

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

**PLANNING COMMISSION/
BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS**

February 21, 2006

Commissioners Present: Cowman, McLean, Gage, Head, Rhodes

Others Present: Brian Faust, Amy Barenklau, Brian McCauley, LeAnne Shields, Jim Bracken, Wynndee Lee, Jim Kaup, Russ O'Meara, Stan Hernly, Darrell Spoon, Jack Rowlett, Jr., Mayor Artie Stuteville

Item 1: Consider the minutes for the January 17, 2006 meeting.

Chair Cowman called the meeting to order with the first order of business the consideration of the minutes from January 17, 2006 meeting.

Commissioners Gage and Head moved to approve the minutes with all Commissioners voting in favor.

Item 2: Preliminary/Final Development Plan – Lot 5 of Baptiste Commons: New multi-tenant building (north of Applebee's)

City Planner Brian Faust introduced Darrell Spoon, owner of the property and Stan Hernly to the Commissioners. He then presented the following staff brief and recommendations:

The applicant desires to construct a six (6) unit shopping center on Lot 5 of Baptiste Commons. This lot is located on the north side of Kansas Drive, directly across from Applebee's and east of Subway/H&R Block. *Per the LDO, a Shopping Center is defined as: A group of commercial retail, service, and other commercial uses, located in a single planned unit and having minimal exterior activities.*

There are several 'special' issues with developments within Baptiste Commons. These include:

1> While on-site stormwater detention is not required (the original development sized their enclosed storm sewers to handle the 'developed' runoff), property owners are required to sign a 'waiver' of the right to protest the formation of a future stormwater benefit district associated with improvements along Baptiste and Hedge Lane.

2> There are covenants and restrictions for development in Baptiste Commons. All buildings, usage, landscaping, and modifications to the northern berm must be approved by First Enterprises, Inc., its successors or assigns. Modifications to the berm are an important

consideration to the city as these terms help provide a buffer between the commercial development and residential properties to the north.

DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS

Lot Size: Required: For a shopping center there is a one (1) acre requirement.
Actual: 38,198sf (0.88 acres). Per the note at the end of Table 4.110A of the LDO, *“the minimum lot size for commercial uses shall be waived if all other requirements of the LDO are met and an additional 5% open space is provided”*.

Minimum Open Space: Required: 20%
Actual: 31% (exceeds the ‘5%’ additional needed for smaller lots)

Setbacks:

Street: 25 ft. required/25 ft. provided
Side: 20 ft. required/side setbacks are exceeded (70’+)
Rear: 20 ft. required/rear setback is exceeded (40’)
Parking: 15 ft. required (street)/15 ft. provided
5 ft. required (side)/5 ft. provided

Parking Requirements:

General Retail = 4 spaces/1000sf
Dry Cleaner = 3 spaces/1000sf
Restaurant = 9 spaces/1000sf

Based on the anticipated usage of the individual tenant space (1 restaurant, 1 dry cleaner, and 4 general retail) a total of 35 spaces are required. The development plan contains 35 parking spaces.

Based on parking requirements for a ‘shopping center’ (1 per 200sf) a total of $7200/200 = 36$ spaces are required. As the ‘dry cleaner’ has a drive through, it seems reasonable to reduce their required parking by at least one space – staff is comfortable with the 35 provided.

Minimum size for a parking stall is 9’x20’ - size provided is 9’x20’.
Two ADA parking spaces are required – 2 spaces are provided.

Landscaping:

Street trees: 1 approved 2.5” caliper canopy tree/50 lineal ft. of street frontage
Parking: 1 p.u./18 parking spaces
Lot: 6 plant units/acre
Bufferyard: A 0.6 opacity buffer will be required along the north property to provide required buffering between the Thoroughfare Access district and the adjoining Suburban zoning district (Table 4.110A). The existing berm can be included in the buffer calculation if it remains. In any case, additional measures will be required.

A landscape plan was included as part of the development plan.

Street trees required: 1 per 50' of frontage [$250'/50' = 5$ street trees]. **Number provided = 5.** Street trees are currently shown behind the sidewalk (off the right-of-way). Street trees are typically placed between the back of curb and sidewalk (on the right-of-way) however it is critically important to provide sufficient spacing to access points to prevent interfering with site distance for traffic exiting the development. As the city water main is located between the curb and sidewalk, staff would prefer to leave the trees as shown.

