

July 11, 2013
Mission Chateau
City-Wide Neighborhood meeting

Begin at 7:03 p.m.

Attendance:

Joe Tutera, Owner/Developer
John Petersen, Polsinelli PC
Approximately 80 residents

Mr. Tutera began the presentation by summarizing the comments that we have received from the neighbors and the Planning Commission members over the past few months and then briefly described the concepts that this latest plan revision focuses on. The plan concepts include transition, Mission Road presence, setbacks and views from the southern property line.

Mr. Tutera then walked through an updated “checklist” exhibit that reflected the changes that have been made to the plan based on the concepts discussed above. Mr. Tutera stated that it is his desire to provide high quality rental product that includes single-occupancy, apartment-style, residential units rather than the typical 20-year old concept for senior living.

Next, Mr. Tutera walked through the current proposed plan and stated that the design team had taken great care and consideration in addressing all of the concepts discussed above. The Architectural Enhancements include: (1) reduced the height of the Independent/Assisted Living building and the Skilled Nursing building by an additional four feet; (2) reduced the height of the commons space at the Independent/Assisted Living building by an additional twelve feet; (3) added brick to improve architectural compatibility; (4) increased the horizontal nature of the design; and (5) re-located the garages on the villas from the side to the front of the buildings. The Transitional Elements include: (1) increased the one-story buffer zone from the south an additional 107 feet; (2) increased the two-story buffer zone from the south by an additional 115 feet; (3) increased the number of villas to create a “villa village”; (4) increased the villa’s back yard setback an additional 14 feet; (5) increased the villa’s front yard an additional 11 feet; (6) widened the interior loop road an additional two feet; (7) and increased the setback of the Skilled Nursing/Memory Care building an additional 30 feet from the southwest property line. The Reduced Scale of the project includes: (1) building frontage along Mission Road reduced by 169 feet; (2) reduced the percentage of frontage along Mission Road by 16%; (3) reduced the FAR by 9%; (4) reduce the total Independent Living/Assisted Living facility units by 30 units; (5) reduced the units per acre to 17.8 units per acre (6) reduced the s.f. of the project by an additional 36,004 s.f.; (6) reduced the area of the two-story buildings by removing an additional 14,832 s.f.; (7) reduced the area of the three-story buildings by removing an additional 3,190 s.f.; (7) and reduced the total building footprint area by removing 4,420 s.f. Overall, these modifications reflect that we have produced fewer units and less impervious surface so that the storm water and traffic requirements are still met with this revised plan.

Q & A began at 7:40 p.m.

Question: Who are you?

Response: My name is Joe Tutera with Tutera Investments.

Question: At the July Planning Commission meeting the developer spoke about providing valet parking in order to address the holiday parking issue. Is that addressed with this revised plan?

Response: We have designed this facility so that it may operate efficiently 365 days a year. We provide sufficient parking to not only handle our regular operations but also handle employee shift change periods. In operating approximately 40 other facilities we have learned to handle holiday season parking operationally through our shift change schedules. First, we strategically schedule the shift changes so that it does not interfere with the peak times that visitors are coming to the facility and then, if needed, we require our employees to park off-site and bus them to the facility for their respective shift.

Questions: By eliminating another 30 units from the project did your rental price points change? How did this affect your business model?

Response: We did not change the pricing model because we did not significantly change the size of units being provided. The units that were eliminated and the reduction in the overall square footage were absorbed from other areas in the project such as circulation, stairwells, etc.

Comment: Everybody likes villas but these are not villas they are duplexes. I do not have any guarantee that only elderly residents will be allowed to rent them. There is a possibility that employees might live in them. I don't believe villas are a transition to single-family homes. A better transition would have been providing villas on north side of the property. These villas will affect that the value and sale of my home. I am fine with for-sale townhomes but not with putting duplexes right next to large lot homes. This is bad planning.

Questions: I would ask that you to address the density. A 9% reduction does not adequately address this issue.

