

Cindi	Doerr	<p>From: Cindi Doerr <cdoerr@kc.rr.com> To: cityclerk <cityclerk@pvkansas.com>; dwarman <dwarman@pvkansas.com>; aweaver <aweaver@pvkansas.com>; snoll <snoll@pvkansas.com>; rhopkins <rhopkins@pvkansas.com>; mkelly <mkelly@pvkansas.com>; awang <awang@pvkansas.com>; lwassmer <lwassmer@pvkansas.com>; bmorehead <bmorehead@pvkansas.com>; cclark <cclark@pvkansas.com>; todell <todell@pvkansas.com>; dbelz <dbelz@pvkansas.com>; mayor <mayor@pvkansas.com> Sent: Tue, Dec 3, 2013 5:04 pm Subject: Neighborhood Significant Input</p> <p>Council Members,</p> <p>As a homeowner that is on the perimeter of the Mission Valley site, I feel as if my property rights might be stripped. The amendment to the Village Vision regarding the redevelopment on the Mission Valley site stated that the surrounding neighborhood would get significant input on any development considered. We have not had significant input. The major issue from the beginning has been the size of the development. The developer has taken insignificant concerns and attempted to sell this off as giving us input.</p> <p>On May 21 2012 you voted to approve the ordinance 2257. This was the amendment to the Village Vision regarding redevelopment on the Mission Valley Site. It can now be found on pages 97-99 of the Village Vision. The following are some of the quotes from this Village Vision amendment.</p> <p>“Any reuse of the site should maintain the status as a center of the neighborhood.”</p> <p>“Any redevelopment of the site needs to address how it will be compatible with or relate to residences adjacent to the site.”</p> <p>“It is likely that the floor area ratio will increase in the future, but it needs to occur in a manner that is compatible with the existing single-family and multi-family residential development.”</p> <p>“Any proposed plans for new uses or the expansion of existing uses-needs the input of the surrounding neighborhood. Due to the former school’s prominent role in the City and surrounding neighborhood, the City and residents expect ample opportunity to provide input into future redevelopment plans for the site.”</p> <p>“The developer needs to conduct an adequate public involvement process to obtain input from the neighborhood.”</p> <p>“The neighborhood is very concerned about the future of this site and will need to have significant input into any future change in use. If any change in use is considered, it is important that the site and the facility be designed compatible with the surrounding neighborhood. To successfully execute a project on the site, it will require creative and unique design talent and buy-in from the neighborhood and the community at large.”</p> <p>Please do not vote against the Village Vision when you vote for this plan. It must be turned down again to force the developer to give the surrounding community significant input prior to submitting a plan for approval. Only a cooperative effort will help heal this community and make way for the right project.</p> <p>Cindi Doerr 4000 W. 86th Street Prairie Village, Kansas 66207</p>
	MVNA	<p>Subject: MVNA: IMPORTANT CITY COUNCIL MTG., MONDAY, 1/6/14, 7:30PM, VILLAGE CHURCH From: "Bob Schubert" <Bob@reschubert.com> Date: Thu, 02 Jan 2014 15:10:37 -0700</p>

		<p>Dear MVNA residents:</p> <p>IMPORTANT CITY COUNCIL MEETING:</p> <p>Monday, January 6, 2014, Village Presbyterian Church, 6641 Mission Road, 7:30 PM</p> <p>MVNA opposition is still strong. We will continue to fight the Application until there is a reasonable development. -- MVNA will not back down!</p> <p>Why you should plan to attend:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Second application for proposed development is almost identical to first application which was denied by the City Council due to the protest petition requirement for a super majority vote. • Developer is continuing with his lawsuit against the City for his first application. • ONLY significant change the developer has made to this application is to create an imaginary line creating a 200 foot buffer in order to circumvent nine nearby residents' due process rights to file a protest petition. • All buildings are now three stories tall and completely out of character with the residential neighborhood. • Increased square footage of skilled nursing over 6,000 square feet. • Now the square footage is about the same size as the IKEA structure being built in Merriam. Drive over and see it for yourself...it is shocking! • Still the second largest senior living facility in all of Johnson County behind Lakeview that is on 100 acres. This application is now on 12.8 acres. • Using similar senior living facilities parking ratios, the development appears to be 90 parking spaces short which may create another parking fiasco like Claridge Court. • Developer has continued to evade the neighborhood and surrounding community concerns-especially regarding the massive size of the proposed project. He has not obtained "buy-in" with the surrounding neighborhood as stated in the most recent amendment to the City Master Plan (which specifically regards this site). <p>Your MVNA Board</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Bob Schubert, 3700 W 83 Terr, Prairie Village, KS 66206</p>
Bob	Schubert	<p>From: Bob Schubert [mailto:bob@reschubert.com] Sent: Tuesday, December 03, 2013 5:09 PM To: Joyce Hagen Mundy Subject: Tutera proposal</p> <p>For the Planning Commission and the City Council,</p> <p>I am the President of the Corinth Meadows Homes Association, directly east of the Mission Valley School site.</p> <p>It continues to amaze me that Mr. Tutera totally ignores the concerns of the immediate neighborhood, most ALL of whom are totally against the SIZE of this</p>