Parking: $35/18 = 2$. A total of **2 plant units** are required.

Lot: Does not include areas covered by building or parking. This equates to [$12,047\text{sf}/43560\text{sf} = 0.28$ acres] x 6p.u./ac = **1.7 plant units** required.

Buffer: Per Table 13.140 of the LDO, a 0.60 opacity buffer is equivalent to a 20' wide bufferyard width with an 8' -100% opaque fence and 2.75 plant units/100lf. This equates to ($315'/100' \times 2.75$) = **9 plant units required.**

There is a fairly significant site constraint that will limit the number of trees planted along both the east and west property lines of this development. Lot 5 of Baptiste Commons has a sanitary sewer main running along the west property line and an enclosed storm sewer running along the east property line.

City staff prefers that larger trees not be planted where they will interfere with the future operation and maintenance of these facilities.

As of this time, staff has not verified the plant unit calculations. Based on our initial check, the northern buffer is close to the required 9 plant units (if 9 – 6' high evergreen trees are included). As it appears the berm will be significantly impacted (reduced in height) by this development, the 5' fence shown on the plans will not be sufficient. As stated above, an 8' fence will be required.

Table 13.110 PLANT UNIT ALTERNATIVES		
PLANT UNIT ALTERNATIVES	SIZE & TYPE OF PLANTS REQUIRED	QUANTITY
STANDARD PLANT UNIT	2.5" caliper canopy tree	1
	1.5" understory tree	2
	3' high shrubs	13
ALTERNATIVE UNIT A*	2.5" caliper canopy tree	1
	1.5" understory tree	1
	6' high evergreen trees	1
	3' high shrubs	11
ALTERNATIVE UNIT B*	1.5" understory tree	2
	6' high evergreen trees	3
	3' high shrubs	7
ALTERNATIVE UNIT C*	6' high evergreen trees	4
	3' high shrubs	15
ALTERNATIVE UNIT D*	2.5" caliper canopy tree	2
	3' high shrubs	3
* Preferred for year-round screen.		
** May be required where visibility is required for automobile operation.		

Signs

In the case of a unified development, one detached ground sign (meeting city size requirements) will be permitted identifying the entire center. One wall sign (meeting city size requirements) will be allowed for each business or commercial establishment. A comprehensive signage plan will be required. The setback for a monument sign is the same as the parking setback. *The development plan shows individual signs for each tenant along with a wall sign naming the shopping center. This would exceed the number of signs permitted. It would be our recommendation to approve the signage as shown if the total coverage of all signs is less than 10%.*

Building Design Standards

Buildings located along Baptiste Drive fall within the 'city entrance area'. All buildings in these areas regardless of the zoning are subject to design review by the Planning Commission. The following building standards shall be applied to the design review of non-residential uses:

- A. **Materials:** Masonry materials including integrally colored textured block, brick and stone with unpainted finishes are required on all street exposures. The use of stucco or

Drainage:

As stated earlier, Baptiste Commons was designed with larger piping to accommodate commercial development without on-site detention. However a 'waiver' on protesting the formation of a stormwater benefit district will be required.

One item not shown on this development plan is current and proposed elevations. These elevations are needed to determine direction of runoff and changes to height of this site. A substantial amount of fill to raise this site will have a negative impact on surrounding properties.

Lighting:

Lighting must be cutoff fixtures and meet lighting standards. A lighting study must be provided to demonstrate compliance. This is especially critical in this area with the proximity of the residential structure immediately north of this development. A photometric study has not been provided at this time.

Recommendation:

Staff recommends approval of the preliminary/final development plan for the proposed shopping center on Lot 5 of Baptiste Commons contingent upon the following:

- 1> Approval of a landscaping plan
- 2> Approval of a lighting plan
- 3> Submittal of site elevations
- 4> Submittal of a 'waiver' of the right to protest the formation of a stormwater benefit district for Lot 5.
- 5> Submittal of documentation from First Enterprises, Inc., its successors or assigns that they approve this development.
- 6> Submittal of building and shingle color samples.

Planner Faust explained the site plan to the Commissioners and discussed the entrances, green space, landscaping and staff's concern about the berm and fencing behind the building used to screen the residential area behind the businesses.

