

**PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
AUGUST 3, 2021**

ROLL CALL

The Planning Commission of the City of Prairie Village met in regular session on Tuesday, August 3, 2021 at 7:00 p.m. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, Commission members attended a virtual meeting via the Zoom software platform. Vice-Chair James Breneman called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. with the following members present: Jonathan Birkel, Patrick Lenahan, Melissa Brown, and Nancy Wallerstein.

The following individuals were present via Zoom in their advisory capacity to the Planning Commission: Graham Smith, Gould Evans; Jamie Robichaud, Deputy City Administrator; Ron Nelson, Council Liaison; Adam Geffert, City Clerk/Planning Commission Secretary.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mrs. Wallerstein moved for the approval of the minutes of the July 13, 2021 regular Planning Commission meeting. Mr. Lenahan seconded the motion, which passed 4-0, with Mr. Birkel in abstention.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

PC2021-117 Preliminary Development Plan and Final Development Plan Applications
Meadowbrook Shopping Center
5300 W. 95th Street
Zoning: CP-1
Applicant: Patrick Reuter, Klover Architects

Mr. Graham Smith, planning consultant with Gould Evans, stated that the applicant was requesting approval of a preliminary development plan and a final development plan for a partial tear down of an existing building, construction of a new two-story building, cosmetic changes to all existing buildings, and associated site improvements at the Meadowbrook Shopping Center. The property is zoned CP-1, Planned Restricted Business, which requires a preliminary development plan and a final development plan for redevelopment.

In this case, the applicant is proposing an increase in the floor area that is beyond 10%, and an increase in the building height greater than 4' or 10% - each requiring a new preliminary development plan. These changes are associated with the new two-story building that will replace the northeast corner of the existing building on the west half of

the site. The front portion of the building and the existing building on the east half of the site will remain and be refaced.

The primary use for the new building will be a childcare center, and the remaining tenant spaces will be unchanged as to their general uses (retail, service and office uses).

The specific changes proposed in the preliminary development plan include:

- A new building (“Building H”) in the north central portion of the existing building footprint, which will be a two-story, 14,000 square feet building proposed for daycare.
- A replacement of the northwest portion of the existing building with an 8,445 square feet playground.
- Reconfiguration of the courtyard space associated with new Building H and the remaining Building B on the east of the site and Building A on the southwest side of the site.
- Removal of approximately 13 spaces of building-front parking on the north side of new Building H.
- The addition of 21 spaces of on-street parking and curb and sidewalk reconfiguration on the north side of 94th Terrace, abutting the site.
- Cosmetic changes to the facades of the existing remaining buildings.

Due to the minor changes to the overall plan, and primarily cosmetic changes to the existing buildings and site, the preliminary development plan and final development plan were submitted together for consideration.

Mr. Smith reviewed the “Golden Factors” that the Planning Commission must consider for a revised preliminary development plan:

1. The character of the neighborhood;
2. The zoning and uses of property nearby;
3. The suitability of the property for the uses to which it has been restricted under its existing zoning;
4. The extent that a change will detrimentally affect neighboring property;
5. The length of time of any vacancy of the property;
6. The relative gain to public health, safety and welfare by destruction of value of the applicant’s property as compared to the hardship on other individual landowners;
7. City staff recommendations;
8. Conformance with the Comprehensive Plan; and
9. Approval of the preliminary and final development plans

He added that staff recommended approval of the revised preliminary development plan and final development plan subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to issuing building permits, the landscape plan be amended and approved by staff with the following changes:
 - a. The street trees on 94th Terrace be coordinated with the approved option in regard to on-street parking in condition 2 below.