Response: The overall FAR was reduced by 9% when we eliminated an additional 36,004 s.f. from the project. We reduced the Independent Living/Assisted Living facility by cutting an additional 30 units which equates to a 14% reduction. We believe this to be a significant change to the project.

Comment: I feel like you are just throwing numbers at us and we cannot intelligently look at the plans and understand what has truly changed.

Question: We started with the question of "why so big" and your answer was that this is a CCRC community. I would still like you to justify why this development is so big?

Response: We have provided a detailed letter to the City responding to this question and it is posted on their website. However, the short answer is our goal is to create a lifestyle by providing the right mix of residents and quality services. There is no lifestyle without these two components. Our development is proposing 190 Independent Living/Assisted Living units, 120 Skilled Nursing units and 17 Villa units in order to create the lifestyle and services that we envision for this neighborhood.

Questions: How many s.f. per acre is be proposed?

Response: (reviewed plans for a moment). We are proposing approximately 17 units per acre.

Comment: This site currently has a lot of green space and I am concerned that you are cramming too much onto this site. You are proposing too much development now versus what we are used to.

Comments: Providing fewer units is a business problem for you not us. You are putting lip stick on a pig. These senior residents will not be doing any activities and skilled nursing patients will not be participating in activities. One resident provided an analogy of an obese patient losing a few pounds is still an obese patient.

Question: This will be second largest CCRC project in Johnson County. I do not believe that you have to be this big. The average CCRC is ____ s.f. per acre and your development is ____ s.f. per acre (it was difficult to hear the person speaking and I could not understand the specific numbers be spoken). We still need an answer as to why this has to be so big?

Response: As I stated earlier the number of units it based on the quality of lifestyle and residential community being proposed.

Question: Will the plan revisions change the proposed construction schedule? In previous meetings you mentioned that there may be a one year construction period with additional construction later?

Response: We initially presented multiple phases of development with the Skilled Nursing and Memory Care being constructed first with the Independent Living/Assisted Living being built later. It is my understanding that the fastest the project could be built in one phase is two to two and a half years. I am not trying to pull the wool over anyone's eyes with the timing of this development. My object is to build the entire community. I understand there are legal and logistical issues with how you go about constructing a development of this size but I will build the project as practically and efficiently as possible and within the appropriate timing determined by the City.

Comment: You have turned the building in a new direction and made the illusion of it being smaller. You say there will be a berm along Mission Road at a certain height and that we will not be able to see much of the building. It's an illusion that you have made the building smaller and this is still an oversized complex.

Response: This is not an illusion. We have physically reduced the total number of units and square footage of the Independent Living/Assisted Living building. We have also reduced the length of the building facing Mission Road and increased the setbacks from the Mission Road and the southern property line.

Question: Have you reduced the number of Skilled Nursing and Memory Care units.

Response: No.

Question: With the buffer on the south you increased the setback from 35 to 50 feet?

Response: The villas were originally proposed at a 35 foot setback that also had a patio included within the setback. The new proposal is to have the villas constructed at a 50 foot setback from the property line and move the patios to the side of each home so that it is no longer within the setback. We stated at the Planning Commission meeting that there is also an additional 7 feet of space that has been provided in the front yard of the villas that could be moved to the back side of the villas, if desired and we would like to know your preference on that.

****There was no response from the neighbors regarding the additional 7 feet of green space.**

Questions: How many Skilled Nursing beds do you propose?

Response: There are 84 units with 100 beds in our Skilled Nursing facility. Sixteen of those units are suites that could potentially have more than one bed and that is why there are 100 beds proposed.

Follow-up Question: When you look at the number of beds at St. Luke's hospital and Santa Marta it appears this facility does not need to be this big.

Response: We are not proposing to build a hospital. We are proposing to build a Skilled Nursing product with both long and short term care. In order to provide the services and products being offered in the community our percentage of Skilled Nursing beds is appropriate. Mr. Tutera provided the percentage of beds provided by Brighton Gardens and Claridge Court to show appropriateness of bed count.

