where the buffer cut through a cul-de-sac. Ms. Schuller also provided that notices to adjacent HOA's within the buffer area are required as is standard for rezoning applications.

Commissioner Bergida requested staff to highlight the traffic study results.

Mr. Chet Belcher, Chief Community Development Officer, answered that the study recommended a right turn lane at College Boulevard. He continued that when the commercial property develops in the future, a signal would be required at that time.

Commissioner Bergida asked for confirmation whether sales tax and property tax would be positively impacted by the project, and Ms. Schuller confirmed.

Commissioner Creighton echoed concern regarding density. Commissioner Creighton stated he likes this is an upscale proposal. He asked for confirmation on the orientation of the garages. **Ms. Schuller** answered in most cases, the garages are interior-facing; however, there are a few that face the street which are required to have an additional architectural features. She demonstrated the location of those garages.

Mr. Patrick Reuter, Klover Architects, 8813 Penrose Lane, Suite 400, Lenexa, KS on behalf of the Oddo Development. Mr. Reuter stated that Curtis Holland (Polsinelli), Jake Haddock (Schlagel Engineers), and Kristin Schooner (Traffic Engineer) are also present. Mr. Reuter presented their application request. The site is located west of K-7 and acts as a buffer between R-1 single family homes to the west and the highway. The current requested R-3 zoning is down-zoning for a less dense multi-family product type, which they believe is appropriate next to single family homes. Mr. Reuter continued that the RP-4 zoning allows up to 29 units/acre and R-3 allows up to 15 units/acre. The applicant is requesting 11.56 units/acre. The proposed building style is Big Home/Mansion Style which are designed to look like larger 2-story single-family homes with walk-out options. Commercial is expected to the north. Dunraven Road will be built with their project and that connection affected the east property line.

Mr. Reuter continued there will be two traffic access points, one on the north and one on the southeast corner. He stated they utilized walk-out buildings to accommodate the 35 foot grade change. There are 24 buildings for 314 total units. The development is intended to be walkable and bikeable and will include a clubhouse, pool, picnic area, two detention areas (one with a fountain), and significant berms and landscaping. He showed renderings of the units with grade perspectives; the units are intended to blend with nearby single-family homes.

Commissioner Terrones asked if these are considered luxury apartments and **Mr. Reuter** confirmed they are.

Commissioner Terrones asked what defines luxury apartments.

Mr. Rick Oddo, President of Oddo Development, 15200 W 105th Terrace, Lenexa answered. Mr. Oddo stated typically luxury apartments have attached garages where each unit is like its little home. The units have kitchen and bath granite, stainless steel appliances, and generally higher finishes. The pool is also sizeable with walking spaces. He worked a deal with Clay Blaire owners on the south line to provide additional setbacks, so they have his approval.

Commissioner Terrones asked if the units contain 1, 2 or 3-bedrooms and the projected rent costs.

Mr. Oddo and Mr. Reuter answered they are one-and two-bedrooms units, split approximately 65-35. Mr. Oddo answered one-bedrooms will start at \$2,000 and two-bedrooms would start around \$2,500 per month.

Commissioner Bergida stated the project makes sense and is pretty. He asked if the applicant would be amenable to preserving the greenspace.

Commissioner Oddo stated that due to purchasing an additional southern property to meet their needed 300 unit minimum and the space needed for the northern roundabout, they don't see how else they can "tighten it up" and still be financially viable.

Mr. Reuter added with additional west setbacks and additional greenspace that exceeds the UDO requirement, he believes they have almost if not completely made up for the forfeited greenspace.

Commissioner Bergida restated that to preserve the greenspace, they would lose Buildings 3 and 4 (and possibly a third building). To be financially viable, they have to keep 300 units, so losing the two buildings would drop the unit number below the minimum.

Mr. Oddo confirmed and stated they also added Tract B on the southeast corner which acts as detention, buffer to southern neighbors, and additional greenspace. Further, the future major street [Valley Parkway] has to go where the greenspace currently is.

