PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
November 5, 2019

ROLL CALL
The Planning Commission of the City of Prairie Village met in regular session on Tuesday, November 5, 2019 in the Council Chambers at 7700 Mission Road. Chair Nancy Wallerstein called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. with the following members present: Jonathan Birkel, James Breneman, Patrick Lenahan, Melissa Brown and Greg Wolf.

The following individuals were present in their advisory capacity to the Planning Commission: Chris Brewster, Gould Evans; Jamie Robichaud, Deputy City Administrator; Mitch Dringman, City Building Official; Ron Nelson, Council Liaison; and Adam Geffert, City Clerk/Planning Commission Secretary.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES
Mr. Lenahan moved for the approval of the minutes of the October 1 regular Planning Commission meeting as presented. Mr. Wolf seconded the motion, which passed 5-0, with Mr. Birkel in abstention.

PUBLC HEARINGS
None

NON-PUBLIC HEARINGS
PC2019-121 Site Plan Application – Exception to Neighborhood Design Standards - 19.08.025 Subsection E - Building Foundation Height 2211 W. 73rd Street

Mr. Brewster stated that the applicant was seeking to tear down the existing structure and replace it with a new home with a higher foundation for proper drainage. Home elevations are addressed in Section 19.08.025.E of the Neighborhood Design Standards, and allow 6 to 24 inches of exposed foundation. Additionally, a new home that has a foundation height greater than one foot more than the previous home must come to the Planning Commission for an exception through site plan approval. The Commission may grant exceptions to any of the Neighborhood Design Standards, including the foundation height standards, subject to the site plan process.

Mr. Brewster noted that the applicant was requesting a foundation top 2.34 feet higher than the current top of foundation, which was more than the 1-foot increase allowed by regulation. He added that the proposal met the criteria for the Planning Commission to grant an exception and recommended approval subject to the following conditions:

1. The exception is limited to the plans included in the application and specifically the proposed top of foundation at the proposed 996-foot elevation contour.

2. The applicant receive all necessary drainage permits and impervious surface approvals from Public Works prior to obtaining building permits.

Brian Kuhn representing BK Builds was in attendance, and stated that he had no concerns with the staff report or conditions.

Mr. Birkel noted that some of the provided drawings showed the home sitting 3 feet higher than the garage floor. Mr. Kuhn stated he was unsure why the distance was so high, and would need to check with the engineer who developed the drawings. Mr. Dringman asked the applicant if the current house was slab-on-grade, and Mr. Kuhn stated that it was. Mr. Dringman said that for a slab-on-grade home, he regarded the finished floor as the top of foundation. This means that the starting point for the exception measurement would actually be one foot above the current finished floor. As a result, the applicant only needed approximately 0.34 feet more than what was permitted by regulation.

Mr. Wolf made a motion to approve the site plan subject to the conditions recommended by staff. Mr. Breneman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

PC2019-122 New Monument Sign Application
CFD#2 – 7810 Mission Road

Paul Hontz with Architectural Stone Products, the manufacturer of the sign, was present, along with Consolidated Fire District #2 Chief Tony Lopez. Mr. Brewster stated that the sign was for the new fire station adjacent to City Hall. He noted that the lot was non-conforming, and did not have direct access to Mission Road. An access easement was obtained from the property to the east that fronts Mission Road. The sign would be located to the west of the parking pad in the easement entry to the lot. Because the sign is an irregular shape, interpretations had to be made to ensure it was less than the 20 square feet maximum described in zoning regulations.

Staff recommended approval subject to the following condition:

1. The easement allowing a sign at this location (or other permission or grant by the property owner) be verified prior to final permits.

Mr. Wolf made a motion to approve the site plan subject to the condition recommended by staff. Mr. Breneman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

OTHER BUSINESS

Consider Approval of Zoning Regulation Interpretations

Mr. Brewster said that while staff had been reviewing the Neighborhood Design Standards, questions arose over how to interpret several specific standards. He added that the standards were being presented to the Planning Commission to ensure members were in agreement with staff interpretations. A document focusing on the following five items was included in the meeting packet:

Wall planes

The wall plane for standards addressing the side elevation includes the basic mass nearest the side property line. It may exclude the following: any wall plane more than 12 feet from the facade closest to the property line; any portion of an exposed foundation; portions of pitched roofs; fascia, sill plates or other ornamental trim; unenclosed projections such as porches and patios, provided wall planes associated with roof or low walls would count, and any enclosure of the projection whether screen, window or wall would count.

Window and entrance percentages

This standard requires at least 8% window openings on side elevations, and applies to the wall plane closest to the side lot line, which includes all of the wall plane elements within 12 feet of that wall plane nearest the side lot line. Additionally, up to 3% of the total of this requirement may include ornamental features such as trim or ornamental details grouping openings together. Faux openings and garage doors do not count.

Additional setback

The additional setback in Section D.2.b. is different than projections or offsets in Section D.2.a. “Additional setback” is a measure that applies to the relationship to the side lot line, based on the overall massing and volume of the building. “Projections” and “offsets” are measures that apply to a wall plane based on its size, regardless of how near or far it is from the lot line. Therefore, Section D.2.b has the following effect:

- 100% of any elevation may be established at 4 feet beyond the minimum side setback, regardless of size.
- 100% of any elevation with a wall plane less than 800 square feet may be established at any place behind the minimum side setback.
- For wall planes larger than 800 square feet, 75% of the wall plane can be placed at the minimum side setback or within 4 feet beyond the required side setback, but the remaining 25% must be setback an additional 4 feet beyond the minimum setback.

Architectural details

Projections and offsets are measures that apply to a wall plane based on its size, regardless of how near or far it is to the lot line. Therefore, Section D.2.a has the following effect:

- Wall planes that are 500 square feet or less require no features (other than the percentage of windows and doors).
- Wall planes over 500 square feet must be broken into distinct masses of at least 20% of total wall plane (projections, offsets, bay windows and other architectural

elements that provide at least 1.5 feet projecting and 2 feet offset of differentiation in the wall plane).

Side setback
The setback requirements have the following effect:

- All buildings shall meet the minimum required width setback on both sides.
- Where lots are wider than the minimum, the required setback is greater based on 20% of the lot width.
- The width is measured at the front setback line (or platted front building line, if applicable).
- The required setback, to the extent a lot requires more than the minimum, may be apportioned in any way so that the cumulative side setback is 20% between both sides.

Mrs. Robichaud stated that there had been confusion among builders and architects based on their interpretations of the standards. She added that if the Planning Commission agreed to the interpretations presented by staff, a training session would be scheduled in the next few months for builders and architects to better understand the regulations.

All Commission members endorsed the interpretations. No formal vote was required.

Mrs. Robichaud said a Planning Commission work session had been tentatively scheduled for December 17 to discuss Village Vision 2.0.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to come before the Commission, Chair Nancy Wallerstein adjourned the meeting at 7:47 p.m.

Nancy Wallerstein
Chair