

Nicki	Adams	<p>Sent: Friday, August 02, 2013 6:58 PM To: Joyce Hagen Mundy Subject: Mission chateau</p> <p>I am writing in support of the Mission Chateau Senior Living Residences in Prairie Village. Mission Chateau will bring the highest quality senior living lifestyles to the residents of Prairie Village. The project is designed to meet all the standards and guidelines proposed by the city staff, the planning commission and the comments by the community at large. The project is consistent with the "Village Vision", the City's master plan, adopted by the City Council in May, 2012 - for our location at 8500 Mission road.</p> <p>As Prairie Village demographics change the need for senior living is greater now than ever and will continue to grow substantially in the years to come. Prairie Village does not have anyrental senior living villas or Independent Living Apartments and is woefully deficient in quality private occupancy assisted-living, memory care and skilled nursing. Mission Chateau will bring all the services together in one community, while offering the public at large, four spacious parks on over 5.3 acres green space, more than 1.2 miles of walking trails to be shared between our residents and the community, a beautifully enhanced streetscape fronting Mission road, substantial economic benefits and many other benefits including improved storm water, traffic etc.</p> <p>We support this project 100%. As a matter of fact we have a our eye on a house that backs up to the project and we just found out someone else has looked at the home as well; the house isn't even on the market. The owner is 94 and there are people waiting in the wings to bid on her house. The oppositions complaints of resale issues are simply not true.</p> <p>Regards, Nicki Adams 4306 w 89 street</p> <p>Sent from my iPhone</p>
Bill	Barr	<p>Sent: Tuesday, August 06, 2013 1:31 PM To: Joyce Hagen Mundy Subject: THE CITY PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION</p> <p>As I looked over the packet for tonight's meeting, I did not see a copy of my June 1st e-mail and wanted to be sure that you were aware of my feelings and concerns about the proposed Mission Chateau Development. Having sat through the process, I still do not feel that the developer has fully addressed the concerns of the neighborhood. The size has increased to 358,040 square feet from 351,240 square feet since the July work session; the Skilled Nursing/Memory Care building remains unchanged; I don't feel the traffic and parking issues have been fully resolved; and a proposed 9% reduction of a "massive" project, is still a "massive" project, that, because of the nature of the units, does not really directly benefit the residents of Prairie Village. If the Commission feels that the city would benefit from a retirement/assisted living community, than the size should be reduced to more appropriately fit into the acreage and the neighborhood. It would be the second largest senior living</p>

		<p>facility behind Lakeview that sits on 100 acres and is surrounded by commercial developments, and highways and not a quiet residential neighborhood. I think the area would benefit more from affordable residential housing in that area or a school for the growing number of new young families to Prairie Village. I know you have heard similar views from many of my neighbors, with compelling reasons and appropriate arguments, to not approve this project. We hope that you listen to our concerns. Thank you— Bill Barr</p> <p>Bill Barr & Kim Rock 8600 Delmar Lane Prairie Village, KS 66207 bill@billbarr.com</p> <p>From: Bill Barr Sent: Saturday, June 01, 2013 2:46 PM To: cityclerk@pvkansas.com Subject: My opposition to the proposed Tutera development of Mission Chateau</p> <p>I want to formally voice my opposition the the proposed Tutera development of Mission Chateau on the former Mission Valley School Property. Let the records show that throughout this planning comment period I have voiced my opposition to this development, and have sent e-mails to the Mayor and each member of the City Council to voice my opposition to the development.</p> <p>Thank you, Bill Barr 8600 Delmar Prairie Village, KS 66207 bill@billbarr.com</p>
Stephanie and John	Beeder	<p>Sent: Monday, August 05, 2013 10:02 AM To: Joyce Hagen Mundy Cc: Ashley Weaver; Dale Warman; Steve Noll; Ruth Hopkins; Michael Kelly; Andrew Wang; Laura Wassmer; Brooke Morehead; David Morrison; Charles Clark; David Belz; Ted Odell; Mayor Subject: Mission Chateau</p> <p>Members of the Planning Commission:</p> <p>We sent a formal letter of opposition to the proposed development of the Mission Chateau at the former site of the Mission Valley Middle School on June 2, 2013 (copy included below)</p> <p>Since that time we have attended the additional planning meetings and heard the adjustments that the developer has made to his plans. In short, it appears he is unwilling to make the type of significant changes that would please the concerned neighbors and it appears that once he makes changes on the plans he can revise them later leaving the residents not sure what the final plan will be.</p> <p>The points we made in our June letter are still very relevant as none of these</p>

issues (size, scale, density, large capacity nursing center, and community need) has been addressed in a meaningful way. Rather than relist all of the relevant facts about the plan that are concerning, we would like to bring the following questions forward for you to discuss and answer amongst the Planning Commission before you vote on the proposed plans for the Mission Chateau.

Before I pose the questions, I would like to call your attention to what I thought was the most profound public comment made during the past months.

It came from a young father of two who recently purchased a home on the east side of Mission Road close to this property. He said that when you look for neighborhoods to live in you ask yourself are there good schools in the area, not are there good senior centers in the area. It caused me to think that is what is wrong with what is happening in Prairie Village. The city has the same number of school age children the day before the Shawnee Mission school district decided to close an elementary and middle school as it did the day after that decision was made. It is a shame that the city could not attract more schools into the area which would bring more young families into the neighborhoods. Instead, the city has approved another senior center, Benton Place, and is now considering a senior campus with the Mission Chateau project.

1) If the Mission Chateau had been built as proposed in 1960, do you think the neighborhoods of Corinth Meadows and Town & Country in Prairie Village or in Leawood would have been developed?

2) Would each member of the Planning Commission sign a written statement that they or any member of their family will not be financially rewarded by the development of the Mission Chateau as proposed by the Tutera Group and would you insist that every member of the city council and the mayor do the same? If not, would you have that member recuse themselves from the vote.

These two questions are key in that it sums up the reason for the neighbor's concerns, they bought their homes next to an appropriate buffer (school property) to the nearby commercial areas. They were there first and the development that Mr. Tutera has proposed dramatically changes the nature of the neighborhood. The second question is key for the residents of the city to have trust and confidence that our elected and appointed officials are free to make objective decisions in the best interest of the citizens.

