**PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES**

SEPTEMBER 12, 2017

ROLL CALL

The Planning Commission of the City of Prairie Village met in regular session on Tuesday, September 12, 2017 in the Municipal Building Council Chambers at 7700 Mission Road. Chairman Nancy Wallerstein called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. with the following members present: Melissa Brown, Gregory Wolf, James Breneman, Patrick Lenahan, Jeffrey Valentino and Jonathan Birkel.

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

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

Patrick Lenahan moved for the approval of the minutes of the August 1, 2017 regular Planning Commission meeting as presented. The motion was seconded by James Breneman and passed by unanimously with Gregory Wolf abstaining.

Chairman Nancy Wallerstein announced a change in the agenda moving item PC2017-110 to the top of the agenda noting that this is routine item that can be handled in a short period of time.

**NON PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**PC2017-110 Request for Building Line Modification**

**7618 Chadwick**

Dennis and Merrill Schapker, 7618 Chadwick Street, stated they are requesting a building line modification to build an expansion on the existing home in association with a new front entry patio and stoop. The proposed addition would extend 3.5 feet beyond the 35’ platted setback line for the forward most portion (“Music Bay”) of the addition, while the bulk of the addition is beyond the 35’ platted line. The current alignment of the garage and second story of the split level home is at 35 feet. Other portions of this remodeling and addition are to the rear of the lot and comply with all zoning and platted building lines.

Wolfgang Trost, 5300 West 94th Terrace, reviewed the proposed renovations that add a music alcove for a piano and the construction of a garden terrace patio in the front courtyard. The renovations have been designed to retain the original character of the home and neighborhood.

Chris Brewster stated this lot is located mid-block on Chadwick Street, and has a platted building line of 35 feet on the fronts of all lots on the block. This building line is in addition to and greater than required by the R-1A zoning (30 feet front setback). Typically, platted building lines in Prairie Village originated from developer imposed-restrictions at the time of the original building to deal with unique circumstances on a lot or block. They may add greater or lesser restrictions than may be required by zoning, but are often used to deal with special circumstances of corner lots or irregular shaped blocks. This block has a greater setback required for all lots due to the platted setback (35’ instead of 30’).

Mr. Brewster stated the proposed addition meets all zoning setbacks for the R-1A zoning district, and the designs are emphasizing the architectural character of the existing home with greater details and ornamentation, and replicating distinctive roof lines with a projecting bay on the single-level portion of the split level.

The Planning Commission reviewed the following criteria for granting building line modifications.

1. **That there are special circumstances or conditions affecting the property;**

The lot is mid-block, and similar to most other lots on the block. However, this block as a whole is a cul-de-sac in the middle of similarly zoned lots that do not have the similar restriction. It is not clear why a 35’ setback would be appropriate to this area instead of the zoning requirement of 30’. Additionally several homes at the end of the cul-de-sac, are built closer to the street than the platted 35’. This is a common condition on the ends of cul-de-sacs.

1. **The building line modification is necessary for reasonable and acceptable development of the property in question;**

The buildable area of the lot is reduced because of the platted setbacks, beyond similarly zoned property. While the lot is typical of similarly zoned property, and there is a reasonable amount of buildable area under the platted setbacks, the platted building lines are more constraining that zoning setbacks and would prevent the addition of more living space – in this case projecting slightly further than the forward-most portion of the 2-car garage on the frontage. The placement of the existing building would mean that most additions would need to occur on the rear of the property, rather than improving the frontage and relationship of the building, entry feature and living space to the neighborhood and streetscape.

1. **That the granting of the building line modification will not be detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to or adversely affect adjacent property or other property in the vicinity in which the particular property is situated;**

The proposed “music bay” is only a portion of the building addition that extends beyond the platted building line and is part of an overall design concept that improves the frontage area. The proposed addition would meet the required zoning setbacks and would only encroach beyond the platted setback by approximately 3.5’.

Gregory Wolf asked if a previous variance had been granted in this area. Mr. Brewster replied that none were found in the city’s records.

Gregory Wolf moved the Planning Commission approve Resolution 2017-110 approving a Building Line Modification to the platted front setback Building Line for 7618 Chadwick Street from 35 feet to 30 feet. The motion was seconded by Jonathan Birkel.

