**PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES**

April 5, 2016

ROLL CALL

The Planning Commission of the City of Prairie Village met in regular session on Tuesday, April 5, 2016 in the Municipal Building Council Chambers at 7700 Mission Road. Chairman Nancy Wallerstein called the meeting to order at 7:00 with the following members present: James Breneman, Melissa Brown, Patrick Lenahan, Jonathan Birkel, Gregory Wolf and Jeffrey Valentino.

The following persons were present in their advisory capacity to the Planning Commission: Chris Brewster, City Planning Consultant; PJ Novick, Meadowbrook Planning Consultant; Wes Jordan, Assistant City Administrator; Mitch Dringman, Building Official; Eric Mikkelson, Council Liaison; Keith Bredehoeft, Director of Public Works and Joyce Hagen Mundy, Commission Secretary.

###### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

James Breneman moved for the approval of the minutes of the Planning Commission for March 1, 2016 as submitted. The motion was seconded by Jonathan Birkel and passed by a vote of 6 to 0 with Gregory Wolf abstaining.

**PUBLIC HEARINGS**

PC2016-04 Request for Amendment to Special Use Permit

For Veterinary Clinic

8823 Roe Avenue

Chairman Nancy Wallerstein noted that the applicant has asked that this application be continued.

**NON PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**PC2016-108** **Request for Temporary Use Permit**

**4801 West 79th Street**

Dr. Trista Perez Crawford with Children’s Mercy South noted they are proposing to once again provide an eight-week Summer Treatment Program for approximately 50 children with ADHD. The program is proposed to be held at the Kansas City Christian School from June 6, 2016 through July 29, 2016. The hours of operation will be 7:30 am to 5:30 pm; Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Friday; and 7:30 am to 8:00 pm on Thursday. Staff will train the previous week, May 31st through June 3rd. The program will use several classrooms, the lunch room, the gymnasium, and the outdoor playgrounds. The proposed Summer Treatment Program will use the existing building, parking lots, and outdoor areas and there will be no changes made to the property.

Nancy Wallerstein confirmed that the same Summer Treatment Program was offered at this location in 2014 and 2015 and Kansas City Christian School and the City did not receive any complaints about the use.

Chris Brewster noted that since the short-term use is for more than 30 days, it requires Planning Commission approval. The Planning Commission may approve the temporary use permit provided that the application meets the following:

1. The applicant shall submit in written form a complete description of the proposed use, including drawings of proposed physical improvements, estimated accumulation of automobiles and persons, hours of operation, length of time requested, and other characteristics and effects on the neighborhood.

The applicant has provided a detailed description of the proposed operation, as follows:

The applicant has submitted a description of the program, floor plans of the area to be used. There will be approximately 50 children and 27 staff (20 counselors, 2 teachers, and 5 psychologists). There will be no external changes to the facility or grounds so it should have no adverse effects on the neighborhood. The program will use approximately 50 parking spaces for either drop of or day parking. The site is more than adequate to accommodate them. This provides a needed service for the community and is a good use of a facility that would remain unused for the summer.

1. If approved, a specific time period shall be determined and a short-term permit shall not be operated longer than the period stipulated in the permit.

The applicant has requested that the short-term use be approved for the period from June 6, 2016 through July 29, 2016, with staff training May 31 through June 3, and that would be the maximum time of operation that would be permitted.

1. Upon cessation of the short-term permit, all materials and equipment shall be promptly removed and the property restored to its normal condition. If after giving full consideration to the effect of the requested short-term permit on the neighborhood and the community, the Planning Commission deems the request reasonable, the permit for the short-term use may be approved. Conditions of operations, provision for surety bond, and other reasonable safeguards may be written into the permit. Such permit may be approved in any zoning district.

There will be no external changes to the building and grounds; therefore, no adverse effects on the adjacent neighborhood.

Nancy Wallerstein asked if the permit could be issued for more than one year since this is an ongoing event. Mr. Brewster replied the provisions for a temporary use permit only allow for a short term permit, but noted this could be investigated for future applications.

Gregory Wolf moved the Planning Commission approve PC2016-108 granting a Temporary Use Permit to Children’s Mercy Hospital for an ADHD Summer Treatment Program at 4801 West 79th Street subject to the following conditions:

1. That the temporary use permit for the ADHD Summer Treatment Program be approved for a period from June 6, 2016 through July 29, 2016, with staff training May 31 through June 3.
2. That the hours of operation shall be from 7:30 am to 5:30 pm on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Friday, and 7:30 am to 8:00 pm on Thursday.
3. That the Summer Treatment Program uses the existing building, parking, driveways, and playgrounds and will make no external changes to the property.
4. That the applicant properly maintains the exterior area of the property and will leave it in an acceptable condition when the program ends on July 29th, 2016.

The motion was seconded by James Breneman and passed unanimously.

**PC2016-109** Request **for Sign & Sign Standard Approval**

 **7830 State Line Road**

Steve Sakoulas, 1222 McGee Street, stated he is seeking to replace the signs on the office building he owns at 7830 State Line Road and move his law practice permanently to this location. As it is a multi-tenant building he is also requesting approval of sign standards for the building.

Chris Brewster noted that this building has previously not had sign standards approved for this location, as permitted by the City’s sign regulations. In 2011 the Planning Commission did approve a monument sign for this location, provided that if any other building signs were proposed, and overall sign package for the building should be submitted. The only other exterior sign on the building currently is the building name mounted above the canopy at the building’s main entrance.

