

The public may attend the meeting in person or view it online at
<http://pvkansas.com/livestreaming>.

**PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA
CITY OF PRAIRIE VILLAGE
TUESDAY, OCTOBER 3, 2023
7700 MISSION ROAD
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
7:00 P.M.**

- I. ROLL CALL
- II. APPROVAL OF PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES - July 11, 2023
- III. APPROVAL OF PLANNING COMMISSION WORK SESSION MEETING SUMMARY
- August 22, 2023
- IV. OLD BUSINESS
- V. PUBLIC HEARINGS

PC2023-112 Conditional use permit for drive-up ATM
5368 W. 95th Street
Zoning: CP-1
Applicant: Scott McGregor, Southwind Group
- VI. NON-PUBLIC HEARINGS

PC2023-110 Site plan for alternate location for standby emergency generator
7340 Windsor Street
Zoning: R-1B
Applicant: Julie Schlachter
- VII. OTHER BUSINESS

Continued discussion of potential updates to R-2, R-3, R-4, C- and MXD districts
- VIII. ADJOURNMENT

Plans available at City Hall if applicable.
If you cannot be present, comments can be made by e-mail to
cityclerk@pvkansas.com

***Any Commission members having a conflict of interest, shall acknowledge that conflict prior to the hearing of an application, shall not participate in the hearing or discussion, shall not vote on the issue, and shall vacate their position at the table until the conclusion of the hearing.**

**PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
JULY 11, 2023**

ROLL CALL

The Planning Commission of the City of Prairie Village met in regular session on Tuesday, July 11, at 7:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers at 7700 Mission Road. Chair Greg Wolf called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. with the following members present: Jonathan Birkel, James Breneman, Patrick Lenahan, Melissa Brown, Nancy Wallerstein, and Jeffrey Valentino.

The following individuals were present in their advisory capacity to the Planning Commission: Graham Smith, Multistudio; Nickie Lee, Deputy City Administrator; Greg Shelton, Council Liaison; Adam Geffert, City Clerk/Planning Commission Secretary.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Breneman moved for the approval of the minutes of the May 2, 2023, regular Planning Commission meeting. Mrs. Wallerstein seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

OLD BUSINESS

Ms. Lee said that there would be follow-up discussions to consider results from the two housing forums that were held, as well as a neighborhood design guideline discussion.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

PC2023-108 Renewal of special use permit for the operation of an animal daycare facility
8827 Roe Avenue
Zoning: CP-1
Applicant: Christine Gregory, Queen of Paws Boutique and Spa

Mr. Smith stated that the applicant was requesting the renewal of a special use permit for a pet grooming, daycare, and training business located at the 89th and Roe Shops. The site is currently zoned CP-1, which allows a variety of retail and service businesses, though pet daycare and related non-medical pet services require a special use permit. The renewal includes no proposed change in operations or physical facilities on the site.

Queen of Paws first began operating at this location in 2015 as a pet grooming business that relocated from its previous location in Prairie Village. In 2016, the Planning Commission approved a special use permit to expand the operation to include animal

daycare services. This application was renewed in 2018 for a five-year period, and authorized care for up to 20 dogs under 20 pounds and up to 15 dogs over 20 pounds for daycare at a single time, with other limitations.

Mr. Smith said that the CP-1 zoning district included several performance standards in Section 19.18.010 which specifically limit outside activities and noise. The expiring permit contained several conditions on the scope, number and size of animals, and coordination with other animal care activities in the shopping center to ensure that the performance standards for the district were met. The conditions also included limitations on outside activities and prohibition of overnight commercial boarding; only medically related boarding in the adjacent veterinary office is allowed. The City has received no complaints regarding the operations of the animal daycare or for violation of these conditions at this property during the five-year renewal period.

Mr. Smith noted that staff recommended renewal of the special use permit for animal daycare facilities subject to the previously established conditions:

1. The renewal be for a period of five years, but any expansion or change in operations related to animal care beyond this permit shall require amendment of the special use permit
2. The use is limited to the scale and intensity. Specifically:
 - a. No more than 20 dogs total at any time, including dog grooming and daycare services
 - b. No more than 15 dogs over 20 pounds at any time, including dog grooming and daycare services
 - c. If complaints are received at this level of activity, staff is authorized to assess the situation, and work with the applicant to reduce activity so that complaints are minimized, and activities and impact remain similar to current levels of activity at this location
 - d. Indoor activities only - behavioral and socialization; and outdoor activity shall be limited as follows:
 - i. Only to the 12' x 130' grass strip behind the building, and specifically excluding any property along the north edge, whether it is owned by the subject lot or the adjacent owner
 - ii. Only for short periods of time sufficient for the animals to relieve themselves
 - iii. No more than four animals at any one time
 - iv. Clean-up and maintenance of this area shall occur on at least a weekly basis
3. No commercial overnight boarding is permitted unless the special use permit is amended. Any coordination with the adjacent veterinary office shall occur within the allowed parameters of each business, and not be used to expand the permitted operations of either business.

Mrs. Wallerstein recommended that the renewal period of the permit be increased from five years to ten.

Applicant and business owner Christine Gregory, 10334 Caanan, Overland Park, KS, was present to discuss the application. She stated that she was supportive of extending the duration of the permit to ten years.

Mr. Wolf opened the public hearing at 7:12 p.m. With no one present to speak, Mr. Wolf closed the hearing at 7:13 p.m.

Mr. Valentino made a motion to recommend approval of the renewal of the special use permit with staff recommendations for a ten-year term. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Wallerstein and passed unanimously.

NON-PUBLIC HEARINGS

PC2023-107 Exception to neighborhood design standards for windows and entrances
2216 W. 71st Terrace
Zoning: R-1B
Applicant: Gary and Cindy Wainscott

Mr. Smith stated that the property was zoned R-1B and that the neighborhood design development standards in Section 19.08.025 of the zoning regulations applied to the property, specifically:

1. Windows and Entrances. All elevations shall have window and door opening covering at least:
 - a. 15% on all front elevations or any street facing side elevation
 - b. 8% on other side elevations
 - c. 15% on rear elevations

Any molding or architectural details integrated with the window or door opening may count for up to three percent of the requirement.

Mr. Smith noted that the standards were intended to break down the volume of the buildable area and height into smaller scale masses and to improve the relationship of the building to the lot, adjacent buildings, and the streetscape. Garage doors are excluded from this count since one of the objectives of the standards is to promote more “human-scale” design and reduce the emphasis on automobiles.

In this case, the four windows on the front elevation account for approximately 7.35% of the wall planes (or 10.35% if the 3% limit for trim and ornamentation associated with the windows or doors is included). These wall planes include the front-facing garage, but the garage door is specifically excluded. Other transparency on this elevation occurs with the front door and with upper-level windows in the wall supporting the staggered pitched roof. However, these wall planes are more than 12’ back from the front building line, and neither the wall plane nor the windows count towards the requirement. The elevation has varied

massing due to the step back of one of the garage bays, gables at two different depths, and a larger remainder of the elevation more than 12' beyond the forward section.

Section 19.06.025(f) of the zoning regulations allows the Planning Commission to grant exceptions to the neighborhood design standards based on the following criteria:

1. The exception shall only apply to the design standards in this section, and not be granted to allow something that is specifically prohibited in other regulations.
2. Any exception dealing with the placement of the building is consistent with sound planning, urban design and engineering practices when considering the site and its context within the neighborhood.
3. The placement and orientation of the main mass, accessory elements, garages, and driveways considers the high points and low points of the grade and locates them in such a way to minimize the perceived massing of the building from the streetscape and abutting lots.
4. Any exception affecting the design and massing of the building is consistent with the common characteristics of the architectural style selected for the building.
5. The requested exception improves the quality design of the building and site beyond what could be achieved by meeting the standards - primarily considering the character and building styles of the neighborhood and surrounding properties, the integrity of the architectural style of the proposed building, and the relationship of the internal functions of the building to the site, streetscape, and adjacent property.
6. The exception will equally or better serve the design objectives stated in Section 19.08.025(a) and the intent stated for the particular standard being altered.

Mr. Smith stated that the existing building did not provide transparency or meet design standards, and that the proposed elevations associated with the remodel are bringing the building further towards compliance. The existing building and proposed remodel have a unique architectural character that is appropriate for this lot and context. Further, the recessed entry court and upper-level windows (which do not count towards meeting the fenestration standard) contribute to the front elevation becoming closer to the intent of the standards than the current building.

Mr. Smith said that staff recommended approval of the exception to the neighborhood design standards (window and entrance requirements on the front elevation) subject to concurrence of the Planning Commission on all criteria and limited to the plans submitted.