Melissa Brown commended the applicant on the design of the renovation that stays within the character of the existing home.

James Breneman asked if the approval was for 3’5” or to a 30 foot setback. Mr. Schapker stated they are requesting approval of a front building line consistent with the city’s regulations although their addition will only extend 3’5” beyond the platted building line for the benefit of future owners. The Board Secretary stated the resolution is written granting a modification to the city’s required 30 foot front building setback.

The motion was voted on and passed unanimously.

**PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**PC2017-02 Amendment to Special Use Permit for Kansas City Christian Private School Site Plan Approval for Expansion of the building 4801 West 79th Street**

Ty Tywater, Vice Chair of the Kansas City Christian School Board, provided background information on the school which was formed in 1951 and moved to its current location at 4801 West 79th Street in 1986. The school currently has 435 students in grades Pre-K through high school. The focus of the school is based on character, faith and knowledge. They offer a strong academic curriculum with Advanced Placement classes offered to the 98% of their graduating students who go on to attend college.

The proposed project is designed to create a better educational experience for their students and affects both the interior and exterior of the building. The program will allow for distinct elementary, middle school and high school classroom areas. They have been exploring options over the past two years and believe the proposed option to be the best alternative. It would be cost prohibitive to relocate to another facility, they like their current location and have designed a project that is attractive and will not only improve their property, but the neighborhood as a whole.

Kelly VanElders, 11710 West 102nd Place, the owners’ representative for the project introduced others in attendance including: Mr. Tywater, Todd Zylstra, Head of the School; Bill Glotzbach, Director of Development; Consultants John Ho with Hollis & Miller and Brian Hochstein, with MKEC.

Mr. VanElders stated that over the past decade they have several options. The purchase of another facility is cost prohibitive and most of their students live in the northeast Johnson County area. Mr. VanElders presented the proposed project beginning with a review of the new building façade which features a significant amount of wood, similar to the look of Corinth Square. The proposed addition transitions well from the big box configurement of the gymnasium, to the new larger entrance area that is closer to the street and the second story addition. A materials board was available for review by the Commission. All of the schools’ windows will be replaced with new energy efficient windows; the current HVAC (boiler system) will be replaced. On the back southeast side of the building an enclosed structure will be added that will contain the dumpsters, HVAC equipment, etc. The new roofline introduces soffits for a more residential appearance.

Mr. VanElders reviewed the proposed floor plan which creates a designated area for elementary students, middle school students and high school students. Currently the middle school and high school students share classrooms. The proposed floor plan does not just add square footage, it allows for the creation of community within the school. A big change in the design will be the main entry which will double in width and be taller. Locker rooms will be added for the students – none currently exist. A music room and art room are being added.

Gregory Wolf asked when the construction would take place. Mr. VanElders responded the construction is expected to take five months. The project will go out to bid and materials will be purchased prior to the close of school. Demolition will begin immediately after the close of school. They will have a delayed start of school in the fall and are speaking with area churches regarding possibly using their classroom facilities if additional time and space is needed. They anticipate completion in October

James Breneman confirmed that the window air conditioning units will no longer be necessary.

Gregory Wolf asked how they planned to keep the neighbors from being impacted by the additional student population. Mr. VanElders responded that no parking spaces are being lost in the project and showed the proposed parking locations. They have 24 more parking spaces than are required by code. James Breneman asked for the breakdown of student enrollment for elementary, middle school and high school. Mr. VanElders did not have the breakdown. Enrollment in grades changes annually as students progress and he does not foresee a significant change in any grade, particularly in high school students. Students do not tend to change schools during high school. They used a baseline of a maximum of six new students at each grade, though due to conditions #1 and #2 there will not be an immediate impact. Mr. Wolf asked how many buses the school had. Mr. VanElders replied the school has a bus that services students in southern Overland Park and a van that services students in the Kansas City area.

Nancy Wallerstein noted that condition number #7 allows four buses. Mr. Brewster responded that that condition was carried over from the existing special use permit. Mr. VanElders stated that other schools will come with buses during athletic events. Mr. Wolf asked what sports were offered. Mr. VanElders responded basketball, volleyball and soccer.

