

Mark and Merrill	Athon	<p>From: d8501@aol.com [mailto:d8501@aol.com]</p> <p>Sent: Tuesday, November 05, 2013 10:12 AM</p> <p>To: Joyce Hagen Mundy</p> <p>Subject: Fwd: Protest letter on Tutera Plan</p> <p>Subject: Protest letter on Tutera Plan</p> <p>I am P.O.A. for Dr. Merrill Athon of 8501 Delmar Lane. He has stated that he is against the Tutera development. Its too large. Please let the planning commission know that.</p> <p>Mark Athon</p>
Bill	Barr	<p>From: Bill Barr [mailto:bill@billbarr.com]</p> <p>Sent: Sunday, November 03, 2013 4:31 PM</p> <p>To: Joyce Hagen Mundy</p> <p>Subject: Mission Chateau Revised Plans</p> <p>My name is Bill Barr and my wife Kim and I live at 8600 Delmar Lane, PV, KS. We were not in favor of the plans that were denied Mr. Tutera's group originally and appreciated the Council's decision that the magnitude was too great for the given area. Apparently Mr. Tutera's group subsequently sued the city of Prairie Village and now, with that suit pending, has submitted a "revised" proposal for the City Planning Commission to approve. I attended a forum in the Shawnee Mission East cafeteria, where the new proposal was outlined. The neighborhood voice has not been heard or heeded and it certainly wasn't that night either. I was flabbergasted that a street of single family residences was proposed, requiring their "massive" development to be shoe horned onto fever acres and putting current neighboring residences on the South side, beyond the 200 foot property line requirement to apparently prohibit or limit a protest petition. If the City Council did not give the project the majority approval necessary when it was spread out on more acreage, how can a developer who is suing our city, request another development opportunity of almost the same size on fewer acres. I would accept and request that the developer develop a smaller retirement complex on the acreage that is more appropriate in size to the property, the neighborhood and more closely follows the Village Vision.</p> <p>My wife and I recently had an opportunity to tour a new warehouse complex in St. Joseph, Missouri that was fewer square feet on an equivalent sized property and was amazed at how large it actually was. Until I physically saw what that many square feet looked like in a confined area, I couldn't appreciate how truly out of place the proposed Mission Chateau would be. I am requesting that the proposal as revised, not be approved, and that the developer truly downsize the project and not use smoke and mirrors to cloudy their proposal. Thank you for your consideration -- Bill Barr and Kim Rock</p> <p>Bill Barr Bill Barr & Company, Inc. bill@billbarr.com</p>
Stephanie	Beeder	<p>From: Stephanie Beeder [mailto:sfbeeder@aol.com]</p>

		<p>Sent: Monday, November 04, 2013 2:49 PM To: Joyce Hagen Mundy Subject: Mission Chateau</p> <p>Please forward to each Planning Commission member prior to the November 5, 2013 meeting.</p> <p>Members of the Prairie Village Planning Commission:</p> <p>I am writing to express my concerns about the new proposal for the Mission Valley site. I have been following this process for the past year, attended many of the meetings and although our property is just outside the perimeter of the landowners who qualify to file a protest petition of the project, I support their efforts in opposing the proposal.</p> <p>I was quite surprised to see that the new proposal looks identical to the first proposal that failed to garner the needed support from the city council in September, 2013. The neighbors have been quite clear that they would embrace a project that has about one half the density and square footage of the proposal and yet the developer has chosen to make other changes to the plans.</p> <p>The most obvious change to the plans is the replacement of the senior villas with empty lots for single family homes. When the earlier plans were discussed with the Planning Commission, one member asked for senior villas to be added to the plans which the developer changed before the final approval. When you review this plan, I would think you would want to know why there are no senior villas. And, will the addition of the single family homes on the south and west sides prohibit the homeowners at those edges of the development from filing a protest petition? I would hope that the Planning Commission does not allow for the developer to create a situation that the only people who can voice opposition to his plan is himself.</p> <p>Thank you for your time,</p> <p>Stephanie Beeder sfbeeder@aol.com</p>
Susan	Birchler	<p>From: Susan Birchler [mailto:sbirchler@att.net] Sent: Friday, November 01, 2013 7:41 PM To: Joyce Hagen Mundy Subject: Mission Chateau Project</p> <p>To the PV Planning Commission:</p> <p>The Mission Chateau Project and revised project are <u>entirely too dense</u> for the area. I spend time at Claridge Court and I ride the van to and from Mission Road Bible Church. There is absolutely no reason to again allow a development with insufficient parking. The same issue occurs with high school parking. The residents in the surrounding neighborhoods do not need to deal with employees and contractors parking on neighborhood streets. Parking must allow for shift changes.</p>