Question: You have not addressed the detention pond issue with this plan revision. I view this as a detention ditch and there is a neighborhood to the east of your development that is concerned about this. We would like the detention to be underground and add more green space. Would you consider doing this?

Response: This type of detention facility is standard practice when proposing a development project. The true hazard is the volume and quality of water coming off of this site today. Our development is going to improve the situation by improving the water quality and making sure that the water is released at a safe rate so that this development does not cause the nearby creek to overflow.

Follow up Question: Will there be a fence around the detention and how tall will it be?

Response: Yes. I do not know the height of the fence off the top of my head but it will be built per the City's guidelines.

Question: Will children be able to scale the fence and get injured?

Response: I will confirm the height of the fence and get that information to you.

Comment: My home backs up to creek and school and I watch students in that area who are monitored by teachers. When these students are walking home they will not be monitored by teachers. My guess is kids will do what they want to do and the height of the fence is critical.

Response: We will deal with the height and adequately address this issue.

Comment: This is still too large. It is not offense looking but is institutional. I have a concern about loss of green space. The previous plan had more Mission Road views. Will you provide those views with the new plan and also do a 3D model? We cannot visual the development with the current plans.

Response: Yes, we will provide new Mission Road views and an updated 3D computer model. We simply have not had time to do that just yet.

Question: How many meetings have we had on this project?

Response: Approximately eight.

Follow-up Comment: Where does this end? With this many people, again tonight, means this plan isn't flying with us. Are you trying to wear us down? Your plan is not acceptable.

Comment: Dennis Enslinger stood up and explained that this is the development process (the room grew too loud for me to understand everything that was exchanged between Mr. Enslinger and the neighbors).

Comment: I want it to be on the record that everyone at this meeting is against the project.

Comment: Mr. Enslinger explained that the applicant will provide a summary of the meeting to the City and those minutes will be provided to the Planning Commission.

Question: Please walk through lighting plan for this project. I see a lot of parking lot area and villas and roadways. I am trying to get a sense of what the lighting will be after dark.

Response: We have a lighting plan on file with the City and it will be updated with this new plan change. In any event, we will have zero foot candles at the perimeter and all lights will be low in height and have a shielded source.

Question: Can we see examples of lights?

Response: Yes. If the plan doesn't currently provide this information we will get that to the City. I cannot think of any examples elsewhere in the City right now but I can tell you that we want the lighting to be subtle and will provide shielded sources.

Question: At previous meetings we discussed emergency responses and the drain this facility will have on city services. About three weeks ago I had to call 911 for my fourteen month old daughter and they had to arrive at our address.

Response: The fire department reviewed the previous plan and found that this development was appropriate and that it could service the residents without a negative impact on city. We have experience in our other facilities and do not experience significant amounts of ambulance and/or fire service. The ambulances do not arrive with sirens on.

Follow Up Comment: I believe that getting emergency services into these facilities can be challenging and they had to wait outside for access.

Response: This facility has emergency call buttons that only notify the staff and they are not connected to 911 like lifeline equipment might do. The staff assesses each situation and then determines if 911 needs to be called.

Comment: I am surprised that you would have so much resistance to the project and still continue with the development. I suggest you look at 95th and Metcalf with all of its huge, vacant buildings as that location would be a better place for your development (it was hard to hear during a portion of this comment).

Comment: If Indian Hills Club has offered you property for this development you wouldn't have considered it because you live near there.

Question: Have you considered taking another level off of the Independent Living facility for a total of two stories in order to reduce density?

Response: No. In order to create the type of quality and lifestyle being proposed we need a certain number of residents in order to create a lifestyle. We did reduce the overall height of the Independent Living facility with changes to the roofline and other architectural elements so that it is physically no taller than the height of a two story building and is shorter than adjacent properties.

***Several audience members began to comment on the project and I was unable to hear and summarize those comments as several people were speaking were at the same time.

