

Joyce Hagen Mundy

From: Cindi Doerr [cdoerr@kc.rr.com]
Sent: Tuesday, December 03, 2013 5:04 PM
To: Joyce Hagen Mundy; Dale Warman; Ashley Weaver; Steve Noll; Ruth Hopkins; Michael Kelly; Andrew Wang; Laura Wassmer; Brooke Morehead; Charles Clark; Ted Odell; David Belz; Mayor
Subject: Neighborhood Significant Input

Council Members,

As a homeowner that is on the perimeter of the Mission Valley site, I feel as if my property rights might be stripped. The amendment to the Village Vision regarding the redevelopment on the Mission Valley site stated that the surrounding neighborhood would get **significant** input on any development considered. We have not had **significant** input. The major issue from the beginning has been the size of the development. The developer has taken insignificant concerns and attempted to sell this off as giving us input.

On May 21 2012 you voted to approve the ordinance 2257. This was the amendment to the Village Vision regarding redevelopment on the Mission Valley Site. It can now be found on pages 97-99 of the Village Vision. The following are some of the quotes from this Village Vision amendment.

“Any reuse of the site should maintain the status as a center of the neighborhood.”

“Any redevelopment of the site needs to address how it will be compatible with or relate to residences adjacent to the site.”

“It is likely that the floor area ratio will increase in the future, but it needs to occur in a manner that is compatible with the existing single-family and multi-family residential development.”

“Any proposed plans for new uses or the expansion of existing uses-needs the input of the surrounding neighborhood. Due to the former school’s prominent role in the City and surrounding neighborhood, the City and residents expect ample opportunity to provide input into future redevelopment plans for the site.”

“The developer needs to conduct an adequate public involvement process to obtain input from the neighborhood.”

“The neighborhood is very concerned about the future of this site and will need to have significant input into any future change in use. If any change in use is considered, it is important that the site and the facility be designed compatible with the surrounding neighborhood. To successfully execute a project on the site, it will require creative and unique design talent and buy-in from the neighborhood and the community at large.”

Please do not vote against the Village Vision when you vote for this plan. It must be turned down again to force the developer to give the surrounding community **significant** input prior to submitting a plan for approval. Only a cooperative effort will help heal this community and make way for the right project.

Cindi Doerr

4000 W. 86th Street

Prairie Village, Kansas 66207

Joyce Hagen Mundy

From: Bob Schubert [bob@reschubert.com]
Sent: Tuesday, December 03, 2013 5:09 PM
To: Joyce Hagen Mundy
Subject: Tutera proposal

For the Planning Commission and the City Council,

I am the President of the Corinth Meadows Homes Association, directly east of the Mission Valley School site.

It continues to amaze me that Mr. Tutera totally ignores the concerns of the immediate neighborhood, most ALL of whom are totally against the SIZE of this project! In our neighborhood, I know of only **one family** who are for Mr. Tutera's project. All the rest think that **IT IS TOO BIG!**

And yet Mr. Tutera tells both of your groups that he has NEGOTIATED WITH THE NEIGHBORS. What he really has done is to PRESENT WHAT HE WANTS TO DO, FIELD QUESTIONS, BUT NEVER GIVE IN SUBSTANTIALLY ON THE SIZE ISSUE!!

The Tutera project is about the same size as the new IKEA store on about the same acreage!

He's not negotiating; he is attempting to DICTATE to the Planning Commission, the City Council, and the neighbors WHAT MUST HAPPEN! That's not negotiating!

Bob

Bob Schubert
Computer Training and Maintenance
(816) 456-7644
Bob@reschubert.com

PC Presentation-Dec. 3, 2013

Brian Doerr-4000 W. 86th Street (borders the School property)

PV resident for most of my life.

I previously remarked to the City Council that I have seen a number of land use developments over the course of that time.

Based on my past observations of the City, I have intuitively trusted the City to make the correct land use decision.

Just under two years ago I reviewed the City's website and discovered that a marketing/feasibility study was published for the MV site that contemplated a mixed use development in excess of 400,000 square feet.

I was stunned. I was stunned that PV could consider something that large at this site.