Mrs. Wallerstein asked if there were enough windows on the eastern wall plane to meet the neighborhood design guidelines. Mr. Lenahan noted only wall planes over 500 square feet required architectural details such as windows to break the plane into distinct masses. In this case, the wall plane is less than 500 square feet. Ms. Lee added that if the wall plane or any other aspect of the design did not meet the guidelines, it would be noted by the building official during the permit process.

Applicants and property owners Gary and Cindy Wainscott were present to discuss the variance.

Ms. Brown made a motion to approve the exception to the neighborhood design standards, including recommendations from staff but without a requirement for window shutters. The motion was seconded by Mr. Valentino and passed unanimously.

PC2023-109 Site plan for monument sign
 3500 W. 75th Street
 Zoning: C-0
 Applicant: Ron Shaffer, RLS Architects

Mr. Smith said that the applicant was requesting approval of a monument sign for a 0.9-acre site and office building on the southwest corner of 75th Street and Windsor Street. The sign will replace an existing monument sign that is currently located on a low wall near the entrance of the building. The wall will remain, but the sign will be removed. The proposed sign will be a more traditional monument sign located in a reconfigured landscape island on the corner of 75th Street and Windsor Street. The property is zoned C-O, Commercial Office District, and includes an approximately 18,000 square foot office building with multiple tenants.

Mr. Smith stated that all monument signs required approval by the Planning Commission and have the following specific standards for signs in nonresidential districts:

- One sign per street frontage
- 20 square feet maximum
- 5' high maximum
- 3' setback from all property lines or 12' from street, whichever is greater, with associated landscape plan to integrate sign into site and soften appearance of structural elements
- Base under at least 75% of sign structure, and materials that complement the building or other site elements

The new sign is 20 square feet (excluding the ornamental brick structure which includes the address numbers). It is located on an 8" high brick base with a 5', 4" side ornamental column. The brick will be painted to correspond with the building colors.

Mr. Smith noted that the application did not include any indication of whether the sign will be illuminated, so the assumption is that it will not. The sign is proposed in a landscape area associated with the southeast corner of the parking lot, reconfigured to accommodate the sign, landscape, and comply with corner sight distance standards. One parking stall will be removed from the east side of the property, but the site will still comply with parking requirements. Mr. Smith added that the applicant would need to provide a planting plan for review by the city planning consultant's landscape architect prior to sign permits.

The sign meets all standards; however, prior to the Planning Commission approval the applicant shall confirm three items that can impact further processing of the sign permits:

1. The applicant shall provide a detailed landscape plan approved by the city prior to permitting
2. Confirm if the sign will be illuminated, and if so, how (details and specifications may be part of construction permits, provided it meets all City standards)
3. The monument signs shall require dimensioned drawings prior to permits, subject to approval by Public Works regarding sight clearance at intersections

Mr. Smith said that the application met all standards, and staff recommended approval of the proposed monument sign, subject to clarification of the above three items prior to Planning Commission approval, and subject to administrative permits confirming any of these details meet city standards, specifications, and construction codes.

Ron Shaffer of RLS Architects, 4011 Homestead Drive, was present to discuss the application. He noted that the resubmitted drawings included a landscape plan, dimensions, and lighting which met City standards.

Mr. Breneman made a motion to approve the site plan with recommendations from staff. The motion was seconded by Mr. Birkel and passed unanimously.

OTHER BUSINESS

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to come before the Commission, Mr. Wolf adjourned the meeting at 7:56 p.m.

Adam Geffert
City Clerk/Planning Commission Secretary

PLANNING COMMISSION WORK SESSION SUMMARY

AUGUST 22, 2023

The Planning Commission of the City of Prairie Village met in work session on Tuesday, August 22, at 6:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers at 7700 Mission Road. Chair Greg Wolf called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. with the following members present: Jon Birkel, James Breneman, Patrick Lenahan, Melissa Brown, Jeffrey Valentino and Nancy Wallerstein.

The following individuals were present in their advisory capacity to the Planning Commission: Chris Brewster, Multistudio; Wes Jordan, City Administrator; Nickie Lee, Deputy City Administrator; Mitch Dringman, Building Official; and Greg Shelton, Council Liaison.

Below is a summary of the discussion. A video of the full discussion can be found at <https://www.pvkansas.com/governing-body/city-council/city-council-meeting-streaming>.

INTROUCTION AND PRESENTATION

Mr. Wolf welcomed the Planning Commission and members of the public in attendance.

Planner Chris Brewster began his presentation titled "Housing Policy - Work Session 1" (attached). The presentation began with an overview of Zoning 101 General Practice and the Comprehensive Plan. The inputs for this presentation were the Comprehensive Plan, prior City Council and Planning Commission discussions, the Ad Hoc Housing Committee Recommendations, the public forums, and the associated survey.

After reviewing a summary of the survey results, Chris Brewster reviewed options within each zoning district as shown in the presentation.

- R-2: Options are no change, or to allow more "house scaled" options
- R-3 and R-4: Options are no change, create greater distinctions in scale/intensity between the districts, or improve criteria for planned applications.
- R-2, R-3 and R-4 Design standards: Options are no change, consider similar approach to R-1A and R-1B, more defined site plan/architectural review, or incorporate into a "planned zoning" approach
- C-0, C-1, C-2, and MXD: Options are no change, target C-0 residential options, consider residential in C-1 and C-2, and improve criterial for planned applications

DISCUSSION

The Planning Commissioners discussed each section individually; a summary of the discussion is below.

R-2 & RP-2 (Duplexes)

- Commissioner Valentino opened the discussion by sharing he wanted to focus more on Commercial areas and not residential.
- Commissioner Lenehan shared that R-2 districts are such a negligible percentage of our City and represents an almost nonexistent market that it hardly seems worth bothering with it.
- The Commission agrees that at this point “No change” is the preferred option.

R-3 & R-4 (Multifamily and Condominiums)

- Commissioner Lenehan stated that development of more design standards may make sense.
- Commissioner Valentino shared that he wanted similar density and product type to what already exists.
 - Planner Chris Brewster informed the Commission that many existing projects in R-3 (multifamily) would not meet current standards if built today. The Commission requested additional information about which existing projects do not meet current standards and which standards specifically would need to be adjusted to accommodate such projects. Staff will bring back at a later meeting.
- Commissioner Brown shared that part of the charge is to look ahead and make sure we aren't missing opportunities. If we keep the current code, are we presenting an adequate buffet for builders and developers to do work in these districts?
- Commissioner Wallerstein asked if anything needs to be adjusted with the current process. Could a developer discuss a potential project with the Planning Commission?
 - Planner Chris Brewster shared there may be options to doing this in some instances.
- Some discussion occurred about the pros and cons of using planned “P” districts, such as RP-3 to address some of these standards and issues on a more case by case basis. One consideration to keep in mind is to build in a process for administrative approval of certain improvements to prevent the applicant from needing to go through the whole zoning process again for improvements such as a sun room in Mission Pines.
- The Commission may consider changes in these areas, after receiving and reviewing additional information.

C-O, C-1, C-2 and MXD (Commercial and Mixed Use)

- Commissioner Lenehan shared that the current pattern of commercial properties seems to work well, and has heard that surrounding infrastructure may not

support additional commercial areas which could also cause parking and traffic issues.

- Commissioner Valentino shared that the commercial areas are the best opportunity for expansion and supports bullets two, three and four from the “C-O, C-1, C-2, & MXD” slide.
- Commissioner Wallerstein asked what Village Vision 2.0 states for mixed use, and wants to ensure we are referring back to the comprehensive plan.
- Commissioner Birkel agreed with Lenahan that in some areas the infrastructure including sewer and water lines may not have the capacity for projects.
- Commissioner Brown referred back to R-1, wondering if the Planning Commission should be more proactive to generate different housing types such as through a change from R-1 to R-2.
- City Administrator Jordan shared an example from staff’s perspective of a conversation with a developer where we may want to communicate with them the door is open for residential. Right now there may be too many unknowns in that conversation.
- Commissioner Brown asked for additional examples of projects, such as Mission Farms in Leawood. Chairman Wolf asked if there were any real downsides to these changes.
- Commissioner Lenahan shared that there were two tiers of commercial districts: The Prairie Village Shops/Corinth Square and other districts. The “character defining” districts could be treated differently than other districts.
- The Commission agreed there were opportunities in the Commercial and Mixed Use areas for expanded residential.
- Staff shared the next discussion would likely be in October. The September meeting could be used to discuss the neighborhood design guidelines. Several Commissioners will be out of town for the September meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Wolf adjourned the meeting at 8:00 p.m.

