**PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES**

June 7, 2016

ROLL CALL

The Planning Commission of the City of Prairie Village met in regular session on Tuesday, June 7, 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: Gregory Wolf, Melissa Brown, Patrick Lenahan, Jonathan Birkel, and Jeffrey Valentino.

The following persons were present in their advisory capacity to the Planning Commission: Chris Brewster, City Planning Consultant; Wes Jordan, Assistant City Administrator; Mitch Dringman, Building Official; Serena Schermoly, Council Liaison and Joyce Hagen Mundy, Commission Secretary.

Chairman Nancy Wallerstein welcomed the Commission’s new Council Liaison Serena Schermoly.

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

Patrick Lenahan moved for the approval of the minutes of the Planning Commission for May 3, 2016 as submitted. The motion was seconded by Jeffrey Valentino and passed by a vote of 5 to 1 with Gregory Wolf abstaining.

Chairman Wallerstein asked the Commission for approval to amend the agenda and consider the Non-Public Hearing item before the scheduled public hearing.

**NON PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**PC2016-118** **Request for Site Plan Approval**

**6701 Nall Avenue**

Bob Treanor, 15506 S. Kenwood St., addressed the Commission on behalf of Nall Avenue Baptist Church located at 6701 Nall Avenue. The church is seeking to replace an aging existing monument sign located at the corner of 67th and Nall. The proposal is for two monument signs, one located on the east side of the west entrance off of 67th street and a second one at a central location between its north and south entrances on Nall. The building has an existing wall sign associated with its primary entrance on Nall.

Chris Brewster noted that all monument signs come before the Planning Commission for approval. This site is a 3.56 acre corner location with 4 driveway entrances – 2 from each street frontage. The lot includes approximately 350 feet of frontage on Nall and approximately 450 feet of frontage along 67th Street. The building facilities include a main hall for services, associated classrooms and meeting rooms, event space, an outdoor playground and accessory parking. The property is zoned R-1A.

The sign ordinance allows churches, schools, and community buildings in residential districts up to 2 signs identifying the premises – which may be either wall mounted or monument signs. [19.48.020.A.] The applicant is requesting approval of the monument sign design and an exception to the limitation on 2 signs to allow the proposed monument signs on each frontage at locations shown on the site plan (to replace existing sign at the corner), and to keep the existing wall sign.

Section 19.48.015.M requires that all monument signs meet the following applicable standards:

* 5’ height limit – each proposed monument sign meets this limit, except that the portion of the structure associated with the Nall Avenue sign containing the flag pole has a base of 6’ high for an approximately 2’ 4” x 2’ 4” portion of the structure. It technically is not part of the sign structure although it shares the same base.
* 20 square feet limit for the sign – each sign is safely below this size limit. The sign area for monument signs is measure by the surface of the sign panel. The proposed signs are ovals. The resulting area of a rectangle entirely enclosing the ovals is less than 20 square feet; therefore excluding areas of that rectangle that would not include parts of the oval surface puts each sign safely below the 20 square foot limit.
* Be located at least 3’ from the property line or 12 feet from the back of curb – the site plan is not scaled exactly, but the proposed locations appear to meet each of these standards, and are in a location with enough space to where they could be adjusted to safely meet this requirement.
* Permanent building materials similar to or complementary to buildings on the site. The proposed signs have a brick base matching the primary brick on the building and a stone cap complementing some of the accent materials and colors of the building. The proposed surface of the sign panel is plexiglass on an aluminum pedestal.
* Signs are to be located in a landscape setback area or have a 3’ minimum landscape setback around the base. Both locations are in a landscape setback area.
* Monument signs in the residential districts may be illuminated provided the source of the illumination shall not be visible from off the premises. The internal cabinet illumination proposed for each sign meets this requirement.

Each of the proposed signs meets the standards for monument signs generally, as well as those for monument signs in residential districts. Staff recommends approval of the proposed monument sign design.

Jeffrey Valentino confirmed the existing façade sign contains non-illuminated free standing letters.

Gregory Wolf moved the Planning Commission approve PC2016-118 granting an exception to allow an increase in the total number of signs on the site from two to three and approving the proposed monument signs as submitted subject to the following conditions: 1) that the location of the monument sign be verified to be at least three feet from the property line and at least 12 feet from the back of the curb; and 2) that the location include at least a three foot landscape buffer around the edge, or where such a buffer is not present at the location that a landscape plan for low ornamental plantings in the landscape area are to be submitted and approved by staff. The motion was seconded by Melissa Brown and passed unanimously.

**PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**PC2016-04** **Consideration of Revisions to the Prairie Village Zoning Regulations**

**Chapter 19.02, Section 19.02.100 “Building Height”**

**Chapter 19.06, Section 19.06.020 “Height**

**Chapter 19.06, Section 19.06.030 “Side Yard – R-1a)**

**Chapter 19.08, Section 19.08.015 “Height – R-1b)**

**Chapter 19.08, Section 19.08.025 “Side Yard – R-1b)**

**Chapter 19.44, Section 19.44.015 “Height”**

**Chapter 19.44, Section 19.44.030 “Building Elevations”**

Chris Brewster stated Prairie Village has been experiencing increasing amounts of investment and infill development in residential neighborhoods. Some of these projects involve tearing down older homes and replacing them with new and larger homes, raising questions and concern regarding the ability of the current zoning standards (R-1B and R-1A zoning districts) to guide new development.

The City conducted public official work sessions, stakeholder focus groups, and public open houses over the last 8 months to discuss and determine a direction on amendments to the R-1A and R-1B zoning districts. Through these discussions, consensus on some of the concepts considered was not evident and a clear direction could not be determined. However on others, there was apparent consensus.

The proposed amendments address three main areas:

1. *Height:* Reducing the overall building height by (a) altering how building height is measured; and (b) changing the maximum height in R-1B from 35 feet to 29 feet.
2. *First Floor Elevation:* Amending sections of the code that apply to the first floor elevations new residential buildings, so that a generally applicable standard for building placement based on the site and grade can apply regardless of where the elevation of the prior existing home is.
3. *Side Setbacks:* Amending the side setbacks from the existing 4 feet (R-1B) and 5 feet (R-1A), with additional building separation requirements dependent on adjacent buildings, to 10% of the lot width on each side regardless of where adjacent structures may be.

The City’s Comprehensive Plan adopted in 2007 specifically addresses this issue as follows:

* *Community Character:* Provide and attractive, friendly and safe community with a unique village identity appealing to people of all ages.
* *Housing:* Encourage neighborhoods with unique character, strong property values and quality housing options for families and individuals of a variety of ages and incomes.
* *Land Resources:* Encourage a high quality natural and man-made environment that preserves community character, creates identity and sense of place, and provides opportunities for renewal and redevelopment, including vibrant mixed-use centers.

Several specific policies and action items under these goals further identify the values of the community in this regard. Strategies identified include updating development regulations to better balance the need for new investment with maintaining the character and identity that have made Prairie Village’s neighborhoods attractive and valuable.

Mr. Brewster noted in the land use element of the comprehensive plan associated with these goals – the Conceptual Development Framework - identifies the neighborhoods for Conservation and Improvement. This includes a majority of the City’s land area which is currently zoned either R-1A or R-1B. In general the plan establishes similar policies and desired outcomes for the “Neighborhood Conservation” and “Neighborhood Improvement” areas. The key difference is the anticipated amount of reinvestment activity based on age and existing conditions in the Neighborhood Improvement areas.

Mr. Brewster stated in August of 2015, staff was directed to follow up on the comprehensive plan policies and action strategies, and begin a process to explore options to amend development standards affecting Prairie Village neighborhoods. In addressing that directive the following actions were taken:

* *September 17, 2015*, Staff Memo to the Mayor and City Council on Residential Infill Development
* *October 1, 2015*, Developer Discussion # 1 - focus group with developers on preliminary issues and analysis.
* *November 20, 2015*, Developer Discussion # 2 - focus group with developers on potential strategies
* *November 2015 – February 2016*, Drafting Committee Work Sessions - several meetings with a smaller group of Planning Commissioners, architects and developers to review and discuss drafts of potential amendments.
* *October 19, 2015 and February 1, 2016*, City Council Status Updates,
* *February 18, February 22, and March 2 2016,* Neighborhood Open Houses - open public forum to review and comment on the Discussion Draft of the proposed amendments.
* *April 4, 2016,* Council Review and Direction – [date of Wes’ meeting and update]
* *April – May 2016*, Drafting Committee Work Sessions – several meetings with smaller focus group to draft proposed amendments.
* *June 7, 2016*, Planning Commission Public Hearing

The result of the analysis and the public process was the recommendation of a “two-tiered” approach to the issues regarding development and investment in Prairie Village Neighborhoods:

*Tier 1* – Address basic zoning standards that are either out of scale with lots in neighborhoods, or which are creating the most difficulties through the development review process (i.e. height, side setback, and standards for first floor elevation of new residential structures).