- b. Additional shrubs or perennial plants be allocated to the four trash enclosure areas on 94th Terrace.
 - c. 8 street trees (or acceptable alternates) be added to the 95th Street frontage, along with preserving the 5 existing street trees.
 - d. Approximately 65 to 70 shrubs be added to the parking perimeter along 95th Street, along with preserving the existing shrubs at the entry.
2. On-street parking on 94th Terrace is subject to further review and approval by Public Works, and 3 alternative options should be considered:
 - a. Use striping for on-street parking on the south side within existing curb and sidewalk configurations and supplement with additional street trees; or
 - b. Use striping for on-street parking on the south side within the existing curb configuration, but relocate the sidewalk with a wider landscape median and plant new street trees; or
 - c. Forego on-street parking at this time.
3. Public works approves any required drainage study and/or a drainage permit in association with the work prior to building permits being issued.
4. Signs included in the plan are conceptual; any future signs are subject to sign permits and otherwise need to meet City sign standards applicable to this property.
5. The Planning Commission approval of the final development plan is conditioned upon the subsequent final approval of the revised preliminary development plan by the City Council.

Mr. Birkel asked if the parking proposed for 94th Terrace was required; Mr. Smith stated it was not, as the site already exceeded the necessary number of parking spaces. Mrs. Wallerstein shared concerns about traffic flow for drop-off and pick-up at the proposed daycare facility. Mr. Breneman stated that he was opposed to the parallel parking spots on 94th Terrace.

Patrick Reuter of Klover Architects, 8813 Penrose Lane, Lenexa, and Eric Gonsler of the R.H. Johnson Company, 2215 Brookwood Road, Mission Hills, were present to discuss the project. Mr. Reuter stated that the proposed parallel parking on 94th Terrace was initially included based on discussions with City staff and the guidance provided in Village Vision 2.0. He added that a daycare drop-off lane could be added if needed. Mr. Gonsler noted that parents would be able to drop off children at the daycare from both the north and south side of the building. Mrs. Wallerstein stated this would be unlikely, since most daycare facilities only have a single entrance for safety purposes.

Mr. Breneman opened the public hearing at 7:46 p.m. With no one present to speak, Mr. Breneman closed the public hearing at 7:47 p.m.

Planning Commission members reviewed the “Golden Factors” and found that the project met all required criteria. However, they felt that more information was needed in regard to traffic flow in and out of the day care facility before they would feel comfortable approving the final development plan.

After further discussion, Mr. Lenahan made a motion to continue the final development plan portion of the application to the next meeting. Mr. Birkel seconded the motion, which passed 5-0.

Mr. Lenahan made a motion to recommend approval of the preliminary development plan to the City Council with staff conditions, including Option 2-C in regard to eliminating the on-street parking on 94th Terrace. Mrs. Wallerstein seconded the motion, which passed 5-0.

NON-PUBLIC HEARINGS

PC2021-116 New Building Signage and Monument Sign Application / Conditional Use Permit - Drive-up Service (Non-Food and Beverage)
3500 W. 75th Street
Zoning: C-0
Applicant: Ron Shaffer, RLS Architects

Mr. Smith stated that the applicant was requesting approval for the following items:

1. A conditional use permit for a drive-up automated teller machine (ATM);
2. A revision to previously approved sign standards for a multi-tenant office building, for the addition of a wall sign; and
3. A new monument sign.

The conditional use permit application for the proposed drive-up ATM was reviewed first. Mr. Smith noted that an accessory use for a drive-up service was an appropriate use at the location. The ATM would be placed at the northeast corner of the lot, and include:

- A 6' x 10' canopy, approximately 11' high;
- The ATM located under the canopy;
- Replacement of 6 parking spaces to locate the facility and configure the access lane;
- A 1' 8" façade on the canopy incorporating backlit signs on all sides;

Mr. Smith went over several staff recommendations that should be considered before the Planning Commission approved the conditional use permit. Most dealt with the relationship of the ATM to nearby residential properties, and could be addressed by the applicant submitting additional design details and specifications for the proposal:

1. No backlit lighting should be allowed on the north and west edges of the canopy, and any material on these sides should be neutral or muted earth tones that blend in with the landscape to minimize impacts on residential property.
2. Any lighting of signs on the south and east edges of the canopy, and any under-lighting of the canopy, should be limited to only lighting that is sufficient for security. No light spill or glare should occur beyond the immediate service area.
3. The north edge should include a dense evergreen screen between the kiosk/canopy and the fence. The screen should be at least as high as the canopy.