		<p>The whole project is too dense and still remains one of the largest projects in the county. It is simply rude that a second proposal that is still too dense is being submitted again.</p> <p>This time please hold the Tutera group to the tightest of standards in density and parking.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Susan Birchler 5417 W. 65th Terr Prairie Village, KS 66202</p>
Susan	Hubbard	<p>From: Hubbred@aol.com [mailto:Hubbred@aol.com] Sent: Sunday, November 03, 2013 2:47 PM To: Joyce Hagen Mundy Subject: In Re: New Mission Chateau Plan</p> <p>Please forward this to each planning commission member prior to the Nov. 5th mtg. Thank you, Susan Hubbard</p> <p>For over a year, I have worked tirelessly for the MVNAssociation in support of their opposition to Mr. Tutera's large retirement project and attended every meeting except one. Moreover, I live across the street from those homes on the perimeter of this large proposed project and it will affect me directly, especially during the 3 year construction. When you ,the Commission, considered his first special use permit application, you may have been looking more closely at the technical zoning requirements and did not have a full appreciation for the <i>intense</i> opposition from all wards of Prairie Village...and the negative impact this project could have on the surrounding neighborhood. You may not have recognized that you should be following the guidelines established by the Village Vision that the <i>neighbors must "buy in"</i> to any project before it's approved. Keep in mind that we are not objecting to a retirement facility on the property, only its massive density. Some of you have or do live in areas close to this property and will realize very quickly how you and Mission Road will be impacted for 3 years and beyond. Mr. Tutera keeps saying that only a small number of neighbors are upset but we have over 400 people from <i>all</i> wards who have asked for our yard signs!!</p> <p>I am appalled and disappointed at what I have seen and heard at meetings and in the community and how those in support of this project have treated the citizens of our city. I'm also surprised the city allowed this new plan to be submitted when Mr. Tutera had a law suit pending against the city. One last thing, I resent people from Mission Hills and Overland Park speaking in favor of this project and that it is good for this neighborhood. We don't travel to their areas and speak out against or for their projects. In summary, I would ask you to deny this new plan and request that Mr. Tutera scale back this project to a reasonable size (preferably 1-2 stories) to complement the neighborhood like Benton House. Thank you, Susan Hubbard</p>
Christine and Larry	McDonald	<p>From: Chris and Mac [mailto:lmac3@sbcglobal.net] Sent: Friday, November 01, 2013 9:10 AM</p>

		<p>To: Joyce Hagen Mundy Subject: Tutera Project</p> <p>We do not support massive development on the site of the former Mission Valley school. Will the voices of the citizens be heard? One can only have hope. Christine and Larry McDonald. 8005 Granada Rd. Prairie Village, Ks.</p>
Jo Lynne	Moore	<p>From: doug [mailto:themoores4@att.net] Sent: Monday, November 04, 2013 2:43 PM To: Joyce Hagen Mundy Subject: Mission Chateau concerns</p> <p>Planning Commission Members: I continue to have concerns with the proposed project for the Mission Valley site. Includes as an attachment, I have a few suggestions to consider as permit restrictions that I feel will go a long way in alleviating liability issues and appeasing the neighbors. I realize this issue is a constraint on your time, is not a pleasant task and I thank you for your time.</p> <p>Just for your information, I live across the street from the project. The Tuterra does not acknowledge our neighborhood's existence. My neighborhood of 71 homes has yet to receive any notice or mailings from the Tuterra Group and of course individuals have noted that their comments at the public meeting have been ignored.</p> <p>Jo Lynne Moore Corinth Meadows resident</p> <hr/> <p>City Council and Planning Commission Members: This evening your vote has a significant impact on the City of Prairie Village and its residents. I urge you to acknowledge the real cost such a project would place on area residents and the City and deny this Special Use Permit. Why Deny: There are sufficient assisted living communities within the Prairie Village area to accommodate those needing services now and in the future. Mission Chateau may generate a small income for the City however the initial costs to Prairie Village financially are significant and will be ongoing. Private entities should not be subsidized in any manner by the City. Projected figures for City and County services appear misleading as Residents and Businesses in Prairie Village will not be providing services at Mission Chateau. Employees and Service Providers will be non-resident. The majority of occupants will be non-residents. Mission Chateau remains too big, will present a traffic problem and will contribute to the flooding problems area resident experience during a significant rain event.</p> <p>Planning Commission recommendations: It doesn't take a panel to determine that the project is designed met the current guidelines for height, setback, and square footage, whatever. It appears that the regulations/codes could use refining, but that's another issue.</p>

