

**PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
MAY 7, 2024**

ROLL CALL

The Planning Commission of the City of Prairie Village met in regular session on Tuesday, May 7 at 7:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers at 7700 Mission Road. Vice-Chair James Breneman called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. with the following members present: Jonathan Birkel, James Kersten, Melissa Brown, and Melissa Temple.

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. Birkel moved for the approval of the minutes of the April 2, 2024, regular Planning Commission meeting. Ms. Temple seconded the motion, which passed 5-0.

OLD BUSINESS

None.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

PC2024-107 Proposed amendments to the PV Zoning Regulations in the R-2, R-3, R-4, C-0, C-1, C-2, and MXD districts, planning applications, and other associated changes

Mr. Brewster stated that the proposed ordinance would make the following amendments and corrections to the City's zoning regulations:

1. Adjust multi-family standards to make existing properties compliant, but otherwise generally maintain current development standards in R-3 and R-4 districts. (Chapters 19.12 and 19.14)
2. Allow residential uses in commercial districts (C-) with no changes to current development standards. (Chapters 19.16, 19.18, and 19.20)
3. Improve mixed-use districts (MXD) by being more specific with preferred building types and scale, and by clarifying the plans necessary to support rezoning to MXD. (Chapter 19.23)

4. Revise the current planned development standards and process to clarify plans necessary to support rezoning to P- districts, and by coordinating specific building types most applicable to each zoning district. (Chapter 19.24)
5. Identify how the updated MXD or P- district rezoning can be applied to specific scenarios in the City.

Mr. Brewster said that the proposed changes had initially been considered in the City's comprehensive plan in 2021. The Planning Commission held work sessions in August 2023, October 2023, December 2023, February 2024, and March 2024 to discuss potential updates to the City's zoning regulations. The work sessions were a follow-up to the public forums held in June and July 2023.

The comprehensive plan spoke to neighborhood development principles, specifically diversifying housing options and maintaining the integrity of neighborhoods in the City. Additionally, the following policy plans for public space and land use were recommended:

- Reinforce existing neighborhood patterns
 - Suburban neighborhoods (primarily large lots)
 - Traditional neighborhoods (primarily narrow lots)
 - Village neighborhoods (broad range of housing types)
 - Activity centers (accessory office and 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

Mr. Brewster noted that the Planning Commission had arrived at five strategies based on the work session discussions:

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

Mr. Brewster next provided information about recommended amendments in R-2, R-3, R-4, C-0, C-1, and C-2 districts:

1. Add intent sections that establish context and relationship to comprehensive plan for each zone district
2. Reformat development standards
 - a. Convert text to tables
 - b. Consistent approach to development standards in all districts (lot size, building coverage, impervious coverage, height, and setback)
3. Add section to establish parameters for application of planned zoning districts (i.e., RP-2, RP-3, CP-0, etc.)
4. Require planned applications to use the new MXD design standards

The specific recommended amendments to each zoning district are as follows:

- R-3 Apartment districts:
 - Add intent section and reformat text to tables
 - Reduce minimum lot area per until from 2,400 square feet to 1,750 square feet
 - Clarify conflict in building coverage (20% vs. 30%); use 30%
 - Add impervious coverage standard - 50%
 - Add section targeting planned rezoning applications (RP-3) to moderate or large-scale residential building types
- R-2 Two-family residential districts and R-4 Mixed-dwelling districts:
 - No substantive changes (added building coverage for consistency - 30% and 50%)
- C-0 Office building districts, C-1 Restricted business districts, and C-2 General business districts:
 - No substantive changes to development standards
 - Add “Residential - Mixed-Use” to the use table for C-0, C-1, and C-2
 - Add performance criteria in C-1 and C-2 for residential uses on upper story or behind first story commercial
- MXD Mixed-use districts:
 - Replace generic development standards (height and setback) with specific “building type standards” for default standards
 - Add mixed-density neighborhood and mixed-use design standards (community design and project design)
 - Remove procedures and defer to improved planned zoning procedures
- P- Planned zoning districts:
 - Simplify and improve intent statement
 - Improve procedures with two specific scales of plans:
 - Community design plan - streets and blocks, streetscape, open space, general land use intensity and transitions
 - Project plans - specific building types, frontages, building design, site/landscape design
 - Based on base district standards (i.e., R-2, R-3, C-1, etc.)

