**PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES**

May 3, 2016

ROLL CALL

The Planning Commission of the City of Prairie Village met in regular session on Tuesday, May 3, 2016 in the Municipal Building Council Chambers at 7700 Mission Road. Chairman Nancy Wallerstein called the meeting to order at 7:00 with the following members present: James Breneman, Melissa Brown, Patrick Lenahan, Jonathan Birkel, and Jeffrey Valentino.

The following persons were present in their advisory capacity to the Planning Commission: Chris Brewster, City Planning Consultant; Wes Jordan, Assistant City Administrator; Mitch Dringman, Building Official and Joyce Hagen Mundy, Commission Secretary.

###### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

James Breneman moved for the approval of the minutes of the Planning Commission for April 5, 2016 as submitted. The motion was seconded by Patrick Lenahan and passed unanimously.

**PUBLIC HEARINGS**

There were no Public Hearings scheduled before the Commission.

**NON PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**PC2015-115** **Request for Site Plan Approval**

**7501 Mission Road**

Chris Hafner with Davidson Architects, presented the revised site plan for 7501 Mission Road a new two-story office building and associated site improvements. The new building replaces the existing two-story, multi-tenant office building on the site. The lot is located on the southeast corner of 75th Street and Mission Road. Mr. Hafner highlighted changes from an earlier proposal presented to the Commission including a different architectural style. The parking will be at the rear of the lot and to the east side of the building. The existing entrance from 75th Street will be closed and an exit is proposed at Mohawk. The trash enclosure has been relocated as recommended by the Commission to a location closer to the building and will be fully enclosed. A monument sign is proposed for the northwest corner of the lot similar to the signage found at the Wireco building also on 75th Street. The monument sign will feature the same exterior materials as the building.

There has been no change to the utility plan or photometric lighting plan. The grading plan calls for more common area without the access to 75th Street. The area in front of the building to 75th Street will be grass. The landscape plan for the site will be revised to meet the staff recommendations given in their report. Mr. Hafner reviewed the exterior building materials and their locations on the proposed building. He noted that he had reviewed the staff report and is in agreement with the conditions listed on the staff recommendation.

James Breneman asked about tenant signage. Mr. Hafner replied that they will come back to the Commission with their signage requests after the building tenants are known.

Jonathan Birkel confirmed the applicant would be replacing any trees/plants lost in grading near the adjacent residential properties. The applicant stated that the landscape plan is what they will be planting. They are not sure what trees are on the neighbor’s property, but they will not touch any on the neighbor’s property or if so they will be replaced. The trees on their property will likely be removed due to grading and what is shown on the landscape plan will replace them. Mr. Birkel questioned the proposed dark bronze colored efface suggesting that perhaps a lighter color would be better. Mr. Hafner replied that he had considered a lighter color and would have no objection to that change.

James Breneman questioned the construction note #21 on page A1-1 which referenced the painting of all exterior utility services to match the color of the building. Mr. Hafner stated there are no exterior utility services and that if there were they would also be landscaped and painted as the same color of the building. Mr. Breneman asked about extending the sidewalk to Mission Road. Mr. Hafner replied that it was considered but because of the significant grade transition the 75th Street sidewalk connection would not be pursued. Mr. Breneman noted the plans indicated a curb cut on 75th Street. Mr. Hafner apologized for that sheet not being replaced with the new renderings and confirmed the only access locations to this site would be off Mission Road and Mohawk. Melissa Brown noted the entrance ramp off Mission Road is very steep and questioned if any blending was proposed to lesson that. Mr. Hafner replied it would be blended along the west edge of the property.