Chris Brewster stated the Special Use Permit for Kansas City Christian School was approved by the City Council on January 18, 1999. It did not have an expiration date, but was subject to four conditions relative to the design, construction and operation of the school, and subject to a Site Plan, subsequently approved on February 2, 1999. A school was originally built on this site in 1954 as a public elementary school. One of the conditions was that expansion of the school, or amending the approved site plan would require an amendment to the Special Use Permit.

Growth of the school, the acquisition of other school properties further south led to reconfiguration of this campus and its operations. In 2008 the school applied for an amended Special Use Permit and Site Plan. At that time, a number of issues related to parking utilization, drop-off procedures and school transportation were raised by the neighbors, and the amended permit and site plan dealt primarily with reconciling those issues. The applicant worked with the City and neighbors to resolve these issues with operational policies. At this time the distribution of facilities and classrooms, and associated parking requirement was as follows:

* 11 high school classrooms – 88 spaces
* 17 elementary and junior high classrooms – 34 spaces
* 51 employees – 26 spaces
* Total parking need – 148 spaces
* Total parking provided – 171 spaces (exceeding minimum requirements by 23 spaces)

The enrollment numbers associated with these issues were as follows:

* 1999 SUP – 543 students (162 of which were high school)
* 2008 SUP amendment – 469 students (274 of which were high school)

In addition, at this time plans for future growth of the school and the possibility of new construction at other campuses were anticipated in the schools long-range plans.

Through the amended Special Use Permit process, the parking and transportation issues were resolved with better utilization of current parking and facilities, reconfiguration of classrooms, and other associated transportation policies. No new facilities were built, however parking and capacity was expanded to address these issues. The amended Special Use Permit was approved on September 2, 2008 with the renewal of the four conditions of the original SUP, plus the following conditions:

5. That Kansas City Christian School adopt a policy that all students will park on site and develop a procedure for implementation and enforcement of the policy.

6. The number of high school classrooms shall be limited to 11.

7. No more than four busses shall be parked in the rear of the school when not picking up or dropping off students, and shall not be idling for more than five minutes during pick-up and drop-off.

8. Kansas City Christian provide to the City at the beginning of each school year an updated student count reflecting the number of students in each grade and the number of classrooms used for each grade level.

The current application is for the renovation and expansion of the existing 55,990 square foot building adding an additional 31,455 square feet. This will provide new and renovated rooms through the expansion and renovation of interior spaces. Specifically, the expansion involves:

* A second story addition over the center 1/3rd of the existing school building and associated with the primary entrance to the west of the existing gymnasium.
* A two story multi-purpose space to the rear of the existing building (southwest corner over current paved play area above an existing underground space).
* A small single story addition to the southeast corner of the building.

The expansions will occur over some existing parking areas, but through reconfiguration of the existing parking lots, five additional parking spaces will be provided.

The traffic study conducted has been reviewed and approved by the city’s traffic engineer and the Director of Public Works and finds that sufficient parking is available for student and staff parking as well as an additional 24 available spaces.

The Storm Drainage Report has been reviewed and approved by the city’s engineer and Director of Public Works and finds the proposed project will have a negligible increase in impervious area compared to the existing conditions. Peak runoff and volume will not be substantially affected. No additional detention or improvements to the adjacent storm water sewer system are necessary.

From the standpoint of design, the proposed project is a considerable improvement of the existing facility. The applicant held a neighborhood meeting on August 8, 2017 in conformance with the City’s Citizen Participation Policy and provided a report on the meeting and attendees.

Gregory Wolf questioned the difference in the enrollment numbers from to initial permit to the existing permit. Mr. Brewster stated the initial numbers were a reflection of the enrollment at the time. The 2008 reduction in numbers reflected enrollment at that time and a condition of the Governing Body was added requiring enrollment figures be given to the city annually. The proposed permit is not based on the number of students enrolled, but on the related impact as it relates to land use. Mr. VanElders noted that the limit on the number of high school classrooms will limit the number of high school students able to be served.

