**PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES**

OCTOBER 3, 2017

ROLL CALL

The Planning Commission of the City of Prairie Village met in regular session on Tuesday, October 3, 2017 in the Municipal Building Council Chambers at 7700 Mission Road. Chairman Nancy Wallerstein called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. with the following members present: Melissa Brown, Gregory Wolf, James Breneman, Patrick Lenahan, Jeffrey Valentino and Jonathan Birkel.

The following persons were present in their advisory capacity to the Planning Commission: P.J. Novick, City Planning Consultant; Wes Jordan, City Administrator; Serena Schermoly, Council Liaison, Mitch Dringman, Building Official and Joyce Hagen Mundy, Commission Secretary.

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

James Breneman moved for the approval of the minutes of the September 12, 2017 regular Planning Commission meeting as presented. The motion was seconded by Gregory Wolf and passed by unanimously.

**NON PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**PC2017-111 Request for Final Development Plan Approval**

**9300 Parkside Drive**

Gregory Wolf stated that his law firm represented VanTrust and that he would therefore need to recuse himself from hearing this application due to a professional conflict of interest and left the meeting.

Justin Duff with VanTrust Realty, 4900 Main Street, Suite 400, Kansas City, Missouri, introduced the following team members in attendance:

Eric Westman with Alley Poyner Macchietto Architect, 1516 Cuming Street, Omaha, NE

Pat Day with DIAL Senior Properties, 11506 Nicholas Street, Omaha, NE

Doug Ubben with Phelps Engineering, 1270 N. Winchester, Olathe, KS

Pat Day provided background on Dial Realty noting that they were formed in 1992 and have communities in Iowa, Omaha and Kansas City. They focus on providing Independent Living, Assisted Living and Memory Care facilities They approached VanTrust because they liked the location, the site, and the demographics of the area. They reviewed the plan presented by VanTrust with its preliminary development plan for the area and feel they can work within the scope of that plan. The proposed project will be called Silvercrest at Meadowbrook.

Justin Duff stated the original senior community plan approved had 330 units of Independent Living, Assisted Living and Memory Care Services. The density of the proposed plan, at full build-out, is less at 222 units which include 60 Assisted Living Units, 20 Memory Care Units and 142 Independent Living Units. The smaller senior living community will be lower in height and provide more green space. The retaining walls proposed and approved in the preliminary development plan will not be needed in some areas and will be reduced in height in other areas and will not be visible from Nall Avenue. Mr. Duff stated the proposed plan remains in spirit with the preliminary development plan approved by the Commission and fits within the vision of the full Meadowbrook development.

Pat Day noted the senior housing center that is proposed will be a total of six (6) interconnected buildings to be constructed in 2 to 3 phases. Buildings 1 through 4 are part of the first phase. Buildings 5 and 6 will follow with future phases. Phase 1 will contain 20 Memory Care Units, 60 Assisted Living Units and 58 Independent Living Units for a total of 138 units. At full build-out, the site will have 102 surface parking spaces and 101 under-building parking spaces and each phase complies with the established parking requirements.

PJ Novick, Planning Consultant for the Meadowbrook Project, stated that he has been working on the development team over the past three months. The proposed plan is not impacted by the 5% rule; this only applies to an increase in the number of dwelling units or building lot coverage allowed from the previously approved preliminary development plan for this facility. The density is lower, the green space is higher and the overall height is lower.

The buildings are proposed to be constructed of a combination of natural stone; full-depth brick, fiber cement lap siding, and fiber cement board & batten siding. The colors range from white to light gray to dark grey. Laminate shingles are proposed for the roof including some areas with gray colored standing seam metal.

The general scale, layout, and drive locations of the proposed senior housing center are consistent with that shown on the Preliminary Development Plan and the buildings comply with the established setback and height limits. The project density is a total of 222 units at full build-out, 118 units less than the 330 units shown on the approved Preliminary Development Plan.

The applicant has provided a concept plan for how they may wish to divide the property into 4 lots for the purpose of financing. It should be noted that the plat has not been reviewed for compliance with city regulations and will require separate review and approval of both a preliminary and final plat.