The new parking proposed has 78 spaces, including 4 handicap accessible spaces at the east edge of the building abutting the sidewalk. Per Section 19.46, Off-Street Parking and Loading Regulations, Section 030, Require Spaces, 69 spaces are required based on the size and use of the building. Patrick Lenahan asked about the parking space size requirements. Mr. Brewster replied the stall parking slots are typically around 16’ in depth and count the overhang buffer area. The code requires 18 or 16’ deep with overhang. Mr. Lenahan encouraged Mr. Hafner to look into the ADA requirements, noting that overhang parking makes sidewalk accessibility difficult and recent changes have been made to the ADA requirements.

Melissa Brown questioned the proposed location of the monument sign in relationship to the street. She suggested the sign be placed at an angle similar to the office building on the north side facing 75th Street. Mr. Brewster responded the proposed monument sign meets the sign requirements. If the building becomes a multi-tenant the signage would need to come back to the Planning Commission for approval of sign standards for on-building signs for multiple tenants.

The primary building materials proposed include a thin-clad stone system, aluminum composite material (ACM) and glazing (glass). The thin-clad stone system is acceptable dependent on the manufacturer’s specifications and grade. A complete set of sample materials should be provided for the Planning Commission review and approval. Natural stone accents and textured EFIS with stone appearances are proposed accent materials to complement the primary stone finish. The ACM or metal panel is not widely used in this immediate vicinity of this site, but is a quality accent material. The proposed color of the ACM should be specified to ensure that it complements the more natural tones of the stone cladding and stone accents. Application of the ACM product does not make up more than 15% of any façade of the building.

Residential uses to the south are currently buffered from the site through a row of mature trees, on the adjacent property. The landscape plan softens the site by providing adequate landscaping to buffer the parking lot from adjacent properties and accents the building along 75th Street and Mission Road. However screening of the parking area along the 75th street frontage with a low hedge line or screen similar to other portions of the parking area should be added. Staff does have a concern regarding some of the species of plant materials selected. Red maples are overplanted in this area and do not perform well over time, needing to be replaced. Appropriate species include White Oak, Swamp White Oak, Kentucky Coffee tree or Autumn Gold Ginkgo, or if fall color is an important consideration Sugar Maple is an acceptable substitute.

Additionally to allow better planting grades, more visibility of the landscape from the Mission Road frontage, and better screening of the parking, staff recommends consideration of a retaining wall on the west side of the parking lot. This could be integrated into the screening wall for the trash enclosure and continue further south along the parking area.

According to Section 19.32.030 of the Prairie Village Zoning Regulations, the Planning Commission shall give consideration to the following criteria in approving or disapproving a site plan.

# The Site is capable of accommodating the building, parking areas and drives with appropriate open space and landscape.

The site plan meets the development standards of the C-O district and adequately accommodates the building, parking and circulation and open space and landscape. It is a similar scale and development pattern to the current building. However the following modifications are recommended for consideration:

* + Switch out Red Maple for one of the recommended substitutes.
  + Add screening on the northwest portion of the parking area along 75th Street, similar to other low parking lot screening proposed on the plan.
  + Consider a retaining wall on the west side of the parking to integrate with the trash enclosure structure.

# Utilities are available with adequate capacity to serve the proposed development.

The proposed use is the same use to the previous development, and of a similar scale. The existing utilities will adequately support the proposed development.

# The plan provides for adequate management of stormwater runoff.

The site plan indicates additional pervious surface on-site through the provision of new landscaping and turf that will provide an opportunity to improve storm water management. In addition the storm water plans will need to be approved by Public Works.

# The plan provides for safe and easy ingress, egress, and internal traffic circulation.

The plan does provide for safe site access, and will improve circulation by routing 75th street access further west to Mohawk Drive. Further, this access is offset from the access on the west side in order to discourage cut-through traffic into the neighborhood.

# The plan is consistent with good land planning and good site engineering design principles.

The site plan moves the building closer to the setback lines hiding the majority of the parking to occur behind the building, away from 75th Street. This will improve the visual aesthetics of the site and contribute to the overall appearance of the 75th Street corridor.

# An appropriate degree of compatibility will prevail between the architectural quality of the proposed building and the surrounding neighborhood.