Stan Hernly stated that their intent was to match the berm and fence height to that of Subway. The plan is to have the top of the fence at the same height as the one currently in place behind Subway. Planner Faust was agreeable that it should look uniform.

Commissioner Cowman inquired if city staff had received complaints from the residents behind Subway. Faust indicated that staff had not received any.

Commissioner Gage inquired about the area of the building that was too high, and said he felt it looked nice. Faust indicated that the LDO had actually been changed in the past to allow for a 52-foot height maximum for the hotel construction. Mr. Hernly said he felt that they would be able to change the pitch of the top portion and be able to meet the height regulations.

Planner Faust inquired about the color of shingles that were to be used on the building. Mr. Hernly indicated they planned to match the color of those on Landmark Bank across the street. He indicated that they were aware of plans for this center, as Mr. Spoon has been providing drawings throughout the process. Faust stated that colors are an item that city staff and the Planning Commission view to ensure consistency with other businesses. Mr. Hernly said the shingles would be a dark color, as they want the signs to stand out, not the color of the roof.

Planner Faust stated he would get the developer a letter to sign waiving the right to protest a benefit district.

Commissioner Rhodes asked if the dry cleaning business was the only tenant at this time. Mr. Spoon indicated that he is in discussion with others to rent remaining spots.

Commissioner Gage made a motion to approve the preliminary and final development plan with noted conditions, Cowman seconded the motion. All Commissioners voted in favor.

Planner Faust told Mr. Spoon and Mr. Hernly the Commissions recommendation would be forwarded to the City Council on the following Tuesday. He also reminded them that there is a plan review process before a building permit would be issued.

Item 3: Work Study Session on Proposed Residential Development: Paola's Growth Area – Estate Zoning District

Planner Faust presented the following staff brief:

Mr. Jim Bracken currently owns a tract of land along the north/northwest boundary of our growth area that he would like to develop. The development would consist of ten (10) lots (between 2 and 4 acres) with access from an internal cul-de-sac or an adjacent county roadway.

Developments within our growth area have several options/ways in which to develop. From Article 14 of Paola's Land Development Ordinance (Special Subdivisions):

In addition to normal subdivisions, special subdivisions have been provided that address special conditions that may arise in Paola's Community Growth Area. The Community Growth Area is zoned for urban development. Sewer may be available to these subdivisions or be easily extended, or the site may be so far from sewer that it cannot be extended at a reasonable cost. Special subdivisions permit landowners under special conditions greater choice in developing their land while ensuring the development pattern does not hinder future sewer extensions by creating excessive costs.

The three special subdivisions are defined as follows:

(1) Rural Subdivision. This subdivision provides limited development opportunity where sewer is at least one-half (0.5) mile away and the landowner desires to continue agricultural

operations, house family members, or raise income to supplement agricultural operations. This subdivision permits development at minimal cost while providing access protection along existing streets. The rural subdivision permits a landowner to subdivide off up to four (4) lots from a large tract; these lots are designated the "residential lots". The remaining parcel is designated the "residual lot". The "residual lot" shall be included as part of the final plat for recordation purposes. The "residual lot" shall be used in part for access and as a reserve for future development that promotes sound land use patterns. The "residual lot" shall contain a note alerting the "residual lot" owner of the requirements for development at such time further subdivision on such "lot" is proposed.

As shown on Table 14.110 (next page), the total acreage for Mr. Bracken's property along with the number of lots desired does not meet the requirements for a Rural Subdivision.

Table 14.110 MINIMUM AREA STANDARDS FOR RURAL SUBDIVISIONS	
Number of Lots	Acreage
2	38
3	55
4	75

(2) Staged Development (Septic). This subdivision permits a landowner to divide the land into lots served with septic tanks. However, it requires the lots to be designed in a manner that permits each lot to be further subdivided into suburban sized lots at the time sewer is available. Homes must be located so they do not prohibit further subdivision. Each lot must show a future development pattern capable of subdivision without the cooperation of other lot owners in the development.

This type of development requires that each lot be at least 10 acres and the ability to subdivide in the future is designed into the layout.