Project History

On November 12, 2015, the Planning Commission held a public hearing on the requested rezoning of the greater Meadowbrook property to MXD (Mixed Use District) including the related Preliminary Development Plan and Preliminary Plat. The Commission adopted a motion to find favorably the findings of fact based on the “golden factors” as detailed in the Commission report dated November 12, 2015, and recommended to the City Council approval of the requested rezoning and proposed Preliminary Development Plan subject to a set of conditions of approval.

Following the Commission hearing, on December 7, 2015, the City Council reviewed the applications and the Commission recommendation and approved the rezoning and the Preliminary Development. The Final Development Plan for the single family residential and apartment complex component of the Preliminary Development Plan was reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission on March 4, 2016.

As noted with the approval in March of 2016 of the first Final Development Plan for Meadowbrook, Final Development Plans for the senior living center and the hotel would be submitted at a later date.

Mr. Novick noted there are no outstanding issues and the proposed Final Development Plan is consistent with the approved Preliminary Development Plan. The applicant will need to submit a separate application for approval of a Preliminary Plat and subsequent Final Plat if they wish to subdivide this property. The proposed parcel lines shown in the Final Development Plan have not been reviewed for compliance with the City Code and all requirements must be met.

Staff recommends the Commission approve the Final Development Plan, subject to the following conditions which were reviewed by Mr. Novick:

1. The brick and stone building exterior shall not be painted and appropriately scaled trim shall be provided along all window edges and wall transitions.
2. An ornamental or decorative style garage door shall be utilized for the opening proposed for Building #5.
3. Prior to issuance of any building permits, the applicant shall update the Final Development Plan to detail the location of exterior light fixtures, excluding building mounted, and provide fixture sheets for the parking lot lighting.
4. Prior to issuance of any building permits, the applicant shall provide engineered design calculations and plans for all retaining walls exceeding 4 ft. in height. Mr. Novick noted the preliminary development plan had the retaining walls rising above the grade with the condition added that the retaining walls along Nall were to be constructed of or faced with a natural stoned. The proposed retaining walls will not be visible from Nall. They can only be seen from the interior of the site.
5. Prior to issuance of any building permits, the applicant shall update the Final Development Plan to include details for the trash enclosure and screening methods for all HVAC/building mechanical equipment to ensure that all trash dumpsters, recycling bins, HVAC and building mechanical equipment, etc., is fully screened from view. All screening shall be designed and constructed of materials that are durable and consistent and compatible with the building architecture.
6. Prior to issuance of any building permits, the applicant shall update the Final Development Plan to show the following minimum required tree sizes: shade trees 3-inch caliper, ornamental trees 3-inch caliper, and evergreens 8’ height.
7. Prior to issuance of any building permits, the applicant shall address any outstanding City comments, including Public Works and Fire Department comments, provide updated plans, obtain approval of the storm water management plan, and verify compliance with emergency vehicle circulation requirements.

Eric Westman presented a color rendering of the proposed complex pointing out the efforts made to make the proposed building compliment the apartment building and other construction within the project. He noted that the buildings have been moved further from the homes on the north side. The taller portions of the buildings will be on the right and the south side. The garages will be located under the buildings. He pointed out the location of the different buildings providing Memory Care and Assisted Living services.

Mr. Westman reviewed the location and change in height of the retaining walls as pointed out by Mr. Novick noting they are only visible from the interior of the project. They are proposing two large monument signs (one visible from Nall and one at their entrance) a smaller monument sign near the main building with monument type way finding signs identifying parking. All signs will be stacked stone-faced look or masonry veneer with precast stone top cap, similar in design with other signs within the development.

The Independent Living buildings have an open view of the park. The Assisted Living building and Memory Care building have internal courtyards. Mr. Westman explained how they parcel out sections of land to accommodate their phased development.

The building materials to be used include standing seam roofing (gray), architectural asphalt shingles, and fiber cement lap siding dark grey in color, fiber cement lap siding light grey in color and fiber cement board and batten system in white. The full bed masonry to be used is Antique Grey matching that of the apartments located on site and the main features will be full bed natural stone. Mr. Westman stated that they would like the Commission to reconsider staff recommended condition #1 prohibiting the painting of brick. They would like to paint the entry brick white to make the accent features “pop out”. He noted that painting of brick is allowed in the project vision book.