Thank you for your time and attention,

Sincerely,
Stephanie and John Beeder
8428 Delmar Lane
sfbeeder@aol.com

Copy of June 2 email:

Let the record show that we have voiced our opposition to this development by copy of this e-mail to the Mayor and City Council members.

		<p>Members of the Panning Commission:</p> <p>We have been following the communications about the proposed development of the Mission Chateau at the former site of the Mission Valley Middle School. We are opposed to the developer's plan as presented to the Planning Commission on May 27, 2013 for the following reasons.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The size, scale and density of the proposed buildings is too large for an 18 acre tract of land. The proposal is to develop 22,000 square feet of building per acre, when the surrounding residential real estate has approximated 6,000 square feet of building per acre. The surrounding Homes Associations also have tight restrictions of maximum roof height and the percentage of maximum roof height per acre, both of which the developer has exceeded. • The inclusion of a 100 bed Skilled Nursing Facility on the site is inconsistent with the reasonable needs of the residents at the Chateau, thereby making this facility a magnet for skilled nursing needs for patients from all area hospitals as they are discharged. What you are considering here is a <u>hospital</u> in a residential zone. • The city already has numerous senior living options that offer everything from independent, assisted living, skilled nursing units and memory care. It is up to the Planning Commission to decide whether this proposal versus any other option is what fits best with Prairie Village needs. • The number of residents/beds planned for the Chateau is large. The developer's proposal calls for approximately 450 senior living spaces in the 18 acre tract. If you think the city needs more senior living, do you really want to see 25 of them living on each acre? <p>We have owned two different properties in Prairie Village for 20 years, we moved to Prairie Village for two reasons, first it had the high school we wanted our children to attend and second it has many neighborhood homes associations which effectively protect their home owners from excessive development. When we purchased our current home in 2003, we were very excited to remodel and improve the look of the property within the Homes Association and city guidelines. We never dreamed that we might be starring at the back of a two story hospital from our front porch.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and consideration.</p> <p>Sincerely, Stephanie and John Beeder 8428 Delmar Lane sfbeeder@aol.com</p>
Janice	Benjamin	<p>Sent: Monday, August 05, 2013 9:43 AM To: Mayor; Joyce Hagen Mundy Subject: Tutera Development on Mission Road</p> <p>Dear Mayor and City Clerk,</p> <p>I am writing to you to express my support for the proposed Mission Chateau</p>

		<p>senior living residences being considered for the former Mission Valley Middle School site.</p> <p>I live just off 102nd and Mission Road and pass this property many times each day. I believe the proposed use for this property is realistic and will provide an important service to seniors and their families, who enjoy living in our area. Having had a loved one at Claridge Court at Somerset and Mission for many years, I see these developments and their benefits as very similar.</p> <p>I appreciate how the Tutera Group has listened to the needs of our community and how it has modified its plans in response to those concerns. I see a number of positive benefits to our community should this development be allowed to move forward. One of those benefits is that aging Prairie Village residents won't have to leave our city when it is time to transition to a senior living community. Another benefit that I see would be the sales tax generated from the construction and the ongoing real estate taxes that will assist in the revitalization of the city now and for years to come. The development will provide parks, walking paths, and beautiful improvements to the neighborhood, particularly the improvements along Mission Road.</p> <p>I believe a vocal minority has been doing most of the talking up to this point. I just wanted to be sure to register my strong vote of support for the project.</p> <p>Sincerely, Janice Benjamin 4000 w. 101 Terrace OP, KS 66207</p>
Michelle	Crist	<p>Subject: Mission Chateau Retirement Community at vacant MVMS site Date: Mon, 5 Aug 2013 07:32:13 -0500</p> <p>Dear City Clerk and Council Members Ward 5,</p> <p>I am in favor of the Tutera Group Mission Chateau Retirement Community at the vacant middle school site. I feel this project should move forward as quickly as possible.</p> <p>It is simply a small minority of people who are the most vocalized. They do not represent all of Prairie Village--they just have the most time to put forth the effort to be heard. This site has been vacant for years now. Let's not forget what has happened to many vacant school sites in our neighboring Kansas City....these sites become run-down and vandalized. It can happen here...PV is not immune to such things.</p> <p>It is my opinion that this small minority of people (the same group that has posted offending red signs all over the area protesting Mission Chateau) has unrealistic expectations. The site has been zoned mixed residential. It was sold a couple of years ago or so as mixed residential. It was not sold with the expectation that it would become a city park. If that was the city intent then the school district would have not sold it to a private entrepreneur. Meanwhile, the Tutera Group has waited years to develop the site.</p> <p>The plans for this new Retirement Community are lovely. It will offer parks and walking paths as well as improving Mission Road, storm water control and generating sales tax and real estate taxes for the city. This area will not become a school again...and this small city has plenty of parks...which do not generate much, if any, revenue for the city. The population of Prairie Village</p>

		<p>does not warrant another school. I feel that the city needs an independent senior living community, offering quality private occupancy assisted-living, memory care and skilled nursing.</p> <p>It's time to think of what's best for the City of Prairie Village. Allowing this site to sit vacant due to the whims of a few citizens wishing for another school or park is not realistic. This site has already been sold to Tutura Group who is ready to move forward with a beautiful plan for an independent senior living community. It is time to move forward.</p> <p>Sincerely, MR Crist, Prairie Village resident</p>
David	Feingold	<p>Sent: Tuesday, August 06, 2013 12:52 PM To: info@pykansas.com Cc: David Feingold Subject: ZONING HEARING MISSION CHATEAU</p> <p>My name is David Feingold and I have been a resident of Prairie Village for over 25 years. I currently live in a typical Prairie Village split and hope to stay there for at least another ten years. However, when I can no longer climb all of the stairs I am happy to know that there will be a facility right here in my neighborhood that will give me some options.</p> <p>I patronize the stores, parks and other city facilities and think that this addition to community will continue to enhance the lifestyle changes that are becoming the new demographic.</p> <p>Mission Valley school closed because of the shift of population base. When it operated as a school, the streets were busy, there was traffic, but that is made the neighborhood and the entire community desirable.</p> <p>As our population continues to age, there needs to be provisions and options so that we can stay in our own community and not be forced to move elsewhere to a completely new environment.</p> <p>Also, Tutura Group is one of the premier developers in the area. They are not from out of the area, and have a real stake in the community, as their offices are located less than 3 miles from this site. Their other facilities are run in an excellent manner, and the Atriums is one of the premier developments in the area for assisted living and elder care.</p> <p>I am not there yet, just getting ready to turn 64, but I am comforted to know that when the time comes, I can still live right here in Prairie Village.</p> <p>David Feingold 8004 Juniper David @dylanjagger.com</p>
Donna	Fischgrund	<p>Sent: Sunday, August 04, 2013 3:25 PM</p>