Sign Standards allow applicants to propose uniform sign designs and plans for eligible (multi-tenant) properties. Sign allowances for other C-o buildings include the following:

* Wall sign – 1 per façade, up to 5% of total area or 50 s.f. - whichever is greater. [19.48.25.B.]
* Monument sign – 1 per each street frontage (multi-tenant); or one en lieu of 1 wall sign (single-tenant) = 5’ high max, 20 s.f., with 12’ setbacks and 3’ landscape areas. 19.48.25.C. and 19.48.15.M.]
* Sub-tenant allowances subject to specifically approved sign plans [19.48.25.O]

The proposed sign standards for the property are consistent with the sign standards generally for the C-O district (wall signs limited to 5% or 50 s.f.). Specifically proposed with this application is a single sign on the south end of the east side (State Line Frontage):

* Internally illuminate wall sign; channel letters, raceway mount
* Acrylic face with black day/night acrylic
* 2.14’ x 18.25’ = 40.125 square feet
* Approximately 2.45 % of the façade (note: this is under the otherwise allowed 5% generally applicable to the C-O district; counting the Building Name sign above the primary entrance (approximately 1% of façade or less) this would leave remaining space for signs for other tenants within the overall limits – both generally applicable in C-O and as specifically proposed for this multi-tenant building by the applicant.

The proposed sign standards also make reference to the existing, previously approved monument sign, as well as the generally applicable monument sign standards (referenced above). However subsection 2.K. of the applicants proposed standard seems to indicate 2 monument signs, one for the “anchor tenant” and one for the “building address and tenants.” No plans for any additional monument signs for the property have been submitted with this application.

Patrick Lenahan asked for clarification on Section K of the sign standards. Mr. Sakoulas responded that the monument sign only applies to the owners of the building.

Nancy Wallerstein confirmed the Commission is taking action on the proposed façade sign and sign standards. The current monument sign remains and any changes to that sign would come back to the Commission for approval.

Melissa Brown asked if there would be any review of the location of the monument sign. Mr. Brewster replied not with this application.

Gregory Wolf moved the Planning Commission approve the proposed façade sign and sign standards for the multi-tenant building at 7830 State Line Road subject to the following conditions:

* The standards are approved as presented by the applicant in the February 1, 2016 draft standards Sections 1. and 2. A – L.
* That section 2.I. is amended to have a new sub-section 4. Stating: “Any additional exterior tenants sign be limited to no more than 5% of the façade, including all existing signs (i.e. “Sakoulas Law” proposed and “Somerset Building” existing), and be of the same style, color, and application as the proposed Sakoulas Law sign.”
* That sub-section 2.K.. be clarified to limit the overall monument signs to the existing sign, or that any different or additional monument signs shall require review and approval by the Planning Commission subject to the generally applicable sign standards for the City.

The motion was seconded by James Breneman and passed unanimously.

Commissioner Jonathan Birkel recused himself from the meeting due to a professional conflict of interest on PC2016-110 and left the room.

**PC2016-110** **Request for First Floor Elevation Increase**

 **2907 West 71st Terrace**

James Engle, 6815 Fontana, appeared before the Commission requesting an exception from Section 19.44.030 to allow the construction of a new home at 2907 West 71st Terrace have a first floor elevation at 2.39’ higher than the current first floor elevation. He noted the existing home has a failing foundation and will be torn down. It was noted that the homes on either side of this site have a wide variation in height and the proposed home will be between their heights.

Mr. Brewster stated the proposed building meets the required zoning setbacks. The existing home has a current first floor elevation of 1009.81 feet. The code allows for increases above the current elevation up to 6” for each additional five feet over the minimum side setback up to a maximum increase of three feet. The proposed building is proposed beyond the required setbacks; however, it is only 6’ beyond the required side setback which would only permit an increase in first floor elevation of 6”. All other proposed increases in elevation – either over the 3’ or not meeting the additional setback requirements – require review and approval by the Planning Commission.

The application proposes a new home with a first floor elevation of 1012.2, which is 2.39’above the existing first floor elevation.

This site is relatively flat with the highest elevation of 1011’ (northeast, front corner) and a lowest elevation of 1005’ (southwest, rear comer), resulting in a gradual downward grade from the street to the rear.

The proposed home meets all required setbacks:

* Front: 30’ required; 42’ +/- for the home and garage; 36’ for the covered front porch (note: a 35’ platted building line also applies to this site)
* Interior side: 4’ required; 10.0’ (west) and 10.16’ (east) proposed. (also meets the required 12’ building separation from existing structure)
* Rear: 25’ required; 46.66’ proposed at closest point.
* The proposed home includes a garage slightly above grade on the front building line (1010.7’); a proposed top of foundation 6” above the garage level (1011.2); and a resulting first floor elevation 1’ above the foundation (1012.2)
* Due to proposed grading the foundation will be raised above grade approximately 2’ on the northeast corner of the structure and 4.2 feet on the rear elevation

The existing home to the east has a first floor elevation of 1013.4 and the existing home to the west has a first floor elevation of 1007.4, and both homes are built at grade without a raised foundation.

The proposed grading plan and foundation placement appear to be an appropriate response to the existing site grades, however a final grading permit and drainage study will be required from Public Works prior to a building permit. Mr. Bredehoeft noted that a watershed study has been completed and submitted to Public Works for review.

Jim Breneman asked if the retaining wall on the plot plan was existing or new. Mr. Engle responded it is new.

Nancy Wallerstein stated she would have liked to see more detailed plans. Mr. Engle replied that he initially submitted more plans to city staff, but they advised him that they were not needed for this application. Mr. Brewster stated that the criteria that the Commission is required to review for exceptions to first floor elevation are reflected in the information presented.

Mr. Breneman confirmed that the driveway grade was being raised. Gregory Wolf asked the status of the watershed study. Mr. Bredehoeft replied it is currently being reviewed. Mr. Breneman stated the study would need to be approved. Mr. Bredehoeft stated the city’s policies require approval of drainage studies prior to the issuance of any building permits.

Nancy Wallerstein stated she would have liked to see all the documents Mr. Engle submitted to staff and was disappointed that all the documents were not included in the Commissioner’s packet.

Mr. Brewster noted the information needed to determine if the criteria for granting a first floor elevation has been presented and analyzed in the staff report.

