

**City of Leawood**  
**Planning Commission Work Session**  
**CIP 2013-2017, Menu Boards, Identity Development Monuments**  
**Wednesday, February 15, 2012**

**CIP 2013-2017**

Mr. Klein: Joe Johnson with Public Works is here to answer questions. It will appear before the Planning Commission February 28<sup>th</sup> for formal recommendation. I think work sessions are also planned on the CIP.

Mr. Johnson: We just had a work session last Monday. We'll go through the process of Planning Commission and City Council. We may have tweaks as we go on.

Mr. Klein: I thought we would open it up for questions or comments on the CIP.

Comm. Neff-Brain: You don't have any state or federal funding until 2015?

Mr. Johnson: Yes, for 143<sup>rd</sup> Street. Generally, when we get federal aid, it's for a big street program when we convert a two-lane street into a four-lane street. The police department gets federal grants, but for public works, the only grants available are through KDOT.

Comm. Neff-Brain: Is this much committed those two years, or do they really commit that far out?

Mr. Johnson: It's not committed. The assumption is as long as the Feds run the program and there is federal aid, we would qualify; but they can't commit until we get into the program cycle. Right now, it's a two- or five-year program. Hopefully, they approve one or the other in the next couple weeks.

Chair Rohlf: Joe, this seems a little different than the one in the past in that there are not many projects, per se.

Mr. Johnson: A lot of this is carryover from the last couple years. We had some projects on 135<sup>th</sup> Street that were TDD and SBD. One was to bury the power lines on 135<sup>th</sup> Street, which was under a TDD. There was an SBD to go with that to widen eastbound 135<sup>th</sup> Street. We have been carrying that over the last several years. With the economy, we decided there was no reason to keep it in the CIP. When the economy gets better, we will ask the city to move forward with that project again.

Chair Rohlf: Were there any other ones you treated that way as well?

Mr. Johnson: Most of the ones that got changed or dropped were developer related. Seville had a TBD that is not in here. We may have shown Park Place's parking structure, which we took out because it's so far out that there is no real need to include it. Also, the state statute now allows "pay as you go," so when that does come, it will be funded that way. The city will therefore not take on any debt; hotel tax will be remitted back to the developer.

Chair Rohlf: It looks like the only building project is the Justice Center.

Mr. Johnson: Yes, and for the most part, it's a cash project between the city's ¼ cent sales tax that generated \$10 million and then our share of the ongoing county sales tax, of which \$10 million is dedicated to the Justice Center. Page 20 shows the big projects between 2013 and 2017.

Comm. Roberson: I assume you're going to widen 117<sup>th</sup> Street.

Mr. Johnson: That will be done this year. We'll start at the middle entrance where it narrows back to one lane and then go down to Tomahawk Creek. That will be done this year with city and county funding through the CARS program. A project we added back in from the 2010-2012 CIP was 143<sup>rd</sup> street widening from Nall to east of Mission in 2010 and then Windsor through Kenneth road in 2012. That got pushed out because of the economy. It is now back in the CIP with Phase One in 2015; Phase Two from Windsor to Kenneth is in 2017. It is in there as an uncommitted project. As we go through the next couple years and the economy starts to turn around, it will become committed. The city's cost on that is \$8 million with \$1.8 million federal aid being added to it.

Comm. Pateidl: Having approved the 270-some unit family project for Oddo and the condition of Mission Road from 135<sup>th</sup> to 143<sup>rd</sup>, also contemplating that Prairie Star School will attract families into that complex, there are no sidewalks. It's a terrible stretch of road with open ditches, and it's not even on the radar.

Mr. Johnson: We've got both Mission Road and 151<sup>st</sup> Street that are out there in the future to be dealt with sometime.

Comm. Pateidl: Nall to Windsor is past a few houses on the south side of 143<sup>rd</sup> Street, and there is plenty of access on the north side as far as those houses are concerned. Then you have the school that is at the end of the project. From a point of public safety and need, how does that overwhelm something like Mission Road, where we can anticipate a problem? Those kids can't cross the street. There are no sidewalks on the east side of the street. Fill me in on the criteria.

Mr. Johnson: A lot of it is driven by development and the traffic that is coming across the City of Leawood. I get phone calls regarding Mission and 143<sup>rd</sup> and 151<sup>st</sup> Street because there are no sidewalks. Generally, the city does not put sidewalks in on those streets until they are widened to four lanes. Several years ago, the city put sidewalks on Mission Road from 151<sup>st</sup> north. When Steeplechase came in, they put in sidewalks that run south, and we tied into that. We look at where development is going to occur and where traffic is. When 143<sup>rd</sup> was put in the CIP, we looked at 143<sup>rd</sup> and 151<sup>st</sup>. This was about eight or nine years ago with not much going on Mission Road south of 135<sup>th</sup> Street. We hired a consultant to take a look at what street we should do, and we basically flipped a coin to do 143<sup>rd</sup> or 151<sup>st</sup> Street. The Governing Body decided it would be 143<sup>rd</sup> Street. At one time, we showed both 143<sup>rd</sup> and 151<sup>st</sup> in the CIP, and I think it went out to 2020. We have taken those streets off that are not within the five-year CIP.