Meeting summary completed by Nickie Lee, Deputy City Administrator, 8/25/2023

Housing Policy – Work Session 1

Agenda

Continuation from 10/25/22, 12/6/22 , 2/7/23, 4/4/23

- Status Review
- Public Forum Summary
- Planning Commission Discussion



Planning Commission
August 22, 2023

Zoning 101 – General Practice

Zoning Ordinance Updates

1. Discussion / Public engagement
(Option: dependent on issues)
2. Notice - public
3. Planning Commission public hearing
4. Planning Commission recommendation
5. City Council meeting
6. Decision

Zoning Map Change (Rezoning)

1. Development application
2. Notice - property owners + public
3. Neighborhood engagement meeting
4. Planning Commission public hearing
5. Planning Commission recommendation
6. City Council meeting
7. Decision

Zoning 101 – General Practice

Zoning Ordinance Updates

1. Discussion / Public engagement
(Option: dependent on issues)
2. Notice - public
3. Planning Commission public hearing
4. Planning Commission recommendation
5. City Council meeting
6. Decision

Zoning Map Change (Rezoning)

1. Development application
2. Notice - property owners + public
3. Neighborhood engagement meeting
4. Planning Commission public hearing
5. Planning Commission recommendation
6. City Council meeting
7. Decision

Inputs

- ❑ Comprehensive Plan: Village Vision 2.0
- ❑ City Council & Planning Commission Preliminary Discussions
- ❑ Ad Hoc Housing Committee Recommendation
- ❑ Public Forum
 - June 22 Open House
 - July 13 Open House
 - On-line (and in-person) Surveys
- ❑ PC Work Session(s)




Comprehensive Plan – Village Vision 2.0

Development Principles: Neighborhoods

- Diversify housing options
- Maintain integrity of PV neighborhoods

Policy Plans: Public Space & Land Use

- Reinforce existing neighborhood patterns
 - *Suburban neighborhoods (primarily large lot SF)*
 - *Traditional neighborhoods (primarily narrow-lot SF)*
 - *Village Neighborhoods (broad range of housing types)*
 - *Activity centers (accessory office & residential)*
- Strengthen neighborhood design
 - *Prioritize well-designed streetscapes*
 - *Compatible range of small- and moderate-scaled building types*
 - *Relationships of housing to streetscape and surrounding property*



Planning Commission Discussions

- **October 25, 2022**

Introduction: Housing policy and current residential districts

- **December 6, 2022**


Discussion: Key housing policy terms, zone district issue, and public engagement options

- **February 7, 2023**

Update on City Council direction and Ad Hoc Committee recommendation


- **April 4, 2023**

Preview / discussion of approach to public engagement



Planning Commission Priorities

1. R-1A / R-1B: *Revise ADUs standards?*
2. R-1A / R-1B or R-2: *Improve process for small lot house patterns (“planned” applications)?*
3. **R-2:** *Allow duplexes on smaller lots?*
4. **R-2, R-3 & R-4:** *Promote row house, tri-plex, or quad-plex building types?*
5. **R-3, R-4, & C- districts:** *Enable small-scale, higher density apartment buildings?*
6. **C-O, C-1, C-2, or MXD:** *Allow residential and/or mixed-use building types?*



Public Forum Summary

- Where are we at?
- What could change / shouldn't change?
- How could change occur?

Stations and Boards

- Introduction: Comp Plan and Current Zone District Standards
- Housing Options: Range of Type, Scale, & Format
- District-specific Issues / Opportunities
- Neighborhood Design

INTRODUCTION

R-2, R-3, & R-4

Current Conditions:

- R-2 duplexes are on larger lots – average lot size is 11,520 sq. ft.; minimum lot size is 9,600 sq. ft.
- R-3 & R-4 development standards work against smaller-scale, multi-unit buildings. By requiring larger amounts of land.
- ~20% / 30% building coverage
- ~2.5K - 3.5K sq. ft. lot size per unit
- ~35' height
- No design standards in R-2, R-3, and R-4.

Opportunities For More Options:

- Consider duplexes on smaller lots in R-2, 6,000 to 10,000 sq. ft.
- Promote compact, smaller-scale, multi-unit buildings in R-3 & R-4.
- Develop neighborhood, project, and building design standards for multi-unit buildings.

C-DISTRICTS & MXD

Current Conditions:

- C-0 district allows residential, but subject to R-2 and R-3 development standards.
- C-1 & C-2 do not allow residential or mixed-use buildings.
- MXD district intended for very large-scale, master planned development.

Opportunities For More Options:

- Enable residential and mixed-use buildings in C-districts in strategic or limited ways.
- Create better "default" standards or development criteria for the MXD district that will allow smaller-scale infill development.

Currently Zoned - R-2, R-3, & R-4 Properties

Standards	R-2	R-3	R-4
Lot Area	11,520 sq. ft. min	11,520 sq. ft. min	11,520 sq. ft. min
Building Coverage	20%	30%	30%
Height	35'	35'	35'
Front	25'	30'	30'
Side	7'	10'	10'
Rear	10'	10'	10'

Currently Zoned - C-0, C-1, C-2, & MXD Properties

Standards	C-0	C-1	C-2	MXD
Lot Area	11,520 sq. ft. min	11,520 sq. ft. min	11,520 sq. ft. min	11,520 sq. ft. min
Building Coverage	20%	30%	30%	30%
Height	35'	35'	35'	35'
Front	25'	30'	30'	30'
Side	7'	10'	10'	10'
Rear	10'	10'	10'	10'

What could change? | Neighborhood Design

DESIGN STANDARDS

Exploring design elements that help the medium and higher density housing fit into the community while respecting neighborhood character. What design elements would have the most impact to the neighborhood character of higher density housing development?

ELEMENTS OF COMMONALITY

Housing Types

Streetscape / Frontage

- Street trees
- Building placement
- Entry feature
- Access and parking

Impervious Surface Coverage
The amount of the lot that a building and improvements can cover.

Frontage Area
The space between the building and the sidewalk or public space.

Building Setbacks
The distance from the building to the property lines, including the front, rear, and sides of the property.

Streetscape Design
The arrangement of street elements - travel lanes, sidewalks, street trees, plantings, seating, and other elements to create a usable space for people.

Building Mass
The size and height of the building.

QUESTION: What design elements are important to create higher density housing appropriate for Prairie Village?

Building Scale & Massing

- Footprint
- Height
- Modulation
- Details / Features

Design Elements:


- Impervious Surface Coverage
- Frontage Area
- Building Setbacks
- Streetscape Design
- Building Mass

Public Forum Summary

- Where are we at?
- What could change / shouldn't change?
- How could change occur?


Questionnaire Responses

- Total responses: 523
 - Paper – 84
 - Online - 439
- Approximately 60% completion rate for online (i.e. 35% to 45% did not complete all questions and just filled in open comments.)
- 32% provided comments to Q7 (“other concerns”) and 40% provided comments to Q11 (“additional comments”)



Community Housing Questionnaire

Thank you for attending tonight's housing forum. Please take a few minutes to review the information provided and fill out the Community Housing Questionnaire by following the QR code below.



Thank you for your feedback! An discussion

WELCOME TO PUBLIC FORUM #2

Thank you for attending tonight's housing forum. Please take a few minutes to review the information provided and fill out this questionnaire. City staff are present to answer any questions regarding the information being presented. Your feedback will inform discussions currently being held by the Planning Commission and City Council regarding the future of housing in Prairie Village. Specifically, potential changes to the R-2, R-3, R-4, and the commercial and mixed-use districts.

Questions

1. Have you ever participated in previous public sessions that address housing issues (like the Open House from the Comprehensive Plan)?
___ Yes ___ No
2. Which types of housing are appropriate for the R-2, R-3, and R-4 districts? See Design Board for definitions of elements. *(Select all that apply)*



	R-2	R-3	R-4
A. Duplex - 6k sq. Ft. Lot			
B. Small lot houses - 3k sq. Ft. Lot			
C. Small lot houses - 2.5k sq. Ft. Lot			
D. Row houses - 1.5k sq. Ft. Lot			
E. Apartment - small			
F. Apartment - medium			
G. Apartment - large			

PRAIRIE VILLAGE KANSAS

PRAIRIE VILLAGE KANSAS

1


Public Forum Summary



Public Forum Summary


Question 4

Please review the conceptual housing types, Zoning Map, and location of existing multifamily zoning districts for Prairie Village. Which types of housing are appropriate for the existing multifamily districts (R-2, R-3, and R-4)? Select all that apply.