- Default to base district development standards
- Specific deviation criteria

Mr. Brewster next shared proposed design guidelines for mixed-density and mixed-use neighborhoods:

- Community design plan vs. project plan:
 - Community design plan (10-to-40-acre scale): streetscapes, circulation, blocks / parcels, open and civic spaces
 - Project plans (lots and block/parcel scale): frontages, site design/landscape, building scale, massing, and design
- Frontage design:
 - Building placement: consistent front building line for different contexts
 - Vehicle access: coordinate at the block scale and limit at the lot scale to maintain consistent streetscape and avoid interruptions in sidewalks
 - Pedestrian access: all buildings and sites from the streetscape
 - Parking and garage location: interior of block; limited and screened from streetscapes
- Building design:
 - Massing: relate buildings to adjacent buildings and sites with similar massing and proportions
 - Articulation: use windows, doors, materials, and architectural features to break up wall planes and have human scale details
 - Transparency: locate windows, doors, and entry features in relation to outside space and activate more important spaces (streets and open space)
- Site design:
 - Screen intense activities or equipment from streetscape, open spaces
 - Locate utilities or stormwater interior to block or otherwise minimize impact on streetscape
 - Buffers for sensitive edges or adjacencies

Mr. Brewster shared proposed parameters and criteria for planned districts:

- Base zone district standards apply
- Deviations based on broader planning benefits
 - Lot coverage
 - Stormwater strategies
 - Improved public or common open space or buffers
 - Lot area per unit
 - Diversity of housing types
 - Support adjacent non-residential uses
 - Building height or setbacks
 - Compatible style / design and transitions
 - Broader community benefits beyond the project
 - Parking standards
 - Data on target market / tenant mix
 - Assurances of no off-site impacts

- Planning criteria
 - Sounds planning and urban design reflecting comprehensive plan policies
 - Flexibility does not strictly benefit applicant or single project
 - Proposed deviations do not undermine other standards

Lastly, Mr. Brewster provided the following summaries:

- Elements that would change right now:
 - R-3 lot area would be reduced from 2,250 to 1,750 square feet per unit (matching existing projects in R-3 districts)
 - Add impervious coverage standards to R-2 (40%), R-3 (50%) and R-4 (50%)
 - Allow residential uses in mixed-use buildings in C-1 and C-2 (no development standard changes)
- Other elements that would change (all require future Planning Commission and City Council decision based on a specific proposal):
 - MXD and P- District procedures and criteria coordinated:
 - New specifications for plans (community plans and project plans)
 - Improved criteria - approval of plans and/or deviation from base or default standards
 - Mixed-use and mixed-density neighborhood design guidelines
 - Added “default” building type standards for MXD districts
 - Added recommended corresponding building types from MXD for application in small projects as P- district rezoning

Mr. Brewster said that if the Planning Commission recommended approval of the updates, the City Council would next review and potentially adopt them at an upcoming meeting.

Mr. Breneman opened the public hearing at 7:35 p.m.

The following residents spoke in opposition to the proposed amendments, citing concerns with maximum building heights, reduced setbacks, increased traffic and density, and other topics:

- Tom Clough, 8510 Delmar Lane
- Carrie Robson, 6 LeMans Court
- Jori Nelson, 69th Terrace
- Pam Justus, 7627 Chadwick Street
- Karen Gibbons, 2904 W. 71st Street
- Mary-Michael Sterchi, 8401 Linden Lane
- Tom Ward, 22 Coventry Court
- Leon Patton, Ward 5
- Tom Hall, 2402 W. 71st Terrace
- Dan Runion, 8417 Reinhardt Street
- Susan Wolfe, 8029 Granada Street
- Paige Price, 6730 Fonticello
- Tom Hamill, 47 Compton Court

- Gary Showalter, 3518 W. 73rd Terrace
- Brooke Morehead, 7921 Fontana Street

With no one else present to speak, Mr. Breneman closed the hearing at 8:25 p.m.

After discussion, Ms. Temple made a motion to table the discussion to a future meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Birkel and passed 3-2, with Mr. Breneman and Ms. Brown in opposition.

Mr. Breneman stated that anyone with specific feedback on what should be changed or addressed in the proposed ordinance should send their thoughts to City staff over the next two weeks.