For almost 2 years I have attended every official Mission Valley site meeting before the City and countless other meetings with and before the Applicant.

As neighbors we have worked to make sure that the Mission Valley site would be reasonably and responsibly developed.

We are not anti-development and we are not opposed to senior housing.

In essence, the Applicant has refused every opportunity to make this development smaller and a win-win for everyone.

We know the history. In April, May, June, July, Aug., Sept. Nov. and now Dec. of this year we have been before the Planning Commission or the Governing Body.

Now the Applicant has presented a "new" plan that is really not new at all. Actually it's a scheme. It's a scheme to evade and suppress our due process rights. It's a scheme to keep us from participating in a Protest Petition.

If this plan is approved there will be a publically dedicated two lane road within 150 feet of my backyard that will serve a nearly 100,000 square foot commercial

skilled nursing facility and that will run past essentially the 3rd largest residential building in the entire County.

According to the Applicant I am not entitled to notice of this Public Hearing nor am I entitled to participate in a Protest Petition.

My due process rights are being eviscerated. If you don't care about my due process rights think of two of my neighbors Shirley Tillman and Esther Levins; two seniors who have each lived in their respective homes since they were built in the 1950's. What about their due process rights?

I believe this is one of those moments where regardless of the size of this proposed development you as the City leaders have to decide whether this is right or wrong. We can debate the legalities but again this boils down to what is right and what is wrong.

Consider the impact on the City from a precedence standpoint. No property owner in Prairie Village will be safe from this type of scheme.

Do you want the City to be complicit in violating our due process rights or in the alternative do you want to state clearly to the Applicant that the City will not participate in this scheme?

Tell the Applicant he needs to listen to and respond to the neighbors and make this project smaller.

This is really up to you tonight to get this matter resolved. It is your choice.

Vote to recommend a denial of this Application.

Thank you.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Planning Commission,

The Parking facts and ratios from the other Johnson County CCRCs clearly show that Mission Chateau does not have enough parking spaces. To support this statement I will first break out just the residential and the visitor parking.

Part one Residential Parking: Lakeview, Santa Marta, and Tall grass each confirmed in an email to me this week that they have and use at least 1 residential parking space for every independent living unit. They stated that although some units did not need a car, many needed two spaces. Mission Chateau provides 106 spaces for residential parking. Mission Chateau should have 136 spaces, one for each Independent Residential unit. Mission Chateau is therefore at least 30 spaces short in residential parking

Part two Visitor Parking: Santa Marta has visitor parking spaces equal to 37% of the total units in the facility and Village Shalom has a 45% visitor parking ratio. Using the conservative 37% percentage, Mission Chateau total visitor parking should be 115 spaces (.37x310 units). Mission Chateau provides a total of 75 spaces for visitor parking, a shortage of 40 spaces.

These two areas alone produce a shortage of 70 parking spaces. Let me repeat, just between residential and visitor parking, Mission Chateau is at least 70 parking spaces short.

Finally, we took the four largest CCRCs in Johnson County and made a total parking comparison. Those CCRCs were Lakeview, Tall Grass, Santa Marta and Aberdeen.

The developer calculated his parking spaces using a multiplication formula. We applied the Applicant's formula to the units in the four CCRCs and came up with an average 30% shortfall to the actual parking spaces being used on their sites. **ALL FOUR CCRC'S ACTUAL PARKING EXCEEDED THE NUMBER PRODUCED BY THE APPLICANT'S FORMULA.** If you apply a 30% error ratio to Mission Chateau's 316 parking spaces, the result is a shortage of approximately 90 spaces.

I ask you tonight to not recommend a plan that dramatically fails to provide enough parking. If you believe the Applicant has enough parking spaces, then you believe that this facility is magically going to be different than the other CCRCs in our area. Keep in mind that the proposed Project is now located on just 12 acres and the ability to add on-site parking later is non-existent. Based on written confirmation from the previously mentioned CCRCs we believe there is going to be a dramatic parking shortage. We as a City cannot afford to be wrong again.