Nancy Wallerstein noted that condition #9 on the site plan approval is based on a capacity of 525. Mr. Valentino stated this is not an enrollment limit. Mr. VanElders replied the 525 is the basis on which the traffic study was conducted. Mr. Wolf asked what happens if enrollment increases to 535. Mr. Brewster replied that the permit is not intended to limit enrollment to 525, but if problems arise from the operation of the school or there is a significant increase in enrollment then the permit needs to be re-evaluated. Mr. VanElders noted that enrollment generally grows from the lower level to the higher level as students continue to attend throughout the years. Mrs. Wallerstein stated she was concerned with the wording of #9. Mr. Brewster #9 is not about the number of students, but the impact of those students. Melissa Brown noted that as #9 is worded the change could be a significant decrease as well as an increase.

Suggested rewordings were discussed including changed “is based on” to “anticipates” referencing the change as a percentage, stipulating the change be an increase. Mr. Brewster continued to stress that the number of students is not important, that the impact of those students on the land use is the important factor.

Mrs. Wallerstein asked how many high school classrooms currently exist. Mr. Valentino noted that middle school students share the high school classrooms. The applicant responded eight designated classrooms with six shared classrooms. Mr. VanElders noted the project will allow for separate classrooms for middle and high school students. Mrs. Wallerstein noted there are currently 14 classrooms being used and the proposed permit limits the number of classrooms to 12. Mrs. Wallerstein questioned the need for condition #6. Mr. Brewster replied that is condition is a carryover from the previous permit with the addition of 1 additional classroom based on the parking that can be accommodated. Mrs. Wallerstein suggested changing the language to reflect “dedicated” classrooms, providing some flexibility if needed in the future.

Chris Brewster proposed the following change to the language in condition #9: “The permit anticipates a projected enrollment of 525 students, and any enrollment significantly beyond this capacity or reconfiguring of classroom that create impacts beyond those anticipated by this baseline may require a revised site plan or may result in revocation of the permit at the discretion of the City.”

Nancy Wallerstein questioned the proposed signage. Mr. VanElders reviewed the proposed location of the façade signs and confirmed that there will not be a monument sign.

Jonathan Birkel asked if the city would need to make any changes to 79th Street with the increased in and out traffic. He noted this is a primary east west street for the city. Mr. Brewster responded that Public Works Director Keith Bredehoeft reviewed the traffic study and stated he agreed with the findings and did not foresee any significant issues.

Mrs. Wallerstein noted the traffic covered only a 30 minute window of time during the day.

Chairman Nancy Wallerstein opened the public hearing for comments on this application advising speakers to come to the microphone and state their name and address prior to making their comments.

Joan Harr, 7911 Juniper, noted her home is near the soccer field. She stressed that this school was originally built as an elementary school. There is no buffer between the school property and hers. There is significant noise coming from the use of the soccer field that she feels is an encroachment on her property. She feels the city should be supportive of the residents surrounding the school and feels the proposed expansion is too large an undertaking. In 2008, the school said that it would be moving its high school campus to another location in southern Overland Park. She is against the project and concerned with its impact on traffic, parking and noise.

Catherine Dayton, 4808 West 79th Street, confirmed the Commission member had received her comments submitted prior to the meeting. The biggest thing about this project is that it is a monumental shift in the intended use for this site, which began as an elementary school site. She is concerned that in addition to the school’s use of the property, they lease their space out for others to use. This should not be allowed as it creates additional noise particularly in the evenings and on weekends. This increases the impact on the neighbors. There are traffic issues related to after school and special events when tons of cars park in the neighborhoods on both sides of the street creating a safety hazard. The increased enrollment from 445 to 525 is a significant increase of 18% and concerns her.

In 2008, the City restricted the enrollment to its current level feeling that was a reasonable maximum for this site and this neighborhood. She does not agree with allowing an enrollment of 525 and feels it needs to be lower. There are buses in front of the building all of the time. She feels there needs to be a person overseeing traffic and parking during student activities and events.

Mrs. Dayton stated she appreciated all of the students parking on the site and the thorough evaluation of the application by staff. She believes that a balance can be found that will be acceptable to both the neighborhood and the school. She feels the application is being rushed and noted the first she heard about it was August 1st and that the school has not talked with her. She appreciates the opportunity to express her concerns.