NON-PUBLIC HEARINGS

PC2024-101 Site plan review - accessory pickleball building and additional parking
 Homestead Country Club
 4100 Homestead Court
 Zoning: R-1A
 Applicant: Jeff Pflughoft, Hulsing Hotels

Mr. Brewster said that Homestead County Club was originally built in 1954 and had been operating under a special use permit since 1982. The permit had been renewed and amended several times to account for different operations and development activity. The current application proposed the following:

- Remove existing storage and outbuildings and replace them with three new enclosed pickleball courts. The building would be attached to a small portion of the existing restroom and storage, which would remain
- Add 18 new parking stalls, reconfigure the entrance to the larger parking area, and include underground stormwater retention

Mr. Brewster said that the proposed changes were within the parameters and conditions of the special use permit, but required site plan review by the Planning Commission according to the permit conditions. The special use permit established use- and site-specific conditions for the relationship to surrounding property, addressing the following primary topics:

- Stormwater issues associated with any expansion of the impervious surfaces, and how it relates to detention, landscape, runoff, grading, and berms. The 2018 special use permit was conditioned on a stormwater study approved by Public Works, which must be supplemented with all future site plans
- Parking, and the buffers of parking areas in relation to adjacent property. The 2018 special use permit established a baseline of 122 parking spaces, plus parking management conditions related to on-street parking

- Landscape design, primarily related to buffering residential property from sound, views of the facilities, and lights

The accessory structure and parking area meet the applicable special use permit conditions and allowances, and otherwise meets R-1A setback, height, and building coverage standards, subject to the specific review comments below regarding stormwater, parking, and landscape criteria.

Mr. Brewster noted that the plan proposed the addition of 18 parking spaces. Through prior special use permit and site plan approvals the following parameters were established to address parking issues on Homestead Court:

- The applicant would manage employee and member parking so that the parking lot is used for all parking, and on-street parking is only used during peak or overflow demands
- Public Works would monitor the on-street parking situation and consider limiting parking to one side of the street if necessary
- For any special events in which excess parking is expected (i.e. swim meets), the applicant would manage parking through off-site, shuttle or valet services

The proposed accessory building encloses three additional pickleball courts; the 18 additional spaces should be sufficient to accommodate any additional capacity at any one time and can help address some of the parking management obligations included in the 2018 special use permit and site plan reviews.

Mr. Brewster noted that the site was also subject to an overall drainage study submitted as part of the 2018 special use permit renewal and site plans. The applicant submitted a drainage report and plans for the proposed underground drainage associated with the new building and parking areas. He noted that Public Works had reviewed the drainage study, provided comments to the applicant, and would address any issues through the construction process and drainage permit issuance.

The plan proposes to replace existing storage buildings at a central portion of the site with three new pickleball courts enclosed within an accessory building. The building would be attached and an expansion of a small portion of the current restrooms which will remain. The new accessory includes the following:

- 60' x 80' enclosed pickle ball courts. (brings total building coverage to approximately 17%; R-1A allows up to 30%)
- 18' to 22.5' high; shed roof, higher on the west elevation interior to the site and abutting the existing outdoor courts
- Approximately 85' from the nearest property line (front edge of the nearest portion of the cul-de-sac)
- Prefabricated, corrugated metal structure; pearl gray walls with dark grey EIFS vertical accent bands, and a bronze roof and gutter system, which matches the colors and design of the of the enclosed tennis structure and other accessory building and is coordinated with the colors of the main clubhouse

- Wood pergolas associated with exterior space on the east and west sides of the building

Mr. Brewster said that additional design considerations arise out of the special use permit, and specifically the permit renewal and site plans approved in 2018. At that time, an overall plan for expansion of the club, including design of the clubhouse and design of the outbuildings was approved. Through a series of site plan reviews and amendments to the plan, the large tennis enclosure was approved with a more basic and utilitarian design and the aesthetics and compatibility with the site and surrounding areas was to be addressed by:

- a. Coordination of color schemes with the clubhouse design
- b. Buffer and screening of the larger, utilitarian buildings from surrounding property with landscape (either within the site or on the perimeter)
- c. This same direction was applied to the smaller enclosed pickleball courts approved by a site plan in 2022

Mr. Brewster noted that the proposed building was consistent with the design of the tennis enclosure and smaller pickleball building. It is located at an internal area of the site and does not have prominent visibility from surrounding property. The most sensitive visibility issues will be from the frontage area at the end of the cul-de-sac, and this issue is more specifically addressed with the parking and landscape design.