		<p>It is my understanding that the Special Use Permit could be issued with RESTRICTIONS. Specific, enforceable, restrictions would go a long way to make this project a “better fit” for the neighborhood.</p> <p>Cost: Require all cost plus overage be secured upfront prior to breaking ground. Developer must pay for all demolition and construction costs including streets, sewers, utility services and all repairs to existing city/county structures changed/damaged. I suggest that the annual operation permit include fees to cover additional emergency response personnel and expenses.</p> <p>Construction: A time limit, such as 3.5 years, should be part of the permit specifying conditions, deadlines, and penalties. Penalties should be enforced thru the permit and not have to go through the code enforcement process.</p> <p>Traffic: Shift changes must not occur between 7:30am – 9:00am or between 2:30pm – 3:30pm. as not to interfere with traffic to/from the school. All vehicles: employees, service and construction vehicles and equipment must remain on the premises at all times. Mission Road will not be impeded during initial or subsequent construction.</p> <p>Parking: Above ground parking will be limited to the single housing units, with minimal spaces for drop-off/pickup at the independent, memory care and skilled units. All above ground roads and parking areas shall be constructed using permeable paving materials to control runoff. Visitor, service and employee parking shall be constructed underground thus providing more green space and a place for occupants to go during inclement weather. Paid parking underground would provide revenue offsetting the construction cost. Parking underground would provide additional green space and make the property appear less dense.</p> <p>Storm water runoff: Water runoff from the roofs of the building (independent and skilled nursing) will be collected in underground tanks large enough to contain the volume from a 2 inch (or consider 3 inch) rain event. The additional volume will be diverted to one or more underground retention system. Water from the retention system will be filtered /treated prior to discharge to the creek. Water accumulated in the tanks will be used for landscaping. Bonuses: reduced water costs, reduced liability and more green space.</p> <p>These restrictions will result in a larger upfront cost for the developer, but will save Tuterra and the City of Prairie Village money, time and headaches in the long run.</p> <p>Respectively submitted: Jo Lynne Moore, 3601 W 84th Ter PV KS Corinth Meadows Resident</p>
	MVNA	<p>From: Charles Clark Sent: Friday, November 01, 2013 3:34 PM To: Joyce Hagen Mundy Subject: Fwd: MVNA important Planning Commission meeting, Tues., 11/5/13, 7pm, Village Church</p> <p>Date: Fri, 01 Nov 2013 05:18:41 -0700</p> <p>Friends of MVNA:</p> <p>This isn't over! We're starting Round 2!</p>