Brenda Satterlee

	Lakeview	Santa Marta	Aberdeen	Tallgrass	Total
Actual Parking spaces	875	274	262	491	1902
est. using Miss Cht. Formula	751	217	189	328	1485
excess parking over formula	124	57	73	163	417
formula error % (excess/estimate)	17%	26%	39%	50%	28%

Mission Chateau estimated parking before villas is 316 spaces, 316 x 28% error rate = 89 spaces short

Parking Code Requirements

		ref: SUP Narrative pg 8 - 4-05-13					
	# of Units	Prairie Village Special Use - 19.23.0701	Code Rqd Parking	Staff	Staff Changeover	Supplemental Visitor Stalls	Total
ILF	136 Units	3 spaces / 4 units	102	26	16		
ALF	54 Units	3 spaces / 4 units	41	10	6		
Memory Care	36 Units (36 Beds)	1 space per 5 beds	8	7	4		
SNF	84 Units (100 beds)	1 space per 5 beds	20	42	24		
310 Total Units							
TOTAL SURFACE PARKING			171	85	50	10	316
Villas	17 units	2 stalls / unit	34	0	0	0	
327 Total Units							
TOTAL PROJECT PARKING			205	85	50	10	350
			290 Code Required Stalls				

26th

Lakeview Parking estimate using Mission Chateau Formula

100 beds

A	B	AXB	C	AXC	STAFF X .55	AX.03	
#Units	su pv code	res. & visitor	staff counts	staff	staff change	supple	total
	19.28.0701				over	visitor	
I/L	557 3 spaces/4 units	418		95	52		
ALF	26 3 spaces/4 units	20	17% staff	4	2		
Memory Care	60 1 space per 5 beds	12	unit ratio	10	6		
SNF	112 1 space per 5 beds	22	2 bds/a stff	56	31		
total units	755						
Total Parking estimate	sub total	472		165	91	23	751
actual Lakeview parking							875
parking shortage							124
Parking shortage % 124/751 =							17%

Santa Marta Parking estimate using Mission Chateau Formula

46 Acres

A	B	AXB	C	AXC	STAFF X .55	AX .03	
#Units	su pv code	res. & visitor	staff counts	staff	staff change	supple	total
	19.28.0701			over	visitor		
I/L	138 3 spaces/4 units	104		23	13		
ALF	32 3 spaces/4 units	24	17% staff	5	3		
Memory Care	16 1 space per 5 beds	3	unit ratio	3	1		
SNF	32 1 space per 5 beds	6	2 bds/a stff	16	9		
total units	218						
Total Parking estimate	sub total	137		48	26	7	217
actual Santa Marta parking							274
parking shortage							57
Parking shortage % 57/217 =							27%

Aberdeen Parking estimate using Mission Chateau Formula

35 added

A	B	A X B	C	A X C	STAFF X .55	A X .03	
#Units	su pv code	res. & visitor	staff counts	staff	staff change	supple	total
	19.28.0701				over	visitor	
I/L	90 3 spaces/4 units	68		15		8	
ALF	41 3 spaces/4 units	31	17% staff	7		4	
Memory Care	15 1 space per 5 beds	3	unit ratio	3		1	
SNF	45 1 space per 5 beds	9	2 bds/a stff	23		12	
	191						
Total Parking estimate	sub total	110		47	26	6	189
actual Aberdeen parking							262
parking shortage							73
Parking shortage % 73/189 =							39%

Tall Grass Parking using Mission Chateau Formula

64 sites

A	B	A X B	C	A X C	A X .55	A X .03
#Units	su pv code	res. & visitor	staff counts	staff	staff change	supple
	19.28.0701			over	visitor	total
I/L	227 3 spaces/4 units	170		39	21	
ALF	32 3 spaces/4 units	24	17% staff	5	3	
Memory Care	28 1 space per 5 beds	6	unit ratio	5	3	
SNF	44 1 space per 5 beds	9	2 bds/a stff	22	12	
total units	331					
Total Parking estimate	sub total	209		71	39	10
						328
actual Tall Grass parking						491
parking shortage						163
Parking shortage % 163/328 =						49%