Additionally, this building is intended for enclosed pickleball courts. Therefore, prior to building permits the applicant should confirm insulation or other noise-mitigating strategies similar to the requirements for other enclosed court buildings. Further, operational standards that ensure that the building retains the full extent of noise mitigation should be required (i.e. proper ventilation, no open doors during play, etc.).

The plan includes an existing tree inventory, a tree replacement and removal plan, and a landscape detail for the specific construction area. The tree replacement and removal plan specifies replacement of several dead plants or other planting requirements as part of prior approvals. The detailed landscape plan for the construction area includes relocation of several trees, protection of some existing trees, and new plantings. Then new planning are a mix of shade trees, evergreen trees, shrubs, and grasses (with five relocated trees). This landscape plan is sufficient to meet requirements of past approvals and to meet requirements for the proposed new construction.

Mr. Brewster said that staff recommended approval of the site plan subject to the following conditions:

1. The site remains under all conditions of the 2023 special use permit, including conditions incorporated from prior permits and approvals. Any changes shall require site plan review by Planning Commission, and any significant changes may require amendment of the special use permit
2. The accessory building should demonstrate proper insulation or noise-mitigating strategies, similar to other indoor court buildings. Additionally, proper ventilation

should be required to ensure that all operations retain the full effect of noise mitigation during use. Open doors or other ventilation that amplifies activities in the building are prohibited

3. At the time of permits the tree protection plan shall be supplemented with plans showing the actual location of all required tree protection fences during construction, and the location and protection area shall meet all requirements of the city's tree protection ordinance

Mr. Birkel made a motion to approve the application as presented, with staff recommendations. The motion was seconded by Ms. Brown and passed 5-0.

PC2024-108 Site plan review - façade refinish, parking lot improvements and related site improvements
Corinth Quarter
3901 W. 83rd Street
Zoning: C-2
Applicant: Tyler Wysong, Kimley-Horn

Mr. Brewster stated that the application was for the approval of a façade refinish of existing buildings in the Corinth Quarter shopping center, for the building on the southwest corner of 83rd Street and Mission Road. He noted that the project was related to the new retail buildings on the remaining portions of Corinth Quarter that received a site plan approval in 2019, and were remodeled and/or reconstructed in 2020-21.

Proposed changes include:

- Refinish of the facades and storefronts
- Removal of the front canopy
- New hardscape and storefront landscape
- Reconfiguration of parking stalls and islands, and related improvements to the perimeter

Mr. Brewster said that expansions of buildings larger than 10% in C-2 districts, or changes in architectural style or exterior materials which vary substantially from existing context, require site plan review by the Planning Commission.

There are no significant changes in the building configurations for this application. All existing buildings meet the current setbacks, and the changes are primarily cosmetic. The structural changes involve removal of the front canopy over the parking area, and tenant improvements to reconfigure existing spaces for multiple tenants, other than parking and landscape standards noted more specifically in the below criteria, all proposed changes meet the applicable zoning standards for C-2. The plan proposes reinvestment in an existing business and building, which reflects policies of the comprehensive plan to strengthen existing activity centers.

Mr. Brewster stated that there would be no changes to access for the site, and no traffic patterns on surrounding streets would be altered. All of the parking changes are minor alterations to the interior circulation and parking. The site has 172 existing parking spaces, and with the modifications will have 189 spaces. The site is currently subject to the blended parking ratio for shopping centers and mixed-use areas that shares peak time and overflow parking. However, gaining 17 parking spaces without increasing building square footage results in no additional parking requirements for this proposed plan.

The site is an infill site that is already served by adequate utilities and the changes result in no increases in service levels or impacts on utility capacity. The applicant has indicated that there are no changes to drainage on the site, and Public Works concurs with this assessment, noting that the changes to the parking result in no net increases in impervious area. Public Works will still require standard drainage permits as part of the construction process.

