

Mission Woods ARB

March 27, 2014 4:00 p.m.

Members present: Chairman David Immenschuh, Ryan Bowden, Mimi Ahsmuhs, Mary Huenkler,

Also present: Heather S. Esau Zerger, City Attorney; Council member John Baenisch, David Sederholm, Mayor Tietze, Mike Henley, Mike Knierim, Carol Thomas, Marguerite Thomas,

John Bainisch

David Setterhomm

Mike Henley

Jeff Martin

Lynn Munding

Marguerita Thomas

Carrol Thomas

Mike Kines???

Chairman Immenschuh called the meeting to order at 4:01p.m. Two presenters and five issues to take up. James Miller with Pembroke Hill School began with three items.

1. **Fencing on interior of property** that will complete fence line from corner where there is side entrance to campus that will go all the way through back end of former church lot and will join by tennis courts. This will allow completion of perimeter fencing around campus. 8 ft. vinyl coated fence with gate to allow mowing of the back of the former church lot and maintain it, but secure it. It is not space that is used by the school but the neighbors would not be able to use property as they like. Fencing would match the style of fencing used elsewhere. It is black vinyl-coated. It will allow the ability to secure the perimeter. The neighbors whose property abuts the fence have signed off. Bowden asked the purpose – it is to secure the property. Some neighbors have expressed concern about security and this allows them to prevent access to campus. Questions from audience: Ms. Carol Thomas asked about property behind Henley’s – the diagonal portion. There will be access between west wall of tennis courts. Mary moves approval of fence as described in plans, Mimi seconds. Additional questions: Mary noted she does believe it will add security and this is a good stop for the neighboring properties. Motion carries.

2. Entrance next to Mr. and Mrs. Baenish's home. There is an apron where mowing equipment is used to access the upper level. It is a small section of where concrete would be replaced to make it more aesthetically pleasing. Three new trees will also be added (instead of the 4 reflected in the plan). They will use same spacing and type in row along the street, immediately east of apron. Board members expressed no questions. Mr. Baenisch asked about damage to street in front of driveway. James indicated he was not aware there was a problem there and they will look at it. Mimi moved, Mary seconded approval of the concrete apron and planting of trees on 50<sup>th</sup> Terrace. Council member Baenisch asked again about whether the committee can monitor approval of the street. Mayor Tietze indicated that John Sullivan would oversee. All voted in favor.
  
3. Behind tennis courts and a residence, there is a request to clear an area and add some evergreen trees that will provide a more permanent screening. To do so, some brush will need to be cleared and some trees will need to be removed to clear a canopy to allow the trees to flourish. A berm will also need to be added because the soil is not the best. The hope is these will provide a visual screen and perhaps some noise screening as well. Height will be 6 to 7 ft. Hickseye Yew – about 2-3ft. apart and offset. There will be starts and stops to the berm concept, not a continuous berm. This way the water will be allowed to pass through. Chairman Immenschuh asked about the growth there now. Most will need to be removed to allow for berms and to remove canopy cover. They are ready to install as soon as possible, weather permitting. Chairman Immenschuh referenced some photographs he took that reflect some mature trees. The mature trees will not be taken out; only the scrubs and some dead trees in the neighbors' yard that will be removed at the same time. Distance between fence and neighbors property line – 15-20 feet. Ms. Carol Thomas asked about what was being taken out – leaving the more desirable trees but the brush and the scrub/trash trees will need to be taken out. The trees coming in will be 6-7 feet when put in. Depending on soil and weather, they will be 10-15ft. high. David noted he has some of these trees in his yard – they are not fast-growing. Carol asked who will maintain the trees: the school will – they will be on Pembroke's land and they will maintain. If any don't make it, plan would be to replace unless it isn't working. Mary moved, Mimi seconds. All voted in favor.
  
4. John Watkins presenting on behalf of St. Phillipine Duchesne. There was a playground there when church was purchased with a swing and slide. They wanted to level ground, so retaining wall was added, pea gravel and a play fort. Wanted to put up wooden stockade fence behind it so kids would not fall off the back. Lowes was supposed to handle building permit element. Mr. Watkins thought it have been approved already. Back would be standard 6 ft. fence and sides and front would be lower with gates. The