Comm. Pateidl: When we are anticipating development in an area and we know we have already approved some heavy density of residential construction, how do we leave that totally off the radar?

Comm. Roberson: If you're referring to the situation with Oddo, he hasn't built in 20 years. He has no intention of building anytime soon.

Comm. Pateidl: We're not even going to begin to get this thing started until 2018 to get onto the radar screen. By the time we get to funding, we'll be 20 years out before we do anything to Mission Road. That's going to really be dangerous.

Mr. Johnson: It could get on the CIP next year.

Mr. Coleman: If he comes in to build the project, it will be the impetus to put that project in.

Chair Rohlf: He's got some responsibilities, too.

Comm. Pateidl: Just the extension of 143<sup>rd</sup> from Windsor down to Kenneth Road is in red; what I wonder is why we wouldn't have something that would at least be in red and on the radar screen.

Comm. Strauss: You do have a wish list later, and maybe it goes on there.

Mr. Coleman: Then it's a recommendation to Council to put it on their radar.

Comm. Strauss: Have you gotten calls about that? Have you heard from the public?

Mr. Johnson: With regard to Mission Road, they would like for us to continue the sidewalk that's on the west side up to 137<sup>th</sup> Street. The problem is we don't have right-of-way once we get to Villaggio at their south property line along Mission Road to accommodate sidewalks. That is the biggest reason that sidewalks are not built. Temporary sidewalks are very costly. We were fortunate that Mission Road was very flat, and we were able to put in sidewalks without major regarding, which is most likely why they were put in some time ago.

Comm. Jackson: Did City Council pass the Complete Streets Plan that we looked at?

Mr. Coleman: Yes.

Mr. Klein: We've been working on that. We've had a couple of meetings to identify certain areas that we think would be appropriate for that. We are still checking field conditions and looking for obstacles. We will bring that back to you as part of an annual update.

Comm. Jackson: It looked like 143<sup>rd</sup> Street had a bike/hike lane included.

Mr. Johnson: Yes, what is left to be improved will have a street wide enough to accommodate cyclists, and we will have a 5-foot wide sidewalk on one side and a hike trail on the other side. We will have vehicle, cyclist and pedestrian access to all of our thoroughfares as we continue to build them out.

Comm. Jackson: This money that has been committed includes all of that?

Mr. Johnson: Yes. In this year's CIP, what has changed the most is we have put 143<sup>rd</sup> Street back in the CIP. In 2013-2016, the city is doing a \$20 million curb replacement program at \$5 million a year for four years for both residential and arterial/collector streets. As part of that, what is being proposed out of the general fund is \$100,000 each of those four years for sidewalk replacement in residential areas. The city is still doing a reconstruction program. We used to do it every other year and then went to every even year. We've got the program this year at about \$1.25 million, but in 2014, it is \$3 million; in 2018, we anticipate it to add another \$3 million as needed.

Comm. Pateidl: Regarding your sidewalk replacement allocation, particularly in the north end of town, is the \$100,000 a band-aid on a belly wound?

Mr. Johnson: This is just to fix offsets and settlements; it is not to replace all the sidewalks.

Comm. Pateidl: I understand, but \$100,000 isn't going to go very far.

Mr. Johnson: Right now, it's not funded at all; I pay for it out of my budget with our own crews. Between materials and labor, we spend anywhere from \$28,000 to \$35,000 a year, with most of that being labor. Having \$100,000 will be three times what the city has done on an annual basis.

Comm. Pateidl: I look at the curb replacement last year on Mission Road. Candidly, I thought a lot of it that was done didn't really need to be done to begin with. If you had a bigger allocation toward the sidewalk where we could get about the business of repairing some of those that, if they have not been cared for to any great extent, would we maybe be a bit more prudent about the curb and gutter we tear out?

Mr. Johnson: We've looked at the curb and gutter. Often, the top of the curb looks great; the bottom is horrible. In most cases on State Line, we've had to fill the bottom of the curb in with asphalt so that a vehicle would not wreck if it ran off the side. The sidewalk is a topic of discussion. State statute and city ordinances state that it is the property owner's responsibility, but the city has come in when we have money and time with our crews to do spot repairs. We prioritize those with city property getting done first. Sidewalk that is settled next to a storm sewer box is second. The third priority is to fix any sidewalk we can. The \$100,000 is at least moving in the right direction to address more of the sidewalk failures than what's been done in the past.