*Tier 2* – Revisit design, scale and massing issues through a broader discussion with continued involvement of stakeholders that were introduced to these issues in the public open houses.

Tier 1 amendments are the subject of the proposed amendments and were summarized by Mr. Brewster as follows:

*1. Height:*

Currently height on pitched roofs is measured to the mean height of a pitched roof structure. This is typically done in zoning ordinances to accommodate the different scale and mass that results from different pitches of roofs. However, in Prairie Village’s context, it can result in buildings significantly out of scale with existing development. The maximum height measured from the grade to the mean of pitched roofs can be up to 35 feet, and consequently the overall height of some buildings could be significantly higher than 35 feet, possibly upwards of 42 to 45 feet. Through staff’s review and analysis houses were identified that have been built to the extent of what the current zoning allows. Many homes that have caused concern in neighborhoods are well within what is allowed by current standards. The response to this situation is to change how height is measured in R-1A and R-1B so that it is measured from the top of foundation to the highest point (or “peak”) of the roof structure (instead of from grade to the mean of pitched roof).

Currently the height limit in R-1A and R-1B is 35 feet. This is more than sufficient to accommodate a 2.5 story dwelling, particularly when considered in conjunction with current height measurement. The R-1B lots are the smallest residential lots, allowing lots as small as 60 feet by 100 feet, with most typically 65 feet by 120 feet. Existing homes originally built on these lots are typically 1-story, 1.5-story, or 2-story with the appearance of 1.5-story elements on the front elevations. Through staff’s analysis it was determined that most new homes built, including many of the exemplary examples of recent builds, are within (or could be easily modified to be within) 29 feet from top of foundation to the high point on the roof structure. The response to this situation is to change the overall height to 29 feet in R-1B and leave the R-1A height at 35 feet with the proposed change as to how height is measured.

*2. Building Elevations:*

Currently new residential structures are required to be set at the same first floor elevation or lower than the original structure. This appears to be an attempt to reduce the scale of new homes in relation to the existing and adjacent homes. However, in addressing only the first floor elevation, these standards do not adequately address this issue. With the noted issues on overall building height, a new structure built at the elevation of a current home could still be substantially higher and out of scale with existing homes while meeting this standard.

Further, since many existing homes are built at grade (some “slab on grade”), which produces drainage problems, many new homes are forced into a discretionary review process for an exception. This process does not have specific criteria to guide applicants, staff or decision makers. Often the appropriate design from a building code or drainage and site design process is forced to get an exception. This, combined with the fact that the standards and exceptions do not seem to adequately address the reason for these standards to begin with (deal with building scale), caused staff to revisit these standards. The goal was to allow all lots a reasonable foundation elevation based on the site grade and lot, and not necessarily tie it to where an existing structure’s first floor elevation happens to be. Further, since the proposed draft addresses some of the overall height concerns on the upper end, a more reasonable allowance for foundation elevations based on typical building practices seems appropriate. The response to this situation is to allow all residential lots a top of foundation that is 6 inches to 24 inches above grade along the front façade, and to improve the current exception process for greater elevations with more specific criteria.

1. *Side Setbacks:*

The relationship and the scale and mass of structures adjacent to each other have been a big part of this discussion. The current side setbacks – 4 feet (R-1B) and 5 feet (R-1A) can allow structures in close proximity. Therefore the current standards also have a minimum separation requirement from existing structures (12 feet in R-1B and 14 feet in R-1A). Since this pins a standard to what a neighbor may or may not do, and is subject to change as different property owners build at different times, these types of standards can become difficult to administer. Standards roughly similar to the current standards and keyed to the lot and not a neighbors building were explored. The response to this situation is to set the setback at 10% of the lot width resulting in a setback for a minimum size R-1B lot of 6 feet on each side (10% of the required 60 foot lot width) and a setback for a minimum size R-1A lot of 8 feet on each side (10% of the required 80 foot lot width). This would result in approximately the same scale, massing and dimensions of the current building separation standards (12 feet and 14 feet, respectively) if each lot were built to the extent of the setback, yet it can be applied independent of any review or analysis of what a neighboring property owner may have done. Further, the setback would scale to the size of the lot, requiring a slightly greater setback the wider the lot is.

Direction from the Council is to continue to work with stakeholders on potential solutions to the “Second Tier” issues. These discussions will involve continued work on more detailed building scale and mass standards, discussion of other elements of site or building design that impact the “neighborhood character” identified in Village Vision, and analysis of new potential strategies bought up in the public forum including basic material standards and “four-sided” architecture requirements.