Chair Breen opened the public hearing. One speaker was signed up to speak. Chair Breen called up the speaker.

Speaker #1, Joshua Derwin, 10831 S. Appleridge Lane, resident of Prairie Brook, shared two concerns: First, another nearby development is planned and postponed from tonight's agenda. The school is already close to capacity. With recently increasing development, he is concerned about where the kids will go. Second, he is concerned about his quality of life. Currently, children from Cedar Creek use Prairie Brook's pool as

overflow. Mr. Derwin stated it will be difficult to enjoy the amenities they pay for with additional overflow from this and Cedar Creek's pools.

Mr. Oddo answered that he understands the neighbors' concerns, but this development will have its own nice large pool with gas grills to entice residents to stay within the community. Additionally, Mr. Oddo answered this development does not have three-bedroom units. The only occupants with kids tend to be divorcees who have the children part-time on the weekends. Further, in similar developments (considered high-end A+ developments), they contribute only 1 child per 100 units to attend the school, while the development produces property tax dollars (approximately \$500,000 to the school) with only two to three additional children. Mr. Oddo stated schools love his developments for these reasons.

With no further comments, **Chair Breen** entertained a motion to close the public hearing.

A motion was made by **Commissioner Corcoran** to close the public hearing, seconded by **Commissioner Bergida**. The motion passed by a vote of 6 to 0.

Commissioner Brown asked if Dunraven will eventually be parallel to K-7 and connect to 119th Street through another recently approved project.

Ms. Schuller confirmed yes, it will go through High Meadows and connect to 119th Street.

Commissioner Creighton asked for the City's position on the impact on schools.

Ms. Schuller confirmed City Staff maintains correspondence to the school district and has communicated this project to them. The district has no concerns about capacity issues.

Commissioner Bergida stated he has two concerns for the record: His first item is the City's concern to preserve commercially zoned property. The second concern is changing from R-1 to R-3 in the greenspace. Although it seems like the project fits in with the community and blends with neighboring single-family, Commissioner Bergida hopes the City doesn't change a lot of R-1 property to R-3.

With no further discussion, **Chair Breen** entertained a motion on the item.

Commissioner Terrones moved to approve RZ23-0003 as stipulated by staff, and **Commissioner Brown** seconded.

The motion passed with a vote of 6 to 0 as follows:

A. Staff recommends approval of RZ23-0003, Oddo Olathe Apartments, for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development complies with the policies and goals of the PlanOlathe Comprehensive Plan.

2. The requested zoning meets the Unified Development Ordinance criteria for considering zoning applications.

B. Staff recommends approval of the rezoning to the R-3 District with no stipulations.

C. Staff recommends approval of the preliminary site development plan with the following stipulations:

1. A waiver is granted from UDO 18.15.020,G.5, applicable to the front facades of Building Style B, to permit a minimum of 15% glass.
2. An 8-foot side path must be constructed on one side of Dunraven Street at the time of roadway construction.
3. Exterior ground-mounted or building mounted equipment including but not limited to, mechanical equipment, utilities' meter banks and coolers must be screened from public view with three (3) sided landscaping or an architectural treatment compatible with the building architecture.



MINUTES

Planning Commission Meeting: February 26, 2024

Application:	<u>RZ24-0001:</u> Request for approval of a rezoning from the BP (Business Park) District to the C-3 (Regional Center) District and a preliminary site development plan for Midland Care Connection, Inc. on approximately 3.89 acres; located southeast of College Boulevard and S. Ambassador Street.
---------------------	--

Ms. Emily Carrillo, Senior Planner, presented RZ24-0001, a request to approve a rezoning at the southeast corner of College and Ambassador Street the Business Park District to the C-3 District with a preliminary site development plan for Midland Care Connections, Inc. including the Program of All-Inclusive Care for the Elderly (known as PACE). The applicant has proposed a 25,757-square-foot medical office and clinic, with nonresidential elderly services. This area remains undeveloped except for the Canterbury Daycare Center. The site is also located near the Evergreen Senior Living site which is also on tonight's agenda for consideration [see RZ24-0002]. Midland Care and Evergreen projects will collaborate to provide a full spectrum of senior services for Olathe and the broader Johnson County area.