		<p>Please plan to attend this IMPORTANT meeting of the Prairie Village Planning Commission, Tuesday, November 5, 2013, 7:00 pm, Village Presbyterian Church, 6641 Mission Road, for a discussion of yet another proposal by the Tutera Group.</p> <p>Since this is a brand new proposal from the Tutera Group, it is entirely appropriate (and you are encouraged) to repeat (to the Planning Commission) any comments you have made at previous public meetings. In addition, you are also encouraged to submit your comments in writing to the Planning Commission, in care of cityclerk@pvkansas.com , preferably prior to the November 5th Planning Commission meeting.</p> <p>Bob Schubert, 3700 W 83 Terr, Prairie Village, KS 66206</p>
Sheila	Myers	<p>From: Sheila Myers [mailto:sjblomyers@sbcglobal.net] Sent: Friday, November 01, 2013 12:43 PM To: Joyce Hagen Mundy Subject: Please reject latest plan for Mission Chateau</p> <p>DATE: Nov. 1, 2013</p> <p>TO: Prairie Village Planning Commission Members Mayor Ron Schaffer Brooke Moorhead, Ward 4 council representative Laura Wassmer, Ward 4 council representative</p> <p>FROM: Sheila Myers 4505 W. 82nd St., Corinth Hills</p> <p>I write to express my dissatisfaction with Tutera’s latest plan for the Mission Valley site. With his last plan rejected by the city council, Mr. Tutera is at it again, submitting what he claims to be a “redesign.” To call this a redesign is a joke, even bordering on offensive. In this iteration, Mr. Tutera has substituted nine residential lots in place of the 11 villas. Because these lots are not part of the special use permit request, I believe this plan is an effort by Mr. Tutera to avoid the super majority vote of the council to approve the special use permit, a hurdle he was not able to clear with his last plan. In another display of arrogance and gall, Mr. Tutera has <i>added</i> — yes, added — 6,000 square feet and a third story to the assisted living/independent living portion . I see this as Mr. Tutera thumbing his nose at the city’s requirements. It shows disrespect for Prairie Village residents, the planning commission, and the city council, and proof that Mr. Tutera has no intention of addressing the concerns of the neighbors who oppose his plan.</p> <p>Villas were never an issue with the previous plan. The issue has been and continues to be density. The Mission Valley Neighborhood Association, of which I am not a member, offered Benton Place as an example of the kind of density they could accept. Not only has Mr. Tutera consistently failed to seriously address the density issue, but he has added square footage to this latest iteration.</p> <p>I attended a neighborhood information session at Shawnee Mission East and</p>

		<p>heard Mr. Tutera say he could not reduce the square footage to the neighbors' satisfaction because the CCRC (continuum of care retirement community) would not work. It is obvious, contrary to Tutera's claims otherwise, that he has no intention of reducing the density because it goes against his vision. Instead, he insists on fitting a square peg into a round hole: a 350,000+ facility on 18 acres in a city that already has enough senior living facilities.</p> <p>In September, I visited my mother in central Florida to check out some CCRCs. One of them, Waterman Village in Mt. Dora, struck me as very similar in size to the proposed Mission Chateau. It has about 350 residents, villas, a 110-bed skilled nursing facility, and independent and assisted living units. This community sits on 45 acres! I can't imagine squishing something that large into the Mission Valley site.</p> <p>Shame on Mr. Tutera for ignoring our requests and stubbornly proceeding with a vision that is not appropriate for this site. And shame on the planning commission for green lighting it the first time through. Filing a lawsuit against the city, and chaining the property after he didn't get his way shows Mr. Tutera's contempt for Prairie Village and its residents. I urge you to reject his latest submission on Nov. 5.</p> <p>Sincerely, Sheila Myers</p>
Anne	Renne	<p>From: pabwr@aol.com [mailto:pabwr@aol.com] Sent: Monday, November 04, 2013 9:53 AM To: Joyce Hagen Mundy Subject:</p> <p>Dear Ms. Mundy,</p> <p>Please pass along my strong opposition to the new massive Mission Chateau plans to the Planning Commission. It lacks the 'village' feel of this beautiful town and will add more traffic congestion, noise and 'Old Town' image to our city which needs a youthful image to recruit younger families. It will cost residents in the end.</p> <p>Thank you for your help,</p> <p>Ann Renne Ward 4 Precinct 2</p> <p>Ann Renne</p>
Margy	Ronning	<p>From: Margy Ronning [mailto:margyronning@gmail.com] Sent: Monday, November 04, 2013 11:52 PM To: Joyce Hagen Mundy Subject: Planning Commission Meeting Tuesday, 11/5/13</p> <p>To the City Clerk,</p> <p>Prior to the City Planning Commission meeting being held on Tuesday evening, 11/5/13, please distribute this information to all those on the planning commission, and the city council, regarding important statistical</p>

information on the devaluation of homes surrounding multifamily dwellings, commercial enterprises or busy streets.