Gregory Wolf asked if a two story home could be constructed under the proposed 29’ height restrictions. Mr. Brewster replied based on their analysis it could be done. Wes Jordan distributed a map for the Commission’s review identifying new homes constructed in 2015 and reflecting their roof height. The average height was 28.6’ with only three homes built that would not be in compliance with the new height regulation.

Jeffrey Valentino confirmed the new setback regulations would remove the location of the first home constructed impacting the setback for the neighbor’s home. Jonathan Birkel asked how windows would be handled. Mitch Dringman replied that windows and bays could project within the setback area.

Gregory Wolf confirmed the new setback regulations would be based on a percentage of the width of the lot and not be a set number. Mr. Brewster noted that many of the homes association deed restrictions in the city already establish setback as a percentage of width.

Jeffrey Valentino asked how the 12’ separation was determined. Mr. Brewster replied there is no magic number or universal residential standard. One of the considerations was having a width great enough to allow equipment to get into a rear yard if necessary. The 12 feet is consistent with other 1st tier suburbs.

Melissa Brown asked if there were any provision regarding roof appurtenances allowed. Mr. Brewster replied that the current code 19.44.015C would remain allowing for these items. Mrs. Brown asked if there was a size restriction. Mr. Brewster replied the items are not to be occupiable space.

Jonathan Birkel asked what exceptions are allowed outside the setback. Mr. Brewster stated Section 19.44.020C from the current code would remain allowing for projecting windows, eaves, cornices, pilasters, trellises etc. to project into required yard setbacks.

Nancy Wallerstein asked how many of the current rebuilds would not be in compliance with the proposed code. Wes Jordan stated staff conducted an analysis of 2015 rebuilds to attempt to get balanced restrictions. He noted that the proposed code allows for the Building Official to grant minor variances to height. Of the 25 homes built last year only three would not comply with the proposed code.

Wes Jordan noted side yard setback is one of the biggest complaints received by the City from neighbors trespassing on and damaging neighboring property while constructing or working on adjacent residences. He stated that the Building Official spent significant time dealing with this problem over the Memorial Day weekend.

There has been significant discussion on these items to get a good balance to address issues and concerns that have been raised. The city has received several letters from members of the Prairie Village Homes Association in support of the proposed regulations.

Chairman Nancy Wallerstein opened the public hearing requesting those speaking limit their comments to five minutes.

Dennis O’Rourke, 5007 West 63rd Terrace, expressed concern with the potential impact the proposed regulations would have on residential home values. He views the changes taking place throughout Prairie Village as strengthening property values. He noted his difficulty in finding a home in Prairie Village that would accommodate his growing family’s needs. He feels trying to maintain a village of Cape Cods is forcing families to move out. There needs to be more flexibility on smaller lots to allow for long term sustainability of housing stock. He asked the Commission to reconsider the 29’ height restriction for the R-1b District. The city needs to look 20 to 30 years ahead to maintain a sustainable housing stock. He would like to have homes be able to have the desired 10’ ceiling height and this can’t be done with the proposed height. Mr. O’Rourke feels 33 to 35’ height is fair and would like to see at least a minimum of 30 feet.

Andrea Ernst, 6828 El Monte, supported the proposed regulations and desires to maintain the character created by J.C. Nichols in developing Prairie Village. She noted some of the new homes constructed recently look like they belong further south. She does not want to see Prairie Village become another Olathe. She recognizes the changing demographics in the city and supports redevelopment but feels that the character of the community needs to be maintained.

Bruce Wendlandt, 4400 West 71st Street, stated the biggest challenge is addressing the density in R-1b. He was on the committee working on the proposed regulations and was hoping for a 30’ height restriction. He wants to see the city re-green and redevelop. Mr. Wendlandt shared different scenarios addressing his concerns with density in R-1b. He feels the goal is to strike a good livable balance with continuity in fabric.

Bill Copeland, 5200 West 81st Street, stated he felt the proposed regulations are reasonable. He does not want to see the growth and increased property values caused by the teardown/rebuilds go to waste.

Annie Ireland, 4905 West 70th Street, moved from Leawood and likes the character and flavor of Prairie Village neighborhoods. She supports the proposed revisions and noted that in building bigger to get more light, the homes are denying light to the adjacent properties. She urged the Commission to approve the proposed regulations.