The site is located in the North Ridgeview Road Corridor Overlay District between K10 to 119th Street and is subject to UDO 18.20.260, including additional Design Guidelines. The overlay encourages a cohesive high-quality design, and decorative features throughout the corridor in addition to standard UDO and zoning requirements.

The property was zoned to the BP (Business Park) District in 1996 but has remained undeveloped. The proposed uses are not permitted by right within the BP (Business Park) District. However, the existing zoning ordinance permits the requested uses. As such, the applicant has requested to rezoning to the C-3 District to align with current zoning district standards and to remove the zoning stipulations related to the BP uses. The C-3 district reduces the intensity of land uses and provides more variety of neighborhood-focused commercial uses and services.

PlanOlathe identifies commercial nodes at major intersections that support neighborhoods; one smaller node is anticipated at this College and Ridgeview intersection with office and light industrial uses established to the north. While the future land use map of the Comprehensive Plan (PlanOlathe) designates this area as an Employment Area, the C-3 District is less intense than the existing BP District and more compatible with the surrounding residential neighborhoods. Zoning to the C-3 District

would allow for lower-intensity uses in proximity to neighborhoods, while still providing employment opportunities. The C-3 District closely aligns with the BP district. To ensure compatibility and in addition to the list of restricted uses within the North Ridgeview Overlay, staff is recommending four (4) additional uses be restricted. The proposal aligns with PlanOlathe policies for integration with adopted plans, high-quality design and reinvestment to create greater vitality.

Ms. Carrillo presented the preliminary site plan, which includes a single-story medical office and clinic with open spaces and pedestrian connections. Approximately 105 parking stalls are being provided, including 8 ADA stalls. Access to the site is provided from two entrances off Ambassador. Stormwater detention is required and being provided off-site, at 112th Street and Ridgeview Road associated with the Evergreen development.

The applicant will preserve over 82% of the existing trees on site, including along the eastern property line. A continuous 10-ft nonresidential buffer with required plantings is provided along College Boulevard. Landscaping will be provided as required in the UDO and by the North Ridgeview Road Corridor Overlay.

The proposed building is subject to the Office Building design standards and will be primarily finished with brick, stone veneer, genuine stucco, and glass with metal roof trim and cement fiber siding accents. The building meets all building material and articulation requirements, with the exception of clear glass on the south facing façade (12.2%). The applicant has agreed to provide the 15% with final site development plan, reflected in stipulations recommended by staff. Overall, the development meets or exceeds all UDO and corridor design guideline requirements for architecture, articulation, and building material requirements on all facades.

The applicant has requested a waiver from UDO 18.20.260 parking/paving requirements within the North Ridgeview Corridor guidelines from 30 feet to 18 feet for parking/paving along the west property line to accommodate the size of the building. A reduced setback would also allow additional needed ADA parking for the particular use while still preserving the existing tree line. The applicant also requested a waiver to Site Design requirements for parking areas not to exceed 125% (64 spaces) of the minimum off-street parking requirement of the UDO. The applicant is requesting additional parking (105 spaces, with 8 ADA spaces) to align with their other facilities in the region and to avoid large areas of surface parking. As proposed, parking is divided appropriately by landscaping and topography. Staff is supportive of the waiver request as further detailed in the staff report and packet.

Ms. Carrillo stated all public notice requirements have been met, and a neighborhood meeting was held. Questions pertaining to lighting, traffic, grading, and general construction which were all addressed by the applicant. Neither staff nor the applicant have received additional correspondence regarding this project.

This application complies with the criteria for rezoning. As such, staff recommends approval of the rezoning with the stipulation regarding the land uses. Staff also recommends approval of the preliminary site development plan with stipulations. The developer is agreeable to staff's recommendation and stipulations.