Dear City Planning Commission, City Clerk and Council Members,

Over the past months I, or my husband, have been to numerous meetings regarding the proposed development at the Mission Valley School site. During this time there have been several occasion when statements have been made that building a development such as this, doesn't affect property value. Mr. Tutera, and his representatives have proposed that it actually helps the value of the surrounding properties. Mr. Steve Carmen, at one meeting noted an appraiser estimated a devaluation of his property by 10%, should a development like this be built.

Rather than go on assumption, there are statistical facts that note the depressed value of a home that sides to commercial, multifamily dwellings, nursing facilities, etc. In addition to the devaluing of the property, the number of people interested in purchasing one of these properties narrows significantly. When selling a house, the homeowner should present their property in such a manner that enlarges the pool of buyers. This is not the case with these properties as noted below due to extenuating circumstances beyond the control of the homeowner.

The following are examples of four Prairie Village properties that either didn't sell due to the type of structure/building adjacent to the home, or the price was significantly reduced. In addition, please note the time on the market. All these homes are priced by various experts in the field of real estate. In all cases, these were agents with high volume and good reputations.

8724 Birch Lane – Red Fox Neighborhood- backs to the parking lot of Hillcrest Covenant Church.

A beautifully updated home which went on the market for \$460,000 on 5/12/12. Over the next 14 months, price reductions occurred until the house was lowered to \$315,000, or a 32% (\$145,000) price reduction. This house never sold and was eventually taken off the market after those 14 months.

3900 W. 86th Street, Town & Country (backs to Mission Valley and sides to Mission)

Completely renovated by the owner/remodeler. This home went on the market on 04/16/2007 for \$779,900. The house had numerous price reductions for two years and eventually ended at \$699,950 with no sale. The house was rented for the next 1.5 years. On 9/21/2012, the house went back on the market for \$650,000. Over the next 5 months, there were again numerous price reductions to \$525,000, when it finally sold. This amounted to a 33% price reduction. This home took 3 years to sell.

8300 Roe Ave, Town & Country, (the corner of 83rd and Roe that looks out on the traffic light)

This home was in original condition. Sales in Town & Country, in similar condition, have been selling for \$475,000-\$700,000, per MLS stats, since 2010. The original asking price of this home was \$445,000. After 642 days, the house finally sold for \$287,000 or 36% discount.

		<p>8300 Somerset Drive, Corner of Somerset and 83rd St. – Somerset Place – faces commercial buildings at Corinth business park and the bank Original asking price of \$379,900 on 10/23/2008. After 9 months on the market, it went to auction and sold for \$220,000 or a 42% drop in price.</p> <p>With the current plan, the massive structure of the Tutera property would devastate the value of the homes surrounding. This very private residential area would be subject to not only the devaluing of the property, but completely narrowing the pool of those who would want to purchase these homes. In today's market, most of these properties that back to this site are valued around \$750K- \$1M. As noted, all the homes above experienced a 32%-42% reduction in value. According to these statistics, if a home were now valued at \$1M, and that was decreased by 35%, then the market should bear a price of \$660K. Ask yourself if you would want a decrease of 35% to your investment? Ask yourself if would YOU purchase a home for \$660K that looked onto that site? Ask yourself if you would simply look for a home in some other location?</p> <p>In summary, these homes noted above are just a few examples of what happens to the housing market with such an enterprise surrounding. The value is not increased as Mr. Tutera suggests, nor does it decrease by simply 10%. These are significant reductions in value that cannot be ignored.</p> <p>Thank you, Margy Ronning 4324 W. 87th Street Prairie Village, KS 66207</p>
Mary	Russo	<p>From: Mary Russo [mailto:mrusso3@kc.rr.com] Sent: Friday, November 01, 2013 11:18 AM To: Joyce Hagen Mundy Subject: Planning Commission meeting November 5th</p> <p>Dear Planning Commission, Mayor, city council et al...</p> <p>I attended the community meeting held by Mr. Joseph Tutera on October 22nd. I have been following the progress of this development since May of 2012.</p> <p>Although I have no objection to Mr. Tutera's basic plan I was VERY disappointed that the plan did not speak to the main concern of the neighborhood, DENSITY. I understand he has eliminated the villa's for single family homes but I did not see the Village Vision requirements in this revised plan. As I understand Village Vision asks that any new development offer green space and community access usage. This plan does not offer either. I'm sure at this point the neighborhood would be willing to work with Mr. Tutera on a satisfactory plan for his property if he were to address some of their concerns – mainly DENSITY. He has increased the buildings to three floors. He increased the Memory care from 20 residents to 34 and increased the Skilled nursing from 84 patients (these are not residents) to 100. All the while decreasing the acreage usage to 12.</p> <p>I also understand this is not an easy decision but I urge all of you to consider</p>

