

Dave	Anderson	<p>From: Dale Warman <dwarman1@kc.rr.com> Date: November 27, 2013 at 11:43:54 CST To: <jhmundy@pvkansas.com> Subject: Fw: A very large and lasting mistake !</p> <p>From: Dave Anderson Sent: Wednesday, November 27, 2013 10:46 AM Subject: A very large and lasting mistake !</p> <p>Subject: A very large and lasting mistake !</p> <p>Dear council person & planning commission member,</p> <p>My wife and I are both very opposed to the Tutera Project. The Planning Commission meetings have been dominated by the applicant and there seems to be a reluctance on the part of the Planning Commission to address the project density or scope and cost of additional city services to adequately provide for 350 to 400 elderly people, their daily family visitors, and the facility staff at the home. Compare this project on 18 acres to the existing Santa Marta facility on 45 acres. If you figure one visitor a day per resident; they won't have anywhere near enough parking spaces when shared with all the food and service delivery vehicles, not to mention visiting medical and social services providers. These "parkers" won't stop coming just because it is crowded. They'll just fan out and crowd the existing neighbors, apartment lots, and Corinth Shopping Center spaces. When you gridlock the Corinth Shopping Center with this dense traffic and parking; you're sending shoppers and their "sales tax dollars" to Ranchmart (Leawood) and Metcalf (Overland Park). People will not consistently fight a crowd. How will this traffic impact the safety of our elementary school children across the street. How many ambulance calls with related noise will 400 elderly generate a day and night? How will this stress the water system, the electric system, and especially the sewer system of the neighborhood. Who will have to pay for these capital upgrades? The costs will trickle down to every tax payer in Prairie Village, not just our ward. Why are we subsidizing this developer?</p> <p>This density will add to the Tutera Groups profits at the entire City of Prairie Village's expense. A total expense that at this juncture is unknown and incalculable. These cost won't show up until a year or two after completion. Then ladies and gentleman it will be too late !</p> <p>There are a number of uses for this land that would enhance both the immediate neighborhood and City of Prairie Village as a whole. Why can't we enhance the neighborhood rather than degrade it. If you study the residential neighborhoods to the south and west of the 18 acres; some nice residential and very light commercial would work. This could generate some substantial tax dollars and you'll know what you are getting. The Tutera Group Proposal was designed to ask for a lot more than they knew they could ever get. This will allow them to scale it back "only slightly" and say they compromised. Now they're up to a 3 story plan. We can see no benefit financially or esthetically to the residents of Prairie Village for this planned purpose on any scale. We would hope that our public officials stand up for all the residents of Prairie Village who have elected them. All of these yard signs give you an indication of the "resounding opposition" to this annoying persistence.</p> <p>Respectfully, Dave Anderson Prairie Village, Kansas</p>
------	----------	---