Question 5


What design elements are most important to address in creating higher density housing appropriate for Prairie Village within the R-2, R-3, or R-4 districts? Please rank your preferences from 1 - highest priority to 5 - lowest priority.



Public Forum Summary


Question 6

Do you have concerns with the mixing of residential uses in commercial use districts? If so, what are those concerns? Please rank your topic of concern from 1 – highest concern to 5 – lowest concern. If you are not concerned about the specific topic, please check "N/A".




Question 9

What design elements are most important to address in creating higher density housing appropriate for Prairie Village with the C-0, C-1, C-2, or MXD districts? Please rank your preferences from 1 – highest priority to 6 – lowest priority.




Question 8

Which types of housing are appropriate to incorporate with commercial uses? Please select all that are appropriate or select None.



Question 10

Would the introduction of a Public Space Network within the R-2, R-3, R-4, and Commercial Districts assist in the protection of neighborhood character for multifamily development and the adjacent neighborhoods?



Public Forum Summary

Open-ended Comments

Q7: Other Concerns Not Listed

- 126 respondents (31.7% of the 523)
- 28 mentioned wanting no change
- 22 discussed housing options – 11 were pro/interested; 11 were against/concerned
- 37 discussed building massing and design
- 24 discussed impacts such as infrastructure, parking, safety.
- 9 discussed walkability and bike ability
- 9 discussed themes on the natural environment
- 16 discussed things not related to the questions or the open house topics

Q11: Additional Comments

- 212 respondents (40.5% of the 523)
- 76 mentioned wanting no change
- 53 discussed housing options – 47 were pro/interested; 7 were against/concerned
- 49 discussed building massing and design
- 40 discussed impacts such as infrastructure, parking, safety.
- 15 discussed walkability and bike ability
- 7 discussed themes on the natural environment
- 51 discussed things not related to the questions or the open house topics


R-2

Current Standards

- 9.6K s.f. lot (4.8K / unit)
- 30% max. lot coverage
- 2-unit buildings only; (1-unit buildings comply with R-1A – 10K s.f. lots)
- 1,100 s.f. minimum unit size
- 35' / 2.5 story max. height

Options

- ❑ No change
- ❑ Allow more “house-scaled” options:
 - Detached houses (smaller lots, courtyard patterns, etc.)
 - Duplexes on smaller lots
 - Row Houses
 - Other




R-3 & R-4

Current Standards

- 2.5K s.f. / unit (R-3); 3.5K s.f. / unit (R-4)
- 20% max. lot coverage (R-2); 30% (R-4, and elsewhere in R-3)
- 35' / 2.5 story max. height

Options

- No change
- Create greater distinctions in scale / intensity between R-3 / R-4
 - Units / acre
 - Lot size / project scale
 - Lot coverage
 - Height
 - Other building type / scale standards
- Improve criteria for planned applications




R-2, R-3, & R-4 Design

Current Standards

- No standards

Options

- ❑ No change
- ❑ Consider similar approach as R-1A & R-1B
 - Streetscape
 - Frontages (building placement, landscape, car/access/parking limits)
 - Building Massing (wall planes, blank wall limits, transparency)
 - Site plan review for exceptions
- ❑ More defined site plan review / architectural review
- ❑ Incorporate into “planned zoning” approach




C-O, C-1, C-2, & MXD

Current Standards

- C-O
 - Residential buildings follow R-1 – R-3 standards
 - Nonresidential height limit 35'
- C-1 & C-2 – no residential uses permitted
- MXD – few standards; subject to discretionary plan approvals


Options

- ❑ No change
- ❑ Target C-O residential options to more compact / walkable (i.e. monitor R-2 through R-4 updates)
- ❑ Consider residential in C-1 or C-2
 - Only if mixed-use project / building
 - Residential only as part of broader mix of uses in district / center
- ❑ Improve criteria for planned applications (MXD and/or residential in C-1 or C-2)



Zoning Ordinance Updates

1. Discussion / Public engagement
(Option: dependent on issues)
2. Notice - public
3. Planning Commission public hearing
4. Planning Commission recommendation
5. City Council meeting
6. Decision



Housing Policy – Work Session 1

Discussion



STAFF REPORT

TO: Prairie Village Planning Commission
FROM: Chris Brewster, Multistudio, Planning Consultant
DATE: October 3, 2023, Planning Commission Meeting

Application: PC 2023-112

Request: Conditional Use Permit – Drive-up Automated Teller Machine.

Action: *A Conditional Use Permit requires the Planning Commission to evaluate the facts and circumstances of a specific request and determine if those facts meet the criteria necessary for approval.*

Property Address: 5358 W 95th Street, Prairie Village, KS

Applicant: Scott McCleary, Southwind Group; Monterey Partners LLC

Current Zoning and Land Use: CP-1 – Planned Restricted Business

Surrounding Zoning; Use: North: CP-1 Planned Restricted Business– Office
East: CP-1 Planned Restricted Business – Office / Restaurant
South: CP-2 Commercial (Overland Park, KS) – Retail
West: CP-1 Planned Restricted Business - Office / Retail

Legal Description: (meets and bounds)

Property Area: 4.08 acres (177,794.63 sq. ft.)

Related Case Files: PC 2021-117 - Preliminary Development Plan in CP-1 Zoning
PC 2021-117 Final – Final Development Pan – Exterior remodel; partial building replacement; and playground

Attachments: Application, and final development plan

General Location Map



Aerial Map



Site




Street Views



Street view looking northwest at the parking area and building frontage from W. 95th Street



Street view looking north at from W. 95th Street at the proposed ATM location prior to construction.



Bird's eye view of site

BACKGROUND:

The applicant is requesting approval of a Conditional Use Permit for a drive-up automated teller machine (ATM). The ATM has already been placed in the parking area for the shopping center. It was included on plans associated with the final development plan for the exterior remodel, building replacement, and playground, approved by the Planning Commission in 2021. The ATM and required CUP was not included in those plans, but was on subsequent permit set plans reviewed and approved by the City. At the time of city-approval of these drawings, it was not caught that the ATM was not on prior plans and that it did not have the required CUP approval.

This application is to review the drive-up service ATM according to the CUP criteria, and issue the appropriate permit provided all criteria are met.

The prior associated application reviewed by the Planning Commission in August and September 2021 was for the partial tear down of an existing building, construction of a new 2-story building, cosmetic changes to all existing buildings, and associated site improvements, for the property which is zoned CP-1, Planned Restricted Business. The uses included a child care center and tenant spaces for retail, service and office uses. The plan also included a playground, reconfiguration of outside courtyard spaces, some parking reconfiguration / reconstruction, and associated landscape.

The Planning Commission approved the preliminary and final development plan subject to conditions – all of which have been met, and the only outstanding issue is the fact that the ATM was submitted, reviewed, and approved with permit documents without approval of the required conditional use permit.

The applicant held a neighborhood meeting on September 26th, 2023, in accordance with the City's Resident Participation Policy, and has provided background on the meeting to supplement the application.

ANALYSIS:

The property is zoned CP-1 Planned Restricted Business District. The zoning ordinance allows accessory drive-up service areas for non-food and beverage businesses, but requires a Conditional Use Permit, reviewed by the Planning Commission. The permit application is accompanied by a site plan.

Conditional Use Permit. According to Section 19.30.030 of the Prairie Village Zoning Regulations, the Planning Commission shall consider the following factors to review a conditional use permit.

- A. The proposed conditional use complies with all applicable provisions of these regulations, including intensity of use regulations, yard regulations, and use limitations.

The CP-1 district provides for low- to moderate-intensity and small-scale commercial, service and office uses as a transition to residential areas. Office and service uses such as banks are permitted in this district, and accessory drive-up service uses are frequently associated with this use

(and other uses permitted in the C-1 district). There are no alterations proposed to the existing building or site; however, the application does include accessory structure (service kiosk) with the use. The structure is located on a center island in the parking area and complies with all required setbacks and height limits for accessory structures.

- B. The proposed conditional use meets any specific standards or limitations for the particular use listed in this ordinance.

Drive up services have specific standards that are listed below.

- C. The proposed conditional use meets all of the site plan review criteria in 19.32.030.