Allen Gregory, 3906 West 69th Street, stated that he is currently rebuilding a tear down in order to meet the needs of his family. He views the issue from the viewpoint of increasing property values and believes everyone benefits from increased building that is occurring. He stated that most surrounding communities have 35 feet for their building height regulation with Fairway having 31 feet. He noted that the city of Leawood allows smaller lots to have a 40’ building height to allow them to accommodate housing needs. He feels the tighter restrictions will result in cheapened construction and he does not want to see market values decrease. Mr. Gregory stated 35’ is the standard height regulation in the metropolitan area regardless of lot size.

Pat Roberts, 3912 West 68th Street, a 40 year resident does not want to stop change, but feels the issue is maintaining an appropriate ratio.

Lissa Haag, 6817 El Monte, stated that she and others in the Prairie Village Homes Association recently went door to door to get resident feedback on the proposed revisions. The majority of the residents they spoke with supported having some limitations put in place. She feels that the proposed 29’ height is actually very tall compared to some of the existing homes in Prairie Village. Ms. Haag noted that families are moving into Prairie Village and there is a lot than can be done to homes within the proposed regulations to continue that trend. She encouraged the Commission to listen to the ordinary residents as well as the architects speaking this evening.

Steve Johnson, 3915 West 73rd Street, expressed appreciation to the Commission and the City as a resident since 1979. He stressed the need to strike a balance that will give families the features they need and desire while maintaining the character of Prairie Village neighborhoods.

Wes Jordan noted that recently a Prairie Village Homes Association had their covenants challenged that restricted homes to one and a half story and lost. Countryside East Homes Association has created an overlay district to provide greater control over redevelopment in their area. Prairie Village Homes Association was seeking to do the same but it became clear that more than an overlay was needed to address this issue. Mr. Jordan noted the PV Homes Association had previously proposed a 27’ height restriction.

Mr. Jordan noted that more restrictive covenants and deed restrictions supersede the city’s zoning regulations. He added it is very difficult and in some cases impossible to change covenants as they require 100% support and that it not possible. The Prairie Village Homes Association Board recently sent notification that the Association supported the proposed amendments.

The Public Hearing was closed at 8:17 p.m.

Mr. Birkel asked for clarification of Mr. Wendlandt’s comments related to density.

Mr. Wolf asked for confirmation if smaller lots in Leawood allowed 30’ height for homes; staff was not aware of this provision in Leawood’s code and had not researched that issue.

Mrs. Brown expressed concern with the 29’ wall section provided by Mr. Wendlandt and the challenges it would provide for windows. Mr. Brewster responded that the regulations address outside massing. Mr. Valentino questioned the ability to construction a standard two story home with a 29’ height restriction. Noting the analysis done with most homes being 29 feet plus inches, suggested that the height be set at 30 feet. He noted he likes that the new houses being constructed in his neighborhood are different.

Mr. Wolf was concerned with the 29’ height restriction was too restrictive causing Prairie Village residents to move south and feels that 30’ makes sense with the ability to request a variance to allow for any higher construction.

Patrick Lenahan asked if heights of existing homes were reviewed by staff in making their recommendation. Mr. Brewster replied staff did not systemically measure specific homes, but did compare the relative scale of typical homes noting that one story elements had eave lines approximately between 8’ and 1’ and ridge lines between 15 feet and 18 feet; one and one-half story elements had ridge lines between approximately 15 feet and 22 feet. Two-story elements have eave lines between approximately 15 feet and 20 feet and ridge lines between 22 feet and 29 feet. Mr. Lenahan replied the crux of the residential complaints is based on how much taller the new construction is than what currently exists in the neighborhood. He noted his home is 22’ in height and a 35’ home would certainly tower over that and many of the existing ranches are 15 feet in height.

He is comfortable with the 30’ noting only one home constructed in 2015 in R-1b exceeded that height or leave it at 29 feet.

Wes Jordan stressed that under the proposed regulations the Building Official can accept up to a 3% tolerance from the height. This would allow for up to 10.5” additional inches and could result in an actual height of almost 30’. If the Commission increases the height to 30’, he recommends the ability to grant a variance be removed.

Jonathan Birkel agreed that with the variance the height is almost at 30’. He noted that missing from consideration with the proposed changes are limitations on the massing portion and scale that will be discussed later. Character is very important, not just height. He feels that a lot of value can be added and still be within scale. Regarding the side setbacks, he feels that they should be at least 5 feet.