Response: Mr. Tutera reiterated all of the plan changes that have been made in an effort to be responsive to the feedback provided by neighbors and Planning Commission members in previous meetings. Mr. Tutera stated that he is not trying to wear people out...rather he is simply trying to

abide by the City's regulations and development process. Mr. Tutera stated that he has been in the senior living business for over forty years and knows and understands the business. He has studied this site and this development and commented that this development will improve traffic and storm water conditions and will provide enhanced setbacks and green space.

Question: When we bought our house we knew that there was a school there. I knew exactly what I was getting into with school traffic and noise. Can you guaranty me that my street will not become a parking lot for your facility?

Response: Yes. We have provided adequate parking for this facility.

Comment: I respect your position and that you have to do your job. I think our argument should be with Planning Board now and not with Mr. Tutera.

Comment: We moved into the area a few weeks ago. I would not say that school would decrease values. Why can't you sell the property to another school district? I am concerned about shift change traffic and values of property.

Response: I purchased the property to develop a senior living facility because that is the business I am in and have been in for over 40 years. We have conducted a study of the property value impact and have provided that report to the City, which is also posted on the City's website.

Question: At a previous meeting we asked about the process of having mandatory background checks done on construction workers? Is this feasible?

Response: I do not have an answer for that today but will explore the question and get an answer.

Comment: There were comments made earlier tonight about why focus groups were not approved by the City with the previous Master Plan amendment. This was rejected by the citizens because the cost of the focus groups would have been paid for with tax payer money. These meetings are the most productive venue for these getting our comments. Nobody here has problem with the efforts you have made but you are still not listening to neighbors. Our main issue is the size. You have made changes to the periphery but have not done enough to reduce the size. Based on all input you have received, will you explore more green space, less parking and placing the detention underground? Will you look at building no more than 150,000 s.f.?

Response: No.

Question: How many units were proposed with the original plan that had retail in it?

Response: I do not recall off the top of my head but I believe it was around 350 units. We provided the City with a market study for that plan.

Comment: We don't disagree with the type of lifestyle being proposed but if you were willing to reduce the project as much as you have so far, why can't you keep going with more reductions and still maintain a lifestyle on a smaller scale?

Response: We have taken a look the product and more reductions do not work. If you get any smaller you don't have enough residents or the right size of units to provide the quality and lifestyle that we are proposing.

Question: Where is the old school on new plan?

Response: Mr. Tutera visually pointed this out on one of the plan boards.

Comment: It does not matter if anyone can see it. It just needs to be smaller.

Response: We have reduced the overall height by another four feet so that the three-story portions will not be any taller than a typical two-story structure.

Comment: The reduction in s.f. is greatly desired by the neighbors. What is your bottom line in that regard? The neighbors will not be enthused about the project until that is addressed?

Response: There is no right answer to that. It is a valid question and I have tried to answer it with the fact that we are proposing a high quality, residential product that requires a certain number of residents in order to create a community and lifestyle. It really isn't a square foot issue but the number of residents is key to making it a quality development and residential community.

Comment: It's really just your business model isn't it?

Response: Yes, it is a business model but not just for the sake of having a business model. It has to make sense.

Follow-up question: Who says that this business model is correct?

Response: I do, based on my 40+ years of experience in this business.

Questions: Other facilities operate with a "lifestyle" that are not this big?

Response: Yes, but it is not the same type of lifestyle. You are comparing apples to oranges. This will be the only for-rent senior living product with villas in Prairie Village that is of a quality and lifestyle that is not currently available.

Comment: I feel that there is a lot of talking past each other. It's not just height. It's sprawl. Can you empathize with people who bought into a neighborhood that had a lot of green space? We are a land-locked city and this is too much sprawl. We need more perimeter green space.

Response: When you look at Brighton Gardens do you see sprawl? (neighbor's response was yes) We showed an aerial visual of that project at the Planning Commission meeting to show relation of building footprint, street presence and setbacks. Our proposed development is providing almost 10 acres of overall open space with 6 of the acres being park-like active open space. No other project in the City currently provides that kind of park area. We have heard the comments about open, green space and feel that we have more than adequately addressed that.

