

**PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES  
FEBRUARY 6, 2024**

**ROLL CALL**

The Planning Commission of the City of Prairie Village met in regular session on Tuesday, February 6 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, and Nancy Wallerstein.

The following individuals were present in their advisory capacity to the Planning Commission: Chris Brewster, Multistudio; Nickie Lee, Deputy City Administrator; Mitch Dringman, Building Official; Terry O'Toole, Council Liaison; Adam Geffert, City Clerk/Planning Commission Secretary.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Mr. Breneman moved for the approval of the minutes of the December 5, 2023, regular Planning Commission meeting. Mr. Birkel seconded the motion, which passed 6-0.

**PUBLIC HEARINGS**

None

**NON-PUBLIC HEARINGS**

PC2024-102            Lot split - 3908 W. 85<sup>th</sup> Street and 3912 W. 85<sup>th</sup> Street  
                              Zoning: R-1A  
                              Applicant: Kevin Green Homes

Mr. Brewster stated that the applicant was requesting to split an existing lot into two lots to allow the individual ownership of each side of a single duplex building. He noted that the property was part of an overall development project for adult senior dwellings that included a special use permit that was approved in 2015.

A preliminary plat, final plat and final development plan for Mission Chateau was approved at the March 1, 2016, Planning Commission meeting. At that time, it was understood that the large lot to the south would be re-platted at a future date to facilitate the construction and sale of the villas. As part of the special use permit and final development plan, it was noted that a subsequent administrative step would be necessary to facilitate recording of documents to allow the sale and individual ownership of each unit in the twin villa buildings. Mr. Brewster noted that seven similar applications had been filed and approved

by the Planning Commission previously, and that two other related applications were submitted with this application.

Mr. Brewster said staff recommended that the Planning Commission approve the lot split subject to the following conditions:

1. That the applicant record the approved lot split with the register of deeds and provide a copy of the recorded document prior to issuance of an occupancy permit.
2. That each of the resulting lots and the building continue to be subject to all conditions of approval of the special use permit, preliminary and final Development plans, and final plat, as well as the covenants recorded with the previous final plat.

Applicant and developer Kevin Green was not present to discuss the application.

**Mr. Lenahan made a motion to approve the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Breneman and passed 6-0.**

PC2024-103            Lot split - 3902 W. 84<sup>th</sup> Terrace and 3906 W. 84<sup>th</sup> Terrace  
                          Zoning: R-1A  
                          Applicant: Kevin Green Homes

Mr. Brewster stated that the applicant was requesting to split an existing lot into two lots to allow the individual ownership of each side of a single duplex building. He noted that the property was part of an overall development project for adult senior dwellings that included a special use permit that was approved in 2015.

A preliminary plat, final plat and final development plan for Mission Chateau was approved at the March 1, 2016, Planning Commission meeting. At that time, it was understood that the large lot to the south would be re-platted at a future date to facilitate the construction and sale of the villas. As part of the special use permit and final development plan, it was noted that a subsequent administrative step would be necessary to facilitate recording of documents to allow the sale and individual ownership of each unit in the twin villa buildings. Mr. Brewster noted that seven similar applications had been filed and approved by the Planning Commission previously, and that two other related applications were submitted with this application.

Mr. Brewster said staff recommended that the Planning Commission approve the lot split subject to the following conditions:

1. That the applicant record the approved lot split with the register of deeds and provide a copy of the recorded document prior to issuance of an occupancy permit.
2. That each of the resulting lots and the building continue to be subject to all conditions of approval of the special use permit, preliminary and final development plans, and final plat, as well as the covenants recorded with the previous final plat.

Applicant and developer Kevin Green was not present to discuss the application.

**Mr. Lenahan made a motion to approve the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Breneman and passed 6-0.**

PC2024-104            Lot split - 3903 W. 84<sup>th</sup> Terrace and 3907 W. 84<sup>th</sup> Terrace  
Zoning: R-1A  
Applicant: Kevin Green Homes

Mr. Brewster stated that the applicant was requesting to split an existing lot into two lots to allow the individual ownership of each side of a single duplex building. He noted that the property was part of an overall development project for adult senior dwellings that included a special use permit that was approved in 2015.

A preliminary plat, final plat and final development plan for Mission Chateau was approved at the March 1, 2016, Planning Commission meeting. At that time, it was understood that the large lot to the south would be re-platted at a future date to facilitate the construction and sale of the villas. As part of the special use permit and final development plan, it was noted that a subsequent administrative step would be necessary to facilitate recording of documents to allow the sale and individual ownership of each unit in the twin villa buildings. Mr. Brewster noted that seven similar applications had been filed and approved by the Planning Commission previously, and that two other related applications were submitted with this application.

Mr. Brewster said staff recommended that the Planning Commission approve the lot split subject to the following conditions:

1. That the applicant record the approved lot split with the register of deeds and provide a copy of the recorded document prior to issuance of an occupancy permit.
2. That each of the resulting lots and the building continue to be subject to all conditions of approval of the special use permit, preliminary and final Development plans, and final plat, as well as the covenants recorded with the previous final plat.