Comm. Jackson: Were you saying that all the watering we do is part of the problem?

Mr. Johnson: When the trees' root diameter increases over time, it impacts the sidewalk. Between irrigation and roots, the sidewalks need to be replaced over time.

Comm. Jackson: You're looking at rain gardens in conjunction with some of these complete streets. Does it make sense to put in a few of those between the big sewer areas?

Mr. Johnson: We won't put any rain garden on the right-of-way of thoroughfares because of the utilities lining both quarters. There is too much of a risk to the utility companies. We work to not put rain gardens on a sanitary sewer line because they hold moisture, and the concern is that it would get into the sanitary sewer system, and they would have to treat clean water. The county is trying to work with developers and cities so that, on new development, when there is a requirement under EPA to do construction on BMPs that they are not on tops of septic sewers.

Comm. Jackson: What is BMP?

Mr. Johnson: Best Management Practice; it is the catch-all term for anything that would collect water before it is released in the storm sewer off the site. We've looked at trying to do things in the street right-of-way without having to do something like that because we have to fight with the utilities when we do the streets. Generally, the utilities lay from the back of the curb to the front base of the sidewalk. On 143<sup>rd</sup> Street, we have a high pressure gas main, Southwestern Bell and Time Warner all on the north side. On the south side, we have water, sanitary sewer and gas.

Comm. Jackson: Is that between the curb and the sidewalk?

Mr. Johnson: Yes, and we'll have buried power at 143<sup>rd</sup>. This is under Tab 6, and it has the Arterial Street Program, Residential Program, Storm Water Projects and "pay as you go." That gives you an idea of the other street and storm water projects. It also talks about anticipated but unfunded projects.

Comm. Neff-Brain: Have you gone out for bids yet on the Justice Center?

Mr. Johnson: The plan is to advertise on Monday. That might get bumped back a week or so, but they'll meet with the architect on Friday and make the final determination. We are looking at opening bids and the first or second meeting in April after approval from the Council.

Comm. Neff-Brain: Should have some good bids.

Mr. Johnson: The city short-listed the contractors down to six from fourteen that were submitted. They'll be getting notices either Monday or the following week.

Comm. Neff-Brain: It is not going to be design-build?

Mr. Johnson: No.

Comm. Strauss: Joe, can you talk about the fire station replacement?

Mr. Johnson: It is really not defined yet. The thought process is once the police department is out of its old building, the existing police station and trailers will be torn down and removed off the site. Then Fire Station One would go back to its original configuration and make it a historic building, along with City Hall. Then behind Fire Station One will be a new operational facility.

Comm. Strauss: Even projects that get a lot of calls from the public could be put on this list, it seems. You've got to have it on this list before it works its way up to the CIP. You know there is a desire for it, and you understand the costs.

Comm. Neff-Brain: The off-leash dog area will be \$300,000 to put a fence in?

Mr. Johnson: I think there is more than that, including site grading, fencing and parking probably.

Mr. Coleman: It's up by 435, and they will put a water line in, too. They have to go across the creek to get to this property.

Chair Rohlf: I noticed there is nothing in here about the amphitheatre.

Mr. Johnson: Next September would be the soonest it would make it back. It may be on the 2014-2018 CIP. It may be shown as a placeholder for some future improvement, but the intent is to look at the land that we just bought and determine if we could physically put it there, do a master plan of the whole site and then make a decision.

Comm. Neff-Brain: That's in South Park, right?

Mr. Coleman: It is in Iron Woods.

Comm. Roberson: Is the sewer worked on out there?

Mr. Johnson: On the recently purchased land, it is surrounded by utilities, but there is no sanitary service running through that new piece. We can tie into it off that force main and extend it.

Comm. Roberson: Isn't storm sewer going in out there? There was a lot of big pipe going in.

Mr. Johnson: That's the 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> plat of Leabrooke, and that storm sewer will not discharge into the park land. It runs parallel back to the east and then will drain into a wet detention basin and then into the existing storm sewer system built at Leabrooke. Those are the highlights of the changes and the new projects in the CIP that have either been delayed since 2010 or new for the next four years.