Merrill	Athon	<p>From: d8501@aol.com [mailto:d8501@aol.com] Sent: Tuesday, December 03, 2013 10:26 AM To: Joyce Hagen Mundy Subject: No Tutera project at Mission Valley site.....</p> <p>Hello,</p> <p>I represent my Father's desire against the Tutera development at the Mission Valley School site. He is against the development as it will ruin property values. He is not opposed to a housing development of just single family homes.</p> <p>Mark Athon, The Attorney in Fact for Merrill D. Athon</p>
Bill	Barr	<p>From: Bill Barr [mailto:bill@billbarr.com] Sent: Monday, December 02, 2013 5:37 PM To: Joyce Hagen Mundy Subject: Proposed Mission Chateau Development on Mission Valley School Site</p> <p>My name is Bill Barr and my wife, Kim Rock, and I live at 8600 Delmar Lane, Prairie Village, KS 66207. We have voiced our concerns and disapproval of the size of development plans by the Tutera Group on several occasions. Once the original plans were not approved by the majority of the City Council, the Tutera Group sued the city of Prairie Village and presented a “new” proposal at the same time (seems a bit odd to us that these 2 items can be done simultaneously), but the proposal has been made. The Tutera Group has not listened to the planning commission, the city council, or the neighborhood group when they have asked for input, instead has moved forward with their agenda.</p> <p>We have several concerns:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. When the first session was held to solicit input from the neighbors on the “new” plan with single family housing on the South side, the plan appeared to have green space with trees planted but it was not green space, it was where the houses would go. It was suggested to the attorney’s making the presentation, that it might be more helpful for the neighborhood to visualize houses there. They thought that was a wonderful idea and would make the change. It was never made and it still looks like a deceptive green space. This is exactly the tact they have taken from the inception of the Mission Chateau concept. Tell the neighbors what you think we want to hear and then don’t take any of it into account. It was suggested by either the planning commission or the city council that Tutera meet with the groups and work out a compromise. I have attended the majority of meetings and this has not happened! 2. The neighborhood suggested that for the safety of neighborhood children, the detention basin or holding ponds for runoff be underground, but the developer said it wasn’t money well spent and has instead designed an open detention pond, which when full will be dangerous and potentially an “attractive” nuisance. 3. One of the reasons the neighbors have complained and apparently one of the reasons the majority of city council did not approve the project is because of the size on the original intended acreage. Now the building space has been reduced to only 12.8 acres and the full three story buildings containing more than 326,000 sq. ft. (more than twice the size

		<p>of Mission's new Wal Mart) will be shoe horned into a smaller area. If it was too big before, how do they justify this now.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. The deeding of the residential acreage takes away the neighbors ability to file a protect petition, denies the neighbors their rights, and allows the developer to have his was with the city. We believe that the city should request that the developers build a scale model of the project to full comprehend the massiveness of this project. 5. Who will be responsible for the maintenance, care and upkeep of our new city street? 6. A development this size will be operational 24 hours per day and 7 days a week creating a nuisance for the neighborhood and a lighting nightmare the scope of a nightly sports stadium for the neighbors as well as a noise nuisance from comings and goings at the property. 7. It will create a city within a city that we find it difficult to believe, fits with the city vision. <p>Thank you for your consideration of the rights and concerns of your neighbors and residents of beautiful Prairie Village—Bill Barr & Kim Rock</p> <p>Bill Barr Bill Barr & Company, Inc. bill@billbarr.com</p>
Joy	Bower	<p>From: bjbower [mailto:bjbower@swbell.net] Sent: Tuesday, December 03, 2013 7:35 AM To: Joyce Hagen Mundy Subject: Mission Valley building project</p> <p>To the City Clerk and the Planning Commission.</p> <p>I am writing to voice my total and utter dismay at yet another attempt by Mr. Tuttera to cram a grossly oversized project into an area surrounded by quality residential housing. He failed once; now his proposal is even larger/taller and he seems intent on doing whatever it takes to build this mammoth project. He refuses to work with the neighborhood on the more appropriate scale of this project. This project does NOT fit the surrounding neighborhood area. I urge the Planning Commission to stand up for the residents and turn this project down...for good....once and for all.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Joy Bower 8332 Delmar Lane</p>
Martha	Hiatt	<p>From: Martha Hiatt [mailto:marthakansas@aol.com] Sent: Monday, December 02, 2013 7:55 PM To: Joyce Hagen Mundy Subject: Oppostiion to Mission Chateau</p> <p>Dear Mayor Shaffer, Members of the City Council, Members of the Planning Commission:</p> <p>It is hard to believe the good citizens of Prairie Village are once again required to</p>