		<p>project! In our neighborhood, I know of only one family who are for Mr. Tutera's project. All the rest think that IT IS TOO BIG!</p> <p>And yet Mr. Tutera tells both of your groups that he has NEGOTIATED WITH THE NEIGHBORS. What he really has done is to PRESENT WHAT HE WANTS TO DO, FIELD QUESTIONS, BUT NEVER GIVE IN SUBSTANTIALLY ON THE SIZE ISSUE!!</p> <p>The Tutera project is about the same size as the new IKEA store on about the same acreage!</p> <p>He's not negotiating; he is attempting to DICTATE to the Planning Commission, the City Council, and the neighbors WHAT MUST HAPPEN! That's not negotiating!</p> <p>Bob</p> <p>Bob Schubert Computer Training and Maintenance</p>
Joyce	Smith	<p>From: Joyce Smith Sent: Friday, November 29, 2013 9:19 AM To: cityclerk@pvkansas.com Cc: dbelz@pvkansas.com ; dwarman@pvkansas.com ; awang@pvkansas.com ; rhopkins@pvkansas.com Subject: MV Site</p> <p>PLEASE DO NOT GRANT A SPECIAL USE PERMIT TO THE TUTERA GROUP FOR THE MV SITE!!!</p> <p>The neighbors have spoken & we don't need or want the massive development in our neighborhood for many obvious reasons. I live directly across from the MV site & I am afraid that my quiet, dead end street is going to become employee parking for Mr. Tutera's project. At this point in time he is 89 parking spaces short for his employees & residents. If this goes through, where are my guests suppose to park? Think about this project as if your street were to become the employee parking lot. VOTE NO FOR THE SPECIAL USE PERMIT.</p> <p>Remember the Golden Factors.</p> <p>Joyce Smith 3611 W 84th St. =</p>
Jana	Terreros	<p>From: Jana Terreros <janagoldsich@sbcglobal.net> To: "cityclerk@pvkansas.com" <cityclerk@pvkansas.com> Sent: Wednesday, November 27, 2013 8:49 PM Subject: support of Tutera Development</p> <p>I grew up in Prairie Village-- moved here in 1959. I grew up on 81st Street, attended Ridgeview Elementary and Meadowbrook Junior High. We boarded our horse at Wolfe farms, and frequently road up to our house via Rosewood. Saturdays were spent at the stable, with frequent stops at PayLess (now Hen House) and the coffee shop. I currently live at a house on El Monte, which was once the field where we used to ride. My street was made to "buffer" the residents</p>

		<p>protesting the now desirable development Corinth Downs. Would it be nice to have things as they were in the 1960s? Sure, but this is 2013. At Corinth Square, there is a gas station, several banks, and an expanded shopping center (and probably in the 60's, there would have been protests about establishments serving liquor, but those establishments remain family friendly and beneficial to our neighborhood). The Shawnee Mission School District decided to close Mission Valley, despite the presence of families who could have enjoyed sending their children to that school. They listed the property for sale. The Tutera Group bought the property with a vision of providing a living community for older members of the community. The Tutera Group has shown that they provide quality living communities. Why not embrace this ? Would you prefer a Wal Mart? Oh, and why do people who live no where near here have signs of protest in their yards? Thank you for your consideration. Jana Goldsich, MD</p>
--	--	--