## **Signage – Menu Boards and Identity Development Monuments**

Mr. Klein: We have written language using some of the input regarding menu boards, so I would like to go over it to see if you think we are on the right track or if you would like to change anything. We looked at other city ordinances as examples and have looked at menu boards around the city. We put together something based on that and also on your input. We are going to recommend that they have one menu board per drive thru lane. McDonald's will be coming to the next meeting proposing a double drive thru and will therefore be adding a menu board. We want to make sure there is a limitation to control the clutter with these menu boards, including a pre-order board and promotional signage. We are proposing one menu board per drive thru with no promotional signage or pre-order board. This would require that the speaker box and display that read out the order is incorporated into the board itself. Additionally, it places a height limitation of 7 feet and a maximum letter height of 6 inches. Other city ordinances addressed that, and the advantage there is it will prevent them from being able to put giant letters to advertise something when the intent is to show the products provided. We feel 6 inches is appropriate for that. Additionally, we discussed screening from the right-of-way. We already have landscaping adjacent to the right-of-way with the street trees at 35 feet on center, 8-foot ornamental trees, 2-inch caliper at a rate of one per 12 feet and then shrubs at one per 5 linear feet. We feel that the Site Plan process gives a good opportunity to ensure the boards are screened with that landscaping, but we do want to put something in here to require that the landscaping screen the back side of the board with masonry or landscaping. We have required this on other menu boards in the city, including Starbuck's on 135<sup>th</sup> Street and Winstead's. Other than that, it is basically the same as we talked about before. We would like to get your input on whether you feel you could support this and if you see anything you feel needs to be addressed.

Comm. Roberson: Which McDonald's?

Mr. Klein: The one off Roe.

Comm. Roberson: There is enough room for another drive thru?

Mr. Klein: Yes; it's tight, but they are changing a bit of the parking. You'll see it in their plan.

Comm. Strauss: Is there discussion on a second drive thru?

Mr. Klein: Yes, and I cannot get too much into the case, but there will be a Special Use Permit requested. You will review it as part of the Final Plan and the Special Use Permit for the drive thru itself. The menu board is signage.

Chair Rohlf: Will they present the menu board in the upcoming meeting?

Mr. Klein: Yes.

Chair Rohlf: So we need to have this as an amendment?

Mr. Klein: This will go prior to them coming forward. Currently, we don't address menu boards in the LDO.

Chair Rohlf: What part is this going in?

Mr. Klein: This will go in a table in the LDO regarding permanent sign regulations. We are restructuring the table to make it easier to address issues and add in various things that may be unique to the particular type of signage. This will be part of the amendment. The table you will see will basically have the same text as this table with this exception. We may be coming back when we review the sign code to change texts and modify some of those other types of signs within the table in the future. This format will allow us to that easily.

Comm. Pateidl: This says, "If it's going to be mounted on a pole, the maximum height of the pole can be 12 inches." The rationale on that is that you want these signs to maintain a very low profile?

Mr. Klein: That is part of it. What we found is most of them are located on a pole, and the LDO prohibits pole signs. In addition to this, we will have a couple other amendments I the LDO that would specifically allow an exception for this particular type of sign. These are changeable copy signs, and we would have an amendment related to that. We also have box signs with the entire face illuminated, which will come as part of this as well.

Comm. Neff-Brain: Talking about lighting, none of these are indirect. Don't you want it backlit?

Mr. Klein: They can also be internally illuminated. We want to allow them to light it, and we figure it will be internal illumination. It is under "Other Lighting."

Comm. Neff-Brain: But then there is the lighting below, which is the menu display lighting.

Mr. Klein: We are breaking those out separately; they are the ones you see adjacent to an entrance and not a drive thru.

Comm. Roberson: The current McDonald's sign is non-conforming based on this.

Mr. Klein: It is probably close; the size may be a bit too large, but it is right around there. This would require that the back be screened.

Comm. Roberson: From what?

Mr. Klein: As you drive around the building, occasionally, you will have oblique angles. We are just trying to screen the back sides that are not attractive.

Mr. Coleman: It may not be a large issue on this site, but we may have others that it will be an issue.

Comm. Roberson: I can understand that, and I can understand it with the second one, but this one is blocked by the store itself. It's not a big deal at this point.

Mr. Klein: It might be a case in which if you do have one that is primarily screened from the store, they would add a couple of evergreens; it might not entail screening the entire back if it is screened by the building.

Comm. Pateidl: Since they're making a revision in this, there will be a change in the LDO that their existing sign will have to be replaced at the time they go to a double drive thru.

Mr. Klein: We have to double check the sign package they're bringing forward. There is a good chance that they are proposing a whole new sign package. They have an entire plan with modifications to the building façade as well.

Comm. Roberson: The waiting area blocks the street in the morning and lunchtime.

Mr. Klein: We will look at traffic as well.

Comm. Strauss: What is an example of a monument and the number of signs on a monument?