		<p>voice their strong opposition to a massive proposal that has been soundly defeated by the elected officials of the Prairie Village City Council on September 3, 2013.</p> <p>The present application by the Tutera Group is taller (now 3 stories of buildings) and denser (329,000 square feet on 12.8 acres) than the prior application in a veiled attempt to circumvent the zoning due process rights of the adjoining property owners. What an insult. What subterfuge. Do the right thing and protect the citizens of Prairie Village and the neighborhoods from a development that is not in character with the surroundings. Deny the application for a special use permit.</p> <p>Cordially,</p> <p>Dan and Martha Hiatt 8123 El Monte Street</p>
Cameron	Jones	<p>From: cambjonj@kc.rr.com [mailto:cambjonj@kc.rr.com] Sent: Tuesday, December 03, 2013 8:02 AM To: Joyce Hagen Mundy Subject: Mission Valley site proposal</p> <p>Any construction at the Mission Valley site on Mission Road should include requirements from the developers to reduce the dust that will blanket neighboring properties.</p> <p>If anyone observed the recent construction of Walmart in Mission Ks this last year, it was obvious that large plumes of dust frequently filled the area and were much worse on windy days.</p> <p>Other cities require soil wetting measures to prevent this from happening. Some southwest cities such as Albuquerque make this provision a must for new construction.</p> <p>Without it neighbors will be inundated with dust on their porches, patios, homes, and cars.</p> <p>Prairie Village should also initiate provisions that prevent the recurrent petitioning of the city for zoning abeyances and construction permits for projects already rejected, without substantial changes in content, for at least one year.</p> <p>This would prevent repeated efforts to construct the same/similar project that were just rejected a few months earlier. The present system seems to allow repeated attempts at substantially the same project which costs the city large sums. Other cities have also seen this problem, and do not allow similar use plans for one year after rejection. This is the case in Seattle, WA.</p> <p>Cameron Jones 3605 W. 85th St.</p>
Debbie	Jones	<p>From: debbie jones [mailto:dotsister@msn.com] Sent: Tuesday, December 03, 2013 3:02 PM To: Joyce Hagen Mundy Subject: Opposed to Mission Chateau</p> <p>Once again I would like to vigorously state my opposition to the Mission Chateau project as currently proposed. It has not changed in size or density but is now being squeezed</p>

		<p>onto an even smaller parcel of land. Anyone who sees the addition of single family home sites as anything other than a thinly veiled attempt to circumvent the Protest petition is dreaming. And who will develop these planned lots? I can't foresee any scenario in which one would build homes in keeping with the neighbors to the south. Also what would keep these from becoming rentals, which was the neighborhoods main objection.</p> <p>A skilled nursing facility of the sized proposed is nothing more than a small, short term stay hospital. On at least one occasion Mr. Tuterra has told me that this is really just a nicer name for a nursing home. If this is true, I would like to see what he intends to charge for these beds. Is it in line with other nursing home fees.? Would the majority of Prairie Village residents find this a viable financial option for long term care? He claims not to know what these charges will be but no one goes into a project of this magnitude without knowing expected profit margins. What is he trying to hide, by not revealing this information?</p> <p>Please consider the affects of property values on surrounding properties. Our homes are admittedly the largest investment most of us will ever have. The appraisal of Dillon & Witt, submitted by Mr. Carmen, conservatively estimates the negative impact to property values at 3 to 5%. Would you be willing to lose this kind of equity in your home? Also there would be a considerable decline in property taxes which would adversely affect the city budget.</p> <p>We have already suffered the indignity of having our neighborhood school shut down, largely in part because the residents of Mission Hills have more money and more political clout than those of Prairie Village. If the situation was reversed, is there any doubt that the city of Mission Hills, would not have let this project get off the drawing board. Please don't let them turn your lovely, bucolic city into the role of Ugly Stepsister.</p> <p>Finally, I continue to be amazed that to a person, you can vote for a project that has such wide opposition among your citizenry.</p> <p>When considering this matter once again, I beg you to look at the long term consequences of your decision rather than any short term gains that may or may not benefit the city.</p> <p>Respectfully,</p> <p>Debbie Jones 3605 West 85th St.</p>
Don and Mary	Krohn	<p>From: Don & Mary Krohn [mailto:marykrohn@sprintmail.com] Sent: Tuesday, November 26, 2013 7:22 PM To: 'cityclerk@pvkansas.com' Subject: Opposition to Mission Valley Site Special Use Permit</p> <p>Donald and Mary Krohn 8361 Reinhardt St. Prairie Village, KS 66206</p> <p>Via E-mail</p> <p>Joyce Hagen Mundy Prairie Village City Clerk</p> <p style="text-align: right;">November 27, 2013</p>