(3) Staged Development (Sewer). This subdivision permits land within the Paola Community Growth Area to develop using a small public sewer system in the manner that would otherwise not be possible because the site is too far from City sewer. This subdivision provides the mechanism to design either a temporary septic system with dry sewer lines or a small sewer plant. The development provides full urban services (sanitary sewer, water, and stormwater systems) that will eventually be tied into the urban system. Under this subdivision type, the subdivision lot design is based upon the ultimate availability and usage of all urban services and

utilities; however, the *initial* development may be allowed on individual septic tank and lateral field systems or an acceptable treatment system as approved by the City. Refer to Division 12.200.

Lot requirements are 30,000sf average (roughly ¾ acre) and the staged development (sewer) option is available *only to property annexed into the City of Paola, or property which is subject to an irrevocable consent to annexation*. Mr. Bracken does not desire to be annexed into the city or to have the city maintain the sewer system. From a practical standpoint, there are no current plans to provide city sanitary sewer service west of Bull Creek.

DISCUSSION:

Mr. Bracken provided a drawing and documentation requesting consideration for his proposed development.

Does the proposed development fit under one of the special subdivision classifications?

- 1) **Rural Subdivision**: This development does not meet the requirements for number of lots or total acreage.
- 2) **Staged Development (Septic)**: This development does not meet the 10 acre/lot minimum.
- 3) **Staged Development (Sewer)**: This development does not meet the lot size requirements and is not annexed into the City of Paola.

While there is no ‘decision’ to be made during this work session, Mr. Bracken would like a feel of the Commission on whether they might be willing to change/modify the requirements in the LDO to permit an additional ‘special subdivision’ classification that would permit some additional level of residential development.

Mr. Bracken stated that the County encourages clustering and would like the Commissioners to consider adding an additional classification to the LDO.

Commissioner Rhodes asked if the area had been perk tested for septic systems. Mr. Bracken indicated his property had not, but there were septic systems on both sides of the location. RWD #2 is in the design stage of a step system that he might utilize for the development.

Faust said that Mr. Bracken is trying at this point to determine if the Commissioners were open to a new classification. Commissioner Rhodes asked if the LDO would allow for a deviation from the standards vs. a new subdivision.

Planner Faust said he feels there is a need to place a limit on size, and explained that Mr. Bracken is not looking to develop 100 homes on 2-acre tracts. Mr. Bracken is looking at smaller lots with homes on a tract of land he currently owns. Mr. Bracken stated that most people don’t

want to maintain 10-acre tracts, 2-3 acres is the extent of the ability of most people to maintain. He stated that 3 and 5-acre tracts surround this property.

Faust said that staff would be hesitant to propose this type of development East of Bull Creek, but he does not see the City of Paola growing West of Bull Creek and he did not believe services would be extended that far. Faust felt there was some reason to consider this type of development. He said the purpose of the growth area is to encourage development in the City and growth areas instead of where cities are not able to provide services.

Commissioner Cowman said that the lay of the land does not provide many other options. The lots as proposed are not tiny and the piece of ground does not fit the classifications in the LDO right now. He said he did not have a problem adding a fourth classification. Commissioner Head stated he agreed with Cowman.

Planner Faust said the proposed lot sizes would look similar to Lakeview South. Commissioner Cowman inquired if the new category could be written for areas only where the City probably would never provide services or West of Bull Creek. Planner Faust said that criteria and size limitations would be considered. He will work with Mr. Jim Kaup to determine size limitations and sewer or septic requirements.

Commissioner Head inquired about lots in the flood plain and Mr. Bracken stated some were in the flood plain, but houses would not be built in those parts of lots.

Commissioner Gage said he was not opposed to a hybrid plan. The other Commissioners agreed that they would be interested in looking at a fourth category. Planner Faust said he would work to develop a fourth, hybrid option for rural development.

Mr. Bracken thanked the Commissioners for their time and consideration.

Item 4: Submittal of Paola's Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

Planner Faust presented the staff brief and forms to the Commissioners. A copy of the 2007 – 2012 Capital Improvements Program Calendar (currently runs to 2010) that provides the timeline for consideration and approval of Paola's CIP was supplied to Commissioners. Contained within the calendar is a discussion of the program's goals and objectives.

The second attachment lists the actual projects budgeted in 2006 and the priority list for various projects from 2007 to 2010.