Mr. Westman reviewed the proposed light fixtures which will be dark bronze in color and include an oversized custom chandelier in the entry area, with wall sconces as accent lighting on the corners of the buildings. Pathway lighting and Parking lot lighting are similar to those already approved for the development.

Pat Day reviewed the locations of the different service components with the Memory Care section being a one-story building with 20 units facing 95th Street. The Assisted Living section is in a three-story building with 60 units facing Nall. The phase one independent building is a four-story building with 58 units facing the park on a platform garage. The phase two and phase three buildings will be for Independent Living. Building 5 is a four-story building with 52 units just north of the initial complex and Building 6 is a four-story building with 32 units south of the initial complex facing the park.

James Breneman stated he is bothered by the lack of skilled nursing services in the community. The original plan presented did include skilled nursing which has been a demonstrated need for this area based on the waiting list for Claridge Court skilled nursing facilities. Pat Day responded that residents are provided rehabilitation services within their units. Mr. Breneman stated he is not referring to rehabilitation, but ongoing skilled nursing care. He feels its omission is letting the community down. Nancy Wallerstein asked why this component was not included. Mr. Day responded that Dial Properties does not offer skilled nursing services in any of its communities. Justin Duff stated that it was included in the original plan based on a possible market demand. It was approved to be included, but not required to be included.

Jonathan Birkel asked what the HVAC operating system was. Mr. Westman replied that it would be a boiler system with pipes and the Independent Living units would use heat pumps. He stated that all of the operating units will be placed on the rooftop and would not be visible to the public; showing the locations on the elevation drawings. Mr. Birkel confirmed that on the east elevation the roof will need to be lowered to drop in the mechanical units. Mr. Westman replied the internal deck is three feet lower for the mechanical units.

Jim Breneman noted the elevations reflected a lot of brick. Mr. Westman stated that is the primary building material for the community. Mrs. Wallerstein asked if the applicant had a materials board that that the Commission could see. They did not. Mr. Breneman noted the plans submitted contained three different brick base materials.

Jeffrey Valentino expressed concern with the consistency of the proposed signs. Mr. Novick replied the materials used are similar to those throughout the development and he feels they will blend in with the others and meet the intent of the previous approval. Mr. Valentino stated he would like to see them be more like the others. Mr. Novick stated this could be reviewed further, particularly for the internal signage.

Mr. Valentino requested a review of the elevation heights noting that this was an area of significant discussion in the initial approval. Mr. Westman provided the following heights from ground to roof: Independent Living building – 66’6”; Assisted Living building – 56’6”; Commons roof – 36’; Memory Care Building – 26’2” and the highest point over the garage is 84’. The highest point on the original submittal approved was over 90 feet. All of the elevations are lower than what was approved in the preliminary development plan approval.

Jim Breneman noted the retaining wall shown on the south elevation has a fence. Mr. Novick replied that if there is no walkway adjacent to the wall a fence is not necessary. He did note the preliminary plan approval condition requiring limestone on any retaining walls exposed along the Nall right of way could be added to the final plan conditions of approval.

Jim Breneman asked if the fire department had reviewed the plans. Doug Ubben with Phelps Engineering stated the plans were sent to the fire district and that they are continuing to work with them. Mr. Novick noted that fire department concerns with the original submittal should be alleviated with this reduced building footprint and he does not anticipate any issues. Mr. Breneman noted there is no fire hydrant shown in the future development locations and suggested that they be added with the phase 1 construction.

Mr. Breneman stated the plans show a slope of 25% and questioned how that would be maintained. Mr. Ubben stated the slope was 20-23% and was considered mowable. Mr. Novick added that standard equipment can mow slopes up to 3:1 (33%).

Jonathan Birkel confirmed the project is designed with cohesive walls creating a strong structural stability.

Patrick Lenahan questioned the elevation on the Independent Living building and how it would screen the mechanical units. He wants the units screened and feels the depicted roofline does not accurately reflect the mechanical screening as it would be He does not want to see sections of the roof removed where mechanical wells are provided.

Nancy Wallerstein asked how many underground parking spaces were provided and if they were for residents only or both residents and staff. Mr. Day replied there are 65 spaces for use by the residents. He showed the location for staff parking in the southwest corner of the complex. Mrs. Wallerstein asked how many employees were anticipated and what that number would be at its peak. Mr. Day responded 80 to 90 employees with a maximum of 30 at any one time. Mr. Breneman asked about shift changes. Mr. Day stated that everyone does not shift change at the same time. Mrs. Wallerstein noted the southwest lot only had 30 spaces.