		<p>the neighbors objection to these plans. These are long term residents who have the interest of the city of Prairie Village at heart. Although Mr. Tutera is a well-known owner and operator of Senior Living facilities he does not live in Prairie Village and will not be faced day to day with living with this facility as will the neighbors.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration in this matter.</p> <p>Mary Russo 8348 Somerset Drive Prairie Village, KS 66207</p>
Dionne	Scherff	<p>From: dscherff@kc.rr.com [mailto:dscherff@kc.rr.com] Sent: Saturday, November 02, 2013 9:20 PM To: Joyce Hagen Mundy; Bob Schubert Subject: Mission Valley site</p> <p>It is my understanding that the Tutera group has a new proposal for the Mission Valley school site. I am adamantly opposed to their development proposal. This is a terrible idea and does not fit the Prairie Village vision already adopted by city government. Please lodge my disapproval! Sincerely, Dionne Scherff, 7919 El Monte.</p>
Janine	Smiley	<p>From: Janine smiley [mailto:janinesmiley4@gmail.com] Sent: Sunday, November 03, 2013 5:09 PM To: Joyce Hagen Mundy Subject: Former Mission Valley Site and Proposed Redevelopment</p> <p>Dear City Clerk:</p> <p>I am not opposed to the concept of developing of the former Mission Valley Middle School site. However, I am opposed to the MVS LLC proposed "Mission Chateau" plan.</p> <p>From total square footage to building height, it is simply too large, does not fit with neighboring land, houses, or other buildings near it. It does not meet what should be allowed in that R-1-a zoned site.</p> <p>Thank you and please copy the planning commission and city council members on this constituent communications.</p> <p>Janine Smiley Prairie Village</p>
Joyce	Smith	<p>From: Joyce Smith [mailto:jayhawkjoy@sbcglobal.net] Sent: Sunday, November 03, 2013 9:23 PM To: Joyce Hagen Mundy Subject: MV Site</p> <p>Planning commission, please vote NO now & end this Tutera circus for all the reasons already on record & because of the Golden Factors!</p> <p>NO special use permit!</p>

		Joyce Smith 3611 W. 84th St.
Jim	Starcev	<p>From: Jim Starcev [mailto:jimstarcev@gmail.com] Sent: Tuesday, November 05, 2013 10:40 AM To: Joyce Hagen Mundy Subject: Mission Chateau</p> <p>Date: August 6th, 2013</p> <p>To: Prairie Village Planning Commission Members Mayor Ron Schaffer Prairie Village City Council Members Prairie Village City Staff</p> <p>From: Jim Starcev Resident at 3507 West 87th Street</p> <p>Re: Mission Chateau Proposal</p> <p>My name is Jim Starcev. I am a resident at 3507 W 87th Street, Leawood, KS. I live a couple of blocks from the proposed development. I also own a property in Prairie Village that is also near the site. I have attended virtually every meeting that the city council and the planning commission have held on this proposal as well as the neighborhood meetings that the Tutera Group has hosted. <i>The current proposal in my opinion is worse than the previous proposal that was turned down by the city council. I am opposed to this plan.</i></p> <p>First, is there any consideration given to the viability of the 9 single family lots being proposed? I can not imagine someone willing to pay for the land and spend the money to build on these sites. They are small sites compared to the area, with no trees, no privacy, next to a busy road and looking directly at a massive development. I fear these will remain vacant lots and be a plight to the city.</p> <p>Second, the new proposal of the CCRC is now on a smaller lot. Based on either units per acre or square footage per acre, this is more dense than the previous proposal that was turned down primarily because of the density. It makes no sense that this is even being considered, seems to be a waste of everyone's time.</p> <p>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, but the facts don't support that. 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</p>