Jeffrey Valentino state that from the information presented the criteria has been met for the requested increase in first floor elevation. He felt that staff could address the drainage and other issues. Mr. Engle noted that this is the first step in the review process. Once he receives Commission approval for the increase in first floor elevation he will need to receive approval from Public Works of the drainage plan and then approval from the Building Official for a building permit. Mr. Breneman noted he also would have liked to have seen more information.

Gregory Wolf moved the Planning Commission approve the requested First Floor Elevation for 2907 West 71st Terrace of 1012.2 with a final grading permit and drainage study required from Public Works prior to a building permit being issued. The motion was seconded by Jeffrey Valentino and passed by a vote of 4 to 2 with Mrs. Brown and Wallerstein voting in opposition.

Mr. Birkel returned to the meeting.

**PC2016-111** **Request for Site Plan Approval for Wireless Antenna**

 **7700 Mission Road**

Sam Davis with Black & Veatch appeared before the Commission on behalf of AT&T requesting approval to an amended site plan for their wireless antenna on the tower located at 7700 Mission Road. They are proposing to remove six antenna from the applicant’s area on the tower at 150 feet and replace them with three new antenna and the associated ground equipment.

Chris Brewster stated this location has a current Special Use Permit valid through 2019. Changes in installations on communication towers are approved by site plan review by the Planning Commission.

In 2014 the applicant proposed the replacement of 3 antenna through a site plan that was approved by the Planning Commission (PC-2014-107). This work was never completed by the applicant. Subsequent to this site plan approval, two other carriers received approval for replacement or additions of antenna. (PC 2014-108, PC 2014-111, PC 2015-114) During this time it became apparent through the comparison of differing structural reports that the facility was close to or over capacity based on industry standards. When the applicant proposed to execute a permit based on the 2014 site plan approval, staff made the applicant aware of the possible structural issues that either occurred or became evident after the 2014 approval. At this point, no facilities – including pending approvals that had not been acted upon by all previous applicants - were permitted. Through discussions with the three carriers, a more up-to-date and accurate structural analysis was requested, prior to moving forward and completed by the applicant.

The applicant is proposing to remove six antennae, each approximately 96” x 12” x 7”, two from each array, and replace them with three antennae, one on each array. Two of these are 96” x. 13.8” x 8.2” and one is 72.8” x13.8” x 8.2”. An additional surge protector will be mounted on the interior of the arrays at the center of the tower, with other minor accessory equipment to support the antennae. All coaxial cable supporting this equipment will run on the interior of the tower.

The proposed application will reduce the load on the tower by the applicant. The applicant has provided a revised structural analysis based on all existing equipment, the pending equipment of recent approvals, and this proposed equipment. The structural report demonstrates that the tower has the capacity to hold all pending and proposed equipment, based on industry standards and based on the assumptions presented in the report.

The Planning Commission shall give consideration to the following criteria in approving or disapproving a site plan.

**A. The Site is capable of accommodating the building, parking areas and drives with appropriate open space and landscape.**

The capacity of the site to accommodate all equipment was addressed in the renewal of the Special Use Permit. The proposed antenna exchange will not increase any impacts that would require a change to that permit or conditions.

**B. Utilities are available with adequate capacity to serve the proposed development.**

This is an existing installation and adequate utilities are available to serve the location.

**C. The plan provides for adequate management of stormwater runoff.**

No additional impervious area will be created and therefore a stormwater management plan is not required.

**D. The plan provides for safe and easy ingress, egress, and internal traffic circulation.**

The site is an existing installation and utilizes the driveway and parking for the site. The ability of the site to accommodate ingress and egress was addressed in the renewal of the Special Use Permit. The proposed antennae will not increase any impacts for ingress and egress to the site.

**E. The plan is consistent with good land planning and good site engineering design principles.**

This is an existing installation, and maintenance and upgrades of current facilities are supported by the City’s current policies and regulations. Site plan review of exchange of equipment is still required;however, this plan is consistent with all existing approvals and standards.

The applicant, upon becoming aware of potential structural concerns regarding pending equipment, prepared a structural analysis considering past approval of others equipment, and the new equipment it proposed. As a solution, they are removing 6 of their antennae and replacing them with 3 – reducing the overall tower loads and keeping the facility within acceptable industry standards for structural loads.

**F. An appropriate degree of compatibility will prevail between the architectural quality of the proposed building and the surrounding neighborhood.**

The proposed antenna will be the same as the existing antenna and located away from the streetscape, and abutting property is a large parking area so there will be little impact on the surrounding area. The reduction of total antennae will also reduce any perceived visual impact on adjacent property of from public spaces and streetscapes.

**G. The plan represents an overall development pattern that is consistent with the comprehensive plan and other adopted planning policies.**

This is an existing site. While Wireless communication facilities are not specifically addressed in Village Vision, the City’s wireless communication policies and regulations promote upgrade and maintenance of existing facilities.

James Breneman asked what impact this would have on coverage. Mr. Davis stated the impact would not be on coverage but on capacity of the antenna.

Gregory Wolf moved the Planning Commission approve PC2016-110 site plan for wireless antenna installation by Black & Veatch on behalf of AT&T, at 7700 Mission Road based on the structural analysis dated February 26, 2016 and per the plans and drawings submitted and dated February 29, 2016. The motion was seconded by Patrick Lenahan and passed unanimously.

**PC2016-112 Request for Final Development Plan – Meadowbrook Community**

 **PC2016-113 Request for Final Development Plan – Meadowbrook Apartments**

**PC2016-114 Request for Final Plat Approval – Meadowbrook Community**

Commissioner Gregory Wolfe recused himself due to a professional conflict of interest on this application and left.