		<p>cityclerk@pvkansas.com</p> <p>Please distribute this e-mail to all members of the PV Planning Commission prior to their monthly meeting, December 3, 2013.</p> <p>The purpose of this e-mail is to voice our strong opposition to Mr. Tutera's (MVS, LLC) latest proposal for redevelopment of the 18.43 acres of the former Mission Valley Middle School property. Mr. Tutera's latest maneuvers attempting to obtain approval of his special use permit application for the property clearly indicates his continuing intentions to disregard the neighboring community and their interests. He has repeatedly rejected requests to reduce the massive size of the structures on the site to a size that would more appropriately fit the area. It has become very apparent that Mr. Tutera's goal is to obtain approval of a development for the site that fits "his business plan" utilizing the resources of Prairie Village.</p> <p>Mr. Tutera's most recent proposal for the development of this property into Mission Chateau remains totally out of character with the neighborhood and Prairie Village. The details against his proposals have been expressed over and over. Prairie Village has developed and retained a genuine small town feel, charm and character that are all tremendous assets for current and future residents. These unique characteristics should not be sacrificed for the development of a massive Senior Housing facility with a Skilled Nursing/Memory Care unit that is nearly 100,000 square feet containing 36 memory care units and 100 skilled nursing beds. This is not good for Prairie Village.</p> <p>The proposed dense development of this prime piece of property is not aligned with the character of Prairie Village. A much smaller facility could provide an environment closer to the life styles that Prairie Village residents currently enjoy. However, we believe there are other options available for the property that would provide better alternatives for the community and its residents. The present residents deserve better and the future direction of Prairie Village could be enhanced without this project!</p> <p>We urge you to vote against the approval of the special Use Permit for the proposed Mission Chateau Senior Housing Development.</p> <p>Respectfully,</p> <p>Donald and Mary Krohn</p>
Dorothy	Meeds	<p>From: Dorothy Meeds <Dottiem@kc.rr.com> Date: November 27, 2013 at 12:07:34 CST To: "cityclerk@pvkansas.com" <cityclerk@pvkansas.com> Subject: Tutera Plan</p> <p>I am a senior that has lived in Prairie Village since 1962 and love this area very much and will continue to stay here as long as I am able. At present, I am living in a house that is too large for me and do not wish to ever go into a retirement building as I prefer to live near people of all ages, not just seniors.</p> <p>I wish that the Tutera's would build nice condos with 1-2 bedrooms on the main level, similar to those in Corinth Downs. These would attract people of all ages, including me. It would be nice to have walking paths, safety and maybe people you can hire to fix things that need fixing in your house. And lawn care.</p>

		<p>Thank you.</p> <p>Dot Meeds</p>
	<p>MVNA</p>	<p>From: "Charles E. Clark" <chasc@list-clark.com> Date: November 27, 2013 at 8:31:55 CST To: Joyce <jhmundy@pvkansas.com> Subject: Fwd: MVNA-Important Meeting, Tues., 12/3, SME Cafeteria, 7pm-Planning Commission</p> <p>From: "Bob Schubert" <Bob@reschubert.com> Date: Wed, 27 Nov 2013 06:16:56 -0700</p> <p>Dear Friends of MVNA,</p> <p>We are steadfast in our opposition to this immense developmental complex.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The developer is suing the City in an effort to deny our residents due process to file a protest petition as allowed under Kansas Statute 12-757. 2. All buildings are now THREE stories tall and out of character with the surrounding residential neighborhood. It's taller and it's denser than the previously rejected application. 3. Developer is now attempting to cram this massive 326,000+ square foot development on only 12.8 acres to circumvent the protest petition in an attempt to silence the neighbors to the south and southwest and take away their due process rights. (This is more than twice as large as the new Walmart in Mission, KS!) 4. The developer refuses to put the detention basin underground for the safety of the children in the area. There is reason to foresee that children could be endangered by this condition. <p>Please plan to attend this IMPORTANT meeting of the Prairie Village Planning Commission, Tuesday, December 3, 2013, 7:00 pm, Shawnee Mission East High School Cafeteria, 75th and Mission Road, for yet another discussion of the Tutera Group's second proposal.</p> <p>As you may know, at its November meeting, the Planning Commission voted to table the Tutera Group's second proposal until this December meeting.</p> <p>Since this is a second proposal from the Tutera Group, it is entirely appropriate (and you are encouraged) to repeat (to the Planning Commission) any comments you have made at previous public meetings. In addition, you are also encouraged to submit your comments in writing to the Planning Commission and the City Council, in care of cityclerk@pvkansas.com. To be recorded, your comments MUST be submitted to the City Clerk prior to the end of December 3rd Planning Commission meeting.</p> <p>Thank You,</p> <p>MVNA Board Bob Schubert, 3700 W 83 Terr, Prairie Village, KS 66206</p>