Commissioner Creighton asked in consideration of the tree preservation and setbacks on the east side, what the minimum distance is from the proposed structure and the nearest residence to the east. **Ms. Carrillo** stated the buffer is 40 feet to the property line, and the structure is an additional approximate 30 feet beyond that property line, so the total distance is approximately 70 feet.

Commissioner Bergida stated he understands these facilities have a higher number of EMS calls. He indicated the closest fire station seems to be Lenexa's Station #4. Commissioner Bergida asked if Olathe's nearest fire station is #2.

Chet Belcher, Chief Community Development Officer stated the nearest fire station is #6, which is approximately 3.5 miles away off College Boulevard and the nearest EMS service is about three-quarters of a mile down Ridgeview Road.

Commissioner Bergida asked to confirm that Station #6 is closer than Station #2 off Renner and 119th, which **Mr. Belcher** confirmed.

Commissioner Bergida asked what the typical response time is, stating that he wanted to make sure conversations with the police chief have occurred to verify Fire/EMS staff can handle increased demand. **Mr. Belcher** answered that he would have to verify response times with the police chief, but prior presentations to Council have provided an average response time of less than five minutes.

Commissioner Bergida also asked about additional traffic demands with additional elderly drivers and a new apartment complex down the road. Mr. Belcher stated according to the traffic memo, it was recommended that every connected road be full build-out arterial road with turn lanes. Mr. Belcher noted this type of use generates primarily off-peak hour traffic, with 10-15 additional cars per peak hour projected.

Chair Breen opened the public hearing, but no one was signed up to speak.

With no further comments, **Chair Breen** entertained a motion to close the public hearing.

A motion was made by **Commissioner Brown** to close the public hearing, seconded by **Commissioner Creighton**. The motion passed by a vote of 6 to 0.

Commissioner Bergida asked to confirm that approximately 115 units are associated with this use. **Ms. Carrillo** answered no, there are no residential units with this application. The associated application for Evergreen [RZ24-0002] has residential units.

With no further discussion, **Chair Breen** entertained a motion on the item.

Commissioner Corcoran moved to approve RZ24-0001 as stipulated by staff, and **Commissioner Terrones** seconded.

The motion passed with a vote of 6 to 0 as follows:

- A. Staff recommends approval of RZ24-0001, Midland Care Connection, Inc., with the following stipulations:
 1. The following uses are prohibited:
 - a. Uses identified as prohibited for commercial districts in UDO Section 18.20.260.B of the North Ridgeview Road Corridor Overlay District are prohibited in this C-3 District.
 - b. Convenience Store (includes fuel sales)
 - c. Gas Station
 - d. Recycling Centers
 - e. Parking Lots, Surface, as Principal Use
- B. Staff recommends approval of the preliminary site development plan with the following stipulations:
 1. A waiver is granted from UDO 18.20.260.C, the North Ridgeview Road Overlay District, to reduce parking and paving requirements and allow for additional parking above the maximum requirement as shown on the preliminary site development plan dated February 19, 2024.
 2. The building elevations must be revised to meet minimum glass material percentages for secondary facades with submittal of the final site development plan.
 3. Exterior ground-mounted or building mounted equipment including but not limited to, mechanical equipment, utilities' meter banks and coolers must be screened from public view with three (3) sided landscaping or an architectural treatment compatible with the building architecture.
 4. All new on-site wiring and cables must be placed underground.



MINUTES

Planning Commission Meeting: February 26, 2024

Application:	<u>RZ24-0002:</u> Request for approval of a rezoning from the BP (Business Park) District to the C-3 (Regional Center) District and a preliminary site development plan for Evergreen Senior Living on approximately 16.40 acres; located southeast of S. Ridgeview Road and W. 112th Street.
---------------------	--

Ms. Taylor Vande Velde, Planner II, presented RZ24-0002, a request to approve a rezoning of 16.4 acres, located southeast of Ridgeview Rd and College Boulevard, to the C-3 District and a preliminary site development plan for Evergreen Senior Living which is moving from their current location at 119th and Ridgeview Road to construct a 200,150 square foot senior living community. The subject property is near the proposed Midland PACE medical facility [RZ24-0001]. These two properties are intended to offer a full spectrum of services for seniors in the area.