The proposed building and site design will improve the relationship to 75th street by moving the building closer to the street and providing a consistent street frontage. This is a similar pattern on sites to the north, as well as sites on the south side of 75th Street just east of this site. This frontage helps frame the corridor with building facades rather than voids and parking areas, creating well- defined public space. Additionally, landscape amenities in association with the building foundations and streetscape will improve the relationship to both 75th Street and Mission Road. The use of predominantly stone and simulated stone materials will create rich natural tones and is compatible with other buildings in the neighborhood. Although ACM is not widely used, it will be in muted colors to compliment the stone and is a high-quality architectural material. The color should be specified to compliment the stone colors, and the glazing tint should also be specified. In general the building includes details to provide depth and texture to the façade, including pilasters, window details and off-set entrance features.

# The plan represents an overall development pattern that is consistent with the comprehensive plan and other adopted planning policies.

The proposed site plan represents an improved development pattern and will be an upgrade to a declining site at a prominent location in the City, and a repositioning of the property to strengthen its current use as office. This is consistent with the comprehensive plan which specifically calls for reinvestment in this area (“Corridor Redevelopment – 75th Street, Section 6 of Village Vision Plan”), identifies strengthening office markets to reduce vacancy caused by aging facilities and sites, and improves the community character by better shaping public space with development.

James Breneman moved the Planning Commission approve the proposed site plan for 7501 Mission Road subject to the following conditions:

1. A final storm water plan be approved by Public Works.
2. That the landscape plan be revised to include:
   1. Replace Red Maple trees with White Oak, Swamp White Oak, Kentucky Coffee Tree; Autumn Gold Ginkgo or other hardy varieties of large landscape trees; or if fall color is desired replace with Sugar Maples.
   2. Low-level plantings for parking lot screening be added on the 75th street edge of the parking area.
3. Sample materials be provided to the Planning Commission for review and approval, and in particular:
   1. The manufactures specifications and quality of the thin clad stone system.
   2. The color and grade of the ACM material.
   3. Specifications on any tinting of the glazing.
4. Any signs for the building shall either be specified by the applicant as to size, location, style and materials, OR shall be submitted as a separate application to the Planning Commission at such time as the sign needs for future tenants is known.
5. Revisit the ADA parking space size requirements to ensure compliance regarding new guidance on accessible spaces.
6. Riff Screen to be a lighter color to match the cornice. Direct staff and the applicant to reconsider the roof screen color. If a lighter screen that better matches the cornice would be less impacting and a better compliment to the building then use that alternate color.

Patrick Lenahan seconded the motion which was voted on and passed by a vote of 5 to 1 with Melissa Brown voting in opposition.

**PC2016-115 Site Plan Approval – Fence**

**7457 Cherokee**

Brian Gordon, Executive Director of Global Montessori Academy, appeared before the Planning Commission to request approval to extend the existing four foot tall black vinyl chain-link fence along Cherokee to include a larger area to the south and an area on the west for a school age playground. The proposal is for an additional 200 linear feet of fence, approximately 4 feet high and matching the current fence material (black vinyl). Mr. Gordon noted there would be two gates, one would be large enough for a riding mower to gain access and the other, near the sidewalk, that would allow truck access.

Mr. Gordon noted the school has grown 30% since opening in 2014 and he has a waiting list for all classes. This has resulted in the need for a larger secure play area.

Mr. Breneman asked if the fence tied into the building. Mr. Gordon replied that it did not.

Patrick Lenahan asked if the fence was inside or outside of the existing tree line. Mr. Gordon responded that it is just inside the tree line on the building side of the trees.

Chris Brewster noted the proposed fence generally meets all other fence requirements in Section 19.44.025. The standards are written assuming more typical lot dimensions and residential uses. This lot has an unusual configuration, making it difficult to determine front, side and rear lots lines. However, Cherokee Drive is arguably the most prominent side of the site and building and has the most direct relationship to the public street. The use of this site and building as a school does present different fencing needs than most other R-1B lots.