James Luce, 4822 West 78th Place, lives adjacent to Mrs. Dayton and stated that he is unable to turn left onto 79th Street because of the stacked parent parking on 79th Street. He noted that many of the residents in the neighborhood are retired, stay at home moms, or parents who work from home and are impacted by activities at the school the entire day. He expressed concern with a potential large increase in high school enrollment and the related increase in student parking. He would like to see parking on 78th Place restricted from school parking.

Stephen Spencer, 4804 West 79th Street, stated that the school has been a great neighbor. It is an excellent school which his children have attended. He is pleased to see the proposed exterior upgrade to the building that he has a direct view of from his windows. He acknowledged that there are traffic issues, which can be found at any school, and feels that they can be worked out with the school. The school is not looking to grow its high school. It is looking to provide a better educational experience for all students. The school currently has 75 middle school students and 215 elementary students. The enrollment varies from year to year and the school has worked hard to be a good neighbor. He strongly supports the project.

Bill Wilkes, 4718 West 80th Street, which backs up to the school expressed concern with increased high school enrollment and an increased number of student drivers. Traffic and parking has to be considered. He also noted the noise when the school lets out. He referred to it as “school bingo” as numbers are called out on an ongoing basis. It can be heard throughout the neighborhood. He reviewed the plans August 1st and noted increase in square footage is significant increase.

Brian Holy, 4700 West 79th Street, stated the school is a great part of the community. Traffic builds up and subsides. He does not want to see a traffic light placed at 79th and Roe. He doesn’t see the increased enrollment as a problem.

With no one else wishing to address the Commission, the public hearing was closed at 8:29 p.m.

Jeffrey Valentino asked for clarification on the traffic study process and report noting the reported data is from 2014, 2015 and trends upward and questioned the conclusion. He noted that if all 12 designated high school classrooms were full with 20 students that would reflect an increase of 50 high school driving students. Brian Hochstein, with MKEC Engineers, explained the process noting that the city’s parking regulations are based on the number of classrooms so that is the data they used along with the condition of the site and applied standard factors. He repeated the earlier comment that it is a realistic assumption that the increase in student enrollment will be distributed throughout all grades and not focused on high school students. The 87% maximum level assumes six additional students per grade. This is reflective of national trends. Mr. Valentino continued to question the accuracy of the calculation and assumptions. Mrs. Brown noted in Mr. Valentino’s scenario, there would be 156 cars. Mr. Hochstein responded available parking has been increased 166 to 171. Mrs. Wallerstein confirmed that included staff parking.

Wes Jordan noted that at the 2008 hearing on this application there was significant resident concern with the number of cars parking on the street. The school made a renewed commitment to pull parking back onto their property and monitor event parking. In his discussion with the applicant, they do not want to take a step backward and return to that situation. Staff has advised the school that they have to be a good neighbor in respect to parking and traffic.

Nancy Wallerstein noted that she had read that the school used off-site parking at Mission Bible Church and ran a shuttle during events. Mr. Glotzbach responded that they do have a partnership with for off-site parking for certain events as well as other procedures in place. During day events, i.e. grandparents’ day, students are required to park in the Mission Bible Church parking lot. Mrs. Wallerstein asked about sporting events. Mr. Glotzbach replied they do provide parking attendants.

Mrs. Brown and Mrs. Wallerstein asked for further information on the “bingo” referenced by one of the speakers. Mr. Van Elder responded the school uses of method of identifying cars ready for pick up so that students can be ready to get into the vehicle immediately making pick-up more efficient and take less time. Mrs. Brown stated she can see how that would be annoying. Mrs. Wallerstein urged the school to look into other, less noisy, options for this process.

Mrs. Wallerstein agreed that the increase in square footage is significant. Mr. VanElders noted that that percentage includes existing renovated space and is not all additional space.

Mr. VanElders stated that in addition to the required certified mailing to residents within 200 feet, the school distributed flyers to homes in the neighborhood.

Nancy Wallerstein asked if any additional landscaping was proposed, noting that landscaping serves as a good buffer both visually and for noise. Mr. VanElders reviewed the proposed landscape plan submitted with additional landscaping being added on the east property line, which came about from a request made at the neighborhood meeting.