The property was zoned to the BP, Business Park District in 1996 but has remained undeveloped. The BP district does not permit Continuing Care Retirement Facilities; therefore, the applicant is requesting to rezone to the C-3 district. The C-3 district provides a wider variety of business opportunities such as retail, restaurants, and services. Staff is recommending that four (4) uses be restricted on the property in addition to the uses currently restricted within the North Ridgeview Road Overlay District.

While the future land use map of the Comprehensive Plan (PlanOlathe) designates this area as an Employment Area, the C-3 District is less intense than the existing BP District and more compatible with the surrounding residential neighborhoods. One hundred eighty-five acres of BP zoning is located to the north and the C-3 District provides the opportunity for a variety of commercial uses located near neighborhoods, while still providing employment opportunities in alignment with the Employment Area designation.

This development is also located in the North Ridgeview Road Corridor Overlay District which requires a higher quality of design and standards than the UDO. To meet these requirements the applicant provided additional landscaping, a fountain, and ornamental fencing.

The proposal also aligns with several land use and housing policies from the PlanOlathe comprehensive plan including housing choices and senior housing for the aging

population. This also aligns with the Community for All Ages program to provide indoor and outdoor activities to seniors.

The development will be split into 3 phases. Phase 1 includes the primary structure with the village center entrance, skilled nursing west wing, assisted living east wing, and the attached independent living. Phase 2 adds the second detached independent living building, and the final phase constructs the independent living townhomes for 12 total units. All of which will allow for seniors to age in place with the services they need within this community.

The preliminary plan includes 5 buildings for a total of 183 residential units for seniors with different levels of need. The townhomes are closest to the residential to the east is setback approximately 52 feet and 46 feet from the residential zoning to the south. Stormwater will be managed on-site with an existing detention basin in the northwest corner and a new basin to the south provided for this development. One hundred sixty-two (162) parking spots are provided including 5 garages based on the number of beds, employees, and visitor parking. Access to the site is provided from two entrances off 112th Street which provides arterial access out to Ridgeview Rd. and College Blvd.

The applicant is preserving approximately 47% of the existing trees including tree preservation easements on the east and south, which far exceeds UDO requirements. The applicant's proposed plan meets landscaping standards as well as additional requirements from the Overlay District including parking lot plantings covering 6% of the parking lot, increased buffering, and a fountain in the northwest corner to serve as a focal point. The development provides several exterior courtyards for the different building wings including outdoor amenities and active space for an increased quality of life for older adults.

The development has a range of building heights, but the skilled nursing, assisted living, and townhomes are all one-story tall and located closest to the residential to the east. The tallest buildings are the attached independent living units at 3 stories and the detached independent living units at 3 ½ stories on the side facing the tree preservation area. Staff recommends stipulating the max height of the buildings as shown to ensure building heights are compatible with the adjacent uses. Several renderings show the individual buildings designed to provide a design that's compatible with the traditional neighborhoods to the east. The individual elevations represent the different building types within the development. Materials including stucco, stone, LP smart siding, and fiber cement board will be used on all buildings for a cohesive design.

The applicant has requested two waivers, the first one is a request to decrease the percentage of Class 1 & 2 materials on two primary facades and the townhomes as highlighted. The applicant provides a range of 34-64% on primary and secondary facades primarily on the townhomes. Additional architectural features such as shutters, wood accents throughout the building, and a large clerestory above the primary entrance to enhance the design of the development which exceeds UDO requirements. Since the

applicant met the approval criteria for this request, staff is supportive of this waiver request.