Jeffrey Valentino confirmed that if the proposed fence was a decorative fence, it would be in compliance with the city’s code. He feels a decorative fence is more appropriate. The applicant responded they would need to research the cost difference for a decorative fence. Mrs. Wallerstein asked the ages of the students. Mr. Gordon responded 18 months to 12 years old. She would be concerned with a picket fence that children could get caught between the planks and felt the continuation of the black vinyl chain link fence would be safer. Mr. Breneman added that a chain like fence tends to disappear from view, where a solid fence would stand out more. Mr. Brewster added the code’s interpretation of decorative is a fence placed more for aesthetic reasons than a fence designed to contain someone or something.

Mr. Lenahan felt the location of the proposed fence behind the tree line was an appropriate location.

The fence standards allow the Planning Commission, through site plan review, to approve adjustments to the height and location of fences if it “results in a project that is more compatible, provides better screening, provides better storm drainage management, or provides a more appropriate utilization of the site.

The following analysis of the proposed fence was presented:

# The site is capable of accommodating the buildings, parking areas, and drives with the appropriate open space and landscape.

The proposed Montessori School will be within an existing structure and parking and access will be accommodated within the existing north parking lot. This proposal is for better utilization of the open space by expanding the outside play area in association with the existing play area, outside classroom and community garden.

# Utilities are available with adequate capacity to serve the proposed development.

This site is currently served by utilities and they should be adequate to serve the proposed use.

# The plan provides for adequate management of stormwater runoff.

No changes in the existing site are proposed other than accessory play equipment and therefore stormwater runoff will not be affected. If any significant grading is needed for the play equipment, or any impervious surfaces will be placed, the applicant shall be required to get a grading permit, with any necessary drainage studies from Public Works.

# The plan provides for safe ingress/egress and internal traffic circulation.

The plan does not provide any significant changes to ingress and egress and internal traffic circulation beyond the initial site plan approved with the Special Use Permit. The fence does extend across an existing sidewalk to the main entrance on the south side of the lot, affecting pedestrian access.

# The plan is consistent with good land planning and site engineering design principles.

The site plan is proposing expanded outdoor use of the site, and is consistent with a larger institutional use on a large lot in a residential setting. Further, this expansion is to the south of the site and the existing residential uses in the area are across streets from this location, with the closest affected homes across Cherokee to the west (house fronting on Cherokee) and across Belinder to the east (house fronting on Belinder)

# An appropriate degree of compatibility will prevail between the architectural quality of the proposed building and the surrounding neighborhood.

It is not proposed to change the external appearance of the building, but it is an expansion of the fenced area. The fence is proposed to be black vinyl commercial grade, matching the current fencing that exists along the east boundary (Belinder) and the smaller area at the extension of the building to the south.

# The plan represents an overall development pattern that is consistent with Village Vision and other adopted planning policies.

One of the primary objectives of Village Vision is to encourage reinvestment in the community to maintain the quality of life in Prairie Village. The proposed Montessori School is an amenity that sets Prairie Village apart from other competing communities in the metropolitan area.

Patrick Lenahan moved the Planning Commission approve the Site Plan for the proposed fence for Global Montessori Academy at 7457 Cherokee subject to the following conditions:

* 1. That the fence be setback at least 10’ from the property edge on all sides, behind the tree line on Cherokee, except that it may continue on the existing fence line established on the east side along Belinder. Further that the fence extend no further towards the 75th street frontage than the current limits of the Community Garden.
  2. The fence be limited to only 4’ in height.
  3. The fence be black vinyl chain link that matches the current fencing and minimizes the visibility of the fence to abutting property.
  4. That a gate be included at the sidewalk entrance to the site on the southwest side.
  5. Should any of the construction activity from the fence or any associated play equipment require grading or increased impervious surfaces, that a grading plan and any necessary stormwater studies first be approved by Public Works.