To: Joyce Hagen Mundy
Subject: ATTENTION TO: THE CITY PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION (Aug. 6 meeting)

The City Planning and Zoning Commission

To Whom It May Concern:

I have been out of town or I would have gotten this to you earlier. I attended the "neighborhood community meeting" conducted by Mr. Tutera on July 11th. And I must say that it was a very frustrating meeting. We as a community clearly voiced our concern about the size and density of Mr. Tutera's plan, yet again. Yet, he appears determined NOT to hear us. We are most definitely not enthused with his plan!

From the beginning, the neighborhood has said the buildings are too many, too massive and too tall. It is simply too large for the site. When Mr. Tutera was asked directly if he would consider reducing the 3 story buildings to 2 story buildings his answer was no and then added that they would be as tall as the 3 story ones even if he did. When asked if he would consider significantly reducing the building size to a previous recommendation, his answer was no. Those answers do not demonstrate a desire to work with the neighborhood. In fact, it is definitely an example of a developer NOT working with the community!

When another neighbor tried to explain why we have taken the position we have, he interrupted and said, "Is there a question in there?" He then proceeded to lecture us for 20 minutes. When I pointed out that this was also supposed to be a chance for him to hear the neighborhood position, his reply was that "it is a question and answer session." He would then proceed to talk and limit our ability to voice our position.

The neighborhood has been accused of not cooperating with the developer but we feel he has made no real effort to cooperate with the neighbors! We have had the same message from the beginning. IT IS TOO BIG! He has no intention of reducing it in any significant manner.

I have heard the comment floating around that Mr. Tutera has a right to do what he wants; after all he owns the property. Mr. Tutera does not live in our neighborhood, he does know our community, he has not spent his life time keeping up our homes and paying our mortgages. He real goal, no matter what he espouses, is to make a profit. He has more than exhibited this with his unwillingness to reduce the size of this development. Why is his ownership of a property more important than our property rights?

During one of the many meetings that I have attended on this matter, the Planning Commission spent a considerable amount of time questioning a gentleman about the height of his roofline on a new construction home he wanted to build and about how his neighbors felt about it. At the time, I was relieved because I thought, if the Commission was that concerned about a few inches of his roofline, they will never let a development of this size be built in this residential neighborhood. Yet, when Mr. Tutera came back with a paltry reduction in his plan, I was shocked at how overjoyed the Commission appeared and how there was not one difficult question asked of him. What about those of us who live in this area and have spent our lives keeping up our homes and taking care of our neighbors and neighborhood? When I heard the Commission grilling the gentleman about his roofline on a private home, I thought, well the Commission really cares about us and our community. But at every meeting I've attended that concerns this Tutera development, I feel an unspecified impatience with our position. I hope I'm

		<p>wrong. Prairie Village's strength has always been it's lovely neighborhoods. Filling this beautiful village with commercial retirement developments seems to be a very wrong direction to take. Please don't let this massive development destroy our neighborhood. Note: My address is 3601 West 85th, Leawood. I am directly across the street from this development. Even though I am one street outside of Prairie Village, my street will be hugely impacted by this. We have a lot of young children on our street and we are very concerned about the increase in traffic and well as the size. Sincerely, Donna Fischgrund</p>
Terri	Helm	<p>Sent: Monday, August 05, 2013 2:08 PM To: Joyce Hagen Mundy; Mayor; Ashley Weaver; Dale Warman; Steve Noll; Ruth Hopkins; Michael Kelly; Andrew Wang; Laura Wassmer; Brooke Morehead; David Morrison; Charles Clark; David Belz; Ted Odell; JCT@tutera.com Subject: Mission Chateau Senior Living</p> <p>To Whom it May Concern;</p> <p>I am proud to say I am a Prairie Village native. I have seen the neighborhood change beautifully through the years. In fact, my once Elementary school, Marsha Bagby, is now the Forum, senior center. My former junior high, Indian Creek, is now a technical center.</p> <p>To keep up with our changing population, I am highly in favor of the Mission Chateau and feel it will only better our community. While I am only 54 now, I can't think of a better place to hang my hat in my senior years.</p> <p>If my children are anything like me, (mixed blessing indeed) they will visit me and boost revenue in the neighboring shops and restaurants. Help me think of some disadvantages!</p> <p>We are not talking about building a correctional institute here and I am strongly in favor of moving forward.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>-- Terri Helm</p> <p>Terra Management Leasing Manager www.terramgmt.com</p>
Andrea	Hickerson	<p>Date: August 2, 2013, 15:33:54 CDT To: "cityclerk@pvkansas.com" <cityclerk@pvkansas.com> Subject: Mission Chateau Project</p>