<p>Brenda</p>	<p>Satterlee</p>	<p>From: Brenda Satterlee [mailto:bsatterlee@kc.rr.com] Sent: Tuesday, December 03, 2013 1:38 PM To: Joyce Hagen Mundy; Dale Warman; Ashley Weaver; Steve Noll; Ruth Hopkins; Michael Kelly; Andrew Wang; Laura Wassmer; Brooke Morehead; Charles Clark; Ted Odell; David Belz; Mayor Subject: Mission Chateau Parking shortage</p> <p>Council members,</p> <p>Please take the time to carefully read the below letter (read at the P&Z meeting 12/3/2013) regarding parking and then review the parking analysis sheets provided by MVNA that support these findings. When the applicant is ask if he has enough parking, his answer is that he exceeds code. We all of learned from Claridge Court, that Code doesn't provide adequate parking for a facility like this. The applicant fails to prove how much excess is needed.</p> <p>The Parking facts and ratios from the other Johnson County CCRCs clearly show that Mission Chateau does not have enough parking spaces. To support this statement I will first break out just the residential and the visitor parking.</p> <p>Part one Residential Parking: Lakeview, Santa Marta, and Tall grass each confirmed in an email to me this week that they have and use at least 1 residential parking space for every independent living unit. They stated that although some units did not need a car, many needed two spaces. In other words, Lakeview, Santa Marta and Tall Grass each have an independent living parking ratio of 100%. Mission Chateau provides 106 spaces for residential parking. Mission Chateau should have 136 spaces, one for each Independent Residential unit. Mission Chateau is therefore at least 30 spaces short in residential parking</p> <p>Part two Visitor Parking: Santa Marta has visitor parking spaces equal to 37% of the total units in the facility and Village Shalom has a 45% visitor parking ratio. Using the conservative 37% percentage, Mission Chateau total visitor parking should be 115 spaces (.37x310 units). Mission Chateau provides a total of 75 spaces for visitor parking, a shortage of 40 spaces.</p> <p>These two areas alone produce a shortage of 70 parking spaces. Let me repeat, just between residential and visitor parking, Mission Chateau is at least 70 parking spaces short.</p> <p>Now we can look at the parking spaces in aggregate (residential, visitor and staff). The developer of Mission Chateau calculated his parking spaces based on a multiplication formula. We took the four largest CCRCs in Johnson County and made a parking comparison. Those CCRCs were Lakeview, Tall Grass, Santa Marta and Aberdeen.</p> <p>We applied the Applicants 's formula to Lakeview, Tall Grass, Santa Marta and Aberdeen and came up with an average 30% shortfall to the actual parking spaces being used on site at those 4 CCRC developments. ALL FOUR CCRC'S ACTUAL PARKING EXCEEDED THE NUMBER PRODUCED BY THE APPLICANT'S FORMULA. If you apply a 30% error ratio to Mission Chateau's 316 parking spaces, the result is a shortage of approximately 90 spaces.</p> <p>I ask you tonight to not recommend a plan that dramatically fails to provide enough parking. Keep in mind that the proposed Project is now located on just 12 acres and the ability to add on-site parking later is non-existent. If you believe the Applicant has enough parking spaces, then you believe that this facility is</p>
---------------	------------------	---