Jeffrey Valentino stated he would support the 29’ height with the allowed 3% tolerance granted by the Building Official, knowing that beyond that they can seek a variance. Mr. Brewster noted in Phase II an appeal process will be established for design. He does not want to address changes through the established variance process which requires legal criteria to be met.

Melissa Brown confirmed that the submitted plans for approval for a building permit must be drawn with a maximum 29’ height and that the 3% allowance is for field conditions or construction practices.

Nancy Wallerstein stated that she preferred a set height limitation. She is hearing between 29 and 30 feet from the commission. She would like a clear maximum.

Chris Brewster reviewed the new definition of height which addresses both how it is measured (from the finished grade) and the 3% tolerance.

Nancy Wallerstein was concerned that the waiver/tolerance allowed builders to exceed the code. Gregory Wolf asked if the tolerance should be reduced from 3% to 2%. Mr. Birkel noted the idea to allow actual construction to be up to 30 feet while ensuring that it does not exceed 30 feet. Mr. Wolf asked if the building was 12” too tall, what the city would do. Would it be required to meet code? Mr. Birkel asked when the height is measured. Mr. Dringman replied it would be measured at rough-in. Mr. Wolf stated that a tolerance of 10.5” seems like a lot to him and he wants to be sure that it will be enforced. Mr. Valentino stated that by making it flexible, it is more likely to be enforced. Mr. Dringman noted that with height measurement taking place at rough-in there is still time to make necessary changes.

Jeffrey Valentino asked how the new side yard setbacks affected odd lots and corner lots. Mr. Jordan replied that the measurement of width would be taken at the front building line. Chris Brewster noted the exceptions granted in the existing code would remain and read them to the Commission. Mr. Lenahan stated that his was more of an issue with pie shaped lots and noted that most commercial zoning has set numbers for setbacks rather than percentages. Mr. Brewster replied the setback measurement is taken at the building line and follows through the lot line on all sides.

Gregory Wolf moved the Planning Commission recommend the Governing Body adopt the proposed revisions for Chapter 19.02, Section 19.02.100 entitled “Building Height”. The motion was seconded by Jonathan Birkel and passed by a vote of 4 to 2 with Melissa Brown and Nancy Wallerstein voting in opposition.

Patrick Lenahan moved the Planning Commission recommend the Governing Body adopt the proposed revisions for Chapter 19.06, Section 19.06.020 entitled “Height” (R-1a). The motion was seconded by Melissa Brown and passed by a vote of 6 to 0.

Patrick Lenahan moved the Planning Commission recommend the Governing Body adopt the proposed revisions for Chapter 19.06 Section 19.06.030 entitled “Side Yard” (R-1a). The motion was seconded by Gregory Wolf and passed by a vote of 5 to 1 with Jeffrey Valentino voting in opposition.

Patrick Lenahan moved the Planning Commission recommend the Governing Body adopt the proposed revisions for Chapter 19.08, Section 19.08.015 entitled “Height” (R-1b). The motion was seconded by Jeffrey Valentino and passed by a vote of 6 to 0.

Melissa Brown moved the Planning Commission recommend the Governing Body adopt the proposed revisions for Chapter 19.08, Section 19.08.025 entitled “Side Yard” (R-1b. The motion was seconded by Gregory Wolf and passed by a vote of 5 to 1 with Jeffrey Valentino voting in opposition.

Gregory Wolf moved the Planning Commission recommend the Governing Body adopt the proposed revisions for Chapter 19.44, Section 19.44.030 entitled “Building Elevations”. The motion was seconded by Melissa Brown and passed by a vote of 6 to 0.

Gregory Wolf moved the Planning Commission recommend the Governing Body adopt the proposed revisions for Chapter 19.44, Section 19.44.015 entitled “Height”. The motion was seconded by Patrick Lenahan and passed by a vote of 6 to 0.

Jonathan Birkel asked what the timeline was for Phase II discussions. Mr. Jordan replied that if the proposed revisions are approved by the City Council on June 20th staff will make sure the Council still wants to proceed with Phase II as a priority. If so, he would anticipate those discussion would begin very quickly.

**NEXTMEETING**

The planning commission secretary noted filing deadline for the July meeting is the end of the week. No submittals have been made to date.

Mr. Lenahan stated he would not be in attendance at either the proposed joint PC/CC meeting on July 5th or the regulation Planning Commission meeting on July 12th.

**ADJOURNMENT**

With no further business to come before the Commission, Chairman Nancy Wallerstein adjourned the meeting at 9:12 p.m.

Nancy Wallerstein

Chairman