Example of how to interpret the 2007 CIP Projects contained under the General Fund – Streets:

<u>General Fund – Streets</u>	<u>Project Rank</u>	
1 – Industrial Park Drive (Phase 2)	A	Our number one priority and a 'gotta' do

- | | | |
|----------------------------------|---|---|
| 2 – K68 Corridor Access Study | A | Our number two priority and a ‘gotta’ do |
| 3 – Kaskaskia Curb/Brick Project | B | Our number three priority and ‘should’ do |

DISCUSSION:

The Planning Commission should review the 2007 – 2010 Capital Improvement Program and provide comments to staff. This input will be forwarded to the City Manager and the CIP Committee.

Planner Faust gave an overview of the ranking system and asked the Commissioners to forward any comments to him in the next week or two.

Commissioners Cowman and Gage made statements that they did not realize how much maintenance was needed, and it’s surprising at the amount of items that have to be put in a budget. Cowman stated that depending on an individual’s interests a case could be made to prioritize certain items, but there was nothing he disagreed with.

Planner Faust said this process was a learning experience for staff, as well. The Commissioners stated that everyone did a good job on the presentation.

Item 5: Concept Plan for Senior Housing on the City Square

Planner Faust introduced Russ O’Meara, one of the partners in the possible project. He then presented the staff brief. City staff met with owners of a prospective apartment building that may be constructed on the vacant lot located at the northwest corner of the City Square. The clientele for these apartments will typically be senior residents and it is the desire of the applicant to provide well maintained, classic dwelling units, near the Square. The proximity of the apartments to local retailers and restaurants will undoubtedly increase business activity around the square.

Again, this is very preliminary as a final decision by the applicant on whether to proceed has not been made.

There are a number of issues (several fairly significant) associated with these apartments that will need to be addressed and staff felt it important to bring the initial concept plan to the Commission at the earliest date.

Apartment Details:

- | | |
|------------------------------|---|
| Number of Proposed Units: | 28 |
| Maximum allowed per the LDO: | Under Section 3.321, there is a maximum of ‘20’ dwelling units in any ‘Downtown’ development. |
| Number of Floors: | 4 |

Height of the Structure: 41' on Peoria Street with a 51' height on the north end (alley)

Maximum allowed per the LDO: 45' Per the LDO, the building height is determined from the vertical distance as measured from the lowest ground elevation on the building to the highest point on the building.

Parking Requirements: 1 space per dwelling unit (commercial apartment). This will be a huge issue for this development. They are currently planning on creating 5 underground spaces which leaves 23 spaces unaccounted for along with additional spaces for staffing personnel.

Section 15.210 of the LDO contains the standards for new buildings constructed in the Downtown zoning district. The Downtown District contains the City Square, Court House Square, City Hall, and Library. The standards of this district are to maintain the historic image and character of the downtown area and to ensure that new buildings fit into that character. All buildings shall be reviewed during site plan approval by the planning commission for adherence to the following:

- A. **Building Material.** Red brick masonry is the preferred building fascia. Stone and other brick masonry may be approved, provided the building fits into the context of its neighbors and is not a sharp contrast to existing buildings.
- B. **Building Height.** All buildings shall be at least two stories in height. If the use proposed is such that two stories are impractical, then the architecture and street facade(s) should be such that the two-story character of the streets is maintained.
- C. **Architectural Style.** There is no single style that is mandated for the downtown area. However, building elevations should be sensitive to the scale and style of neighboring buildings. Overall window placement, window size, decorative trim or material, and colors should be consistent with the general street face.
- D. **General.** In looking at neighboring structures it should be understood that some older buildings have been degraded with applications of more modern materials over the original building facade. In these cases the Planning Commission may insist on a facade that more closely resembles the original styles, or is in keeping with buildings further down the same street that have preserved their historic character.

DISCUSSION:

From staff's perspective, the biggest issues are:

- 1> Does the Planning Commission feel that increasing the number of dwelling units from 20 to 28 is an insurmountable issue? The applicant needs a minimum of 28 units for the project to be economically viable.

2> Does the Planning Commission feel that measuring the height of the structure from Peoria Street is reasonable?

3> Does the Planning Commission feel that all required parking spaces be identified before any additional planning occurs? *Of all the issues in the Downtown district, staff continues to hear about limited parking on and around the square. If all 23+ cars for this building park in spaces on the square, it will have a negative impact on adjacent businesses.*

Mr. O'Meara said that they want to re-inject the senior community into the center of the community with this project. He said that he and his partners will start investing deeply around March 15th and need to know if the Commission has any concerns.