Justin Duff, 4900 Main Street, introduced Jim Constantine who reviewed revisions to the applicant’s following changes to their vision book:

**Attached Home Lots**

1. Now have a minimum lot area of 4,000 square feet. (was 3,000)
2. The lot width at the front setback is 35 feet. (was 25 feet)
3. The side yard setback is 5 feet to the interior lot line. (was 6 feet)
4. Window wells providing light and access for basements are permitted to project up to a lot line. Yard areas may contain fencing and/or masonry walls designed to be compatible with the architectural design of the associated home(s) and that serve to define, separate or enclose yards, patios or other private or semi-private space. (New)

**Cottage Lots**

1. Now have a minimum lot area of 5,600 square feet. (was 4,000)
2. The lot width at the front setback is 43 feet with typical 48 feet (was 40 feet)
3. Window wells providing light and access for basements are permitted to project up to a lot line. Yard areas may contain fencing and/or masonry walls designed to be compatible with the architectural design of the associated home(s) and that serve to define, separate or enclose yards, patios or other private or semi-private space.

**Village Lots**

1. Now have a minimum lot area of 6,000 square feet. (was 5,000)
2. The lot width at the front setback is 55 feet.
3. Window wells providing light and access for basements are permitted to project up to a lot line. Yard areas may contain fencing and/or masonry walls designed to be compatible with the architectural design of the associated home(s) and that serve to define, separate or enclose yards, patios or other private or semi-private space. (new)

**Manor Lots**

1. Now have a minimum lot area of 6,500 square feet. (was 6,000)
2. The lot width at the front setback is 60 feet.
3. Window wells providing light and access for basements are permitted to project up to a lot line. Yard areas may contain fencing and/or masonry walls designed to be compatible with the architectural design of the associated home(s) and that serve to define, separate or enclose yards, patios or other private or semi-private space. (new)

**Exterior Materials and Colors**

**Attached Homes**

The palette of materials and colors for the attached homes is the following:

* A brick or stone base course will be provided along all facades. The brick or stone base shall extend to the first finished floor height. In any location where the foundation wall is fully screened by, foundation plantings or a wall, the brick or stone base course shall not be required, however, there shall be minimal exposure of the foundation wall and it shall be covered with a parge coating.
* The color schemes will be light-tone or medium-tone neutral colors with deep color usage limited to on doors, windows, shutters, projecting bays, awnings & railings or the color schemes will be medium-tone to dark-tone colors with medium to light color usage limited to on doors, windows, shutters, projecting bays, awnings & railings.

**Detached Homes**

The palette of materials and colors for the detached homes is the following:

* A brick or stone base course will be provided along all facades. The brick or stone base shall extend to the first finished floor height. In any location where the foundation wall is fully screened by, foundation plantings or a wall, the brick or stone base course shall not be required, however, there shall be minimal exposure of the foundation wall and it shall be covered with a parge coating.
* The color schemes will be light-tone or medium-tone neutral colors with deep color usage limited to on doors, windows, shutters, projecting bays, awnings & railings or the color schemes will be medium-tone to dark-tone colors with medium to light color usage limited to on doors, windows, shutters, projecting bays, awnings & railings.

**The Inn**

* Inn – 50 rooms with a 5,000 square feet commercial area

The proposed way finding signage and street lighting was presented including the following signage:

* Community Primary Entry Sign – constructed with a masonry wall, columns and base with random cut limestone and pre-cast masonry cap with rear LED illumination behind the letters and metal panels with lettering punched completely through panel to reveal wall behind. The 8 foot stone column/wall on the end of the sign will have a 2 inch thick metal medallion, finished in a highly durable automotive paint. Letters and rings sit on solid face, with icon punched completely center to reveal wall behind. The medallion will be pinned 1” off the face of the stone column on both sides and will have read edge lighting to give a halo effect.
* Secondary Community Entry Sign – will repeat the 8 foot stone column/wall depicted on the on primary entry sign.
* Neighborhood Entry Signs (west) – masonry columns six feet in height with random cut limestone and pre-cast masonry cap with a 2” thick metal medallion.
* Neighborhood Entry Signs & Gate (East) - These continue the use of the masonry columns. Columns on the center monument sign with have copper gas lanterns. The gates proposed are 2” thick hollow metal bars/tubing, finished in a highly durable automotive paint to mimic a wood finish.
* Green space markers are 3’ masonry columns with random cut Mountain Ridge Limestone veneer and pre-cast masonry cap. The face will have a recessed smooth finish cast masonry with beveled edges and letters sandblasted into the surface of the masonry.
* Vehicular Directional Signs – 1” thick metal panel signs 3’3” x 2’3” on dark bronze smooth finish poles topped with a double-sided 2” thick medallion
* Regulatory Street Signs and Traffic Control – 4” cap height high contrast vinyl letters applied to a City approved brown colored backer, Icon punched completly through center street sign frame placed a dark bronze smooth finished pole.

Three similar street light designs are proposed: Sternberg Double Arm Fixture at height of 19.2 feet to be placed along the boulevard; a Sternberg Single Arm Fixture at 19.2 feet placed on the primary drives and a Sternberg Single Arm Residential Fixture at 17.2 feet placed in the residential neighborhoods.

Jonathan Birkel asked why the covalence for the monument sign was on the inside instead of at Nall. Mr. Constantine replied that the is a slight drop in the grade at the proposed location and the design as proposed leads into the development with the stair stepping in height of the monument sign. Nancy Wallerstein confirmed that the sign was double sided.

Melissa Brown asked if there had been consideration to adding banners to the double light fixtures along the boulevard. Justin Duff noted that this is a city street located in the park and no banners have been discussed.

Nancy Wallerstein asked if the lights would be owned by the city. Keith Bredehoeft replied that the street lighting would be owned by city with the other lighting owned and maintained by the Homes Association.

James Breneman stated he liked the proposed designs. However, he would recommend the use of LED lighting for the lanterns rather than gas. He noted electricity is already available and more environmentally friendly. Mrs. Wallerstein noted that other homes associations have had maintenance issues with gas lanterns.

Jonathan Birkel asked if the location for the gate closing pedestal and transformers has been determined. Mr. Duff replied not at this time, but noted it is their intent that they would be hid using landscaping and placed on the back sign of the entrance sign.

Nancy Wallerstein confirmed that the green space markers are one-sided.