The motion was seconded by Melissa Brown and passed by a vote of 4 to 2 with Jonathan Birkel and Jeffrey Valentino voting in opposition.

**PC2016-116 Request for Site Plan Approval – Fence**

**4205 West 64th Street**

Joseph Jimenez, addressed the Commission on behalf of Shaul and Michelle Jolles of 4205 West 64th Street. The applicant replaced a galvanized chain-link fence with a new stained cedar fence with horizontal open slats with two of the finished sides facing inward. The slats are finished and stained on both sides. Mr. Jimenez presented letters from both of the adjacent neighbors supporting the fence as constructed. The lot is a corner lot with the home situated at an angle bringing the rear side corners of the house very close to the property lines and creating a triangular configuration of the rear fenced area. Neither of these locations are very visible from the public street and the greatest impact is on the residential lots to the west and east, which face opposite streets.

Jonathan Birkel asked if the design submitted for approval of the building permit clearly indicated the proposed construction. Mr. Jimenez replied that the contractor replacing the fence was unaware that a fence permit was required for the replacement of an existing fence and did not get a permit. Mrs. Wallerstein noted that fence permits are a standard practice followed in most Johnson County cities. Mr. Jimenez replied that the contractor generally works in The Plaza area and was unaware that a permit was needed when replacing an existing fence. Mitch Dringman noted the error was discovered when the applicant called in for a fence inspection.

Chris Brewster noted that the applicant originally applied for a variance; however, the city’s code allows for the Planning Commission to approve adjustments to fences through site plan approval. He noted that the fence on the side viewed by the public has the finished side on the outside, it is the sides facing the adjacent properties that are in violation. Since this is an exception to the standards through site plan review, and not a variance, the opinions of the affected landowners can be considered as the support for the decision which does not necessarily need to be a hardship or practical difficulty inherent in the property..

Nancy Wallerstein noted that site plan approval is generally prior to the construction of a project. Mr. Breneman expressed concern is granting approval after the fact. Mr. Jimenez replied there was no intent to circumvent the process, the contract truly felt that the replacement of an existing fence in the same location was allowed. He noted that a permit was received for the earlier construction of a deck in the rear yard that has been completed.

Jeffrey Valentino agreed with Mr. Breneman that proper process was not followed in not getting a permit prior to construction; however, he also recognizes the only persons impacted are the adjacent neighbors who have expressed support for the fence as constructed.

Wes Jordan stated intent of the code is to have fences constructed to not negatively impact adjacent properties by having the finished side facing outwards. He also noted that this is one of the ways ownership of a fence is determined when it is unknown. Mr. Dringman confirmed the fence is in compliance in all other terms.

Jonathan Birkel noted that perhaps a decorative feature was added to the outside of the fence facing the neighboring fence to bring this into compliance without requiring the removal and reconstruction of the offending walls. Mrs. Wallerstein agreed and noted that possibly slats could be added to fence that would bring it into compliance. Mr. Birkel suggested possibly an asymmetrical design on the out of the fence.

Patrick Lenahan questioned the reasoning of adding to the exterior of the fence which the neighbors approve as constructed. He does not see any intent on behalf of the applicant to deceive the city. Based on the character of this fence it is clear to determine its ownership. Mr. Jimenez replied they have looked at other options to try to address this.

Mrs. Wallerstein stated she cannot understand why a permit would be pulled by the contractor for the deck, but not for the fence. Mr. Jimenez replied that he was not the contractor who built the fence.

Melissa Brown stated it was a contractor error and noted the fence facing the public was installed correctly. Since the neighbors are supportive of the fence as constructed, she doesn’t see a need to add to it. Mr. Lenahan noted that if the neighbors were opposed to the fence, he would support rejecting the application.

Nancy Wallerstein warned the Commission against setting a precedent.