		<p>I want to cast my support for this project as: it is excellent use of the land, provides many options for baby boomers living in the Prairie Village area (which I do), provides fabulous architecture and landscaping to the area, provides many job opportunities for area residents (my mother is at the Forum and the residents love the waiters and staff as many waiters are local young people who have gone to Shawnee Mission East and South), provides much needed revenue to the city and county!</p> <p>Andrea Hickerson</p> <p>Sent from my iPad</p>
Bethany	Klug	<p>Date: 08/02/2013 2:42 PM (GMT-06:00) To: Joyce Hagen Mundy <jhmundy@pvkansas.com> Subject: FW: Mission Chateau Update #14, August 2, 2013</p> <p>I support this! Thank you.</p>  <p>Bethany Klug, DO 1900 W 75th ST, STE 250 Prairie Village, KS 66208</p>
Donald and Mary	Krohn	<p>Sent: Friday, August 02, 2013 10:47 PM To: Joyce Hagen Mundy Subject: Mission Chateau Project</p> <p>August 2, 2013</p> <p>Attention: Prairie Village City and Zoning Commission</p> <p>We attended your meeting on July 2, 2013 when Mr. Tutera presented his 9% reduction plan for the Mission Chateau project. He seems oblivious to the concerns of the neighbors surrounding this project. We believe, his cosmetic change to the architectural features of the project does not address the problems with proposing an enormous project of this size on a mere 18 acres of land in the middle of a residential area.</p> <p>We also attended the July 11 meeting Mr. Tutera had with the neighbors. It became even more apparent at that meeting that he is not willing to work with anyone to reduce the size of this project. When challenging Mr. Tutera on the massive size of the project, his pat response was, "The project needs to be this size to provide the lifestyle that the residents will expect". We do not know what the content of that statement really means, but many other nursing home complexes provide a "quality life style" for far fewer than 400 residents.</p>

		<p>We could go on in detail with the deficiencies of this project but they have been presented previously by residents opposing this project. This project does not meet the Village Vision goals adopted in 2007, or the Golden Factors. This project is not good for Prairie Village. This is one of the last sizable open green spaces available in Prairie Village and decisions regarding the utilization of this space are of utmost importance and value to the future of our city.</p> <p>We would like to go on record in strong opposition to this project.</p> <p>Respectfully,</p> <p>Donald and Mary Krohn 8361 Reinhardt St. Prairie Village, KS 66206</p>
Susan	Moehl	<p>Sent: Tuesday, August 06, 2013 7:45 AM To: Joyce Hagen Mundy Cc: athensh@aol.com; mail2pj@kc.rr.com; bob@reschubert.com; margyronning@kansascityhomes.com Subject: Opinion re: proposed Tutera Project...Attention Planning Commission and City Council</p> <p>Hello:</p> <p>My name is Susan Moehl and I live at 4401 Somerset Drive.</p> <p>I happened to watch a program on KCPT (7/30/13, 9 p.m.) that I think the City Council and Planning Commission members should be made immediately aware of. It was called "Life and Death in Assisted Living" - an episode of FRONTLINE. Here's why I think any official involved in the decision-making surrounding the proposed Mission Chateau project should watch this program (see pbs.org/frontline for more information). Emeritus, a company headquartered in Seattle, Washington...is a giant in the Assisted Living industry which blossomed during the 1980's. Bottom-line, companies such as Emeritus (and, possibly, Tutera) target individuals who more appropriately belong in skilled nursing facilities -- in order to maintain their residency quotas and feed their cashflow. Administrators in these facilities are encouraged to cut labor costs and, as a result, there is case after case of preventable harm caused to residents with complex illnesses (such as Alzheimer's and dementia) and frequently death. This program focused upon a \$22 million cash award to the Boice family for premeditated negligence in the death of their mother. Several other high profile and tragic stories are shared in this program.</p> <p>Services provided to residents at skilled nursing facilities and nursing homes is supported by a vast web of municipal, state and, importantly, federal monitoring and regulation. Not so with this relatively new concept of Assisted Living. And it is exactly this lack of government supervision/oversight which attracts the large for-profit organizations such as Tutera. Several comments from this program: "The individuals who are in Assisted Living today are the same individuals that 10 years ago would have been at nursing homes."</p>

		<p>And..."Assisted Living is the 'rock that no one wants to look under."</p> <p>Those individuals now involved in the effort to stop the Tutera project (not to minimize it in scope, <u>but to stop it completely which is the goal of virtually every neighbor I have spoken with privately and at town hall meetings</u>) should be aware of the dangerous dynamics which undergird this industry. This is NOT a dynamic we wish to "invite" into our beloved neighborhood home.</p> <p>Please share this email with all that you think might benefit from it.</p> <p>I am personally confident that the officials will weigh the preponderance of irrefutable evidence speaking against this project and put a FINAL end to it this very evening.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>Susan Moehl</p>
Jo Lynne	Moore	<p>Sent: Tuesday, August 06, 2013 9:44 AM To: Joyce Hagen Mundy Subject: Suggestion tor consider for the MVMS site</p> <p>To: the City Clerk, Planning Commission Member and my Ward 5 representatives; David Morrison & Charles Clark</p> <p>I respectfully request that the Planning Commission deny the special use permit requested for construction of a Skilled Nursing Facility on the property formally used by Mission Valley Middle School.</p> <p>I realize that the the current plans for Mission Chateau conform with existing zoning ordinances and building codes, yet the project remains too large and is not a good fit for area residents or the City of Prairie Village. Property values and the residential character of the area are at stake. This is a major issue with my neighborhood, Corinth Meadows, as our neighborhood is turning over. And no, those residents are not moving to skilled nursing facilities or assisted living, they have remained in their homes until their passing.</p> <p>Concerns still first and foremost besides the size, include the additional traffic congestion, and dangers to children and all pedestrians. Secondary concerns affecting my neighborhood include increased surface water runoff and the flooding issues we experience with the inadequate storm water drainage system and Water One's aging sewer system. Currently neither system functions as it should during a rain event greater than average.</p> <p>Although changes have been made by Tutera, the current plan remains to dense and large for the site. It does not fit in with the neighborhood. An appropriate sized building would not have to be hidden or softened with berms and landscaping. I urge the Planning Commission to seriously consider the short & long term consequences of such a facility in Prairie Village. Health care reimbursement will change again with the next political administration and most likely will not be a lucrative.</p> <p>For now, your residents are here to stay and their welfare, including their property values, should take priority.</p>