**The Apartment**

Victor Buckles, reviewed the site plan for the apartment complex containing 280 units, with enclosed parking structure, auto court and outdoor pool/court yard areas. The proposed signage for the apartment area which continues the theme established in the residential areas with masonry columns with LED illumination at the edges on the main metal panel. The main signage contains dimensional letters pushed through sign panel internally illuminated with a semi-opaque face. Rear side columns with a “Lightbox” sign panel with opaque face and edges are placed on the sides of the auto court with projecting 20” copper gas lanterns. The apartment elevations and landscape plan were reviewed

Jonathan Birkel asked how the Fire Department would gain access through the neighborhood gates. Justin Duff responded the per condition 3 of the staff recommendation a “Knox-Box” and “Yelp” sensor for emergency vehicles to open the gated at the entrance to the single family neighborhood would be installed.

P.J. Novick noted that the Senior Living Building will be coming in as a separate final development plan.

Jeffrey Valentino asked for clarification on the final traffic design. Keith Bredehoeft noted these are presented on sheets C1.9 and C1.10. A left hand turn lane will be added on the north side at Nall. A concrete median will be installed for a crosswalk and warning sign similar to that used near Weltner Park would be installed.

On Roe a median would be constructed to prevent vehicular traffic from turning left onto 91st Street going east. A left turn lane is being added going north on Roe into the development. There will be a pedestrian refuge area and pedestrian flashing beacons activated by the pedestrian to cross. The parkway has also been moved to the west.

Wes Jordan complimented VanTrust and Mr. Bredehoeft for their efforts to resolve the concerns of the neighborhood in the revised design.

Jonathan Birkel stated he felt the removal of the parking lot in the park area is a missed opportunity. Mr. Jordan responded that the parking lot is still reflected in the Parks Master Plan; however, anticipated construction will be based on need and expected to be several years down the road.

Mr. Breneman noted the parallel parking along the boulevard and stated available parking could be increased significantly by changing that to diagonal parking. Mr. Novick replied the City Council opposed the removal of park land that would be required with diagonal parking rather than the proposed parallel parking. Mr. Birkel and Valentino suggested areas for diagonal parking. Mr. Breneman noted that parking on the north and west sides of the roadway would allow access to the park without having to cross roadway traffic. Mr. Valentino felt it should be re-evaluated, but did not feel the commission had sufficient information to make a recommendation. Mr. Jordan noted the proposed plan has been approved by the Johnson County Park & Recreation District.

Justin Duff stated the parking count has been highly scrutinized. He noted the plan being presented is for their development and does not incorporate the parks master plan. There are options to address parking in the Parks Master Plan.

Judd Claussen with Phelps Engineering noted there are 84 parking spaces currently proposed along the street. The Park District likes the proposed parallel parking because it spreads the parking out. He identified parking spaces within their development. He noted that adequate parking is essential to the marketing success of this project and reviewed the parking counts listed on page C1.11. They feel they have sufficient parking for their development.

James Breneman stated he does not question the traffic counts, but the design. He does not feel parallel parking is safe for the dropping off of children at the park. He believes a higher density is needed in some areas. He also believes that parallel parking will create traffic jams on the roadway with people driving through and those attempting to park.

PJ Novick noted that this was not a condition of approval for the preliminary development plan approval and therefore not addressed in the final plan. He feels the Commission needs to trust that the Park District and the City to appropriately addressing those needs.

Nancy Wallerstein confirmed the Commissions desire to add the condition for re-evaluating parking.

Jeffrey Valentino noted there was significant discussion that the trailhead parking at the Roe entry would address this rather than having it addressed on the main boulevard.

Keith Bredehoeft replied that parking has always been an issue. The Johnson County Parks Master Plan has parallel parking and the City Council questioned the need for additional parking at the trailhead. The proposed parking is adequate for the proposed initial development and use of the park. The additional parking can be added as amenities are added that result in the need for more parking.

Jonathan Birkel stated he believes there is not enough parking or sufficient park access to address the density of use this park will have. Diagonal parking is needed. It was noted that there is diagonal parking available in other areas of the park to address park patrons. Mr. Valentino noted the best the Commission can do is to make a strong recommendation to review parking needs and design.

Mr. Valentino asked what was being proposed for the traffic circle area. Scott Bingham replied they are still working out the details. It will be a cast stone element, not a statuary piece.

Mr. Breneman asked about emergency access to the residential area. Mr. Duff replied access would be through the apartment entrance for both the apartments and residential area. Mr. Breneman asked if that would be in place at the same time. Mr. Duff replied that phasing of the project has all horizontal construction going in at the same time. Mr. Novick stated that a Certificate of Occupancy for the apartment would not be issued until the emergency access was constructed.

James Breneman noted the vision book states the side yard setback for the Village and Cottage lots to be 5 feet on one side and 0 feet on the other. Mr. Duff replied that is an error. The side yard setback would be five feet on both sides.

Mr. Breneman confirmed that the Fire Department has approved the dead-end alleys proposed.

Nancy Wallerstein noted that a Blade Sign is proposed for the apartment and noted that “blade signs” are not allowed by city code. Mr. Novick replied that under MXD zoning the codes do not apply. Mrs. Wallerstein expressed concern that if the proposed sign would be approved at this location similar signs in other areas of the development would have to be approved. She does not want a sign sticking out from a building. It is not consistent with signage in Prairie Village. Mr. Duff stated that they are proposing only one blade sign to be located on the northwest corner of the building. Mrs. Wallerstein asked what was the reasoning for the proposed signage design.

Victor Buckles replied the sign would be visible at a distance and provides a European feel, whereas a ground level sign would not be as visible.

Mr. Breneman noted that blade signs were more of a commercial use sign than multi-family use. Melissa Brown felt the proposed blade sign was more commercial in nature. They are used in historic residential areas, but this is not a historic area.

Nancy Wallerstein felt that a flat sign would be more appropriate on the front of the apartment building and would last longer than a blade sign.