Mr. Jolles acknowledged a mistake was made in not getting a permit; however, it was not done intentionally noting the earlier permit received for the deck construction. He added that not only do the neighbors support their request for the fence. One of them talked with the contractor about doing the same fence for their property; however, the cost was too high. He added this cannot be easily fixed. The installation cost for the fence was $12,000. This is an improvement to the neighborhood with the approval of the neighbors.

Mr. Brewster’s staff report presented the following analysis of the criteria for approval:

# The site is capable of accommodating the buildings, parking areas, and drives with the appropriate open space and landscape.

This site is capable of meeting all requirements for residential property, although its configuration as a corner lot with an angled building presents a different rear yard fencing configuration in relation to the street than would typically occur. The configuration in relation to adjacent property is typical

# Utilities are available with adequate capacity to serve the proposed development.

This site is currently served by utilities and they should be adequate to serve the proposed use.

# The plan provides for adequate management of stormwater runoff.

No changes in the existing site are proposed equipment and therefore stormwater runoff will not be affected.

# The plan provides for safe ingress/egress and internal traffic circulation.

N/A

# The plan is consistent with good land planning and site engineering design principles.

The intent of the proposed design standards for fences is to improve the appearance of the community with proper relationships of fences to streetscapes, and to avoid any adverse impacts on abutting property from fence design. The proposed fence does not adversely affect the relationship to the streetscape as the fence is not clearly visible and the most visible sides have the finished side out. However, the sections with the finished sides out are along abutting property lines and it could adversely affect adjacent owners.

# An appropriate degree of compatibility will prevail between the architectural quality of the proposed building and the surrounding neighborhood.

Other than as noted above in E., the fence otherwise complies with all design standards and is compatible for the area.

# The plan represents an overall development pattern that is consistent with Village Vision and other adopted planning policies.

N/A

Patrick Lenahan stated that based on the neighbors’ approval of the fence and the orientation of the public side of the fence, moved the Planning Commission approve PC2016-116 for the fence as constructed at 4205 West 64th Street. The motion was seconded by Melissa Brown and voted upon with Melissa Brown, Jonathan Birkel and Patrick Lenahan voting in support and Jeffrey Valentino, James Breneman, and Nancy Wallerstein voting in opposition. With further discussion and with reluctance to approve a fence constructed without a permit in violation of code, recognizing that the actions were the result of an unintentional error on the part of the contractor, and due to the little impact on the public streetscape and support of the affected neighbors, Nancy Wallerstein voted in support of the motion which then passed by a vote of 4 to 2.

**PC2016-117** **Request for Site Plan Approval for Wireless Antenna**

**9011 Roe Avenue**

Chris Brewster presented the application on behalf of the out-of-state applicant representing AT&T for approval to replace three antennas on this existing cell tower location, and accessory equipment associated with the antenna replacement. A structural analysis has been submitted with this application, which indicates that the replacement of this equipment is within the acceptable structural capacity of this facility. The three new antennas which are approximately 24” diameter and 96” long will be similar in appearance to the existing canisters that are already on the pole. The fiber optic cable will be concealed within the pole.

This monopole was approved in 1996 and at that time approval was by Conditional Use Permit. The monopole was approved for a height of 100 feet and Sprint antennas are on the top. In 2004, a Special Use Permit was granted to Cingular (now AT&T) to install antennas at the 90 foot elevation along with equipment cabinets in the compound at the base of the antenna. In 2009, a Special Use Permit was granted to Clearwire to install antennas and equipment cabinets.

Mr. Brewster presented the following review of the criteria for approval:

1. **The site is capable of accommodating the building, parking areas and drives with appropriate open space and landscape.**

The capability of the site to accommodate the equipment compound was addressed in the approval of the Special Use Permit. The proposed improvements will occur on the existing tower and within the existing equipment compound.

1. **Utilities are available with adequate capacity to serve the proposed development.**

Adequate utilities are available to serve this location.