Commissioner Gage said his ideal location would be closer to a supermarket, somewhere with more parking and a location that was not as loud as the Square. Mr. O'Meara said that some seniors want to be where the action is, where they can walk to restaurants, banks, attorney, shops, view parades and holiday activities. Commissioner Gage asked about parking. Mr. O'Meara indicated he had been in talks with a third party who owns property in the vicinity.

Commissioner Cowman and Head stated they felt the partners would need to get the parking resolved before moving ahead with the project. Mr. O'Meara stated that a similar venue in Council Grove, only approximately 1/3 of their residents have vehicles. Commissioners Gage, Rhodes and Head re-iterated that parking would be a huge issue to resolve.

Commissioner Rhodes said that the LDO looks at tenants and residents as having cars vs. not having cars and this is a huge issue to resolve.

Planner Faust said staff has been working on the issue of parking on the Square and that staff continues to receive calls about parking on the square on an on-going basis.

Commissioner Cowman said that parking should be resolved before moving forward with the project. Planner Faust said that the issues to be resolved are parking, the maximum number of dwelling units and height of the building. The height along Peoria is within limits, but the ground falls away along Silver Street.

Mr. O'Meara inquired about parking on the east side of Silver Street. Faust indicated that parking on Silver would be a big shift in the way the street currently lays out and would be tough to accomplish. He added that there is a lot of foot traffic at that intersection.

Commissioner Gage asked about parking for staff, maintenance personnel, and visitors. Mr. O'Meara stated there would be a manager and assistant manager. Commissioner Gage said it was an interesting proposal and he wished them well.

Item 6: Items from Staff

Planner Faust presented an update on items.

a> Discussion on 295th (Northridge Estates): During their January 10th meeting, the City Council discussed the future of 295th (between Old KC Road and Hedge Lane).

The following is the brief as presented during the Council discussion:

Background

Staff is working with Mr. Dennis Doherty and Allenbrand-Drews & Associates to plat approximately 132 acres immediately north and east of Rockwood Estates (north side of 295th). This development will consist of 253 homes (m/l) and is in the Suburban zoning district.

A major consideration for this property is the future status of 295th Street. During a recent work study session with the Paola Planning Commission, the topic of possible closure of the road was discussed. There are several reasons that the topic of closing a portion of 295th was raised. These include:

- (1) The proximity of the intersection of 295th and Hedge Lane to the at-grade railway crossing. As Paola continues to grow northward, this intersection will experience increased traffic volumes. As Hedge Lane will be a major arterial between K68, the new development to the north, and commercial/USD368 to the south; a new 'underpass' to eliminate the at-grade rail crossing is an improvement that will be needed. The timing for upgrades to the rail crossing are not known (5yrs – 25yrs), however planning for this eventuality does have merit.
- (2) Proximity of buried high pressure gas main to the intersection.
- (3) Flooding conditions (overtopping of 295th) during storm events. This overtopping occurs along the east property line of Rockwood Estates. This is not a new condition however it is a life-safety issue that will become more critical as traffic volumes increase. This high flow also impacts property to the south by creating soggy conditions/ponding water and eroding fairways.

In order for this development to move forward through the platting process, the city needs to provide direction to the developer and his professional engineers on the future of 295th.

Options:

- Option 1: Leave 295th open between Old KC Road and Hedge Lane (no closure – road remains unchanged)
- Option 2: Leave 295th open between Old KC Road and the last residence to the east (this would close the eastern ½ of 295th Street)

Option 3: Leave 295th open between Old KC Road and the entrance to Rockwood Estates (this would result in the closure of the majority of 295th)

The three options are highlighted on the attached drawing.

Issue

Does the City desire to close a portion of 295th between Hedge Lane and Old KC Road in conjunction with the development of Northridge Estates?

Legal Impact

The City Attorney has not been asked to review this issue. The City has spoken with Miami County about possible closure and they are supportive as long as accommodations are made for the existing County residents.

Financial Impact

Any financial costs are not known at this time. If a section of road is closed, it will need to be removed and the area reestablished. There may also be some participation from the city to upgrade the main road in Northridge Estates to accept the increased traffic volumes (some over-width and possible increased pavement thickness).