Question: What is your idea of a park?

Response: Active and open green space.

The meeting was concluded at 9:00 p.m.

Mission Chateau

Presentation to the Planning Commission Work Session July 2nd, 2013

Presentation by MVS, LLC of potential design changes in response to Planning Commission and Public comments

The Goal of Mission Chateau

A Rental Continuum of Care Retirement Center

- Provide the highest quality residential lifestyle options for seniors in the community.
- Provide seniors a range of services and residential choices so they can remain in their community close to family, friends, community, and faith services.
- Provide the services on a rental basis to avoid large upfront investment and maximize the resident's choices.

Mission Chateau's Primary Design Criteria

- **Conform to the R1-A zoning and the site-specific amendment to the Village Vision adopted by the City Council in May 2012**
- **Meet and exceed all planning requirements such that no code variances are required**
- **Provide a state-of-the-art design based on a residential and social model for senior living versus a medical model**
- **Provide a range of unit sizes to maximize resident choices**
- **Provide private occupancy residences in ALL lifestyle options**
- **Create a pleasing, inviting residential architecture with designs and materials that compliment and enhance the surrounding community**

City's Design Primary Requirements (Partial List)

- Minimum building setback of 35' or 45' when additional height is permitted
- Not more than 30% lot coverage; this equates to 721,353 sqft on 18.4 acres
- Improve storm water runoff to meet current standards
- Improve traffic congestion and ingress/egress
- Provide transition spaces to adjacent single-family residences
- Height not to exceed 3 stories and 35' height to the midpoint of the roof
- Provide parking that exceeds city code
- Provide appropriate lighting that does not illuminate adjacent properties

Mission Chateau First Plan for Public Comment

January 2013



- Exceeded all Primary Requirements
- The property contained:
 - 376 units (36 MC, 91 SNF, 62 ALF, 180 ILF, 7 Villas)
 - 405,255 sqft
 - 26.3% lot coverage
 - 47.5% green space

Mission Chateau Modifications Per Input From Neighbors

- No mixed use**
- Increased green space**
- Buildings shifted north**
- Building heights reduced**
- Add Villas along SW boundary**
- Delivery shifted to North**
- Main drive shifted to interior**
- Walking trails, micro park & dog park**
- Reduce building size on Mission Road**
- Water run-off reduced**
- Number of units reduced**
- AM Traffic Reduced**
- Employee count reduced**
- No lights at perimeter**
- Crosswalk to remain**
- Employee Parking moved to the north**
- Contributes to the Revitalization of the City**
- Allows current PV residents to remain in community**

Mission Chateau's Revised Plan Filed April 4th, 2013



- Exceeded all the standards
- The property contained:
 - 351 units (36 MC, 84 SNF, 60 ALF, 160 ILF, 11 Villas)
 - 387,244 sqft
 - 22.9% lot coverage
 - 52% green space (5.3 parks and 1.2 of trails)

Comments from Planning Commission

June 4, 2013

- Mission Chateau is located on a “Transition Site”: efforts should be made to enhance the transition between residential and commercial uses
- The width of the Independent and Assisted Living Facility fronting Mission Road is 520' : efforts should be made to reduce this impact on Mission Road.
- The view of the Independent and Assisted Living facility from the residences to the south should be minimized

Comments from Planning Commission June 4, 2013 (cont.)