The second waiver requests that the applicant be allowed to increase the percentage of Class 4 materials on all 44 facades. The applicant exceeds the 5% maximum and provides a range of 20-48%. The UDO states that Class 4 materials should be used in "limited use" for minor trim elements. The applicant has requested to allow for the use of composite wood for as much as 48% of facades. Ms. Vande Velde explained composite wood is constructed of wood fibers blended with plastic materials and wax. The proposed siding is listed as a Class 4 building material because it is less resistant to pests, prone to wood rot and warping, and most importantly combustible and less resistant to fire. Though they are visually similar, fiber cement board is more durable and reinforced with cellulose fibers, more resistant to pests, and most importantly noncombustible with a Class A fire rating for improved safety. Since the applicant's second waiver request does not meet the approval criteria, staff is not supportive of increasing the maximum allowable Class 4 building material requirements on all facades within the development. The amount of Class 4 material does not achieve the high-quality design of the City and Overlay district as well as significantly exceeds all recently approved senior housing within the past 5 years.

All notification requirements were met, and a neighborhood meeting was held on January 25th with 13 attendees with discussions on lighting, building heights, staffing, emergency services, and construction. Staff has not received any additional correspondence.

The proposed rezoning meets the Golden Criteria, and staff recommends approval of the C-3 District with use and height restrictions. Staff recommends approval of the preliminary plans as stipulated.

Commissioner Brown asked if he read correctly that the project will not begin for five years.

Mr. Chet Belcher, Chief Community Development Officer, answered that Evergreen has to have a building permit by mid-year, so they indicated they don't have five years to relocate.

Commissioner Bergida asked how many parking spaces are slotted for the project. **Ms. Vande Velde** answered 162. **Commissioner Bergida** asked if it would be sufficient, for 90 staff and 40 units without counting the townhomes. **Ms. Vande Velde** confirmed, stating the applicant provided a parking analysis which incorporated all those factors and additional visitor parking.

Commissioner Bergida asked about the waivers and clarification about whether staff was not supportive of both or just one waiver. **Ms. Vande Velde** answered that staff supports the first waiver to allow decreased Class I and II materials. However, staff is not supportive of the second waiver, and thus has recommended Stipulation #2 which

requires applicant to revise their plans to Class 4 materials for the final site development plan review.

Commissioner Bergida acknowledged the applicant has still decided to bring their request forward. He asked what collaboration took place with staff to try to resolve the difference. **Ms. Vande Velde** acknowledged the applicant originally had several architectural waiver requests. Applicant and staff were able to reach an agreement for glass and Class I and Class II materials. Discussions included substituting proposed Class 4 materials for similar Class 3 materials. Applicant chose to keep and pursue approval for Class 4 materials.

Chris Osborn, CEO of Evergreen Community, presented their company's history. Evergreen began in 1864 as the Johnson County Poor Farm, which became the Johnson County Nursing Center. In 2003, the County turned over the operation to Evergreen. Evergreen Community is an award-winning nursing home, including receiving the Olathe Accessible Award. They provide long term care and hospice care. This is a replacement project.

Jordan Anderson, Scenic Development, 25893 W. 143rd Terrace, Olathe, Kansas, stated his company was retained by Evergreen Community to assist through this process. The question is whether LP Smart Siding or Hardie siding should be used. Mr. Anderson presented their rationale for why they prefer LP Smart Siding to Hardie. Mr. Anderson stated LP has a 50-year warranty versus Hardie's 30-year limited warranty. He continued that LP Smart is constructed of engineered wood particulate, slightly thicker, less susceptible to freeze/thaw cycles and sagging, more aesthetically pleasing with better-hidden joints, and slightly less expensive. Mr. Anderson presented that Hardie is comprised of primarily cement board reinforced with wood fiber and resin, more susceptible to sagging and damage due to freeze/thaw cycle, and less aesthetically pleasing over time with more prominent butt joints. They have had other projects over the last 20 years in Iowa and Missouri which fared much better with LP Smart Siding. He demonstrated comparative photos between LP Smart Siding versus Hardie. With this experience, the applicant requests the second waiver be approved.

Commission Corcoran asked about the fire rating for LP Smart Siding.

Mr. Anderson confirmed Ms. Vande Velde was correct that LP Smart Siding is combustible. He countered that other Class III siding would also include what he assumes would be similarly combustible materials. That said, the applicant will comply with all required building code fire ratings, and in independent living where not required, they will have a fully sprinkled facility.