Jonathan Birkel asked how much parking was planned for the 60 Assisted Living units. Mr. Day replied no parking is planned for residents; however, 52 spaces are available for guests. He stated the parking is based on their experiences at their other communities which have been consistent. Mrs. Wallerstein asked where the overflow on holidays would park. Justin Duff stated that parking would be available on the street within the development. Mr. Birkel confirmed that street parking is parallel parking.

Nancy Wallerstein asked about trash procedures. Doug Ubben referred to the back entrance area for the residents and pointed out two areas where several small dumpsters will be pulled out for pickup from the garage. The larger bins from the kitchen will be located within the enclosures on the south side of the development. Melissa Brown asked how trash would be handled in area 5. PJ Novick responded that they will have to be pulled to the identified areas. All trash will be screened. Justin Duff noted that all service traffic will enter off 94th Terrace and Rosewood.

Patrick Lenahan noted that parking shown on sheet C-1 calculations only deal with the phase 1 construction, what happens in phase 2 to accommodate parking. Mr. Westman replied those buildings will have underground parking and will have additional parking available to the north. Based on their experience, they do not believe that these will be needed. Mr. Lenahan suggested that they be added to the calculations to ensure that they are available. Jonathan Birkel asked how many parking spaces were allotted per Independent Living unit. Mr. Day responded 1.5 spaces. Nancy Wallerstein noted the future parking lot abuts the townhomes. Mr. Duff stated that there is a buffer between the townhomes and the parking lots that they are comfortable with.

Eric Westman noted the future units require 56 parking spaces and 57 spaces are provided by the garages along with the 22 available in the lot. Their goal is to accommodate all residential parking in the garage.

Jonathan Birkel asked what the average age of residents in Independent Living was. Pat Day replied 84 -85 years old.

Mr. Breneman suggested that they construct the future parking lots during phase 1 so they do not have to disrupt the area in future phases.
Mr. Day responded that their experience has shown there is not a need for lots of parking. They do not want empty parking lots, so although they plan for them, they do not want to construct them until the need is demonstrated.

Nancy Wallerstein asked for a time frame for phase 2 and 3. Mr. Westman replied that it will be after phase 1 is built-out and stabilized. Construction of phase 2 and 3 will be market driven.

Jonathan Birkel stated that he was uncomfortable with the use of streets in the residential area for overflow parking. Mr. Day responded that in their 12 other communities they have not had any need for overflow parking.

Justin Duff noted the need to be careful not to design to an overflow condition. Mrs. Wallerstein noted that less asphalt is always good, but they are just trying to think through possible situations/problems. Mr. Birkel stated that based on the average age of their residents, he feels that the parking is sufficient. Mr. Breneman noted the additional staff required for phase 2 & 3 buildings could create a need for more parking.

PJ Novick stated that a condition could be added when phase 2 and 3 are constructed if additional parking is needed the Building Official can require it. Mr. Duff noted that if their past experience doesn’t hold true, there will be indications that additional parking is needed.

Nancy Wallerstein stated that she is looking for contrast on the buildings. Mr. Westman noted the darker colors surrounding the windows, doors and gutters. There will be textural changes providing contrast. They are asking to be allowed to paint the brick white to help those contrasts to pop out.

Jonathan Birkel confirmed that it would all be type 5 construction except for the garages.

Jeffrey Valentino asked for the ratio of full balconies on units. Mr. Westman stated he did not know the ratio, but noted that the Assisted Living building does not have full balconies.

Melissa Brown expressed concerns with the grading coming off from Nall storm water may flow directly toward the building. She feels the grading could be used to direct more storm water to the north away from the building. Mr. Westman noted that the city has the most intense stormwater review process that he has seen. Doug Ubben reviewed the mechanisms in place to divert the water including swales and drainage piping directing the water away from the building. The drainage system is designed to address the 100 year storm.

Melissa Brown questioned the layout of the one story Memory Care building. She expressed concern that one third of the units are looking out over the service area with only 25% of the units looking out into the courtyard. Mr. Lenahan noted these residents are unlikely to be concerned with views from their units. Mr. Breneman note similar layout for the Assisted Living area. Pat Day responded they are very focused on the atmosphere created for their clients. They will be adding landscaping around the building outside of windows. Their courtyards will be impressive.