		<p>My neighbors and potential new residents desire to live in Prairie Village NOT Senior Village.</p> <p>When plans for the Mission Chateau are rescaled to a more appropriate neighborhood facility, I ask that the Planning Commission and City Council require two provisions with the permit. First - All construction related vehicles must remain onsite at all times as not to impede traffic on Mission Road.</p> <p>Second - As a condition of employment, all vehicles used for employee transport must remain onsite during drop-off/pick up or remain parked onsite during said shift.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and service. This issue, your recommendations, and the City's final determination will impact us all for years to come. Remember the Golden Rule.</p> <p>Please note that this is a prime vacation week for families before school starts, attendance at tonight's meeting will be less than usual.</p> <p>Jo Lynne Moore 3601 W 84th Ter, PV, KS</p>
Mary Jo	O'Byrne	<p>Sent: Saturday, August 03, 2013 12:48 PM To: Joyce Hagen Mundy Subject: Mission Chateau</p> <p>I have lived in Prairie Village for the last 15 years and I want to continue to spend the last years of my life here. I have 4 children and 11 grandchildren who live within walking distance of my home, and this is very important to me. Prairie Village also offers lots of lovely shops, wonderful parks, things of many interest, and my church, St. Ann.</p> <p>I am very supportive of the beautiful Mission Chateau and of the Tutera Group, and look forward to living in this outstanding complex. This developement would be such a great addition to our community.</p> <p>Mary Jo O'Byrne 3312 West 71st Street Prairie Viullage, Ks. 66208</p>
Ned	OConnor	<p>Sent: Friday, August 02, 2013 4:54 PM To: Joyce Hagen Mundy Subject: Mission Chateau</p> <p>To the Prairie Village City Clerk,</p> <p>Please accept this note as an indication of my enthusiastic support for passage of the Mission Chateau project in Prairie Village. As a former 30 year</p>

		<p>property owner in Prairie Village, I have attended several of the public forums at which Mr. Tuter and his team have apparently listened to the concerns of those in attendance and made modifications to what I believe to be a responsible, beautiful and appropriate project at this location.</p> <p>I must also say that a very close personal family friend has been a resident in a Tuter property for many years. I can honestly say that the quality of our friend's life would not be what it is without the commitment to excellence in the operation of the facility.</p> <p>If you have any questions, certainly feel free to contact me.</p> <p>Best Regards,</p> <p>Ned OConnor</p> <p>Ned OConnor, SIOR Waterford Property Company, LLC 6811 Shawnee Mission Parkway, Suite 210 Overland Park, Ks. 66210 Email: ned.oconnor@waterfordproperty.net</p>
Chris	Price	<p>Date: 07/31/2013 2:37 PM To: Joyce Hagen Mundy <jhmundy@pvkansas.com> Subject:</p> <p>To the Prairie Village Planning Commission and City Council of Prairie Village,</p> <p>I will be unable to attend the August 6th Planning & Commission meeting and I would like to request that my opinion below be ON RECORD regarding the proposed Mission Chateau development at the former site of Mission Valley Middle School. <i>I am firmly against the proposed Mission Chateau development and any other development similar in scope and size. I am requesting that the Planning Commission reject the application for a special-use permit by the Tuter Group.</i></p> <p>Firstly, I am all for the <i>proper</i> redevelopment of this property. However I am completely against the proposed and redesigned Mission Chateau development on that property, and any other type of apartment or condominium development there. I believe that this type of big development is completely out of character for this particular neighborhood. The Mission Valley property is surrounded by several of Prairie Village's and Leawood's finest single-family home neighborhoods. I truly cannot comprehend why a proposal of this magnitude would ever be considered for that property.</p> <p>Furthermore, I feel that the only type of re-development that should be considered for this property is a high-end single-family home neighborhood. High-end single-family dwellings will not only add value to the city's tax base, but also wouldn't decrease the value of the surrounding neighborhoods, which will have a net positive on the city's tax base. This particular piece of property and its surrounding residents deserve better and Prairie Village can certainly do better. We do not need to "sell-out" for a project that hurts the local residents and only creates marginal tax revenue.</p>

		<p>The Tutera Group's proposal will essentially turn the large majority of that property into concrete and apartments. The city will never recover what could be a beautiful neighborhood with plentiful green space. This property is constantly being referred to as a "transition" zone. In my opinion that term completely fails and undervalues what this property could be. How many senior living centers do we need? Is it within the Village Vision plan to line Mission Road with apartments for senior living? Is Prairie Village going to turn its back on its residents and "sell-out" for this unnecessary type of development that is adjacent to some of our highest tax revenue producing neighborhoods? I really hope we are smarter than this.</p> <p>I have heard many parties' opinions and I have seen every architectural drawing for Mission Chateau (which I believe they look very nice). But no matter what, this type of development, and anything similar in scope and size, is much better suited for somewhere else (maybe another site in PV). This type of development (condominiums, apartments, medical centers, duplexes, retail, etc.) simply does NOT fit the character of the surrounding neighborhood and I personally don't want to see one of Prairie Village's finest areas ruined. Quite simply, The Tutera Group made a BIG mistake by purchasing this property. We don't need this. We want something better... and I know we can do better.</p> <p>Best regards,</p> <p>Chris Price 5506 W 82nd PI Prairie Village, KS 66208 chrisprice@colonialpatterns.com (e-mail)</p>
Jose	Ramirez	<p>Sent: Saturday, August 03, 2013 5:08 AM To: Joyce Hagen Mundy; Jamie Davidson Subject: I think this is good</p> <p>We in our local area a place our seniors can continue to stay in our city and add to our community events, invest, and pay taxes. I'm all for this, I am a small business working hard for 3 other family's to have a livelihood on the northeast johnson county area.</p> <p>Thank You! Jose Ramirez Moss Printing</p>
Shelley	Runion	<p>Sent: Monday, August 05, 2013 1:20 PM To: Joyce Hagen Mundy Subject: Proposed development at Mission Valley Middle School and water management issues in southeast Corinth Meadows</p> <p>Dear Members of the Planning Commission:</p> <p>Our family lives at 8417 Reinhardt Street in Prairie Village. We have grave concerns about the proposed Mission Chateau plan. We moved into our</p>