Mr. Breneman confirmed there was a large ground mounted sign at the building entry. Mr. Novick added that columnar signs anchored with the medallions were also included near the auto court area.

Mrs. Wallerstein asked if the blade sign would shine light into the apartments. Mr. Buckles replied it was at a 45% angle and soft glow and would not impact the residents in the apartments. He added they would present to staff for review the foot-candle lighting from the proposed signs

Melissa Brown asked if the amount of street light could be limited. Mr. Bredehoeft replied the city would regulate the street lights.

Mrs. Brown noted the similarity between the proposed monument sign and the city identification signs although the apartment monument sign is different. Justin Duff responded that focus groups recommended incorporating the design used by the city’s signs.

James Breneman noted that the utility plan (C3.2) shows several water lines being placed under the street and feels that they would be better placed along the street. Mr. Bredehoeft responded the waterline on Rosewood would be located on the east side of the street.

Judd Claussenwith Phelps Engineering replied that WaterOne requires a wide easement for their lines that did not fit well with the proposed close-in design. He noted that the easements would extend into the lot footprint. Mr. Breneman confirmed that the easements never encroach the building line.

Jeff Valentino confirmed that the Meadowbrook parking areas would be concrete surface. Mr. Bredehoeft replied the crosswalks would be full depth concrete with a surface material. Mr. Valentino noted the new micro surface topping material available now.

Chairman Nancy Wallerstein noted that from her notes she has the following concerns being noted:

* Recommend the use of LED rather than gas lanterns on the lighting noting that options are available that have the appearance of gas
* The motors for the gates be placed behind the pedestals and landscaped walls.
* The vision book is corrected to reflect both side yard setbacks for Village and Cottage lots are 5 feet.
* A blade sign is only approved for the northwest corner of the apartment building.
* The foot-candle and illumine for all signage by reviewed and approved by city staff.

Commission members continued their discussion of blade signs. Mr. Birkel noted there was no use for it as proposed, that it is simply a design element. Mr. Valentino, Mr. Lenahan and Mrs. Brown are fine with the proposed signage. Mr. Breneman doesn’t see a need for the sign and Mrs. Wallerstein is concerned with its approval leading to the approval of others in the development. Mr. Novick stated he would be concerned if this were a residentially zoned property, but not as a mixed use property. He feels it adds a different, special urban quality to the development. It was consensus to approve this sign.

PJ Novick asked for a clarification from the Commission on their direction on parking. He heard the direction to be for the applicant to revisit the issue of parking with staff and Johnson County Park District. Mr. Breneman noted it is not a question of quantity, but of design. Justin Duff noted that the Parks Master Plan contains loop areas where vehicles can pull in and drop of individuals. The proposed uses along the parkway are for passive park activities, not high density uses. Mr. Valentino stated the Commission is not trying to dictate a change, but to document that it feelings on this issue.

Mr. Novick noted the Commission’s concerns will be expressed by the applicant to the Johnson Country Park & Recreation District regarding the Parks Master Plan as it relates to parking. Mr. Bredehoeft noted that this is a public street.

Wes Jordan noted there has been exhaustive discussion on the parking lot off Roe. This area remains in the Parks Master Plan. As the park develops, it will analyze its need and if the parking is not needed it will not be built. The direction from the City Council was not to take away any additional green space.

Justin Duff stated the applicant is as concerned that there be adequate parking and access for those residing in their homes and apartments. Mr. Breneman agreed street parking will be needed for the attached homes. Mr. Breneman confirmed parking for the apartment building was the same as presented in the preliminary development plan with the enclosed parking structure accommodating both residents and guests.

Mr. Novick noted that the final development plans for the senior living center and hotel will be submitted at a future date. The design and development of the approximate 80 acres of park land are not included in the application.

Consistent with the approved Preliminary Development Plan, the updated Vision Book for the site proposes the creation of a mixed use development that includes:

* Detached Single Family Homes - 53 homes composed of 20 Cottage Lots, 13 Village Lots and 20 Manor Lots
* Attached Homes - 70 units
* Luxury Apartments - 280 residences
* Inn - 50 rooms with a 5,000 square feet commercial floor area
* Senior Living - 120 units of Independent Living, 120 units of Assisted Living / Memory Care, 90 units of Skilled Nursing Living, with restaurant and ancillary service and amenity space, totaling approximately 8,000 square feet and exterior grand terrace and pool.

The Final Development Plan does not include the hotel or the senior living development. It is intended that Final Development Plans for those projects will be submitted at a future date for review and approval.

On November 12, 2015, the Planning Commission held a public hearing on the requested rezoning of the subject property to MXD (Mixed Use District) including the related Preliminary Development Plan and Preliminary Plat. The Commission adopted a motion to find favorably the findings of fact based on the “golden factors” as detailed in the Commission report dated November 12, 2015, and recommended to the City Council approval of the requested rezoning and proposed Preliminary Development Plan subject to a set of conditions of approval. As part of this action, the Commission also approved the Preliminary Plat for the site.

Following the Commission hearing, on December 7, 2015, the City Council reviewed the applications and the Commission recommendation and approved the rezoning and the Preliminary Development, subject to the following conditions of approval:

1. The applicant addressing the comments from the traffic impact study review conducted by TranSystems.
2. The applicant providing revised plans that identify the necessary improvements to the proposed intersection of Nall Avenue at W. 92nd Terrace to accommodate the proposed boulevard entrance drive including a center left-turn lane on Nall Avenue, verification of sight lines, and adjusting the intersection design to accommodate adequate travel lane alignments.
3. The connection to Roe Avenue shown on the Preliminary Development Plan approved by the Planning Commission as an emergency access road (not open to general public vehicular use) be changed to a public street connecting to Roe Avenue as far north as possible, and that applicant work with the City and with Johnson County Parks and Recreation District in the design of the public street.
4. The applicant finalizing the acquisition of the right-of-way necessary for and constructing the public street connect to 94th Terrace/Rosewood Avenue as proposed, otherwise the Preliminary Development Plan must be brought back to the Commission and Council for review and reconsideration.
5. The applicant agreeing that all major service vehicles for the Senior Living and Inn shall use only the entrance at 94th Terrace/Rosewood Avenue. The applicant shall direct their vendors to avoid am and pm peak traffic hours.
6. The applicant designing the proposed gate at the entrance to the single family area to accommodate emergency vehicle access and include a ‘Knox-Box’ and a ‘yelp’ sensor for emergency vehicles to open the gate. The final design of the gated access must be reviewed and approved by the Fire Department and Police Department.
7. The applicant developing pedestrian crossings at the proposed Nall Avenue entrance and the proposed Roe Avenue park entry.
8. The applicant providing detailed elevations and materials for all proposed signage as part of each Final Development Plan and ensuring that all proposed monument signs, structures and landscaping are located outside of any sight visibility zones necessary to accommodate safe vehicular and pedestrian movement at all street intersections. The final signage submittal for the apartment portion of the project shall include all signage within the apartment development as well as all signage within the “public areas” of the entire project.
9. The applicant updating the Preliminary Development Plan to designate that the retaining walls proposed along Nall Avenue to be constructed of or faced with natural stone and labeled as Type A retaining walls.
10. The Planning Commission approving an exception from the retaining wall setback requirement for the retaining wall as proposed along the south property line of the senior living center.
11. Prior to construction, the applicant providing engineered design calculations and plans for all retaining walls exceeding 4 ft. in height.
12. The applicant providing with the Final Development Plan, detailed plans for all trash enclosures and HVAC/building mechanical equipment screening to ensure that all trash dumpsters, recycling bins, HVAC and building mechanical equipment, etc., is fully screened from view. All screening shall be designed and constructed of materials that are durable and consistent and compatible with the building architecture.
13. The applicant providing details for calculating the parking required for the apartment complex with the Final Development Plan and providing an amount of parking that is acceptable to the City. At a minimum the applicant shall design to provide apartment parking at a rate of 1 stall per bedroom plus guest parking at 15% of total dwelling unit count; and, staff shall work with the applicant throughout the development of the Final Development Plan to verify that the parking total is appropriate and bring a final recommendation to the planning commission.
14. The applicant ensuring that the minimum tree sizes for this project are defined as follows: Large Trees – 3 inch minimum caliper, Ornamental Trees – 3 inch minimum caliper, and Evergreen/Coniferous Trees – 8 ft. minimum height.
15. The applicant updating the Preliminary Development Plan by showing street trees along the streets to the north and south of the open space island that is east of the senior living center; adding trees to the open lawn area of the senor living center building; and additional landscaping in the open space that is west of the Inn.
16. The applicant updating in the Preliminary Development Plan the exterior building material labels for the senior living center building to define “composite material” and “masonry base” consistent with the labeling shown for the Inn and the apartment building.
17. The applicant providing elevations and proposed materials for all pool structures including; restroom structure, shade structure, pump house, trellis, ornamental fencing and landscaping at the Final Development Plan submittal.
18. The applicant addressing all Public Works comments and detailing on the Final Development Plan, the Final Plat(s), and the utility improvement plan(s) all of the existing and proposed storm, sanitary sewer, and water mains, labeling them as public or private, and labeling the required public or private easements including all other necessary utility easements.
19. Prior to obtaining any permit for construction, the applicant shall submit a Final Development Plan for review and approval by the Planning Commission. Public improvement plans and Final Plat(s) as necessary shall also be submitted by the applicant for review and approval prior to issuance of any permits and start of any construction. It is understood that this development will have multiple Final Development Plan submittals.
20. The applicant shall work with the school district to ensure school bus access to the gated residential development and include this in the Final Development Plan.
21. Staff shall work with the traffic consultant to further review the need for a traffic signal at the Nall Avenue intersection and work towards its installation. This includes working with the City of Overland Park to gain their input and concurrence.
22. All landscaping shown on the Final Development Plan shall be maintained including the replacement of all plant materials lost due to plant death or damage.
23. Maximum height of single family residential structures shall be 45’ with an additional 10’ allowed for chimneys.
24. Building height for the single family residential structures shall be defined as the dimension from the top of the foundation at the main entry to the ridgeline of the structure.
25. Building height for the apartment and Inn structures shall be defined as the dimension from the FFE (finished floor elevation) at the main entry to the ridgeline of the structure.
26. Building height for the senior housing structures shall be a maximum of 90’ from the FFE of the parking garage at the location being measured.
27. Lot widths shown on the Preliminary Plat shall govern and the Vision Book shall be revised at Final Development Plan to reflect the correct dimensions.

Subsequent to the Council approval, the boundary of the Preliminary Development Plan for the Meadowbrook Park was expanded to include the existing office building at 5200 West 94th Terrace in response to the planned platting and construction of a public street through this property that will connect Meadowbrook Park to Rosewood Drive. The plan also includes the construction of a 3-story tall, 6-unit residential condominium building on the remnant parcel that will be on the east side of this new roadway. A separate Final Development Plan is anticipated to be submitted for the condo building at a future date.

PJ Novick stated there are no outstanding issues. The applicant has updated the Vision Book to address the previous conditions of approval and the Final Development Plans for the residential lots and for the apartment complex are consistent with the approved Preliminary Development Plan. The proposed Final Plat is also consistent with the previously approved Preliminary Plat.

Staff recommends the Commission approve the Final Development Plan (including the updated Vision Book) for the Meadowbrook Community, Final Development Plan for the Meadowbrook Apartments and the Final Plat for the Meadowbrook Community, subject to the following conditions of approval:

1. Prior to filing the Final Plat with the County, the applicant providing all necessary legal documents and easements for dedication.
2. Prior to start of any construction, the applicant providing and receiving approval for the necessary public improvement plans.
3. Consistent with the conditions of approval for the Preliminary Development Plan, the applicant agreeing to maintain and keep clear of snow the emergency vehicle road to be installed along the east end of the apartment complex and agreeing to install a ‘Knox-Box’ and a ‘yelp’ sensor for emergency vehicles to open the gate planned at the entrance to the single family area to accommodate emergency vehicle access.