Mr. Klein: This is identity development monuments, and I'd like to go into that next. That will be a bit more theoretical. We touched on it at the last meeting, but we need to get a direction and come back to you. They are the ones like what is over at Park Place. There are three different types of signs, including the menu boards we talked about and menu displays. It seems like everybody was fine with the language we had before. These are located at the entrance to restaurants. The intent is that they will be incorporated into the façade of the building and that they will be fairly small with a little external illumination but nothing big and flashy.

Comm. Jackson: Regarding the drive thrus, I am fundamentally opposed to them in general for several reasons. I would like to see us grandfather what is there and not allow any more. You've got the pollution from the things. A lot of schools have stopped allowing idling. You're adding to the asthma and other health issues.

Mr. Coleman: Does that include banks and pharmacies?

Comm. Jackson: It does.

Comm. Roberson: You're not going to stop that.

Comm. Jackson: We need to start talking about it. You're also wasting a lot of gas. We've come to the end of cheap abundant energy in this country, no matter how much we drill. Every gallon you waste sitting in that lint ups the energy costs the businesses are going to have to pay down the line. It is adding cost that we're not looking at, including pollution and health. You are increasing obesity just by the fact that you're not getting out of your car and walking into the store.

Comm. Roberson: You're not going to legislate that; I'm sorry.

Comm. Jackson: It needs to be talked about. It's also a job issue. Some of these, you're driving through and talking to someone in Colorado; some of the jobs get shipped out.

Comm. Roberson: I have never heard of that. Who does that?

Comm. Jackson: Some of the McDonald's and Hardees do it. There are issues that need to be talked about. We should not just adopt these things without thinking. There are issues I think the community needs to be aware of, and I think we should be talking about them.

Comm. Neff-Brain: On the other side, we need to keep government as small as possible and out of people's lives.

Comm. Roberson: I agree. Let's go back to monument signs.

Chair Rohlf: Does this language cover what you've seen out there and what you think we might see from McDonald's?

Mr. Klein: We have asked for their package, but we have not actually seen it.

Mr. Coleman: They sent us a bunch of stuff.

Chair Rohlf: I just don't want to get caught with this language, and then they present something completely contrary.

Mr. Coleman: Hopefully, they won't do that.

Mr. Klein: There is one critical question on the drive thrus themselves. They are only allowed in the SD-CR District, and they are all SUPs, so there is a bit more restriction with location. It is not just a slam dunk that they get them just because they are in the zoning district. By default, the MX-D District incorporates everything within SD-CR and all the rest of the districts as well outside the BP.

Chair Rohlf: Are they grandfathered in with anything else as part of the ordinance? If they were coming as a brand new building on that site, is there anything that would have kept them from going in there based on the ordinance today?

Mr. Klein: They could have made the application, and nothing stands out.

Mr. Coleman: They meet all the setback requirements.

Mr. Klein: I do have one question with regard to this. We have talked about drive thrus with regard to fast food, but as Kelly mentioned, there are other drive thrus who may want other boards. We have a dry cleaner that comes through and may want a menu board. Do we want to limit this to fast food or restaurant drive thrus, or do we want to apply these same regulations to all drive thrus?

Comm. Jackson: Could we limit them to fast food and not let a bank or someone else to have them?

Mr. Klein: If we limit this to the fast food drive thrus, then basically our options are to only allow restaurants with drive thrus, or we could have separate regulations for those because they might have other issues associated with them, or we could apply these regulations to those.

Comm. Neff-Brain: Did that Tide place have a menu board?

Mr. Coleman: They wanted one. They put one inside the building, and you can look at it through the glass.

Chair Rohlf: We have the Starbucks with one.

Mr. Klein: Winstead's has one as well.

Mr. Coleman: I haven't seen any pharmacies with one.

Comm. Jackson: The banks put out advertising in their drive thrus on banners.

Chair Rohlf: For those of us who are here, we are okay with the language?

Comm. Strauss: The maximum number of signs is really one of the key issues, and sometimes as a customer, I like having that advanced sign so I don't feel rushed when I get up there. I'm sure the businesses like it to move people through faster. I think the issue is more one of screening. I feel a second menu board could be incorporated if it were screened properly.

Comm. Roberson: Does McDonald's have one now?

Mr. Coleman: No, but some of their new ones do.

Comm. Strauss: Starbucks has one, and while someone is ordering, you have a chance to see what you want.

Mr. Klein: Some of those are promotional.

Comm. Roberson: No, they're menu boards. They list the products and also specials. Burger King does that frequently.

Mr. Coleman: You would end up with four menu boards in this one here.

Comm. Neff-Brain: It gets awfully cluttered.

Comm. Pateidl: What's to keep them from putting temporary signs up as a prelude?

Mr. Coleman: Not much.

Comm. Pateidl: Remind me again why our temporary signs don't have a time limitation.