		<p>magically going to be different than the other CCRCs in our area. Based on written confirmation from the previously mentioned CCRCs we believe there is going to be a dramatic parking shortage. We as a City cannot afford to be wrong again.</p> <p>Brenda Satterlee</p>
Linnea	St. John	<p>From: "Linnea St. John" <lstjohn@kc.rr.com> Date: November 30, 2013 at 15:02:09 CST To: <cityclerk@pvkansas.com> Subject: Mission Valley site</p> <p>To the Planning Commission and City Council members: The old Tutera project was too large for the space, and now we have an ever denser proposal! It seems that if Tutera doesn't fit Prairie Village, he is trying to make Prairie Village fit Tutera. His new tactics are underhanded and designed to disallow our voices to be heard. Our neighborhood and city will be negatively impacted by such an Oversized project. Do not let his legal shenanigans rob us of our rights.</p> <p>To do so is to play into his manipulative, deceptive, self-serving behavior. This large project will cost us money over time. Also, The peaceful nature of the area will be negatively impacted by increased traffic, service vehicles, ambulance, fire and employee and visitor parking problems. Why would our officials on whom we rely To protect our neighborhoods subject us to this?</p> <p>Tutera says we need quality senior living in Prairie Village.....we already have 3 within blocks of this proposed site. At one of the public meetings, Tutera Was asked why this needed to be so dense. His reply was that to make it smaller did not fit his business model (translation: profit margin). But are we, as Prairie Village residents obligated to sacrifice Money and environmental quality in order that Tutera makes the amount of money he desires on this project?</p> <p>This project will not bring in any significant tax revenue to Prairie Village. In fact it will cost us to provide basic services for the project. It only makes financial sense to the developer. If he had proposed a project half the original size, there would probably have been little opposition. This is prime real estate for which there are many suitable Uses.</p> <p>Please look at all the opposition signs and listen to our concerns. Please represent US in this matter.</p> <p>I thank the city council members who have supported us in this project; I ask the others to re-examine the facts and support us. To the planning commission, I ask the same; do not lay this solely at the doorstep of the Council.</p> <p>Do not let Tutera maneuver the rules in order to fit a square peg into a round hole.</p> <p>Respectfully submitted,</p> <p>Linnea St.John</p>

Jim	Starcev	<p>From: Jim Starcev [mailto:jimstarcev@gmail.com] Sent: Monday, December 02, 2013 12:06 AM To: Joyce Hagen Mundy Subject: Mission Chateau</p> <p>Date: August 6th, 2013</p> <p>To: Prairie Village Planning Commission Members Mayor Ron Schaffer Prairie Village City Council Members Prairie Village City Staff</p> <p>From: Jim Starcev Resident at 3507 West 87th Street</p> <p>Re: Mission Chateau Proposal</p> <p>My name is Jim Starcev. I am a resident at 3507 W 87th Street, Leawood, KS. I live a couple of blocks from the proposed development. I also own a property in Prairie Village that is also near the site. I have attended virtually every meeting that the city council and the planning commission have held on this proposal as well as the neighborhood meetings that the Tutera Group has hosted. I will be out of town and will miss the December 3rd meeting. I would like to share some thoughts on the new proposal from the Tutera Group that was presented at the November meeting.</p> <p>From my notes from the November 5th meeting, the Tutera Group said that the new proposal will have 190 assisted living units and 136 skilled nursing units. I would like a better explanation of why there are so many skilled nursing units. Based on numbers presented, the project would have 42% skilled nursing units (136 of 326 total units). The most recent study I could find that statistically showed what the average unit break down in a CCRC was a 2004 by AAHSA¹. Per that study, the average CCRC has 23% of it's units dedicated to skilled nursing. To put that in perspective, with 190 assisted living units, the average CCRC would have 57 skilled nursing units. The Mission Chateau proposal has 139% more skilled nursing units than the average CCRC.</p> <p>Another issue that concerns me is the dividing of the plot. This move, while it may be technically legal (and I am not entirely sure of that) seems to have the intent of denying home owners around the property their due process. I recently read a story about the NCAA that reminded me of this. A college basketball player was having a year of eligibility taken away because he had played three games in a recreational church league over the summer. The author of the story said that this is why most people hate the NCAA. While technically their might have been a rule violation, the intent of the rule was not broken. The player gained no advantage. The author went on to say that someone had to be able to look at this situation with logic and reason and decide what is really right. That is what I would ask of you. Look at this situation with logic and reason and decide what is really right.</p> <p>Thank you for your time,</p> <p>Jim Starcev</p> <p>¹ "From Start-Up to Success: A Statistical Approach of Emerging Continuing Care Retirement Communities", 3rd Edition. Brecht Associates Inc®</p>
-----	---------	--