back would be double-sided so it looks good from both sides. The material is cedar. Mr. Watkins believes the intention is to use 6 ft. It will be solid on the south side and picketed on the other three sides so you can see through. It may be the same type of fencing used by a neighbor of the property. Chairman Immenschuh inquired whether the plans the ARB have are current to what the church wants to do. Mr. Watkins referenced the drawings and the height of the fence around the playground. Chairman Immenschuh noted his preference that the diagonal section also include the privacy and 6ft. height, and be double-sided. On the pickets, the good side of the pickets should be on the outside. Jeff – from the other side, from the back – the retaining wall is 4 or 5 feet high and 76 feet of 10 feet of visual. It will be a major impact from a visual perspective on the south side. It will be a taller screen, but it is better for the safety of the kids and perhaps from a noise perspective. Chairman Immenschuh asked for additional questions. Council member Baenisch asked about the noise coming from the playground and whether any noise barriers were being considered. Ms. Thomas noted that there is a great deal of noise from the kids playing in the back of the church. Mr. Knierim asked about a slope on the east side of the fence and whether the fence should be higher in a section to ensure safety there as well. Chairman Immenschuh asked Mr. Watkins to verify with Fred Sherman his plans for the east side and whether a portion should be at 6ft. in height. Mr. Watkins will ask Lowes' to resubmit bid with diagonal and a minimum of 10 feet on the east side also. Mr. Knierim asked about original approval for dimensions of playground. Mr. Watkins indicated a retaining wall did not need a permit, based on what he was told. Mr. Knierim also asked about the dimensions of the playground and he believes it has grown over time. Mr. Knierim indicated there used to be only a 2-seat swing set. Mr. Watkins stated the play area has not grown but the amount of area covered by pea gravel has. Mary moves approval of the fence permit with the addition of the tapering of the fencing along the east and west sides of diagonal and the opens to pickets, Ryan seconds. Motion carries unanimously. Work will start? Need to get back in touch with Loews and bring new sketch to Fred next week. And then work will progress after that – maybe two weeks. Certainly this spring.

5. Lighting – two on south side, one on the north side which illuminate the parking lot. Sodium lamps on poles, pre-existing the church's purchase. One went out. KCP&L fixed. Jim Sherman called and asked what had been done – a light went up without building permit. Jim Sherman told him he needed a permit for a new fixture. John says he's called KCP&L and they sent a brochure on the lamp and John wrote up a request for a building permit. Intent is to illuminate the parking lot for safety purposes. From a safety standpoint, they want to keep what was already there. If the light had not burned out, this issue would not have come up. Chairman Immenschuh went by and identified where the lights were. The light on the north side is the one that went out. Some discussion occurred about where the lights are located and which the church is responsible for. Mr. Watkins indicates he is only billed for two of the lights. Mr.

Watkins states he has talked to “Bud” and he is satisfied. Mr. Watkins states he is frustrated about the fact that the church never knows the origins of complaints against them. Ms. Ahsmus noted that she drove by last night -- the fixture at the back is a different fixture and they put out a substantially different amount of light. They are specified on the bill as 400 watt sodium lights. Public asked about complaints or issues related to the lights. Mr. Knierim noted that two lights have been changed. The one on the north side and the one by the playground have been changed. He called and KCP&L tried to redirect, but with that type of fixture, you can only tilt it so much. Mr. Watkins pointed to the halo as referenced by the engineer and does not understand how it is reaching Mr. Knierim’s property. Mr. Knierim said his neighbor, Jody Cash, also indicated it affects her. Mr. Immenschuh also said that the lights are substantially brighter than the ones in the front. It is a very bright light. In fact, Mr. Immenschuh says it is too bright. A 400 watt fixture in one type of lamp is totally different than a 400 watt lamp of another type. Mr. Watkins talked about the safety concerns associated with the property. Megan Dorton – there is a light in the middle of the backyard – second house from Rainbow on north side of church. One of the lights that exists does shine into her backyard. Mary Heunkler asked about changing the lights in a fashion that doesn’t illuminate the air space. Mr. Baenisch noted that the light is much more intense than it used to be. Mr. Baenisch also wondered whether we need to find out who owns which lights and whether the lights should be lowered on the pole. Lower lights would be better. Safety is a concern but there is a light that is out that used to light up the church. John Sullivan has a great deal of knowledge and might be a good resource. Chairman Immenschuh suggested John Watkins and Mr. Sherman and Mr. Sullivan work together to do some further investigation. This subject will be continued to a later date.

Expansion of playground – no understanding of whether the expanded playground was to be approved. How was it approved to expand equipment on the property? Never came before ARB. No recollection of submission of it for approval. It has expanded greatly. Now there are 50 or 60 kids on the playground. Even if David approves it, there is still a permit that needs to be issued. Fall of 2013 was when the work was done. We need to research whether they actually applied for a permit.