Applicant and developer Kevin Green was not present to discuss the application.

**Mr. Lenahan made a motion to approve the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Breneman and passed 6-0.**

## **OTHER BUSINESS**

Election of Chair, Vice-Chair and Secretary

**Mr. Birkel made a motion to reelect the current slate of officers:**

- Mr. Wolf, Chair
- Mr. Breneman, Vice-Chair
- Mr. Geffert, Secretary

Ms. Brown seconded the motion, which passed 4-0, with Mr. Breneman and Mr. Wolf in abstention.

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

Mr. Brewster said that the Planning Commission held work sessions on August 22, 2023, and October 3, 2023, to discuss potential strategies for housing policies laid out in Village Vision 2.0. The work sessions were a direct follow-up to the public forums held on June 22, 2023, and July 13, 2023. He added that the Planning Commission had previously discussed concepts and strategies on August 22, October 3, and December 5.

Mr. Brewster provided the following background based on direction given by the Planning Commission at its October 5, 2023, meeting:

1. Hold the status quo in R-3 and R-4 districts
  - a. Make existing conditions compliant with standards
  - b. Clean up any conflicts / interpretation issues
2. Allow residential uses in C- districts
  - a. Permit mixed-use residential (upper floors or behind ground level residential)
  - b. Allow subject to current commercial building development standards
3. Improve the MXD district (planned district)
  - a. Promote smaller scale / more practical to Prairie Village's context
  - b. Improve expectations
4. Revise current planned development standards and process
  - a. Define planning thresholds to justify flexibility in standards
  - b. Improve expectations
5. Consider MXD for application in a variety of contexts
  - a. Mixed use redevelopment of activity centers
  - b. Strategic infill in activity centers (mixed-use or residential)
  - c. Residential redevelopment in transition areas or multi-family districts

Mr. Brewster said that based on discussion at the previous meeting, the maximum height recommendation for large apartments or mixed-use development in an MXD district had been changed from 65' and six stories to 50' and four stories.

Mr. Birkel asked if the term “townhome” should be used consistently instead of “row home”. Mr. Brewster said the current zoning regulations used both terms interchangeably, but that only townhome could be used going forward.

Mr. Brewster next presented suggested potential amendments to MXD and -P districts:

- MXD District
  - Replace development standards reference (no standards - subject to plan proposals); add specific building type standards for default
  - Add mixed-density neighborhood and mixed-use design standards
  - Remove procedures and defer to improved planned zoning procedures (community plans, project plans, and updated criteria)
  
- Planned Zoning District
  - Simplified and improved intent statement
  - Improved procedures with two specific scales of plans:
    - Community design plan - street and blocks, streetscape, open space, general land use intensity and transitions
    - Project plans - specific building types, frontages, building design, site/landscape design
  - Establish base zone district standards as the “default standard”; add specific criteria for deviations in lot coverage, lot area per unit, building heights and setbacks, parking
  - Improved rezoning/P-district designation criteria and “Effect of Decision” section noting when deviations from plans require review by the City Council

Mrs. Wallerstein asked what would happen if a developer brought a proposal to build on existing park land. Mr. Brewster stated that he was not aware of what the City’s policies were, but in other cities, a public vote was often required to eliminate a city park.

Lastly, Mr. Brewster shared proposed design standards for mixed-density and mixed-use neighborhoods:

- Community design
  - Streetscapes
  - Open and civic spaces
  - Surrounding area survey for smaller-scale projects (integration and transitions)
  
- Landscape and frontage design
  - Street trees and frontage trees
  - Frontage types - front building line, driveway widths, garage limits; two types: “pedestrian” (most limited) and “neighborhood” (moderate limits)
  - Greenspace - tie to community design plan and to landscape standards
  
- Building massing (similar to R-1A and R-1B, but adjusted for larger building types)
  - Windows and entrances

- Wall planes (increasing side setbacks for larger masses)
- Front entry features (variation, human-scale details, activate frontages)
- Exceptions (similar process and criteria as R-1A and R-1B)

Mr. Brenneman asked that the building type standard tables for all zoning districts include the same information for consistency.

Mr. Lenehan suggested that certain standards carried over from residential districts to mixed-use and planned districts, such as wall-plane, scale and massing requirements be removed to make design proposals for these districts less cumbersome. He also noted that the transparency requirement of 50% to 90% on the ground level for commercial or mixed-use districts could be difficult to attain due to current energy codes.

Ms. Brown added that she didn't feel standards should be so restrictive that they would force designers to abandon unique building features to meet requirements.

After further discussion, Mr. Brewster stated that he would update the draft with feedback received from the commission and share it at the next meeting.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

With no further business to come before the Commission, Mr. Wolf adjourned the meeting at 8:45 p.m.

Adam Geffert  
City Clerk/Planning Commission Secretary