Margi	Wilson	<p>From: Margi [mailto:wilsonmargi@hotmail.com] Sent: Tuesday, December 03, 2013 8:45 AM To: Joyce Hagen Mundy; Margi Subject: Mission Valley redevelopment</p> <p>To the City of Prairie Village,</p> <p>As a lifetime resident of Kansas City and parent of four children, two whom attend Corinth Elementary, I am adamantly opposed to the continued disregard by Tutera for the safety and well being of our children. They continue not to listen to our community's concerns about their development and have now taken a posture of getting what they want at all costs.</p> <p>They are attempting to deny our due process as citizens according to Kansas Statute 12-757.</p> <p>The newly proposed, three story tall building is completely out of character with Prairie Village. What makes this area part of the "golden triangle" is the dedication and long term vision of the city to build beautiful, timeless developments. No other developer has felt the need to destroy the character of our city, while updating their facility. Corinth Square and the Village are perfect examples. In addition, citizens have not been opposed to a facility that is modeled after Benton House - the most recent addition of long term care to our city.</p> <p>The facility they are suggesting is twice as large as the new Walmart in Mission, Kansas. What would we do with something like that on Mission Road, across from a school? Clearly, the police department would have a nightmare on their hands with a facility of that size and the safety of the children at Corinth during the day.</p> <p>Mainly, they have zero concern for the safety of an elementary school with over 500 children. Their refusal to put the detention basin underground as requested is proof of this stance.</p> <p>There are many developers (including Kansas City Christian School, Bickford Living company) that have offered to utilize this property in a way that covers the concerns of your citizens, still garners tax dollars for our city, and most importantly, keeps Prairie Village the unique suburb that is coveted in Kansas City.</p> <p>I ask you to deny their proposal again because it is the right thing to do and it is what your citizens want. Please listen to us and our concerns.</p> <p>Thank you for your time,</p> <p>Margi Wilson 3500 West 92nd Street</p>
-------	--------	---

KAY CALLISON

December 3, 2013

Planning Commission Members
City Council Members
Prairie Village, KS 66208

Dear Members of the Planning Commission and City Council:

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my letter and express my concerns about the proposed Tutera Group re-development plan for the property on Mission Road. It is my opinion that the proposed project is too large for the site, Mission Road location and Prairie Village. In fact, all three buildings are now three stories high and the buildings are much denser than the original plan that was submitted and rejected. The proposed project is now located on 12.8 acres, thus more buildings on less area. My other concerns include adequate parking for employees and visitors, traffic from/to project off of Mission Road and the effect of this traffic on the primary school (and those students/parents/teachers/visitors) to the east, adequate landscaping and the need for such a facility in Prairie Village.

Many citizens of Prairie Village have voiced their concerns and objections to this development, and the plan that has been re-submitted poses questions also. It is my opinion that the current plan does not allow neighbors who live very close to the site to state their concerns in a protest petition.

Respectfully submitted,



Kay Callison