Ms. Shearer: There are many court cases about putting time limits on them, and it is mainly tied to political signage. When we decided to rewrite the temporary sign ordinance, we decided to write it for all temporary signs and apply the same rules.

Comm. Pateidl: So they could put a temporary sign as a menu board and we couldn't do anything about it?

Ms. Shearer: There are some size regulations, so it would be difficult for them to pull it off.

Comm. Roberson: The yogurt place always has the sign out in front of Camelot.

Ms. Shearer: It depends on the materials; I don't know that it is temporary.

Comm. Roberson: It's one you stick in the ground.

Comm. Neff-Brain: Don't they put it in the right-of-way on the street?

Comm. Roberson: This one was in the entrance to Camelot. I don't know if it's in the right-of-way or not.

Ms. Shearer: They are allowed to be in the right-of-way. It is a 5-foot rule. We had some Council members concerned that if we prohibited them in the right-of-way, they could not put homeowners association advertisements by the entry to their subdivision.

Comm. Neff-Brain: So every store in Camelot Court, for instance, could put a temporary sign up on the right-of-way?

Mr. Coleman: No, they can only have three per property.

Mr. Klein: At a maximum of 48 square feet with 16 square feet for one sign.

Comm. Roberson: They could have one at each entrance.

Mr. Coleman: Well, MD Management owns the majority of the parcels out there. McDonald's, I think, owns the parcel, so they could have three. The stores that are a part of the overall center would have to get MD Management permission to have one out there on their property.

Comm. Neff-Brain: So you can put up garage sale signs?

Mr. Coleman: Yes.

Comm. Neff-Brain: Then why, in my homes association, don't we allow it?

Ms. Shearer: Your homes association rules would trump.

Comm. Neff-Brain: Even in the right-of-way? So the city would allow a political sign in the right-of-way, but the subdivision won't?

Mr. Coleman: Maybe not, but that would be the person running the homes association.

Ms. Shearer: Not that I don't think this is a worthy topic, but we didn't notice for it, and we're getting down an in-depth road.

Mr. Coleman: The other one that Mark was talking about was these entry markers that Park Place wants to put up. Some of it comes down to whether or not you think it is a good idea for the mixed-use developments. Then the other issue is that they wanted to use these markers as a venue for different temporary advertising for their center. It might be their ice skating rink or organic foods market or Ra Sushi having a special.

Comm. Roberson: There are two monuments now, and I think those are almost pieces of art. It's a nice touch to the entrance to that road. I wouldn't mind seeing that at each entrance of Park Place. What I wouldn't want to see is having some sign hanging off, advertising Ra Sushi.

Mr. Coleman: We probably ought to put a prohibition against putting temporary signage on these particular markers.

Comm. Neff-Brain: I agree.

Comm. Pateidl: The observation I made is the maximum number of signage per monument would be four, and I presume what you're thinking is their development logo would be on all four sides. I'm a little concerned with the use of the word "sign" without some definition as to what it means. When we last talked about this, I thought we all pretty well agreed that we didn't want to see the advertising. I would be cautious with that word.

Mr. Coleman: We might want to change some of the rest of this, too, as 5% of the area is pretty big.

Comm. Neff-Brain: I have a question about the maximum height of 30 feet. I know it is because they are tall and linear, but does that mean Camelot could put a sign up that is 30 feet?

Mr. Coleman: Right now, we are saying 200,000 square feet of development.

Comm. Neff-Brain: So is an entrance marker for a subdivision considered under this?

Mr. Klein: Actually, it is just in mixed-use developments.

Comm. Roberson: Can we limit this to Park Place at this point?

Mr. Coleman: I personally don't think it would be a good idea to do it specifically for that development, but we only have a couple of mixed-use developments in the city right now.

Comm. Roberson: You have Mission Farms.

Mr. Coleman: Yes, and then Parkway Plaza is also one.

Comm. Neff-Brain: Mission Farms wanted more on their sign at one point.

Mr. Coleman: Yes, and they have talked to us about identification signage they would like on the building that faces I-435 because a sign at the ground level would not be visible because of the embankment. They have talked to us about putting more signage on the building. Maybe we can tweak this and come back to you.

Mr. Klein: Just to give you some examples of how large some of these developments have been, Park Place is 1.2 million square feet, so they would probably qualify for the maximum number of signs; however, they would be the only one at this point. Mission Farms is 320,000 square feet. Mission Corner is a mixed-use development that was approved but then expired, and it was approved to be 315,000 square feet. Then the Cornerstone development is not a mixed-use development, but it's one of the larger ones within Leawood at 356,000 square feet. Each would only be allowed one of these monuments based on these criteria. Additionally, these are tall, and Park Place is unique in the fact that the buildings have height, while many of the other developments do not. Mission Farms is three stories; however, Parkway Plaza, outside of the condominium buildings is pretty much just a one-story development out there. I'm not sure if that is something you think has an effect.