If 295th remains open, there will be future costs associated with improvements to 295th. These include the acquisition of additional rights-of-way, paving/curb & gutter, and a new entrance once an 'underpass' is constructed. Improvement costs should be assessed back to the adjoining property owners (Northridge and the Country Club)

Alternatives

Three possible options are shown above.

Recommendations

Guidance is needed by staff and the developer/engineer to allow forward movement of the Northridge Estates plat. The City Engineer recommends that 295th be closed (once the main road through Northridge is constructed) east of the 3 residences. Access for these homes will be from 295th (west to Old KC Road) and through Northridge Estates. This option does not land lock the tract immediately east of the County Club.

If the property east of the Country Club does not require access, it is staff's opinion that the section of 295th between Rockwood and the 3 residences be eliminated. This area could be reestablished in grass and/or a retention pond to reduce water runoff and create an amenity for the area.

Action

Discuss the merits of closing a portion(s) of 295th and provide direction to staff.

In the meeting on Tuesday, Mr. & Mrs. Medlen, Mr. & Mrs. Pierce, Mr. Doherty, and a representative from Allenbrand-Drews were in attendance. After an extended discussion, the majority of the Council felt that a possible realignment/closing of 295th (identified as Option 2 – or something similar to this alignment) would be supported by the City. This support was contingent upon talking with the property owners along 295th that may be negatively impacted by changes to the road alignment.

Staff will continue to work with both the developer and the residents/property owners along 295th on this issue. It is staff's strong desire to provide direction to the developer to enable the plat of Northridge Estates to move forward.

b> *Townsend Inc. Update:* *Staff talked with representatives of Townsend Inc. about their plans for the property east of the Miami County Medical Center. Based on this discussion, there are no current plans (from this developer) to develop the property.*

c> *Comprehensive Plan:* Planner Faust turned the floor over to Jim Kaup and Wynndee Lee to talk about the Comprehensive Plan Update. Jim said they were looking for how much the Commissioners would like to partake in the process. He stated that it is very early in the process. A survey is going to be sent out to about half the residents in Paola in the next week. The surveys will provide a great deal of information as they move forward in developing the plan and the responses will be very valuable.

Jim said that is a somewhat long document, but they are legitimate and important questions that will provide the sentiment of the community. He and Wynndee plan to tabulate the results as they get returned from residents. The surveys are completely anonymous.

Commissioner Rhodes inquired about the mechanism for returning surveys. Planner Faust stated that a self-addressed envelope would be provided and could be returned in the water payment drop off box, to City Hall or a stamp could be placed and dropped in the mail.

Commissioner Cowman asked if there would be a cover letter explaining options and Faust explained that there would be.

Jim Kaup provided a sample Table of Contents that they plan to use as a framework or starting point for the process. Commissioner Rhodes inquired about the assessment process, how they reach goals and determine functional areas. Jim indicated that they could attach those types of documents to the goals. Wynndee Lee added that the information is for those who are to carry out the specific goals.

Jim said the comprehensive plan needs to be a fluid document that should be revisited periodically. Constant review is the key to the plan, most jurisdictions look at the plan yearly to keep it current. It was mentioned that it is possible to put in the plan a requirement to update the plan at certain intervals which makes the City responsible for looking at the plan.

Commissioner McLean inquired about input from the growth area. He felt that they should have the ability to give input as they do not have much representation or say in what happens in their area. Planner Faust said they there were plans to have something put in the newspaper encouraging them to fill out the survey and return it. Jim Kaup stated that there is a need to maintain the integrity of the survey, and the need for their input is important.

Wynndee and Jim plan to use the information from the survey as a guide to encourage discussion with groups and as a way to structure meetings. They plan to work with city staff to set up meetings with interest groups, organizations and individuals over the next month.

Jim and Wynndee expressed their desire to have an on-going relationship with the Planning Commission and asked how much participation they desired. Commissioner Gage stated it would be nice to attend meetings, depending on time and length of meetings. All Commissioners indicated it would be nice to be informed of upcoming meetings so they could determine which ones they would be able to attend.

Item 7: Items from the Planning Commission

There were no items at this time.

Item 8: Adjourn

Commissioners Cowman and Head made a motion to adjourn with all in favor.