The proposed refacing of the existing northeast corner building includes the following:

- Repair of the existing brick facades and repainting them white
- Repainting existing wood columns to match new wood accents
- New stucco vertical box entry features to replace the existing gable, canopy entry features, and drive-through canopy (white) at four locations
- New stucco vertical box corner element and cornice (black)
- Black storefronts
- New wood accents (manufactured wood slats), prefabricated wood cornice on the vertical entry features, wood backing on some sign panels and a new wood trellis related to an outside patio / entrance feature

Mr. Brewster said that the vertical box cornice and entry features were a departure from scale and formats of the existing building and from other buildings in the area, including the Corinth shopping center across 83rd Street. However, they are consistent with the prior approved designs of Corinth Quarter, in which the wood accents on architectural features and exterior space elements were considered unifying features with other buildings and sites in the area.

The building elevations also include sign concepts and locations. These concepts are generally acceptable, however there are no specific sign plans or dimensioned sign areas. Provided future signs for specific tenants meet the general ordinance requirements signs within these concepts can be approved by staff through the sign permit process.

The application proposes the following new landscape items for the 83rd Street frontage and parking areas:

- 12 frontage trees
- 10 ornamental trees
- 50 shrubs
- 4 parking lot trees

- 35 parking perimeter shrubs
- Landscape associated with building frontages and outside gathering space

Mr. Brewster noted that the proposal met the standards applicable to the site for the 83rd Street frontage, except the need to add one additional street tree on the western edge of the frontage to replace a recently lost street tree. However, no landscape is proposed for the streetscape, frontage, and parking area on the Mission Road frontage. Although no construction activity is occurring within the existing parking area, the entire site is subject to the landscape standards, and the parking area and streetscape already include area for landscape (the area once had landscaping that has been removed.) Therefore, the landscape plan should be revised to include landscape on this portion of the site which meets the ordinance requirements. In general, this should include:

- Add one shade tree to the western edge of the 83rd Street frontage to replace recently lost tree
- Eight large shade trees along Mission Road to meet the streetscape/frontage and parking lot perimeter requirement
- 35 to 50 shrubs along Mission Road to meet the frontage/parking perimeter / head in parking near right-of-way buffer requirement
- Six large shade trees in the parking lot islands to meet the parking perimeter and internal parking lot requirement

Mr. Brewster said staff recommended approval of the site plan subject to the following conditions:

1. The landscape plan be amended to include the following:
 - a. One shade tree on the western edge of the 83rd Street frontage to replace the recently lost tree
 - b. Eight shade trees and 35 to 50 shrubs on the Mission Road frontage to meet the streetscape / frontage landscape requirement and the parking lot perimeter landscape requirement
 - c. Six shade trees be included in the landscape islands on the east side of the site to meet the internal parking landscape requirement and replace trees that were previously there
 - d. The plan be amended to document existing plants in all areas which are referenced “existing landscape to remain” - this is to enable ongoing enforcement of landscape requirements against any approved site and landscape plan
 - e. The resubmitted plan shall be approved by the staff landscape architect prior to permits and may include revisions of proposed species to other substitute species recommended ensure proper maintenance, durability, and longevity of landscape investments
2. Signs plans are approved in concept only. Future signs shall be reviewed through sign permits and will be required to meet the general ordinance requirements for signs in the C-2 zone district

Andrea Hildago with First Washington Realty, and Tyler Wysong with Kimley Horn, 805 Pennsylvania Street, Kansas City, MO, were present to discuss the project. Ms. Hildago stated that she agreed to the conditions for approval.

Mr. Kersten and Mr. Birkel shared concern that the white EIFS panels would become dirty quickly and would require additional maintenance since they would be touching the ground.

Ms. Brown stated that she felt the proposed design did not meet or reinforce the character of the area, and added that selecting a different color for the EIFS panels would be an improvement.

Mr. Birkel made a motion to approve the application as presented, with staff recommendations. The motion was seconded by Ms. Temple and passed 4-1, with Ms. Brown in opposition.

PC2024-109 Site plan review - expansion of existing building for animal care use
Tomahawk Animal Hospital
6301 W. 75th Street
Zoning: C-2
Applicant: Brian Michener, Lo Design

Mr. Brewster stated that the application was for the approval of a site plan to expand an existing building for an existing use. The business is a permitted animal care facility in the C-2 zoning district, and is expanding to take over a portion of the premises previously used as a nursery. The application is associated with a related request for a variance to the west side setback. The proposal would remove two outbuildings and allow a smaller expansion of the principal building and reconfiguration of the parking areas and a rear outside yard.