Chair Rohlf: Could you do something in proportion to the building height?

Mr. Klein: Possibly, and perhaps that is something that is reviewed when they make their application and come forward with one of these. The maximum could be 30 feet, but then it is maybe determined through the planning process that it is not in scale with the development and therefore should be shorter.

Mr. Coleman: These are very nice monuments that they've done, but somebody else doing a development might not design them as well. Then you're in a position of denying them based on how they look.

Comm. Neff-Brain: I think 30 feet is really high.

Chair Rohlf: They have two currently and could get two more?

Mr. Klein: Yes.

Comm. Roberson: I don't think that's overkill for Park Place, but they've got three other entrances, and then they'll have other entrances when they are done.

Mr. Coleman: Their proposal right now is to have them singular and not together. One would be at Nall; the other would be at 117<sup>th</sup>. I'm diverging off a bit, but it looks like we will have a joint meeting with City Council on April 10<sup>th</sup>. It has to do with mixed-use development. We're looking at the 135<sup>th</sup> Street Corridor. Potentially, we could have other developments similar to Park Place in the 135<sup>th</sup> Street Corridor, and we could be dealing with these monuments then, also.

Comm. Jackson: Could you say, “30 feet or not to exceed 50% of the tallest building”? I don’t know what the proportion would be. Then when you start looking at the 200 square feet, if you have something 12 feet high, you could get a massively wide sign.

Mr. Coleman: I don’t think they’re too big for where they are right now because AMC is on one side. If they’re in a mixed-use development, for the most part, the buildings are going to be two stories or more because of the density issue. California Pizza Kitchen is the exception in Park Place.

Comm. Jackson: Maybe we would want to put a maximum on the width, then.

Mr. Coleman: Sure.

Mr. Klein: We talked last time about whether or not we should have a requirement that they cannot come before you unless they have them incorporated into sign criteria and design guidelines for the overall development. That may be a situation in which you could review it in context with the rest of the development as far as materials, location and size. These are related more to the development.

Chair Rohlf: That’s a good idea.

Comm. Strauss: Yes.

Comm. Pateidl: Ken made the comment that the monuments at Park Place are more a piece of art. It looks nice for the city and community. What if you put the jurisdiction for these kinds of monuments in the art commission and let them use part of their dollars related to that against the cost of those monuments? Then you would have complete control over what they would look like.

Mr. Coleman: I don’t think so; I think you lose control over what they will look like.

Comm. Pateidl: Who picked the tin can?

Comm. Roberson: How about the jail door or the flying bat wing?

Mr. Coleman: I think it would be better to have them incorporated in the design guidelines so we get a preview look at them.

Chair Rohlf: We didn’t even think about these until they were up.

Mr. Klein: Maybe developers would like to use the art impact fee and apply it to a piece of art they have on their site. The city’s interpretation is that the art impact fee is for public art that is not to be associated with any one development. That has been denied before.

Chair Rohlf: If we put in something about it being temporary signs, maybe that won’t be as desirable to them at Park Place as part of this. If they were only putting up ones that match the other two, it’s different. If they want to use them as temporary sign boards and we don’t want them to do that, is the language in here that will prevent that?

Mr. Coleman: I was saying that we probably want to put something in there that says the entry markers are not to be used as temporary signage.

Comm. Strauss: I would recommend maybe taking out sign verbiage in this monument discussion. Perhaps we say, “maximum number of insignia or logo” instead of the word “sign.”

Mr. Coleman: Or we could say that any signage on the monument is limited to the name of the development, and it has to be a certain size.

Chair Rohlf: More like our monument restriction, yes.

Comm. Jackson: Under your maximum number, the “signs” should be changed to “monument.”

Comm. Roberson: I’m not sure I would agree with that.

Comm. Jackson: Here, I think you would need to change it to “monument.”

Comm. Roberson: I’m not sure I would limit the monuments, per se.

Mr. Klein: Are you referring to the 200,000 square feet per monument?

Comm. Roberson: Using Park Place as an example, it will have multiple entrances. Again, I don’t know how it would look with multiple monument signs, but why would you want to limit it to four? If they pick those two other slots, they’re done, even if they build The Residences.

Comm. Strauss: You could argue that they only have one and that the bookends work together as a single monument.

Mr. Coleman: One of them is not on their property.

Comm. Roberson: Mission Farms, for example, could have two that would be sufficient because of the one main entrance. Park Place may have more than one main entrance. If you have any new developments along the 135<sup>th</sup> Corridor, it could be similar; we don’t know at this point.