	<p>home in 1993. That summer, the Kansas City area experienced record level flooding. We did not have any water issues at that time.</p> <p>In the last ten (10) years, however, that situation has changed. Please see the attached photos of our flooded basement.</p> <p>In addition to basement flooding, the surface water is uncontrolled. Our house is on a hill. We have had water come up our driveway at least one and one-half vertical feet from the street surface; a goodly portion of the island in front our house has been underwater. During a recent rain, the surface water flowed so strongly against a neighbor's basement window that the window broke and the water flowed directly into the basement. There are at least eight (8) homes in the southeast corner of Corinth Meadows that experience various water related issues when it rains. The situation has continued to worsen such that relatively small amounts of rain now cause problems. We have spent thousands of dollars to clean up and repair damages caused by water as well as to replace furniture and appliances.</p> <p>Since that time, I have contacted the PV Public Works Department and multiple Prairie Village councilpersons. The responses have been extremely disappointing. The PV Public Works Department blames Johnson County Wastewater and Johnson County Wastewater blames the City of Prairie Village. Once councilperson advised me that the City of PV is aware of the problem, but doesn't have the money to remedy it.</p> <p>In regard to the Mission Chateau project, we've been told that the City of PV doesn't have any responsibility as long as the proposed project doesn't make the situation worse. It is extremely hurtful to be told that our city leaders are aware of a problem and has no interest in fixing it.</p> <p>I am not a water engineer, but believe common sense dictates that paving and roofing at least twelve (12) acres will increase the amount of water that runs off the Mission Valley property. Has anyone studied the issue besides the party in interest? One inch of rain on the 17+ acre site equates to nearly one-half million (500,000) gallons of water - the equivalent of one olympic size swimming pool. It is not difficult to see that a retention/detention facility is unlikely to be sufficient to handle normal, let alone excessive, precipitation for this area. Contrary to the applicant's unfounded beliefs he will not be able to direct the flow of water in contravention of generally applicable simple laws of physics.</p> <p>Due to the above, I do not find Mr. Tutera's statements (or those of his representative) regarding water runoff credible. Furthermore, I have personally heard him make other untrue statements and generalizations about our neighborhood. For example, he has stated that we have a traffic problem and parents 'circle' our neighborhood to drop off and pick up their students at Corinth Elementary. He also said that parents park on streets in our neighborhood two to three nights a week for activities at Corinth Elementary and Mission Valley. As someone who has lived in Corinth Meadows for 20 years and who has two children who attended Corinth Elementary, Mission Valley and Shawnee Mission East, I can tell you both of Mr. Tutera's statements are false.</p>
--	--

City employees and officials are aware of the water management problem. The existing problem should be remedied before increasing the amount of water that the same systems will be expected to handle. Failure to definitively address and resolve those existing problems would be irresponsible compelling us to consider and exhaust our civil remedies.





Craig	Satterlee	<p>Date: 08/01/2013 9:59 PM (GMT-06:00) To: Joyce Hagen Mundy <jhmundy@pvkansas.com> Subject: Planning Commission Meeting for August 6th and Subsequent City Council Meeting Regarding Mission Valley Development</p> <p>Dear Members of the Planning Commission and City Council Members,</p> <p>Tonight, I had the opportunity to watch the PBS Frontline program regarding assisted care facilities. It is powerful. As a physician I have always been aware of Skilled Nursing Facility abuse and nursing home abuse in general. We are trained to look for it and respond. However this was eye-opening as to the potential problems with assisted living and memory care. At one point in time my mother was in low-density assisted care and then memory care units here in town. My experiences with her were very positive. But I see after reviewing this program that greed can change all of that-for the worse. <u>Density reflects greed.....plain and simple.</u> The proposed Mission Valley Development is too dense in population and square footage. The SNF is obviously too large to be subordinate to the assisted and independent living. But my eyes were opened as to unregulated assisted care and memory care possibilities. I encourage you all to watch the program. Please go to pbs.org/frontline. The program is called " Life and Death in Assisted Living". It is good food for thought.</p> <p>Best Regards, Craig Satterlee</p> <p>Sent from my iPad</p>
Bob	Schubert	<p>Sent: Friday, August 02, 2013 2:59 PM To: Joyce Hagen Mundy Subject: Fwd: MVNA-MOST IMPORTANT meeting to date: this Tuesday, August 6th, 7pm!</p>

		<p>Below is a link to the PBS show. If you have not seen it, I would urge each of you to watch.</p> <p>http://video.pbs.org/video/2365054620/?utm_source=youtube&utm_medium=pbsofficial&utm_campaign=froncovfullprogram</p>
Jim	Starcev	<p>Sent: Tuesday, August 06, 2013 12:20 AM To: Joyce Hagen Mundy Subject: ATTENTION TO: THE CITY PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION Re: Mission Chateau Proposal</p> <p>Date: August 6th, 2013</p> <p>To: Prairie Village Planning Commission Members Mayor Ron Schaffer Prairie Village City Council Members Prairie Village City Staff</p> <p>From: Jim Starcev Resident at 3507 West 87th Street</p> <p>Re: Mission Chateau Proposal</p> <p>My name is Jim Starcev. I am a resident at 3507 W 87th Street, Leawood, KS. I live a couple of blocks from the proposed development. I also own a property in Prairie Village that is also near the site. I have attended virtually every meeting that the city council and the planning commission have held on this proposal as well as the neighborhood meetings that the Tutera Group has hosted. <i>I am opposed to this plan as it is currently proposed.</i></p> <p>Unfortunately, I will be out of town for the August 6th planning commission meeting, but I have a few issues I would like addressed that I have not heard brought up yet.</p> <p>First, I know the overall size of the project has been thoroughly discussed, but I specifically would like to address a comment made by the Tutera Group. Mr. Tutera has said multiple times that a Continuing Care Retirement Communities (CCRC) has to have 330-350 units to support the lifestyle of the residents. He has said this is why it has to be the size that he has proposed, that it is not a business or financial decision. I did some research on this and found some that seemingly supports this, I am assuming it is data that the Tutera Group is using. According to AAHSA¹, in 1998 the average total number of units/beds in a CCRC was 354. In 2004, the average had fallen to 337. However, this looks at average size, not median size. I found a more recent report from the Zeigler² group that states the following: "A typical CCRC has fewer than 300 total units; about one-third have more than 300 units; only 8% have more than 500 units." While a small percentage of communities are very large, therefore bringing up the average, the typical community is less than 300 units and the median community is approximately 250 units. The current proposal is approximately 50 to 100 units larger than this. Clearly there are many successful CCRC's that have created a viable community with far less units than what is currently being proposed. Unless the Tutera Group can provide a better explanation, I</p>

strongly feel that the planning commission should **reject the current proposal** because it is still way too large for a R-1 area.