There are no alterations proposed to the principal building and only minimal changes to the proposed site. The plans propose an accessory structure – a service kiosk and canopy – on the center west parking end cap island. This island did not have any landscape elements in it per the approved landscape plan. The application includes a metal, acrylic, and translucent vinyl cabinet and canopy structure with a total footprint of approximately 9-feet wide by 8.5' deep (canopy structure) and approximately 10-feet high. The structure has a green, white, and grey color scheme, and the canopy includes LED downlighting for security, directed on the service area. Since it is situated in the center of a commercial parking lot, and bordered by commercial buildings, there are not any sensitive borders associated with this drive-up service. addition to the site plan does not significantly impact the site plan criteria in 19.32.030 with respect to the overall site, other than specifically noted in criteria D. immediately below.

- D. The proposed conditional use at the specified location is adequately planned, designed, located, and limited to not cause any impacts on the character of the area, the public streetscape, or adjacent property, different from any other permitted use.

The site is located in a larger commercial center and is part of a planned commercial development. The drive-up service area is located a commercial parking area and is bounded by commercial buildings on most sides. It is setback approximately 75 feet from 95th Street and is not prominent in this setting, and does not create any other impacts on the character different from the generally permitted uses or the prior approved site and landscape plan.

- E. In meeting these criteria, the Planning Commission may place additional conditions that it deems appropriate to ensure that the criteria are met based on the particular context, site, or plan.

See staff recommendations below.

Section 19.30.050.C also has the following specific criteria for drive-up service areas:

1. The service area and any circulation or stacking areas are designed and located in a way that minimizes impacts on any adjacent residential uses. This may include locating the service area at a remote part of the site, using enhanced screening and buffering of service areas, limiting the hours of operation and anticipated peak times of the operations, or demonstrating other operational or technical controls that will clearly meet the City's noise ordinance standards.

The drive-up service area is internal to a large commercial site and will not have impacts on adjacent property. It does not include any audio prompts and the lighting is directed to the service area or otherwise integrated with the overall parking and site lighting. It is in an area designed for vehicle and service access and screening of this area from the perimeter was already included in the approved landscape and streetscape plan associated with the prior application.

2. The access and circulation do not present any disruption to surrounding traffic patterns in the street, any pedestrian access points to the site, or along the streetscape beyond ordinary vehicular access.

The drive-up service proposed is generally appropriate considering the orientation of this site, and current access and circulation patterns. While it is possible that queuing vehicles could block a parking area, this situation is likely self-managed – any occurrences would only be occasional, and cars can maneuver to avoid this situation in the larger context of the parking lot and circulation patterns. The service area and vehicle circulation associated with it does not cross any designated pedestrian areas or otherwise include areas that are not already designed for vehicle circulation. The operations are all internal to the site and will not have any impact on adjacent uses or public streets.

Public Works and the Fire District have reviewed the plan and do not have any access, circulation or public safety concerns.

3. No food or beverage services are permitted. Drive-through retail food and beverage services require a special use permit according to the procedures and criteria in Section 19.28.

The proposal is for an automated teller machine with no retail food or beverages.

RECOMMENDATION:

The application meets the criteria for conditional use permits for drive-up service areas, and is consistent with the approved preliminary development plan, final development plan, and landscape plan. Staff recommends approval.



CITY OF PRAIRIE VILLAGE

The Star of Kansas

Planning Commission Application

For Office Use Only
Case No.: <u>PC 2023-112</u>
Filing Fee: <u>\$100.00</u>
Deposit: <u>\$500.00</u>
Date Advertised:
Date Notices Sent:
Public Hearing Date:

Please complete this form and return with Information requested to:

Assistant City Administrator
City of Prairie Village
7700 Mission Rd.
Prairie Village, KS 66208

Applicant: SCOTT McCLEARY/SOUTHWIND GROUP Phone Number: 325.668.3667

Address: 1218 ENERGY DRIVE, ABILENE, TX 79602 E-Mail: SCOTT@SOUTHWINDGRP.COM

Owner: MONTEREY PARTNERS LLC Phone Number: 816.561.5111

Address: 4520 MADISON AVE, KCMO 64111 Zip: 64111

Location of Property: 5368 W. 95TH ST, PRAIRIE VILLAGE, KS 66207

Legal Description: _____

Applicant requests consideration of the following: (Describe proposal/request in detail) INSTALL A NEW DRIVE-UP ATM AND CANOPY IN THE PARKING LOT

AGREEMENT TO PAY EXPENSES


APPLICANT intends to file an application with the PRAIRIE VILLAGE PLANNING COMMISSION or the PRAIRIE VILLAGE BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS of the CITY OF PRAIRIE VILLAGE, KANSAS (City) for ATM & CANOPY @ 5368 W. 95TH ST, ACADEMY BANK

As a result of the filing of said application, CITY may incur certain expenses, such as publication costs, consulting fees, attorney fees and court reporter fees.

APPLICANT hereby agrees to be responsible for and to CITY for all cost incurred by CITY as a result of said application. Said costs shall be paid within ten (10) days of receipt of any bill submitted by CITY to APPLICANT. It is understood that no requests granted by CITY or any of its commissions will be effective until all costs have been paid. Costs will be owing whether or not APPLICANT obtains the relief requested in the application.

Scott McCleary 9.15.2023
Applicant's Signature/Date

Scott McCleary AGENT FOR MONTEREY PARTNERS
Owner's Signature/Date



PLAN VIEW



Outdoor surface mount security camera by others.

NO. OF LIGHTS	3
WATTAGE PER LIGHT	100
TOTAL WATTAGE	300
VOLTS	120
AMPS	2.5
WIRE GAUGE	14
WIRE COLOR	White
WIRE TYPE	THHN
WIRE SIZE	1/2"
WIRE LENGTH	10'
WIRE WEIGHT	1.5
WIRE TYPE	THHN
WIRE SIZE	1/2"
WIRE LENGTH	10'
WIRE WEIGHT	1.5
WIRE TYPE	THHN
WIRE SIZE	1/2"
WIRE LENGTH	10'
WIRE WEIGHT	1.5

GENERAL NOTES:
Kiosk to be painted to match PMS #356c Green and MP White with a smooth finish.


Front panel to be 1/8" thk. Glass White Alucabond with routed outdoor Logo and copy. Push-thru to be 1/2" thk. #7328 white acrylic with translucent vinyl to match PMS # 356c Green and Black.

Approach side, Exit side and rear side LOGO AND ACADEMY BANK graphics to be painted to MP White with a smooth finish.


Canopy to be painted RGB Color to match R:120 G:116 B:116 Grey with a medium stipple finish.

Canopy down lighting to be (3) 4' long Led's

ACCEPTED BY: _____
DATE: _____




APPROACH SIDE VIEW



Outdoor surface mount security camera by others.


Note: Electrical for heavy surround (1) 20 AMP circuit required, (heavy surround has down lighting & security camera.)



REAR VIEW



EXIT SIDE VIEW SCALE: 1/4" = 1'

Revision R1 5/18/2022 ENLARGED THE CANOPY WIDTH	ISLAND SURROUND KIOSK w/CANOPY FOR NCR 6688 ATM		
--	--	--	--






GENERAL NOTES:

- CONCRETE SHALL CONFORM TO ACI 318 AND HAVE MINIMUM COMPRESSIVE STRENGTH OF PSI

SITE PLAN LEGEND:

- PROJECT SCOPE
- BUILDING FOOTPRINT

LEGAL DESCRIPTION:
MEADOWBROOK PLACE, LOT 3




OWNER
DICKINSON FINANCIAL CORPORATION
1111 MAIN STREET #1600
KANSAS CITY, MO 64105
816.472.5244

ARCHITECT
GENERATOR STUDIO LLC
1615 BALTIMORE AVE
KANSAS CITY, MO 64108
816.333.6527
GENERATORSTUDIO.COM

CONTRACTOR
SOUTHWIND GROUP
1218 ENERGY DRIVE
ABILENE, TX 79602
325.695.1111
SOUTHWINDGRP.COM

ARCHITECT: MIKE KRESS
LICENSE NO. 5715



**ACADEMY BANK
BRANCH:
MEADOWBROOK**

5368 W 95th St
Prairie Village, KS
66207

PERMIT SET

REV	DESCRIPTION	DATE
1	LANDLORD COORDINATION	12/07/22
3	LANDLORD COORDINATION	07/14/23

PROJECT NO. 16014
DRAWN BY: SD
CHKD BY: JH
SHEET TITLE


ARCHITECTURAL SITE PLAN
AS101

GENERAL NOTES:



- ALL CONSTRUCTION SHALL CONFORM TO AHJ MUNICIPAL CODE IN EFFECT ON THE APPROVAL DATE NOTED ON THESE PLANS AND INCORPORATED HEREIN BY REFERENCE OR THAT OF THE KC METRO CHAPTER OF THE AMERICAN PUBLIC WORKS ASSOCIATION.
- ALL TRAFFIC CONTROL SHALL BE IN CONFORMANCE WITH THE MANUAL OF UNIFORM TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES (MUTCD) CURRENT EDITION.
- THE LOCATION OF THE UTILITY LINES, AS SHOWN ON THESE PLANS, ARE APPROXIMATE AND HAVE BEEN INDICATED TO THE GREATEST EXTENT AVAILABLE TO THE ENGINEER. THE SERVICE LINES FROM THE MAINS TO EXISTING BUILDINGS ARE NOT SHOWN; HOWEVER, THE CONTRACTOR IS RESPONSIBLE FOR OBTAINING THE EXACT LOCATIONS OF THE UTILITIES AND SHALL BE HELD RESPONSIBLE FOR ANY DAMAGES DONE TO THESE LINES DURING CONSTRUCTION.
- THE CONTRACTOR IS RESPONSIBLE FOR:
 - PROTECTION AND /OR RESTORATION OF ALL PROPERTY AND SECTION CORNERS. ANY PROPERTY/SECTION CORNERS THAT GET DISTURBED OR DAMAGED BY CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES SHALL BE RESET BY A REGISTERED LAND SURVEYOR IN THE STATE OF KANSAS, AT THE CONTRACTORS EXPENSE.
 - THE RESTORATION OF THE RIGHT-OF-WAY AND FOR DAMAGE IMPROVEMENTS SUCH AS; CURBS, SIDEWALKS, DRIVEWAYS, STREET/PEDESTRIAN LIGHTS, TRAFFIC SIGNAL JUNCTION BOXES, LOOP LEAD INS, AND POLES, IRRIGATION SYSTEMS, ETC. DAMAGED ITEMS SHALL BE REPAIRED IN CONFORMANCE WITH THE LATEST CITY STANDARDS AND TO THE APPROVAL OF THE CITY.
 - COMPLYING WITH STATE LAW REQUIRING ANY PERSON OR FIRM DOING EXCAVATION ON THE PUBLIC RIGHT-OF-WAY DO SO ONLY AFTER GIVING NOTICE TO AND OBTAINING INFORMATION FROM UTILITY COMPANIES.
 - PROVIDING EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL BMP'S TO PREVENT SEDIMENT FROM REACHING PAVED AREAS, STORM SEWER SYSTEMS, DRAINAGE WAYS AND ADJACENT PROPERTIES. IN THE EVENT THAT PREVENTION MEASURES ARE NOT EFFECTIVE, THE CONTRACTOR SHALL REMOVE ANY DEBRIS, SILT, MUD OR TRASH AND RESTORE THE RIGHT-OF-WAY, OR ADJACENT PROPERTIES TO BE IN CONFORMANCE WITH THE LATEST CITY STANDARDS AND TO THE APPROVAL OF THE CITY.
 - SODDING ALL DISTURBED AREAS WITHIN THE PUBLIC STREET RIGHT-OF-WAY UNLESS NOTED OTHERWISE ON THE PLANS. OR IF SPECIFIC WRITTEN APPROVAL IS PROVIDED BY THE CITY.
 - ALL DAMAGE TO EXISTING UTILITIES, PAVEMENT, FENCES, STRUCTURES AND OTHER FEATURES NOT DESIGNATED FOR REMOVAL. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL REPAIR ALL DAMAGES AT THEIR EXPENSE.
 - VERIFICATION OF QUANTITIES. ANY/ALL QUANTITIES SHOW ARE FOR ESTIMATING PURPOSES ONLY.
 - OBTAINING ALL PERMITS NECESSARY INCLUDING RIGHT-OF-WAY, HAULING, ETC. PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION.
 - PROVIDING AND MAINTAINING ALL SIGNAGE, BARRICADES, LIGHTING ETC. AS REQUIRED FOR TEMPORARY TRAFFIC CONTROL DURING THE CONSTRUCTION OF THIS PROJECT IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE MUTCD.
 - AGREES THAT THEY SHALL BE SOLELY RESPONSIBLE FOR THE SAFETY OF THE CONSTRUCTION WORKERS AND THE PUBLIC. THE CONTRACTOR AGREES TO HOLD THE ENGINEER AND OWNER HARMLESS FOR ANY AND ALL INJURIES, CLAIMS, LOSSES OR DAMAGES RELATED TO THE PROJECT.
- ALL SIDEWALK RAMPS TO BE CONSTRUCTED SHALL COMPLY WITH THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT (ADA) AND CITY OF OVERLAND PARK SIDEWALK DETAILS MOST CURRENT APPROVED VERSION.
- ALL PAVEMENT BOUNDING EDGES SHALL BE SAW CUT.
- THE DEMOLITION OF EXISTING PAVEMENT, CURBS, STRUCTURES AND ALL OTHER FEATURES NECESSARY TO CONSTRUCT THE PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS SHALL BE PERFORMED BY THE CONTRACTOR. ALL WASTE MATERIAL REMOVED DURING CONSTRUCTION SHALL BE DISPOSED OFF THE PROJECT SITE. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR ALL PERMITS FOR HAULING AND DISPOSING OF WASTE MATERIAL. THE DISPOSAL OF WASTE MATERIAL SHALL BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH ALL LOCAL, STATE AND FEDERAL REGULATIONS.
- ALL CONCRETE SHOWN SHALL BE BE KCMMB 4K, A/E MIX DESIGN. INFORMATION REGARDING KCMMB APPROVED MIX DESIGNS CAN BE FOUND AT WWW.KCMMB.ORG THE CONTRACTOR OR THEIR CONCRETE SUPPLIER SHALL, AT THE CONTRACTORS EXPENSE, SHALL SUBMIT A CONCRETE MIX DESIGN FOR APPROVAL PRIOR TO PLACEMENT OF CONCRETE.
- ALL DIMENSIONS ARE IN FEET AND ARE TO BACK OF CURB UNLESS NOTED.

SITE DEMOLITION NOTES:



- SITE HAS PREVIOUSLY BEEN DEMOLISHED TO AN UNKNOWN EXTENT. REMOVE ANY ADDITIONAL PAVING, CURBS, ETC. NECESSARY FOR INSTALLATION OF ITM AND ASSOCIATED PENINSULA.
- ALL WORK TO BE DONE WITHIN PROPERTY LINE LIMITS AS SHOWN.




ITM ENLARGED PLAN:




ITM ENLARGED DEMOLITION PLAN:



CURB REPLACEMENT






SITE & GRADING PLAN:



LEGEND:

- ===== CONCRETE CURB
- TYPE 'B-DRY' CURB
- 97.00 SPOT ELEVATION
- TC TOP OF CURB
- G GUTTER
- P PAVEMENT
- EX EXISTING ELEVATION
- LP LOW POINT
- HP HIGH POINT
- ME MATCH EXISTING
- FOC FACE OF CURB
- BOC BACK OF CURB



OWNER
 DICKINSON FINANCIAL CORPORATION
 1111 MAIN ST #1600
 KANSAS CITY, MO 64105
 816-472-5422
 WWW.DFCCK.COM

ARCHITECT
 GENERATOR STUDIO LLC
 1701 MCGEE STREET, SUITE 600
 KANSAS CITY, MO 64108
 816.333.6527
 WWW.GENERATORSTUDIO.COM

CONTRACTOR
 SOUTHWIND GROUP
 1218 ENERGY DRIVE
 ABILENE, TX 79602
 325.695.1111
 WWW.SOUTHWINDGRP.COM

CIVIL
 UHL ENGINEERING
 4121 W. 83RD ST #156
 PRAIRIE VILLAGE, KS 66208
 913.385.2670
 WWW.UHLENGINEERING.COM

ARCHITECT: MIKE KRESS
 LICENSE NO: 5715



**ACADEMY BANK
 BRANCH:
 MEADOWBROOK**

5368 W 95th St
 Prairie Village, KS
 66207

FOR CONSTRUCTION

REV	DESCRIPTION	DATE
#1	Landlord Coordination	12/06/2022
#2	Landlord Coordination	06/19/2023
#3	Landlord Direction	07/10/2023

PROJECT NO: 16014
 DRAWN BY: DCC
 CHKD BY: TSU
 SHEET TITLE

**ITM Site & Grading Plan
 C101**



September 19, 2023

RE: Conditional Use Permit for Academy Bank ATM at 5368 W 95th St, Prairie Village, Kansas.

To Whom it may Concern,

Academy Bank has filed an application with the Prairie Village Planning Commission for the construction of a new automated drive-up teller machine and stand alone canopy in the property parking lot of redevelopment at the northeast corner of 95th and Nall.