Mr. Klein: That is a good point as far as what you see these being used for. Currently, they are being used to mark the boundaries of the development as opposed to entrances. Last time, we had discussions about them being entrances to the city. In other words, a development located along a city limit line, the monument could act as an entry into the city. We did talk about being more flexible. Take Parkway Plaza, for example, which has Briar on either side. It would have one on one side of the street and another on the other side, which isn’t too different from what Park Place has. Say they also wanted them off either private entrance, which we currently call 134<sup>th</sup> Street, which actually is a private drive that runs through the development. Would you want them to be able to do that? Or say it’s a driveway entrance, as an example. Would you want one to be allowed on either side of the drive entrance? 134<sup>th</sup> is a street that runs all the way through Parkway Plaza, whereas, at Town Center Plaza, you go up 117<sup>th</sup> Street and turn next to where the Hereford House is; that’s just a driveway that enters the parking area. Would you be supportive of one on each side of the driveway?

Comm. Neff-Brain: Getting too much.

Comm. Pateidl: I would think they might put one off 119<sup>th</sup> Street where you have lights and where you’re into a more commercial area. I don’t think any developer is going to spend money to put up a monument to drive into a parking lot.

Mr. Klein: There is one off Nall that is between Dick’s and Bristol.

Comm. Pateidl: I doubt they would do that, either.

Comm. Roberson: I happen to like them. I think they're nice markers for a development, but I sure wouldn't want to see advertising on them.

Mr. Klein: To summarize, generally, the commission is supportive of the identity monuments; however, they would like to see a limitation of no temporary signage. You are also fine with advertising the development, including the name and logo, and the city. You would like to see them within design guidelines or sign criteria for the overall development and be approved that way prior to them actually coming forward with the actual monument. You would like to see a maximum width and maximum height proportional to the height of the development and possibly a limitation on the total number of them. You are fine with limiting them to the mixed-use development of 200,000 square feet.

Comm. Strauss: I like the limitation on them because they lose their uniqueness if you get too many. I don't know what is too many, but it is a possibility.

Mr. Klein: So take a look at the limit.

Comm. Roberson: You don't want Camelot or Town Center putting one up.

Comm. Neff-Brain: That's the problem. You like them here because they're beautiful towers, but it could be not all that attractive, and then you're just multiplying that.

Comm. Roberson: But we're talking only mixed-use developments, and we would have to approve them here in the Planning Commission before they would be allowed. There are checks and balances.

Mr. Klein: The other thing we had a bit of concern about or wanted to get your opinion on is that these may be used in lieu of a monument sign. We want to see if the commission feels they should be allowed to have both the monument signs and these. In some cases, it may actually make sense with identity signs along the primary traffic area and monument signs on the side that is not heavily traveled. That may be more appropriate if it is adjacent to residential. Does the commission have a feeling as far as the combination of the two?

Chair Rohlf: I think that will depend so much on the development and if it's new or existing development.

Mr. Coleman: We could put it in their sign / design package, too.

Mr. Klein: Perhaps we could prohibit them from going adjacent to residential areas because of the scale.

Chair Rohlf: What is our current sign restriction on monuments?

Mr. Klein: It is 6 feet in height, 10 feet in length and 50 square feet total. The only reason I bring that up is, for instance, Parkway Plaza is adjacent to residential on the north and 135<sup>th</sup> on the south. If you had a restriction like that, it would not allow them to come in with a proposal. On the other hand, you would be reviewing this as part of the overall design criteria where you could actually make the determination of if you thought it was appropriate.

Chair Rohlf: I could see Park Place wanting monument signs on the residential side.

Mr. Klein: I didn't think about the mixed-use having residential incorporated into it. Maybe that restriction wouldn't be appropriate.

Comm. Roberson: But you've got Parkway Plaza, and it might be appropriate there on 134<sup>th</sup> Street.

Comm. Neff-Brain: It really does depend on the development.

Comm. Roberson: I agree.

Mr. Klein: So maybe it is the design guidelines for the development overall so they can indicate the location and the basic design.

Chair Rohlf: I think so; I think they need to have a comprehensive plan for their signage. With the mixed-use, it comes in slower. I never even thought about these identity monuments. I don't remember seeing them on the detail. Are they in the design guidelines?

Mr. Klein: Park Place really has gone at that development a little differently. They have tenant design guidelines, but each building has come in separately. That's basically all I had tonight.

Chair Rohlf: Do you think we'll see both of these at our next meeting?

Mr. Klein: I think we'll probably bring the identity monument signs back with some new language so you can see it ahead of time. I think you should probably see the menu boards at the next meeting.

*MEETING ADJOURNED*