Chair Breen opened the public hearing, but no one was signed up to speak.

With no further comments, **Chair Breen** entertained a motion to close the public hearing.

A motion was made by **Commissioner Terrones** to close the public hearing, seconded by **Commissioner Bergida**. The motion passed by a vote of 6 to 0.

Commissioner Creighton asked staff to highlight their reason for preferring Hardie over Smart Siding.

Ms. Kim Hollingsworth, Planning and Development Manager answered that when the UDO was updated in 2018, class materials were vetted thoroughly. During the 2018 update process, the architecture code was updated with extensive community involvement and with eleven Planning Commission, City Council, and Workshop meetings. Workshops were held with the entire development community including architects, builders, developers, and the HBA (Home Builders Association), so there were many parties involved in determining which materials belong in which Class. That process has already been done. Staff utilizes the UDO with the classifications as the standard, and the Applicant is allowed to use no more than 5% of Class 4 materials.

Commissioner Corcoran stated he believes this project is a beautiful, well-designed, well-seated project that the community needs. Having gone through this with his family, there are not enough facilities that allow transitioning (aging-in-place). That said, he's not prepared to go against staff recommendations for the materials. He will support the application with staff's stipulations.

Chair Breen agreed, saying he appreciates tonight's applications which serve a community need. He is glad Evergreen can relocate near their current location, in Olathe.

Commissioner Bergida said he would defer to Commissioner Corcoran's expertise, but with his own experience in research and development, products can change quickly. He stated the two products seem to be comparable, and the spirit of the UDO is that high-quality materials are used. The applicant believes their LP Smart Siding is a higher-quality material. Commissioner Bergida asked Commissioner Corcoran if there's anything in Commissioner Corcoran's experience to caution against Mr. Anderson's viewpoint.

Commissioner Corcoran answered he doesn't consider himself an expert in these types of materials, so he cannot answer. Commissioner Corcoran added he believes staff has thoroughly vetted materials and their reason is sound, and he would not be willing to go against their recommendation.

With no further discussion, **Chair Breen** entertained a motion on the item.

Commissioner Creighton moved to approve RZ24-0002 as stipulated and recommended by staff including Item C regarding approval of the preliminary site development plan, and **Commissioner Terrones** seconded.

The motion passed with a vote of 6 to 0 as follows:

- A. Staff recommends approval of RZ24-0002, Evergreen Senior Living, for the following reasons:
 - 1. The proposed development complies with the policies and goals of the PlanOlathe Comprehensive Plan.

2. The requested zoning meets the Unified Development Ordinance criteria for considering zoning applications.

B. Staff recommends approval of the rezoning to the C-3 District with the following stipulations:

1. The following uses are prohibited:
 - a. Uses identified as prohibited for commercial districts in UDO Section 18.20.260.B of the North Ridgeview Road Corridor Overlay District are prohibited in this C-3 District.
 - b. Convenience Store (includes fuel sales)
 - c. Gas Station
 - d. Recycling Centers
 - e. Parking Lots, Surface, as Principal Use
2. The building height for the attached independent living wing is limited to 3 stories and 50 feet and the building height for the detached independent living building is limited to 4 stories and 50 feet.

C. Staff recommends approval of the preliminary site development plan with the following stipulations:

1. A waiver is granted from UDO 18.15.020.G.5 allowing primary and secondary façade building materials to decrease the minimum Class 1 and Class 2 materials, as shown on the Building Elevations dated February 16, 2024.
2. Prior to the submittal of final site development plans, building elevations must be revised to meet UDO requirements for Class 4 materials. This request impacts all facades in the development.
3. Exterior ground-mounted or building-mounted equipment including but not limited to, mechanical equipment, utilities' meter banks and coolers must be screened from public view with three (3) sided landscaping or an architectural treatment compatible with the building architecture.
4. All new on-site wiring and cables must be placed underground.



MINUTES – Closing Remarks

Planning Commission Meeting: February 26, 2024

There were no announcements.

Meeting adjourned.