The Commission reviewed the required findings for a special use permit as presented in the staff report:

1. **The character of the neighborhood.**

This site is located on the south side of West 79th Street between Roe Avenue and Nall Avenue. The surrounding area is all single-family neighborhoods. In general, schools are compatible and contribute to the character of single-family neighborhoods provided the location, access, and site design is managed in a way that is compatible with residential living in neighborhood environments.

1. **The zoning and uses of property nearby.**
* North: R-1B Single-Family District – Single-family dwellings
* East: R-1A Single-Family District – Single-family dwellings
* West: R-1A Single-Family District – Single-family dwelling
* South: R-1A Single-Family District – Single-family dwelling

The Prairie Village Zoning Ordinance allows private schools in the R-1A and R-1B zoning district through a special use permit.

1. **The extent that a use will detrimentally affect neighboring property**

The site has been a school since the building was originally constructed in 1954. It became a private school in 1986 and received an original Special Use Permit in 1999. In 2008 the SUP and site plan were renewed due to some specific concerns regarding parking, transportation and operations of the school in the neighborhood. Outside of these concerns, this campus has existed within this neighborhood without detrimental effects on the surrounding property. This is due primarily to the school addressing growth through additional campus facilities outside of the City, allocating space on this campus in relation to the scale of the building and site, and managing the intensity of the use with transportation and operational policies that limit traffic and parking impacts on the neighborhood.

1. **The relative gain to public health, safety and welfare by destruction of value of the applicant’s property as compared to the hardship on other individual landowners.**

This application involves the expansion and remodeling of an existing school building, and allows affective utilization of an older school site within the neighborhood. Provided the parking, transportation and operational intensity is limited similarly to past approvals, it is reasonable to expect the school to contribute positively to the neighborhood.

1. **The proposed special use complies with all applicable provisions of these regulations, including intensity of use regulations, yard regulations and use limitations.**

Private schools are permitted through a special use process by the Prairie Village zoning ordinance. The existing building and the proposed expansion meets all other standards applicable to the building and site relating to height, setback, and lot coverage.

1. **The proposed special use at the specified location will not adversely affect the welfare or convenience of the public.**

The site has been used as a school for approximately 63 years and the approval of this amended special use permit will be consistent with that use. Since this is the continuation of a current condition it is not expected that the use will cause any new issues with respect to the compatibility of uses, provided that the expansion of the building and the potential increase on capacity is adequately addressed through other criteria and conditions.

1. **The location and size of the special use, the nature and intensity of the operation involved in or conducted in connection with it, and the location of the site with respect to streets giving access to it are such as the special use will not cause substantial injury to the value of the property in the immediate neighborhood so as to hinder development and use of neighboring property in accordance with the applicable zoning district regulations. In determining whether the special use will cause substantial injury to the value of property in the immediate neighborhood, consideration shall be given to:**
	1. **The location, size, nature and height of buildings, structures, walls, and fences on the site; and**
	2. **The nature and extent of landscaping and screening on the site.**

The modification of the building improves the overall appearance and utilization of the building in relation to the public streetscape and homes to the north fronting on 79th street. Residential lots to the east of the building are well screened by landscape. Residents to the west are separated by the existing play field and parking area, which are a suitable transition between school campuses and housing. Residential lots to the south are lower than the school site, and a combination of grades, street configurations in this area, and the back yards and landscape help screen the campus from housing. The building expansion – in footprint and height is proposed internal to the campus site (within the current footprint and the internal area to the south and west over the existing blacktop play area). The second story addition is lower than the current gymnasium and is only proposed on a portion of the current footprint, so the scale of the building should not have a significant impact on the site. Provided the parking, transportation, and operational intensity is limited similarly to past approvals, this should not have an adverse impact.

West 79th Street is a neighborhood street, but it has good connectivity to other collector-level and arterial street connections to Roe, Nall, Mission, Lamar and Metcalf. This network, as well as other well-connected east-west streets to the north (75th Street) and south (83rd Street) provide good access for this use. The applicant has submitted a traffic memo dated 8/11/17 to provide specific analysis of the transportation impacts of this expansion relative to the current conditions.