Mr. Novick asked the Commission to take individual action on the two site plan approvals and the Final Plat approval.

 **PC2016-112 Request for Final Development Plan – Meadowbrook Community**

 **9101 Nall Avenue**

Patrick Lenahan moved the Planning Commission approve PC2016-112, the Final Development Plan for the Meadowbrook Community subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to the start of any construction, the applicant provide and receive approval for the necessary public improvement plans.
2. Consistent with the conditions of approval for the Preliminary Development Plan, the applicant agree to maintain and keep clear of snow the emergency vehicle road to be installed along the east end of the apartment complex and to install a ‘Knox-Box’ and a ‘yelp’ sensor for emergency vehicles to open the gate planned at the entrance to the single family area to accommodate emergency vehicle access.
3. LED rather than gas lanterns be considered for lighting at the entry monuments
4. The motors for operation of the gates be placed behind the pedestals and landscaped wall.
5. The parking configuration and location be revisited with staff.
6. The Vision Book be amended to reflect side yard setbacks of 5 feet on Village and Cottage lots
7. The foot candles and lumens for all proposed sign lighting be reviewed and approved by staff.

The motion was seconded by Melissa Brown and passed by a vote of 6 to 0.

**PC2016-113 Request for Final Development Plan – Meadowbrook Apartments**

 **9101 Nall Avenue**

James Breneman moved the Planning Commission approve PC2016-113, the Final Development Plan for the Meadowbrook Apartments subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to the start of any construction, the applicant provide and receive approval for the necessary public improvement plans.
2. Consistent with the conditions of approval for the Preliminary Development Plan, the applicant agree to maintain and keep clear of snow the emergency vehicle road to be installed along the east end of the apartment complex.
3. LED rather than gas lanterns be considered for lighting at the entry monuments
4. There is only one blade sign to be located on the northwest corner of the apartment building.
5. The foot candles and lumens for all proposed sign lighting be reviewed and approved by staff.

The motion was seconded by Jeffrey Valentino and passed by a vote of 6 to 0.

**PC2016-114 Request for Final Plat Approval – Meadowbrook Community**

 **9101 Nall Avenue**

Jeffrey Valentino moved the Planning Commission approve PC2016-114, the Final Development Plan for the Meadowbrook Apartments subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to filing the Final Plat with the County, the applicant provide all necessary legal documents and easements for dedication.

The motion was seconded by Jonathan Birkel and passed by a vote of 6 to 0.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

Wes Jordan reported that 7501 Mission Road was cited and has met with staff to review new plans. They will be on the May 3rd meeting for site plan approval.

Mr. Jordan provided an update on the status of the neighborhood design standards. On February 1, 2016, city staff presented a concept draft to the City Council of potential changes to the current zoning standards for R-1a and R-1b residential zoning districts. This effort was an assigned initiative based on Council Priority #3 “Prairie Village HOA Overland District – Rebuild guidelines to include a City-wide ordinance.”

The informal presentation introduced the Governing Body to the draft of the regulatory strategies prior to the public information meetings. The concepts are the result of many meetings with a technical development committee comprised of City Staff/Planner, architects, builders and residents. The policy goal of the committee was to protect neighborhood character while balancing the changing demographics and needs of the Prairie Village Community.

The Council approved presentation of the concept draft to the public to provide a forum for residents to evaluate and contribute to the process by sharing their thoughts and ideas. Staff advertised three public meetings through available media sources and written notification to all Homes Association Presidents. Meetings were held February 18th , February 22nd and March 2nd in the Council Chambers. Approximately 50 to 60 individuals attended each of the meetings. Attendees were comprised of residents, elected officials, media and representatives from committee members who contributed to the project with several individuals attending more than one meeting.

The spectrum of opinion on the proposal varied with most discussion centering on possible changes to residential lots that are zoned R-1b (smaller lots averaging approximately 65’ x 125’) A large number of attendees also felt the ordinance proposal should include a requirement for four-sided architecture and a list of restricted materials. A number of residents expressed a need for an architectural review board (ARB). Mr. Jordan noted that if an ARB were to be considered by the Governing Body there would need to be a comprehensive evaluation process separate of possible zoning changes.

Mr. Jordan stated he does not have a timeline going forward and does not want to rush the project, but acknowledged the need to continue proceeding with due diligence as the issue remains and permit applications continue to be submitted. He feels there is some consensus on the proposed height and setback regulations and these issues could be brought to the Planning Commission for review and adoption while the committee continued to work through the other issues. The committee will be enlarged to include other knowledgeable individuals. Due to the ongoing submittal of “teardown” applications (5 currently in review and 12 submitted but not reviewed) the Mayor has asked for a two phase approach with initially addressing height and setback regulations.

Mr. Jordan also reported that the City has entered into a Memorandum of Understanding with Consolidated Fire District #1 who will be purchasing land on the southeast corner of the municipal complex for construction of Fire Station #23. As part of the agreement they have formed a committee to consider the exterior design of the building with representation from the City Council and the Planning Commission. Mayor Wassmer would like to have an architect on that committee. They will be meeting soon. He is unaware whether the meetings would be held during the day or in the evening. Commissioner Jim Breneman stated he would be willing to represent the Planning Commission on that committee.

Mr. Jordan received a call from Mitch DiCarlo with Block and Company and their agreement with Slim Chickens has fallen through.

**NEXT MEETING**

The planning commission secretary noted agenda for the May meeting will include site plan approvals for 7501 Mission Road, site plan approval for a fence at 7457 Cherokee (Global Montessori) and site approval for a fence at 4205 West 64th Street. There will be no Board of Zoning Appeals meeting.

**ADJOURNMENT**

With no further business to come before the Commission, Chairman Nancy Wallerstein adjourned the meeting at 10:05 p.m.

Nancy Wallerstein

Chairman