		<p>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 strongly feel that the planning commission should reject the current proposal because it is still way too large for a R-1 area.</p> <p>Third, 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 projects 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Jim Starcev</p> <p>¹ "From Start-Up to Success: A Statistical Approach of Emerging Continuing Care Retirement Communities", 3rd Edition. Brecht Associates Inc®</p> <p>² Ziegler National CCRC Listing & Profile, 2009</p>
Dick and Diane	Waers	From: Diane Waers [mailto:jwaers@kc.rr.com]

		<p>Sent: Sunday, November 03, 2013 5:44 PM To: Joyce Hagen Mundy Subject: Mission Chateau</p> <p>Please forward the following to the Planning Commission and the Prairie Village City Council.</p> <p>We have been residents of Corinth Meadows for over 30 year and we have enjoyed living in Prairie Village. We are not opposed to a senior living facility. However, it is clear that the facility proposed by the Tutera group is simply not appropriate for the available acreage. The density of the project has always been the primary complaint. While the Tutera group has made cosmetic changes to its original proposal, it has not addressed this central question. The size of the proposed facility is too large for the available space. It is not compatible with the Village Vision as adopted by the city council As such, we are opposed to the current Tutera plan before the planning commission. We urge that you reject it.</p> <p>Dick and Diane Waers 3700 W 84th Terrace Prairie Village, Kansas 66206</p>
Kathy and Jeff	Wright	<p>-----Original Message----- From: Kathy Wright <kdwright@kc.rr.com> To: cityclerk <cityclerk@pvkansas.com>; mayor <mayor@pvkansas.com>; snoll <snoll@pvkansas.com>; rhopkins <rhopkins@pvkansas.com>; lwassmer <lwassmer@pvkansas.com>; dmorrison <dmorrison@pvkansas.com>; cclark <cclark@pvkansas.com>; bmorehead <bmorehead@pvkansas.com>; aweaver <aweaver@pvkansas.com>; dwarman <dwarman@pvkansas.com>; mkelly <mkelly@pvkansas.com>; awang <awang@pvkansas.com>; dbelz <dbelz@pvkansas.com>; todell <todell@pvkansas.com> Sent: Sun, Nov 3, 2013 7:04 pm Subject: NO MASSIVE DEVELOPMENT MISSION CHATEAU!!!!!!!!!!</p> <p>To the Mayor and City Council of Prairie Village:</p> <p>From: Kathy and Jeff Wright 3916 West 90th Street Prairie Village, Kansas 66207</p> <p>Please do NOT approve the special use permit for the Mission Chateau project!!! Please mark our opposition on the record.</p> <p>We, as well as many of our neighbors, are opposed to this project because it is too big, too high and too dense. As it is currently designed, it simply does NOT fit into the neighborhood. We don't understand how you could let a skilled nursing facility with 100 beds into a residential neighborhood (remember that this property is zoned R1a). This is indeed a few less beds than is at St. Luke's South.</p> <p>We are also opposed to the height of the project. The city Council's planning</p>