1. **Off-street parking and loading areas will be provided in accordance with the standards set forth in these regulations and such areas will be screened from adjoining residential uses and located so as to protect such residential uses from any injurious effect.**

The ordinance requires that elementary, junior high and equivalent schools provide two spaces for each classroom, and high schools provide eight spaces for each classroom, plus one space for each two employees. The application adds new classrooms, one of which is a high school classroom. By ordinance, this would mean a minimum 21 additional spaces, assuming 6 new employee / faculty positions. The 2008 indicated a surplus of 23 spaces based on the capacity of the school at the time and the site configuration. The new site plan includes 5 additional spaces. Therefore, although some of the existing surplus will be used up, the application meets the ordinance requirement for parking. Additionally, the applicant has included a parking analysis base on a utilization rate and study over a 3-year period using past enrollment numbers. Based on this rate, and projecting a full enrollment of 525 students, they project that the lot will ordinarily operate at 87% capacity at peak times, leaving a surplus of 24 spaces based on utilization rates.

1. **Adequate utility, drainage, and other such necessary facilities have been or will be provided.**

Much of the new construction is occurring on existing impervious areas, either an additional story within the current footprint or expansion into current paved areas. The applicant has supplied a drainage letter comparing existing and proposed conditions, and expected impacts on drainage. Public Works has reviewed this letter and concurs with the findings, subject to a final drainage permit prior to building permits.

1. **Adequate access roads or entrance and exist drives will be provided and shall be so designed to prevent traffic hazards and to minimize traffic congestion in public streets and alleys.**

The site access from 79th street will not change. A traffic memo supplied by the applicant has projected traffic conditions (including access, parking, and drop-off / pick-up procedures) based on a projected enrollment capacity of 525 students (current is 444). The highest change in volume is expected to be during the morning peak hours. Public Works has reviewed this memo and concurs with the findings, and does not expect any significant traffic impacts beyond those currently experienced in the area or beyond with the overall network can handle.

1. **Adjoining properties and the general public shall be adequately protected from any hazardous or toxic materials, hazardous manufacturing processes, obnoxious odors or unnecessarily intrusive noises.**

This particular use is not expected to produce any hazardous or toxic materials, hazardous processes, obnoxious odors, or intrusive noises beyond what is ordinarily associated with a school. The use is compatible with surrounding neighborhood properties with regard to these criteria.

1. **Architectural design and building materials are compatible with such design and materials used in the neighborhood in which the proposed facility is to be built or located.**

The addition to the building includes the following:

* + Two story, multipurpose spaces to the rear of existing building, near the southwest corner. The addition lies within an existing paved area. The height of the addition will be equivalent to a two-story volume, but it is not visible from 79th Street as it sits behind the 2nd story addition to the school.
	+ Second story addition over the center 1/3 of the existing school building. The height of the addition from 79th Street will be less than the existing gymnasium space to the east of the proposed addition. The addition will house new classroom and lobby space.
	+ Single story addition to the southeast corner of the building. The addition lies completely within an existing paved area of the site. The addition will allow the expansion of classroom spaces.
	+ Two story addition to the front of the building, at the center of the existing school building. The addition will tie into the second story addition to the school and provide additional entry/ lobby space.

The materials proposed include – wood (rain/shade screen), glazing, brick veneer, EIFS and metal (fascia). New brick veneer and EIFS will match the existing brick veneer and EIFS used on the gymnasium. The proposed design is consistent with and enhances the existing character of the building, and there for will improve the degree of compatibility with the neighborhood.

1. **Conformance with the Comprehensive Plan**

One of the primary objectives of Village Vision is to encourage reinvestment in the community to maintain the quality of life in Prairie Village. This application is for reinvestment and expansion of an existing institution within the community, and provided the impacts from additional enrollment are adequately mitigated and capacity is limited it is consistent with Village Vision in encouraging reinvestment.

1. **City Staff recommendations.**

Staff believes that with the proposed improvements this site will be near maximum development for a school site within a neighborhood. However, the parking utilization and access strategies, based on proposed enrollment projections appear to adequately address any potential impacts on the surrounding area. The investments in the building and the design are appropriately scaled for the neighborhood and improve the appearance of the site. Subject to appropriate limitations on capacity beyond projections, and the operational and intensity limitations of previous Special Use Permit approvals, staff recommends approval.