1. **The plan provides for adequate management of stormwater runoff.**

No additional impervious area will be created and therefore a stormwater management plan is not required.

1. **The plan provides for safe and easy ingress, egress, and internal traffic circulation.**

The site utilizes the existing driveway and parking lot for circulation that currently serves it and no changes are proposed.

1. **The plan is consistent with good land planning and good site engineering design principles.**

The details of the overall design of the equipment compound were worked out on the approval of the Conditional Use Permit. The applicant has submitted a structural analysis to confirm that the tower has sufficient capacity to carry the existing and proposed load.

1. **An appropriate degree of compatibility will prevail between the architectural quality of the proposed building and the surrounding neighborhood.**

The tower has been at this location for approximately eighteen years. The tower is located at the Fire Station in a commercial area and has very little impact on surrounding residential areas. All the equipment will be located within the equipment compound. The existing ice bridge will be used. The wiring will be inside the tower. An eight-foot high fence has been installed to provide better screening of the equipment compound.

1. **The plan represents an overall development pattern that is consistent with the comprehensive plan and other adopted planning policies.**

Wireless communications are not specifically addressed in Village Vision. Generally it falls into maintaining and improving infrastructure.

Nancy Wallerstein asked if the applicant was aware of the pending relocation of the fire department from this site. Mr. Jordan responded that the city has become aware that the tower property is not owned by the Fire District, but that the structure has been purchased by AT&T. He added that the Fire District is looking at keeping its location at this site until it is clear what the impact will be of the development of the Meadowbrook Property and Mission Chateau on their call load. It should be noted that after the meeting Mr. Jordan informed the Planning Commission he learned the Fire Department still “technically” owns the land the tower occupies. However; the Fire Department has entered into a perpetual lease agreement with a carrier that limits their ability to sell the property without substantial penalty. Mr. Jordan did provide notification to the Planning Commission of the information.

James Breneman moved the Planning Commission approve PC2016-117 granting approval of the site plan for 9011 Roe Avenue for the replacement of three antennas on the existing wireless telecommunications facility for AT&T subject to the following conditions: 1) that the antennas be installed as shown on the proposed plan dated 04/04/16. The motion was seconded by Jeffrey Valentino and passed unanimously.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

**PC2015-08 Final Development Plan – Mission Chateau**

Rick Jones, with NSPJ Architects, 3515 West 75th Street, appeared before the Planning Commission to review the final exterior materials and design for this project approved by the Commission on March 1, 2016. New photo renderings were presented along with material samples. Mr. Jones noted that some of the cedar has been replaced with stone; the stucco color is browner. He reviewed the specific locations of the different materials on the presented color renderings. The architectural style of the project has moved toward a more double hung craftsman style. The Twin Villas will have a more traditional design. A developer is purchasing all 22 units that will wrap about the senior living complex.

Jeffrey Valentino expressed appreciation to Mr. Jones for coming back to the Commission with the requested color renderings and final material samples. The new design is much clearer and better than that presented in March. Mrs. Wallerstein agreed, noting that she liked the changes presented.

Rick Jones reviewed the proposed construction schedule stating they are looking at a June 14th submittal of building plans for review with a tentative construction start date of July 1, 2016 with anticipated completion the end of 201

Chris Brewster reported that the applicant is currently working with staff on the changes to the final landscape plan. Planning Commission review of this project is essentially complete; however, the applicant will return to replat the property for the Villas prior to construction.

**NEXT MEETING**

The planning commission secretary noted filing deadline for the June meeting is the end of the week. No submittals have been made to date; however, it is anticipated that the Public Hearing on the revised design criteria will be on the June agenda. Mr. Jordan presented an update on progress on that project.

James Breneman presented an update on the meetings with the fire district committee for the design of the new fire station on the municipal complex.

**ADJOURNMENT**

With no further business to come before the Commission, Chairman Nancy Wallerstein adjourned the meeting at 9:10 p.m.

Nancy Wallerstein

Chairman