The application will be heard by the Planning Commission on Tuesday, October 3, 2023 at 7:00 P.M. in the council chambers at the Prairie Village Municipal Building, 7700 Mission Road.

You are invited to attend an informal neighborhood meeting at the site at 5368 W. 95th St, Prairie Village, KS, from 5:00-5:30 P.M. on Tuesday, September 26, 2023.

The drawings for the proposed ATM lane and canopy will be presented to you and you will have the opportunity to ask questions regarding the project proposal.

If you cannot attend and have questions, please contact;

Gretchen Blain
gretchen@generatorstudio.com

Sincerely,

Gretchen Blain
Sr. Project Manager
Generator Studio

Sign-In Sheet

ACADEMY BANK NEIGHBORHOOD MTG

Date: 09/26/23

	Name	Phone	Email
1	Steve Stechschulte		hcetsg@gmail.com
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			

Adam,

Attached is a copy of the sign in sheet from the neighborhood meeting last night on site.

Steve had no objections to the project. He asked why the project was already under construction. I had to clarify that a permit had originally been issued, so construction commenced and that we then were going to planning commission.

STAFF REPORT

TO: Prairie Village Planning Commission
FROM: Chris Brewster, Multistudio, Planning Consultant
DATE: October 3, 2023 Planning Commission Meeting

Application: PC 2023-110

Request: Site Plan for alternate location for standby emergency generator

Action: *A Site Plan requires the Planning Commission to apply the facts of the application to the standards and criteria of the ordinance, and if the criteria are met to approve the application.*

Property Address: 7340 Windsor Street

Applicant: Julie Schlachter

Current Zoning; Use: R-1B, Single Family Residential; Detached House

Surrounding Zoning; Use: *North:* R-1B Single Family; Residential
East: R-1B Single Family; Residential
South: R-1B Single Family; Residential
West: R-1B Single Family; Residential

Legal Description: PRAIRIE VALLEY LOT 20 PVC-0586 0020

Property Area: 8,436.18 s.f. (0.19acres)

Related Case Files: n/a

Attachments: Application, Lot Plan


General Location Map



Aerial Map



Site



Birdseye



Street Views



Street view looking northwest on Windsor Street at West 74th Street– house oriented to Windsor



Street view looking north on West 74th Street – proposed generator location.

BACKGROUND:

The applicant is requesting approval of permit for a generator. The Building Official has determined that the proposed location needs to be approved by the Planning Commission through the site plan review process, due to the proximity to the adjacent house.

Permanent standby emergency generators are permitted as an accessory use for any single-family dwelling subject to specific conditions and location criteria. [Prairie Village Zoning Ordinance, Section [19.34.040\(f\)](#)]. The Building Official may require an application to the Planning Commission where there are questions or interpretation issues associated with the conditions or location criteria. [Section [19.34.040\(f\)\(i\)\(6\)](#)].

In this case there is an interpretation issue associated with the side and rear yard, and the proximity to the adjacent house.

The applicant held a neighborhood meeting on September 12th, 2023, in accordance with the City's Resident Participation Policy, and has provided background on the meeting to supplement the application.

ANALYSIS:

Permanent standby generators are permitted in the R-1B zoning district as an accessory use to any single-family house. They are required to "be located in the building envelope but no further from five feet from a wall of the principal structure and not in a front or side yard." [Section [19.34.040\(f\)\(d\)](#)]. In this case there are two interpretation issues – first, whether the location is the "side yard" or the "rear yard"; and second, regardless of this determination whether the proposed location meets the criteria for alternative locations. The side yard is generally any yard that is not the front and the rear, and the front of a lot is defined as the short side of the lot, unless the Building Official determines otherwise based on the context. [Section [19.02.320](#) and [19.02.520](#)]. Therefore the 74th Street frontage is the front yard unless circumstances determine otherwise. The house has an atypical configuration and is oriented to Windsor Street, which is the short side; the lot is also addressed as Windsor Street. However, the building is positioned similar to other buildings along the blocks in relation to the lot, so the home to the west has a side-to-side yard relationship, and the home to the north has a rear-to-rear yard relationship. This circumstance does warrant consideration of the location criteria to allow the generator to be placed in a location different from what otherwise may be considered the rear yard, regardless of the interpretation.

As a general rule staff allows side yard locations based on the criteria in Section [19.34.040\(f\)\(i\)\(1\) through \(5\)](#), and provided they are sufficient distance from adjacent houses. Due to the proximity of the proposed location to the adjacent house and the option of placement on the north side of the house the Building Official is requiring a Planning Commission site plan review according to Section [19.34.040\(f\)\(i\)\(6\)](#).

The relevant criteria for approving alternate locations are:

- (1) There are special circumstances or conditions affecting the property
 - (2) That adequate distance exists between the location and adjacent property.
 - (3) That the proposed location will be adequately screened from the street.
 - (4) That the location will not cause adverse impact on adjacent properties.
-

[Section [19.34.040\(f\)\(i\)\(1\) through \(5\)](#).]

The Building Official (or Planning Commission in this case) may place conditions on the location to ensure that these criteria are met.

Criteria (2), (3), and (4) are at issue in this case. The generator would be closer to the adjacent house than is typically allowed in special circumstances; however, this is the garage side of the adjacent house, and there are noise mitigating strategies and equipment that can minimize any anticipated adverse effects. This location currently has other mechanical equipment serving the house, and there is the opportunity to screen these from the 74th Street frontage.

RECOMMENDATION:

If the Planning Commission finds that the relevant location criteria are met, staff recommends approval of the site plan and proposed alternative location subject to the following conditions:

1. The applicant submits specifications or other equipment information regarding noise or noise mitigation, that ensures the equipment is operated within Prairie Village noise ordinances or otherwise does not cause adverse impacts. This may include a low-noise generator, and noise shield, or other type of buffer and sound barrier.
2. The location is within 5 feet of the principal structure.
3. The equipment is screened with landscape and/or a decorative fence at or behind the building line on 74th street; and the equipment is also screened from the adjacent property by the same techniques or by equipment casing.



CITY OF PRAIRIE VILLAGE
The Star of Kansas

App# 0030491
Cust# 01402

Planning Commission Application

For Office Use Only	
Case No.:	PC2023-110
Filing Fee:	\$100.00
Deposit:	—
Date Advertised:	—
Date Notices Sent:	—
Public Hearing Date:	—

Please complete this form and return with Information requested to:

Assistant City Administrator
City of Prairie Village
7700 Mission Rd.
Prairie Village, KS 66208

- ✓ Applicant: Julie Schlachter ✓ Phone Number: 816.716.2907
 ✓ Address: 7340 Windsor St. ✓ E-Mail: jschlach822@gmail.com
 ✓ Owner: Julie Schlachter ✓ Phone Number: 816.716.2907
 ✓ Address: 7340 Windsor St. ✓ Zip: 66208
 ✓ Location of Property: —
 Legal Description: PRAIRIE VALLEY Lot 20 PVC-0586 0020
 ✓ Applicant requests consideration of the following: (Describe proposal/request in detail) Generator install on the back of my house, which is my neighbor's side yard.

AGREEMENT TO PAY EXPENSES

APPLICANT intends to file an application with the PRAIRIE VILLAGE PLANNING COMMISSION or the PRAIRIE VILLAGE BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS of the CITY OF PRAIRIE VILLAGE, KANSAS (City) for _____.

As a result of the filing of said application, CITY may incur certain expenses, such as publication costs, consulting fees, attorney fees and court reporter fees.

APPLICANT hereby agrees to be responsible for and to CITY for all cost incurred by CITY as a result of said application. Said costs shall be paid within ten (10) days of receipt of any bill submitted by CITY to APPLICANT. It is understood that no requests granted by CITY or any of its commissions will be effective until all costs have been paid. Costs will be owing whether or not APPLICANT obtains the relief requested in the application.

Julie Schlachter
Applicant's Signature/Date

Owner's Signature/Date

From: [Julie B Schlachter](#)
To: [Adam Geffert](#)
Subject: Fwd: BID ACCEPTED: JOB SCHLACHTER (E) 7340 WINDSOR STREET
Date: Monday, August 28, 2023 3:21:58 PM

This is an EXTERNAL email. Please use caution. DO NOT open attachments or click links in unexpected emails or from unknown senders.