- The architecture is attractive but should be more consistent with existing architecture and target towards reducing the appearance of grandeur
- Consideration should be made to increase the width of the interior road
- The relationship of the villas to the single-family houses to the south should be considered, specifically the front and rear yard setbacks
- Consider the height in relationship to adjacent properties

ENHANCED SITE CONCEPT

SUMMARY OF ENHANCMENTS

1. Improved Transition Zone to the South


- i. Created a 300' buffer zone (-----)
- ii. Added 6 Villa Units (ADDED VILLAS)
- iii. Created a 'villa village' along loop road
- iv. Increased Villas front and rear yard
- v. Enhanced micro parks and trails
- vi. Eliminated parking to the South
- vii. Eliminated ALF entry to the South
- viii. Increased Setback at the Memory Care and Skilled Care

2. Reduced the Scale of the Project

- i. Reduced Frontage on Mission Road from 520' to 352' (-168')
- ii. Lowered the entry to the Independent Living to a 1 Story Elevation (-12')
- iii. Reduced ALF/ILF unit count by 30 (-14%)
- iv. Reduced ALF/ILF size by 42,800 SF (-16%)

3. Enhanced Architectural Features

- i. Provided a 26' wide loop road
- ii. Lowered roof heights throughout
- iii. Reduced scale of all facades
- iv. Introduced new building materials



----- 300' BUFFER 3 STORY SPACE 2 STORY SPACE 1 STORY SPACE ADDED VILLAS PREVIOUS OPTION

scale= 1:50 North


MISSION ROAD TRANSITION ZONE



PREVIOUS DESIGN


SUMMARY OF ENHANCMENTS

1. Reduced frontage from 520' (49%) to 352' (33%)
2. Increased setback from 112' to 120' at the tips (+8')
3. Increased setback from 246' to 286' at the entry (+40')
4. Broke up 3 Story Facade with a 1-story facade at the entry.
5. Improved "Figure Ground Relationship" by creating gap between structures.
6. Gap between wings is 93' narrower and 32' deeper, reducing facade on Mission
7. Preserved 40' wide greenspace on Mission Rd




EXISTING 1 STORY HOMES

SOUTHERN TRANSITION ZONE




SUMMARY OF ENHANCMENT:

1. Created an approximate 300' buffer zone to the South and Southwest
2. Increased setback from 148' to 284' (+136')
3. Increased back of house setback from 234' to 340' (+116')
4. Closest portion of 2 story was 148', now 255' (+107')
5. Closest portion of 3 story was 172', now 284' (+112')
6. Eliminated ALF parking and entry and replaced with 4th micro-park




VILLA'S SETBACK AND TRANSITION ZONE




SUMMARY OF ENHANCMENTS

1. Created a traditional neighborhood street with Villas
2. Increased rear yard setback from 35' to 50' (+15')
3. Moved patios off the 35' setback
4. Increased front yard from 5' (avg.) to 16' (avg.) (+11')
5. Moved driveway and garage access to the front of the villa
6. Created green side yard and eliminated headlight impact
7. Northern Villas offset to further screen the view from the South




WEST AND SW TRANSITION ZONE




SUMMARY OF ENHANCMENTS

1. Increased set back from 133' to 163'
2. Increased Micro Park from 1.7 to 1.85 acres
3. Reduced height of 1 story Memory Care and 2 Story Skilled Care by 4'
4. Architecturally enhanced SW facade to Memory Care
5. Moved service area further to North



HEIGHT TRANSITION



SUMMARY OF ENHANCMENTS

1. Floor elevation (951.5') remains
3' below the existing structure (954') and
4' below Mission Road (955')

- Existing School Floor Elevation = 954'
- Proposed ILF Floor Elevations = 951.5'
- Existing Mission Road Elevation = 955' (at Center of the Site)

ENHANCED ARCHITECTURAL CHARACTER

ENHANCED FEATURES

1. Added Brick for richer material palette & to better fit with context
2. Lowered the Roof lines by 4'
3. Integrated the dormer with 3rd Floor to reduce height
4. Enhanced the horizontal character of the design
5. ILF wings are facing in vs. facing Mission Rd



PREVIOUS DESIGN



ENHANCED DESIGN

REFINED ARCHITECTURAL CHARACTER

ENHANCED FEATURES

1. Reduced Height at Central Common Space
2. Created a Visual Separation between the 2 wings
3. Pushed the Entry Further away from Mission Road (+40')
4. Lowered the Roof lines by 4'
5. Integrated the Dromer with 3rd Floor to reduce height



PREVIOUS DESIGN



ENHANCED DESIGN

REFINED ARCHITECTURAL CHARACTER

ENHANCED FEATURES

1. Reduced Height of Memory Care and Skilled Care by 4'
2. Created a Visual Separation of the Memory Care with design feature and material change.
3. Pushed the Memory Care and Skilled Care 30' further away from neighbors.