Second, I would like a better explanation of why there are so many skilled nursing facility (SNF) units. As a point of clarification, every study I saw listed SNF units as total number of beds. Per the drawings that the Tutera Group submitted, it appears that the two bedroom units could be used as separate beds simply by closing the privacy curtains. For this reason I am counting units as total beds. Based on the last drawings I saw, there would be 136 units in the SNF and a total of 343 units in the entire CCRC. 136 units would be 40% of the total units. Referring back to the AAHSA study¹, in 2004 the average CCRC had 23% skilled nursing units. **The current proposal would have almost double, approximately 60 units, more SNFs than the average CCRC.** This seems excessive. **Has the planning commission questioned the size of the SNF? Has the planning commission asked the Tutera Group for a projection of how many of the units would be utilized by residents and how many would be transfers?** At 40% of total units, I would assume that well over half would be transfers. SNF units also generate higher revenue than assisted living or independent living units. **Has the planning commission asked for revenue projections for the project from the Tutera Group?** I ask this because at 40% of total units and a higher rate, it is possible that at full capacity the SNF may generate more than 50% of the revenue of all units. There has been a lot of discussion if the SNF could be built first, because it can only be built as a subordinate accessory use on a R-1 site. My question is that if the revenue projections are for the SNF to generate more than half of the total revenue, could it really be considered a subordinate accessory use period.

Third, have there been any studies or inquiries to the environmental impact on the waste water for a project of this density in this area? I know there have been a lot of discussion on the water run off, but I have heard no discussion of the water use on the property and the waste water run off it would generate as well as the amount of chemicals that would be in that run off. At full capacity, I would assume this site would prepare over a 1000 meals a day resulting in thousands of dishes being washed, hundreds of showers per day, hundreds if not thousands of uses of toilets, etc. **Would this put a strain on the current system?**

Thank you for all of the work you have put in to evaluating all of the proposals that have been submitted and all of the comments you have received. I appreciate that you are in a predominantly thankless position and no matter what you decide, someone will be unhappy. I fully believe that you are working and will continue to work for what is best for Prairie Village and the surrounding community.

Thank you,

Jim Starcev

¹ "From Start-Up to Success: A Statistical Approach of Emerging Continuing Care Retirement Communities", 3rd Edition. Brecht Associates Inc®

		² Ziegler National CCRC Listing & Profile, 2009
Dan	Sterbenz	<p>Sent: Monday, August 05, 2013 7:11 PM To: Joyce Hagen Mundy; David Morrison Cc: ict@tutera.com Subject: In favor of Mission Chateau</p> <p>To Council Members/City Clerk:</p> <p>I wanted to convey my support for the Mission Chateau project, as outlined by Joe Tutera, and the Tutera Group. As a lifelong Shawnee Mission resident, and 15 year resident of Prairie Village, I see tremendous value in supporting a worthwhile project such as the one the Tutera Group has outlined for Mission Chateau. Local residents will soon be in great need of additional specialized care, as our loved ones transition to long-term care. A recent event in my family has highlighted the need for this service near my home. I can only see more need in the future.</p> <p>Having personally known the Tutuera family for over 20 years, I have full confidence the Tutera Group will be able to fulfill their promises to bring exceptional care to Prairie Village at a time when we need both the personal and financial benefits of such plan. I know there are many who oppose the plan, but feel there is much potential for Prairie Village to realize both financial and community benefits if the plan passes.</p> <p>Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact me.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Dan Sterbenz</p> <p>9108 Delmar</p>
Tipton	Wiscombe	<p>Date: August 2, 2013, 15:51:39 CDT To: "cityclerk@pvkansas.com" <cityclerk@pvkansas.com> Subject: In Favor of Mission Chateau</p> <p>Dear Council Member:</p> <p>I am writing to you to express my support for the proposed Mission Chateau senior living residences being considered for the former Mission Valley Middle School site.</p> <p>The Tutera Group has listened to the needs of our community and has modified its plans in response to those concerns. For this reason, and many others, I see a number of positive benefits to our community, should this development be allowed to move forward. One of those benefits is that aging Prairie Village residents won't have to leave our city when it is time to transition to a senior living community. Another benefit that I see would be the</p>

sales tax generated from the construction and the ongoing real estate taxes that will assist in the revitalization of the city now and for years to come. The development will provide parks, walking paths, and beautiful improvements to the neighborhood, particularly the improvements along Mission Road. A few other things to consider, in making your decision:

- Mission Chateau has been designed to meet the community's growing need for the highest quality lifestyle and services today's seniors deserve.
- Mission Chateau will offer senior residents who currently live in Prairie Village additional options for staying in the community they love, with the security of a continuum of care setting.
- The City's existing senior living properties and those adjacent to the City were built many years ago to accommodate the existing needs at that time. These mature facilities range in age from 15 to 24 years and operate at approximately 95-98% occupancy. The newest property specializing in memory care and assisted living is already 50% occupied, having only recently opened a few months ago.
- Existing retail, restaurants and shops in the area will benefit from the patronage by our residents, their visitors and families. Not only will the development itself generate tax income for Prairie Village, but the increase of employees, residents and their families dining and shopping locally will bring additional sales tax revenue to the city as well.
- Mission Chateau will enhance the area's appeal by leading a major revitalization effort in the community.
- The uncertainty of the repurposing of the property and the potential impact on property values will be stabilized through the completion of Mission Chateau.
- Tutera is locally-owned and operated with a reputation for dedicated, personalized care and expertise in senior living and skilled nursing communities. Tutera owns and manages 40 senior living and healthcare communities in 12 states, including independent living, assisted living and skilled nursing facilities, with specialized programs in memory care, rehabilitation and home health and hospice.
- The project will feature over five acres of park-like grounds, with 1.2 miles of walking path, available for community use.

I believe a vocal minority has been doing most of the talking up to this point. I just wanted to be sure to register my strong vote of support for the project and its mission.

Thank you for your time and consideration!