Julie

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Jimmy England <JEngland@teagueelectric.com>
Date: August 24, 2023 at 3:32:36 PM CDT
To: Julie B Schlachter <jschlach822@gmail.com>
Subject: FW: BID ACCEPTED: JOB SCHLACHTER (E) 7340 WINDSOR STREET

<!--[if !supportAnnotations]--><!--[endif]-->

From: Mitch Dringman <mdringman@pvkansas.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 23, 2023 2:48 PM
To: Ann Garcia <AGarcia@teagueelectric.com>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] RE: BID ACCEPTED: JOB SCHLACHTER (E) 7340 WINDSOR STREET

Ann Garcia,

Although the house faces Windsor east of the house that side is technically a side yard which makes the west area a side yard. Also The plat for lot 20 below (7340 Windsor) defines the side yards .


We do make exceptions for generators in side yards provided they are a minimum 20 feet from the neighboring house. Assuming the generator will set approximately the same as the AC unit on that side I get 15 feet approximately when measured in JOCO AIMS.

Two options are available

1. Move the generator to the north side of the house behind the fenced area.
2. Seek planning commission approval.

Thank you
Mitch Dringman
BOPV
913-385-4687

mdringman@pvkansas.com



From: Ann Garcia <AGarcia@teagueelectric.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 23, 2023 12:21 PM
To: Mitch Dringman <mdringman@pvkansas.com>
Cc: Jimmy England <JEngland@teagueelectric.com>
Subject: FW: BID ACCEPTED: JOB SCHLACHTER (E) 7340 WINDSOR STREET

This is an EXTERNAL email. Please use caution. DO NOT open attachments or click links in unexpected emails or from unknown senders.

Hello Mitch,

We wanted to clarify this generator location is in the rear of the house not a side yard. It looks like it failed due to being in the side yard...?

Thank you,

Ann Garcia
Office Admin
Teague Electric
913-529-4600
agarcia@teagueelectric.com
www.teagueelectric.com
12425 W. 92nd St, Lenexa, KS, 66215

P Please consider the environment before printing this email.

-----Original Message-----

From: Jimmy England <JEngland@teagueelectric.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 22, 2023 8:55 AM
To: Permits@pvkansas.com
Cc: Ann Garcia <AGarcia@teagueelectric.com>
Subject: RE: BID ACCEPTED: JOB SCHLACHTER (E) 7340 WINDSOR STREET

This was submitted and not approved saying the generator was in a side yard. We resubmitted again to clarify that this is not the side yard, the generator location proposed is in the rear yard.

This property faces windsor st.

Please review this again and let us know if we can move forward.

-----Original Message-----

From: Ann Garcia <AGarcia@teagueelectric.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 8, 2023 9:20 AM
To: Permits <Permits@pvkansas.com>
Cc: Jimmy England <JEngland@teagueelectric.com>
Subject: FW: BID ACCEPTED: JOB SCHLACHTER (E) 7340 WINDSOR STREET

Good Morning,

I was wondering if I could get the attached location approved for a generator install?

Thank you,

Ann Garcia
Office Admin
Teague Electric
913-529-4600
agarcia@teagueelectric.com
www.teagueelectric.com
12425 W. 92nd St, Lenexa, KS, 66215

P Please consider the environment before printing this email.

-----Original Message-----

From: Jimmy England <JEngland@teagueelectric.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 8, 2023 8:54 AM

To: Ann Garcia <AGarcia@teagueelectric.com>
Cc: Lynda Crable <LCrable@teagueelectric.com>
Subject: RE: BID ACCEPTED: JOB SCHLACHTER (E) 7340 WINDSOR STREET

Jimmy England
Vice President
Teague
913-529-4600 | 913-927-0007
jengland@teagueelectric.com
www.teagueelectric.com
12425 W. 92nd St, Lenexa, KS, 66215

September 1st, 2023

Property location: 7340 Windsor Street
Prairie Village, KS 66208

Dear Neighbor,

The purpose of this letter is to make you aware of plans to install an emergency backup generator next to my air conditioner, at the back of my house. Because of the orientation of my house on the lot, Prairie Village zoning considers the back of my house a side yard, so per Prairie Village Planning Commission, I am required to send this letter to all residents within 200 feet of my property to make you aware of my plans.

Current Prairie Village zoning regulations require that I hold a meeting to address any concerns. The generator installation will be scheduled in mid to late November 2023 depending on contractors scheduling considerations and weather conditions, and should take no more than three days max. Upon completion, the generator will be obscured from view with the addition of landscaping.

An application has been made to the City of Prairie Village Planning Commission for approval of the plans. The Planning Commission's process requires an opportunity for residents nearby to raise any questions or concerns regarding the above plans. This letter is to inform you of a meeting that will be held at 8pm on Tuesday, September 12th outside in the driveway at the above address. You are invited to attend but not required, to express any concerns you may have.

A record of the meeting will be submitted to the Prairie Village Planning Commission. This record will show attendees and will document any concerns that may be expressed.

If you would like to attend, please email jschlach822@gmail.com.

Thank you.

Julie B. Schlachter

Meeting Agenda

September 12th, 2023

8pm-8:05pm

Give people time to arrive and sign in

8:05pm-8:10pm

Explain the project, and tour the install location

8:10pm-8:20pm

Answer questions

Neighborhood Meeting Summary
Tuesday, September 12th, 8p-8:20p

Rebecca Stover (3412 W. 74th St.) arrived first and declined a tour of the installation site, had questions about the approval process, but stated that she has no objections to the installation of a permanent generator.

Larry and Madeline McClary (7400 Windsor St.) arrived before Rebecca left. They also declined a tour of the installation site, and had a few questions about the specifics of the generator, and how it would be obscured from view. They expressed appreciation for going with the quieter option, and wished me the best, stating they have no objections to the installation of a permanent generator. They left at the conclusion of the meeting, at 8:20pm.

Ashley Swinford (3506 W. 74th) had emailed her RSVP to the meeting (attached), but did not show up.

From: Ashley Swinford Ashley.swinford83@gmail.com
Subject: Generator
Date: Sep 7, 2023 at 2:32:42 PM
To: jschlach822@gmail.com

I would like to attend the meeting regarding generator installation plans.

Thanks!
Ashley

Sent from my iPhone

DISCUSSION MEMO

TO: Prairie Village Planning Commission
FROM: Chris Brewster, Multistudio, Planning Consultant
DATE: October 3, 2023 Planning Commission Work Session

The Planning Commission held a work session on August 22, 2023 to discuss next steps on housing policies related to Village Vision 2.0, and the specific task of considering updates to R-2, R-3, R-4, C-, and MXD districts to integrate housing options. This work session was a direct follow-up to the public forums held on June 22, 2023 and July 13, 2023.

The direction of the Planning Commission based on the August 22, 2023 work session was:

- R-2 district
 - Monitor if changes are needed to be a better transition between R-1 and R-3 districts, but no specific changes identified.
- R-3 and R-4 districts
 - Inventory some R-3 or R-4 properties to evaluate non-compliance with current district standards
 - Consider updates to the code to reflect the scale and intensity of what is currently in this district.
 - Use “planned applications” or future rezoning to –P designations for any redevelopment of different types, patterns, or intensity.
 - Consider improvements in criteria, plan submittals, and process for future planned zoning applications for better expectations
- C-O district
 - Target residential development that is more appropriate to the pattern and scale of mixed-use contexts to enable residential, rather than just default to R-1, R-2, and R-3 standards
 - Enable “mixed-use” projects – i.e. residential in commercial buildings and subject to C-O development standards
- C-1 and C-2
 - Allow “mixed-use” projects – i.e. residential in commercial buildings and subject to current C-1 and C-2 development standards
 - Consider any residential only or larger-scale mixed-use redevelopment through either improved planned zoning processes and/or upgrades or and future rezoning to the MXD districts
- MXD district
 - Improve criteria, plan submittals and future MXD development plan applications for better expectations.
 - Repurpose the MXD district to current needs – smaller-scale mixed-use projects and/or strategies infill / redevelopment of residential or mixed-use buildings in larger mixed-use contexts.

A work session agenda item at the regular Planning Commission meeting on October 3, 2023 will continue this discussion. This will cover:

- Review and confirmation of the above general direction.
- Presentation and discussion of a specific strategy based on this direction.
- Direction on next steps.

The overall goal of this process is for the Planning Commission discussions to give sufficient direction to staff so that potential updates to the zoning ordinance can be drafted. If changes are warranted, staff anticipate that draft changes will be brought back to the Planning Commission for further review and discussion, and from that discussion the final recommended drafts could be refined by staff. At that point, official public hearings could be scheduled before the Planning Commission, where public comment on specific proposals could be accepted and the Planning Commission could make a formal recommendation to the City Council. (Dependent on the depth and direction of these discussions, staff anticipates that any changes would be in the last part of 2023 or early part of 2024.)