4. No audio service prompts should be permitted, and noise shall otherwise be mitigated through either the technology or design of the canopy.
5. Materials and colors of the canopy should be specified - particularly as it relates to the residential property and minimizing impacts on residential property. A combination of muted colors, complimentary materials, landscape, and/or a lower-profile canopy should be considered.

Mr. Birkel asked if illumination should be removed from the east side of the ATM canopy as well, to prevent light spill to the homes facing the parking lot across Windsor Road. Mrs. Wallerstein shared concerns about traffic flow through the parking lot, suggesting that the curb for the ATM be extended.

Ron Shaffer, RLS Architects, and Dan Smith, property owner, were present to discuss the project. Both agreed to remove the lighting from the east side of the canopy, and to extend the curb on which the ATM would sit one stall to the west.

Ms. Brown made a motion to approve the Conditional Use Permit for the ATM, with staff recommendations, as well as limiting lighting to only the south side of the kiosk and extending the curb one parking stall to the west. Mrs. Wallerstein seconded the motion, which passed 5-0.

Mr. Smith next reviewed the multi-tenant building sign plan. He noted that the plan was a revision of a previously approved sign standard, originally approved in 2013. A monument sign was approved in 2014, and an amendment to the sign plan to add a sign to the front of the building was approved in 2017. The applicant is requesting a new 50 square feet wall sign on the south end of the east elevation at the mid-point of the building, between the windows of the first and second story.

Mr. Smith noted that the proposed building sign did not meet the current sign plan for the building in the following ways:

1. It does not use dark bronze cut out letters, with limited letter sizes;
2. It exceeds the 30 square feet per sign limit (though it does meet the overall sign size requirements);
3. It does not meet the criteria for an amendment to the sign plan because the proposed sign does not use the recommended guidelines for coordinating multiple signs on a building, and does not propose other strategies to coordinate this sign with the existing sign or any future or replacement signs on the building.

Mr. Shaffer asked that the signage portion of the application be continued to the next Planning Commission meeting so the applicant had a chance to further review the approved sign plan from 2017.

Mr. Lenahan made a motion to continue the building signage portion of the application to the September meeting. Mr. Birkel seconded the motion, which passed 5-0.

Mr. Shaffer asked that the monument sign portion of application also be continued to the next Planning Commission meeting.

Mr. Lenahan made a motion to continue the monument sign portion of the application to the September meeting. Mr. Birkel seconded the motion, which passed 5-0.

PC2021-118 New Monument Sign Application
 The Village at Mission
 7105 Mission Road
 Zoning: R-1B
 Applicant: Joe Tindall, GrandMark Signs, LLC

Mr. Smith said that the applicant was requesting approval of a monument sign associated with an adult senior living facility. The monument sign would be similar in scale, design, and location to the previous monument sign on the site. However, all new monument signs require approval by the Planning Commission, based on the zoning ordinance.

Mr. Smith noted that staff recommended approval of the new monument sign, subject to the following conditions:

1. Planning Commission approves an exception for the 13.5” diameter logo on the brick pillar;
2. The applicant specify the pillar cap material prior to Planning Commission approval; and
3. The current landscape be retained or replaced with similar low-level ground cover and ornamental plants, to be verified at the time of permits.

Joe Tindall with GrandMark Signs, 15301 W. 109th Street, Lenexa, was present to discuss the project. He stated that the pillar caps would be made of stone.

Mrs. Wallerstein made a motion to approve the new monument sign with staff recommendations. Mr. Birkel seconded the motion, which passed 5-0.

OTHER BUSINESS

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to come before the Commission, Vice-Chair James Breneman adjourned the meeting at 9:11 p.m.

Adam Geffert
City Clerk/Planning Commission Secretary