Tipton Wiscombe
4027 W 72nd Terrace
Prairie Village, KS 66208

Theodore E. LoScalzo

8305 Howe Dr.
Prairie Village KS 66206

Dear Prairie Village Planning Commission

This communication is in regards to the planned development of Mission Chateau on the Mission Valley land. As the Planning Commission for Prairie Village I believe that it is incumbent upon you to address and ask the pertinent questions prior to authorizing the special use permit for this development.

Based upon the Village Vision that was put together with the input of many stakeholders there were stated goals, priorities, and development principals defined that directly address the direction of Prairie Village's future that are contradictory to the current plan.

I would like to know how the planning commission sees the development in adherence to the following principal statements in the Village Vision:

Village Vision Priorities:

Update the zoning ordinance to reflect contemporary land use issues while preserving the identity and character of Prairie Village.

Currently as it stands the density of the development and the size and structure of the development would radically change the character of Prairie Village and forever alter the character from a upper end residential community to something else. This future path needs to be investigated and evaluated so that prior to approval we know where we will end up 5, 10, and 20 years out. What projections have been done for property value changes, increased infrastructure needs, and overall city budget impacts?

Development should help "repair" or enhance existing neighborhoods or create new ones and should not take the form of an isolated project.

Currently as planned this would be an "isolated project" and would impact the city in a negative manner which is in direct contradiction to the defined development principals.. Property values of the surrounding houses would be impacted negatively immediately! Traffic would increase substantially in very close proximity to Corinth Elementary School creating a danger zone for our children.

Theodore E. LoScalzo

8305 Howe Dr.
Prairie Village KS 66206

Village Vision Development Principals Continued:

Development should incorporate open space in the form of plazas, squares and parks that may include civic uses. They should also be interconnected with the public realm as defined by the street network.

As it stands the proposed development does not meet any of the above principals. There is very little open spaces and not as a plaza or square nor is there any civic use land apportionment. There is no interconnection to the public realm as demanded by the enunciated principals.

Areas within existing neighborhoods or along corridors should be reclaimed by using redevelopment strategically to leverage current investment and strengthen social fabric.

The development is bordered on two sides by residential neighborhoods and a residential area directly across Mission Road placing it directly within existing residential neighborhoods. This development as proposed does not strategically leverage current investment, but will negatively impact the investments by the homeowners. Due to the predominantly low wage employment positions created and the non-mobile residents will do nothing to strengthen the social fabric but in fact will stress the social fabric of Prairie Village.

Village Vision Key Findings:

Maintaining a high quality of life for Prairie Village residents is a priority

Based upon the whole of the development plan proposed I see no way that this will maintain the high quality of life for Prairie Village residents.

I respectfully ask that as the Planning Commission to only approve a special use permits if the strict adherence to the overall improvement to the high quality of life be maintained and guaranteed by the developer!!

At this point in time I can not and will not support this development and respectfully ask that you reject this plan in whole!

Sincerely
Theodore Loscalzo

I am Steve Price; I live at 4403 west 97th Place in PV and have lived in PV for 50 plus years.. Prairie Village was and is still known to be a great place to raise a family but the world has changed, demographics have changed. My needs as well as everyone else have evolved. Myself as well as all my neighbors that have supported Prairie Village for all these years still want to call it home and not be pushed out of the city. My wife and I and many of our friends and neighbors have been monitoring the Mission Chateau project for quite some time. We along with many of our Prairie Village friends believe that providing quality senior living residences to Prairie Village as proposed by Tutera Group would be a great asset to the city. We strongly encourage the planning commission and the City Council to approve the project. We have seen many seniors who have had to move from city as a result of the lack of these services. Having such in community in Prairie Village will not only allow the resident to stay in the community they love but will provide the perfect repurposing of this former school site. The development will provide much needed infrastructure improvements to the site, as well as provide substantial short and long-term financial benefits to the city in terms of sales taxes from the construction and ongoing real estate taxes and fees. The project exceeds all the design requirements and will greatly enhance the neighborhood.



Steve Price

July 16, 2013

Planning Commission
City of Prairie Village
7700 Mission Road
Prairie Village, KS 66208

To the Planning Commission:

We would like to indicate our support for the proposed Senior Continuing Care Community to be built by the Tutera Group on the Mission Valley site at 85th & Mission Road.

We are seniors and have been residents of Prairie Village for decades. We have chosen to stay here because of our community ties--to our churches, friends, neighborhoods, and local merchants. To do this, we must face the day-to-day difficulties of maintaining our homes and properties.

This new facility would offer a wonderful alternative for many residents. In addition, we believe it would bring additional revenue and clients to Prairie Village businesses, new employment opportunities, and additional tax revenue.

Please approve this project for our city.

Name: William R Dooley

Signature: William R Dooley

Address: 5300 W 69th St

Name: Nancy Silverforb

Signature: Nancy Silverforb

Address: 5219 W. 69th St.

Name: Dave Silverforb

Signature: Dave Silverforb

Address: 5219 W 69th St.

Name: Phyllis Henderson

Signature: Phyllis Henderson

Address: 7417 Ash

July 16, 2013

Planning Commission
City of Prairie Village
7700 Mission Road
Prairie Village, KS 66208

To the Planning Commission:

We would like to indicate our support for the proposed Senior Continuing Care Community to be built by the Tutera Group on the Mission Valley site at 85th & Mission Road.

We are seniors and have been residents of Prairie Village for decades. We have chosen to stay here because of our community ties--to our churches, friends, neighborhoods, and local merchants. To do this, we must face the day-to-day difficulties of maintaining our homes and properties.

This new facility would offer a wonderful alternative for many residents. In addition, we believe it would bring additional revenue and clients to Prairie Village businesses, new employment opportunities, and additional tax revenue.

Please approve this project for our city.

Name: PATRICIA M. KOLARIK

Signature: Patricia M. Kolarik

Address: 7041 Granada Ln

Name: Catherine A. Abram

Signature: Catherine A. Abram

Address: 7142 Buena Vista

Name: Esther Buzal

Signature: 4008 W. 94 St

Address: _____

Name: Rita Dooley

Signature: Rita Dooley

Address: 5301 W 69th St