		<p>commission asked Mr. Tutera to work with the neighbors, which he has said he did. We TOTALLY disagree! At the last meeting, he was asked directly if he would consider making the project two stories rather than three. His terse remark was that a two story would be the same height as a three story, really??? When asked if he would consider reducing the entire size of the project, he just said “no”. Those of us that attended the meeting do not feel that any effort has been made to work with the neighbors. He has only given very slight changes.</p> <p>The strength of the City of Prairie Village has been the beautiful residential areas and abundance of green space. This should be your primary concern, not the desire of profitability by a large, powerful company. We have several styles of older living communities within our city boundaries and near our borders. We are not opposed to commercial enterprises but they should be located in the right place and if near a residential community, they should fit in by being the right size and attractive. This project DOES NOT measure up by any means.</p> <p>I hope the Prairie Village City Council is listening to its community members. Please do NOT approve the special use permit for the Tutera group project. We do not want a large hospital-like facility on the Mission Valley site. The description of a ‘skilled nursing 100 bed facility’ with patients who may not stay longer than 20 days would NOT be an asset to our Prairie Village community.</p> <p>Thank you very much for hearing YOUR neighbors and YOUR friends who are voicing their strong opposition for the Mission Chateau project.</p> <p>Kathy and Jeff Wright kdwright@kc.rr.com November 3, 2013</p>
Margie	Lundy	<p>From: Margie [mailto:kansaspiggy@kc.rr.com] Sent: Tuesday, November 05, 2013 12:57 PM To: Joyce Hagen Mundy Subject: Comments for Planning Commission</p> <p>To the Planning Commission,</p> <p>I am unable to attend tonight’s meeting, but would like to again voice my concern about the new plan submitted by the Tutera Corp. I attended the meeting all the way to the 1 a.m. conclusion when the vote was conducted. I do not believe Tutera has taken into consideration the concerns of the citizens against this massive development. They have not really pared it down very much at all. Time and again the opponents said they are not against this kind of a facility – just that they wanted it to be less dense.</p> <p>I also do not feel Prairie Village needs another facility of this sort...three for a community our size is more than enough.</p> <p>Just because there is nothing against the zoning code for this property is not a reason to approve it when there are so many other factors to consider.</p>

		<p>I do not live near this property, but am a resident of 43 years.</p> <p>Respectfully, Margie Lundy</p>
Charlotte	Hall	<p>From: Charlotte Hall [mailto:charlottehall5@gmail.com] Sent: Tuesday, November 05, 2013 1:05 PM To: Joyce Hagen Mundy Subject: Planning Commission</p> <p>It seems to me we should just encourage all of you to move the Tutera project to Franklin Park. In my mind it is just as appropriate there as on the Mission Valley site.</p> <p>I hope you will be more professional in your meeting. After the last meeting with Joe this and Joe that there was no question that you were for this project.</p> <p>I used to be proud to be a Prairie Village resident but I am wavering in that belief.</p> <p>Charlotte Hall</p>
Lyla	Hoyland	<p>From: Lyla Hoyland [mailto:lylapiano@kc.rr.com] Sent: Monday, November 04, 2013 10:42 AM To: Joyce Hagen Mundy Cc: Brenda Satterlee Subject: Mission Valley Project</p> <p>Please forward this letter to the Mayor, the City Council and the Planning Committee. Thank You.</p> <p>To the Mayor, the City Council and the City Planning Committee:</p> <p>Please pay attention to those of us who oppose the Tutera plan for the Mission Valley property. I am only thinking about the future of Prairie Village. I am a senior citizen, but I consider there to be enough accommodations in Prairie Village for me if and when I need them. Is the future of PV that you are thinking of a retirement community such as Sun City, AZ or Lakeview Village, KS? I am not thinking in those terms.</p> <p>Seems to me that Prairie Village should be planning for a future that includes more housing choices for families with school age children. If we are to remain a viable community we need new housing to include reclamation and redevelopment of some of the blighted neighborhoods as well as development of upscale homes that will attract young professionals. That will attract more families with school age children. If we lose any more schools, we are doomed. The death knell of many communities has been the loss of their schools. The neighborhood in question at the Mission Valley Site is one of large, expensive homes and should continue to be that with the development of that property into new housing for that market.</p> <p>In addition to my concern for the future of our lovely little city, I am appalled at the lack of consideration you have shown for such a large part of the population who elected you to represent them. How can you ignore our pleas? And how can you ignore the contentious problem this matter has</p>

		<p>become? This is not my first or only letter to you. My first ones have been ignored. I received no reply and certainly you showed no consideration for my thoughts. I voted for you to represent me. I beg you to do so.</p> <p>Lyla C. Hoyland, 7866 Howe Circle, Mission Pines, Prairie Village, KS 66208</p>
--	--	--