Expansions of buildings larger than 10% in C-2 districts requires site plan review by the Planning Commission. This application proposes expansion of a building for animal care use, which is allowed in the C-2 zoning district. The proposed building expansion is associated with a variance request to continue an existing non-conforming side setback on the west side of the lot. Other than this request, and except where noted specifically below with regard to other site plan criteria for specific standards, the proposal would meet all C-2 standards. The plan proposes reinvestment in an existing business and building, which reflects policies of the comprehensive plan to strengthen existing activity centers and corridors and promote neighborhood-serving businesses.

Mr. Brewster said that the plan proposed using the two existing access points off Lamar Avenue, with changes to the configuration of access. The removal of one of the outbuildings would permit the two access points to be linked, and for the parking areas to be connected and reconfigured, which would allow easier internal maneuvering of parking and should not negatively impact pedestrian or vehicle traffic in the public right-of-way.

The plan also proposes 19 parking spaces. Based on the square footage of the proposed building, the ordinance requires 13 spaces.

Since the site is an existing site and is utilizing the reconfigured parking lots, there is very little grading associated with this plan. The removal of the outbuildings and inclusion of a rear yard will result in no increase in impervious surfaces.

The plan proposes a rear addition to an existing building, so it does not significantly impact the relation to the streetscape. This is a corner lot where access and parking are primarily from the side street, and the building does have a partial corner orientation. None of the building elements that impact the relationship to the streetscape (windows, entrances, architectural details) are changing, with the only changes being an extension of the east elevation further to the rear and a change in the roof structures and gables. The relationship to adjacent property is primarily addressed in the associated variance application; however, beyond those specific issues, as a single-story building it does not have significant impacts on adjacent property.

The design proposes a continuation of the current building style and materiality - a residential single-story building with a low pitch roof and wood siding. The most significant changes occur in the roof structure, but this only shifts location of gables and orientation of roof planes and is consistent with the current structure. Although there are a variety of building types in the vicinity, this scale and massing is similar to other residential structures in the area.

The application does not include a landscape plan. The landscape standards were adopted in 2021, and no applications or development has occurred on the site in that time. Since this is an application for reuse of an existing building, the application should make up for any current deficiencies on the site with respect to current landscape standards.

The landscape standards apply based on four components of sites - streetscapes and frontages, foundations, parking, and buffers. Existing plants can contribute to the standards, and landscape plans can permit plants to contribute to requirements in more than one of the above categories. This site would require the following:

- Streetscape and frontages - six large trees (one per 40' on frontage and one per 80' on street side streets)
- Foundation - two ornamental trees and eight shrubs; but recommend site plan exception. (one per 25' of building frontage; and five per 25' of building frontage). This is an existing building frontage and there is no area for foundation landscape. No work is being proposed associated with the building frontage, and foundation landscape intent is better addressed by the right-of way parking buffer
- Parking - six large trees and 50 shrubs; but recommend site plan exceptions (one per 40' of parking perimeter; and five per 25' of parking perimeter). This is an existing site and there is limited parking landscape areas on the site. The street tree and parking perimeter trees can count to both requirements, and the shrub requirement should be concentrated on the right-of-way parking buffer see below

- Buffers - the only buffer landscape requirement triggered is the screen parking areas adjacent to the right-of-way. A 2.5' to 4' hedge, ornamental fence screen, or combination is required. This can be accounted for by approximately 50 shrubs along the parking perimeter, located and spaced to screen the parking - particularly the head and back-end parking

These requirements, when accounting for the recommended site plan exceptions justified by the nature of this infill site, can be met with five to six large shade trees on the streetscape frontage and approximately 50 shrubs on the parking perimeter. A landscape plan should be submitted and approved by the staff landscape architect prior to building permits.

Mr. Brewster said staff recommended approval of the site plan subject to the following condition:

1. A landscape plan with approximately five to six large shade trees (species from the Prairie Village right-of-way tree list) and approximately 50 shrubs be submitted and approved by the staff landscape architect prior to building permits

Brian Michener with Lo Design, 7327 Summit Street, was present to discuss the application.

Ms. Temple made a motion to approve the application as presented, with the staff recommendation. The motion was seconded by Ms. Brown and passed 5-0.

OTHER BUSINESS

None.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to come before the Commission, Mr. Breneman adjourned the meeting at 9:39 p.m.

Adam Geffert
City Clerk/Planning Commission Secretary