Chairman Nancy Wallerstein asked for last part of the applicant’s presentation on the civil engineering features.

Doug Ubben noted that many of these features have been addressed through Commission questions. He reviewed how the plan proposed handles the large drop in grade from Nall. The maintenance access from the southeast corner is consistent with the preliminary development plan approved. Mr. Ubben verified that fire hydrants will be added.

Jonathan Birkel confirmed that no on site storm drainage retention is needed. Mr. Ubben reviewed how the three ponds in the development will address storm drainage issues and how the water from the site will be treated.

Mr. Ubben pointed out the monument sign location along Nall.

Mrs. Wallerstein noted that she has five additional conditions written down from the discussion of the Commission regarding the application. Mr. Novick stated he had four and read his four. Mrs. Wallerstein noted her fifth was regarding the location of the directional sign being placed closer to the monument signs by Mr. Valentino. Mr. Valentino stated he did not feel that needed to be a condition of approval.

PJ Novick stated that applicant is requesting permission to paint the brick white on the one-story entry to the commons building to create a greater contrast, which is allowed by the vision book approved for the development.

Melissa Brown stated that she doesn’t like painted brick. Justin Duff stated there will be homes constructed in the development that will that will want to have stucco over the water table and painted homes will be in the fabric of the development.

Mrs. Wallerstein polled the Commission on the question of keeping condition number 1 as recommended by staff with the majority of the Commission desiring to keep condition one.

Patrick Lenahan moved the Planning Commission approve PC2017-111 the Final Development Plan for Silvercrest at Meadowbrook, 9300 Parkway Drive subject to the following conditions of approval:

1. The brick and stone building exterior shall not be painted and appropriately scaled trim shall be provided along all window edges and wall transitions.
2. An ornamental or decorative style garage door shall be utilized for the opening proposed for Building #5.
3. Prior to issuance of any building permits, the applicant shall update the Final Development Plan to detail the location of exterior light fixtures, excluding building mounted, and provide fixture sheets for the parking lot lighting.
4. Prior to issuance of any building permits, the applicant shall provide engineered design calculations and plans for all retaining walls exceeding 4 ft. in height.
5. Prior to issuance of any building permits, the applicant shall update the Final Development Plan to include details for the trash enclosure and screening methods for all HVAC/building mechanical equipment to ensure that all trash dumpsters, recycling bins, HVAC and building mechanical equipment, etc., is fully screened from view. All screening shall be designed and constructed of materials that are durable and consistent and compatible with the building architecture.
6. Prior to issuance of any building permits, the applicant shall update the Final Development Plan to show the following minimum required tree sizes: shade trees 3-inch caliper, ornamental trees 3-inch caliper, and evergreens 8’ height.
7. Prior to issuance of any building permits, the applicant shall address any outstanding City comments, including Public Works and Fire Department comments, provide updated plans, obtain approval of the storm water management plan, and verify compliance with emergency vehicle circulation requirements.
8. Any retaining wall extending above grade and visible from the Nall right-of-way shall be veneered with native limestone to match the color, texture and pattern of other limestone elements within the development.
9. Prior to issuing a Building Permit the applicant shall ensure that the required fire hydrants are provided within the project site for Phase 1. In addition, future phases of the development shall also include the required fire hydrants within the NE quadrant of the project site.
10. Where mechanical wells are required to screen HVAC equipment, a continuous ridgeline shall be provided to complement the structure.
11. When Phase 2 and Phase 3 plans are submitted for Building Permit the parking requirements shall be reviewed by the Building Official and any additional parking required shall be included in the plans.

The motion was seconded by Melissa Brown and passed by a vote of 6 to 1 with Mr. Breneman voting in opposition because of the lack of the skilled nursing component.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

There was no Other Business to come before the Commission.

**NEXT MEETING**

The filing deadline for the November Planning Commission meeting is Friday with at least two applications expected to be submitted.

**ADJOURNMENT**

With no further business to come before the Commission, Chairman Nancy Wallerstein adjourned the meeting at 8:30 p.m.

Nancy Wallerstein

Chairman