PREVIOUS DESIGN




ENHANCED DESIGN

SUMMARY OF CALCULATIONS

Item	Previous Design	Enhanced Design	Delta	% of Change
1 Reduced Scale of Project				
a Building Frontage on Mission (Reduced)	521 feet	352 feet	(169)	-32%
b Percentage of Frontage Along Mission (Reduced)	0.49 %	0.33 %	(0.16)	-32%
c FAR (Reduced)	0.48	0.438	(0.04)	-9%
d ILF / ALF Units (Reduced)	220 units	190 units	(30)	-14%
d Total Number of Units (Reduced)	351 units	327 units	(24)	-7%
e Units per Acre (Reduced)	19.1 un/ac	17.8 un/ac	(1.30)	-7%
f SF of Project (Reduced)	387,244 sf	351,240 sf	(36,004)	-9%
g SF per Acre (Reduced)	21,046 sf/ac	19,089 sf/ac	(1,957)	-9%
h Area of 1 story (Increased)	50,300 sf	63,902 sf	13,602	27%
i Area of 2 story (Reduced)	62,878 sf	48,046 sf	(14,832)	-24%
j Area of 3 story (Reduced)	68,740 sf	65,550 sf	(3,190)	-5%
k Total Building Area Footprint (Reduced)	181,918 sf	177,498 sf	(4,420)	-2%
l Lot Coverage (Reduced)	22.70% %	22.15% %	(0.006)	-2%
2 Increased & Improved Transition Zone				
a 1 Story Transition Zone from South (Increased)	148 feet	255 feet	107	72%
b 2 Story Transition Zone from South (Increased)	169 feet	284 feet	115	68%
c Number of Villas (Increased)	11 units	17 units	6	55%
d Villa's Back Yard Setback (Increased)	36 feet	50 feet	14	39%
e Villa's Front Yard (Increased)	5 feet	16 feet	11	220%
f 26' Wide Interior Loop Road	24 feet	26 feet	2	8%
3 Architectural Enhancements				
a Height of Common Space at ILF/ALF (Reduced)	34 feet	22 feet	(12)	-35%
b Height of 3 Story Roof at ILF/ALF (Reduced)	40 feet	36 feet	(4)	-10%
c Height of 2 Story Roof at ILF/ALF (Reduced)	32 feet	28 feet	(4)	-13%
f Roof Height at 1 Story SNF (Reduced)	26 feet	22 feet	(4)	-15%
d Added Brick to improve compatability				
e Increased the Horizontal Nature of Design				
g Villa's Garage Enter from Front				

	UNITS	PREVIOUS SF	NEW SF	CHANGE
ILF/ALF	190 units (-30 units)	271,140 SF (1232 SF/UNIT)	228,340 SF (1202 SF/UNIT)	(42,800 SF)
SNF	120 units	91,200 SF	91,200 SF	(UNCHNG'D)
VILLAS	17 units (+6 units)	24,900 SF	31,700 SF	(+6,800 SF)
TOTAL	327 units (-24 units)	387,244 SF	351,240 SF	(-36,004 SF)

PARKING	NEW	PREVIOUS
SURFACE STALLS	300 Surface	328 Surface
TOTAL RQD PARKING	334 Total	350 Total



Senior Living in Prairie Village


		Land	Building Total SF	% of Frontage along Property Line	Closest Setback from Single Family Homes	Setback from Mission (or Somerset)	# of Stories (includes basement)	Est. Height
CLARIDGE COURT	8101 MISSION	4.78	253,818	76%	505'	18'	5	52
BRIGHTON GARDENS	7105 MISSION	4.42	80,382	69%	140'	125'	3	37
BENTON HOUSE *	SOMERSET & BELINDER	6.8	79,548	48%	130'	124'	1	28
MISSION CHATEAU	8500 MISSION	18.43	351,240	33%	340'	120' to 286'	3	36

	# of Units	# Units Adj for Semi Private Occ	Units Per Acre	Adj Units Per Acre	SF Per Acre	SF per Unit	Adj SF per Unit	FAR
CLARIDGE COURT	180	180	37.66	37.66	53,100	1,410	1,410	1.22
BRIGHTON GARDENS	134	164	30.32	37.10	18,186	600	490	0.42
BENTON HOUSE *	87	118	12.79	17.35	11,698	914	674	0.27
MISSION CHATEAU	327	343	17.74	18.61	19,058	1,074	1,024	0.44

* Total building square footage and unit counts includes 16 units with an additional 32,000 SF (4 - fourplexes - 2,000 SF per unit)

Units Adj for Semi Private - Benton and Brighton both include a compliment of semi private units.

BRIGHTON GARDENS SITE AERIAL



ADDITIONAL EXHIBITS

PARKING ANALYSIS


	# of Units	Prairie Village Special Use - 19.28.0701	Code Rqd Parking	Staffing Counts	Staff	Changeover Ratio	Staff Changeover	Total
ILF	139 Units	3 spaces / 4 units	105	re: SUP Narrative pg 8 - 4-05-13 (approx. 17% staff per unit ratio)	24	re: SUP Narrative pg 8 - 4-05-13 (approx. 55% staff changeover ratio)	14	
ALF	51 Units	3 spaces / 4 units	39		9		5	
Memory Care	36 Units (36 Beds)	1 space per 5 beds	8		6		3	
SNF	84 Units (100 beds)	1 space per 5 beds	20		1 staff per 2 units		42	
310 Total Units								
TOTAL SURFACE PARKING			172	<i>plus</i>	81	<i>plus</i>	47	300
Villas	17 units	2 stalls / unit	34		0		0	
327 Total Units								
TOTAL PROJECT PARKING			206	<i>plus</i>	81	<i>plus</i>	47	334

*35 Parking Stalls will be Covered

PREVIOUS SITE CONCEPT



ALTERNATE SITE CONCEPT 1a



	UNITS	PREVIOUS SF	NEW SF	CHANGE
ILF/ALF	190 units (-30 units)	271,140 SF (1232 SFA/UNIT)	237,075 SF (1247 SFA/UNIT)	(-34,065 SF)
SNF	120 units	91,200 SF	91,200 SF	(UNCHNG'D)
VILLAS	17 units (+6 units)	24,900 SF	31,700 SF	(+6,800 SF)
TOTAL	327 units	387,244 SF	361,815 SF	(-27,269 SF)


SITE CONCEPT #1a - VILLAS ALONG SOUTH PROPERTY LINE

190 UNIT ILF /ALF

--- 300' BUFFER
 3 STORY SPACE
 2 STORY SPACE
 1 STORY SPACE
 ADDED VILLAS
 PREVIOUS OPTION

scale= 1:50 North

ALTERNATE SITE CONCEPT 2a



	UNITS	PREVIOUS SF	NEW SF	CHANGE
ILF/ALF	190 units (-30 units)	271,140 SF (1232 SF/UNIT)	237,075 SF (1247 SF/UNIT)	(-34,065 SF)
SNF	120 units	91,200 SF	91,200 SF	(UNCHNG'D)
VILLAS	17 units (+6 units)	24,900 SF	31,700 SF	(+6,800 SF)
TOTAL	327 units	387,244 SF	361,815 SF	(-27,269 SF)

SITE CONCEPT #2a - VILLAS FACE TO FACE

- - - - - 300' BUFFER
 3 STORY SPACE
 2 STORY SPACE
 1 STORY SPACE
 ADDED VILLAS
 PREVIOUS OPTION

scale= 1:50 North