Melissa Brown moved the Planning Commission recommend the Governing Body approve PC2017-02 the requested amendment to the Special Use Permit for Kansas City Christian Private School at 4801 West 79th Street subject to the following conditions (1-5, 7 and 8 being carried over from the 1999 and 2008 Special Use Permits, 6 being revised for this application, and 9 being an additional condition for this application).

1. The applicant shall meet all conditions and requirements of the Planning Commission for the approval of a site plan.

2. The Special Use Permit not have a termination or expiration time established for it.

3. If the applicant violates any conditions of the zoning regulations and requirements as part of the Special Use Permit, the permit may be revoked by the City Council.

4. The applicant cannot further expand or amend the Site Plan without an amendment to the Special Use Permit requiring a public hearing before being approved.

5. Kansas City Christian School adopt a policy that all students will park on site and develop a procedure for implementation and enforcement of the policy.

6. The number of designated high school classrooms shall be limited to 12.

7. No more than four busses shall be parked in the rear of the school when not picking-up or dropping-off, and shall not idle more than five minutes during pick-up and drop-off.

8. Kansas City Christian provide to the City at the beginning of each school year an updated student count reflecting the number of students in each grade and the number of classrooms use for each grade level.

9. The permit anticipates a projected enrollment capacity of 525 students, and any enrollment significantly beyond this capacity or reconfiguring of classrooms that creates impacts beyond those anticipated by this baseline may require a revised site plan or may result in revocation of the permit at the discretion of the City.

The motion was seconded by Gregory Wolf and passed by a vote of 5 to 2 with Mr. Birkel and Mr. Valentino voting in opposition.

**Site Plan Approval**

Mr. Brewster noted along with the amended Special Use Permit a revised site plan for the proposed expansion needs to be reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission. Many of the factors for consideration were covered in under the Special Use Permit. This is a separate action that does not go forward to the City Council. The following staff comments address the site plan analysis:

1. **The site is capable of accommodating the buildings, parking areas, and drives with the appropriate open space and landscape.**

Addressed in special use permit analysis.

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

This site is currently served by utilities and they should be adequate to serve the proposed expansion.

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

This is a second story addition with some expansion of the footprint over existing paved areas. The impervious surface will be increasing very little.

1. **The plan provides for safe ingress/egress and internal traffic circulation.**

Addressed in special use permit analysis.

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

The expansion is within the current footprint of the building or impervious surfaces, and produces very little impact on grade, drainage, open space or relationships of the building and site to surrounding areas. It represents the effective utilization of an existing neighborhood campus site, in a manner that is compatible with the character of the surrounding area.

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

Addressed in special use permit analysis.

1. **The plan represents an overall development pattern that is consistent with Village Vision and other adopted planning policies.**

Addressed in special use permit analysis.

Gregory Wolf moved the Planning Commission approve the Site Plan submitted for application PC2017-02 for the expansion of Kansas City Christian School at 4801 West 79th Street subject to the following conditions:

1. Signs are approved in concept. The applicant shall submit a sign permit application demonstrating that the proposed wall signs comply with the Prairie Village sign ordinance, specifically showing the dimensions of the signs and the dimensions of the walls.

2. A drainage permit be finalized and approved by Public Works prior to issuance of a building permit.

The motion was seconded by James Breneman and passed by a vote of 5 to 2 with Mr. Birkel and Mr. Valentino voting in opposition.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

Chris Brewster stated that staff has had meetings with a potential applicant for an infill project. This has not materialized into a formal application, however it has brought up some associated planning and policy issues not completely addressed in the comprehensive plan. The potential applicant has requested to appear before the Planning Commission to discuss some of these issues.

Adam Piper, with NSPJ, stated he is working with developer John Moffitt on a potential rezoning of property for redevelopment. He noted that the city’s comprehensive plan points out the need for affordable and diverse housing stock. The city currently has two single family residential zoning designations – R-la and R-lb). Most dominant is the R-la zoning which has minimum lot sizes of 80’ width and 125’ depth. The R-lb zoned lots have 60’ width and 100’ depth for 6,000 square feet and are primarily located around the 75th Street corridor. Mr. Piper noted that there is a four block area that is currently zoned R-la, but has the lot dimensions of R-lb and that they would like to rezone that property to the appropriate zoning designation to allow for redevelopment.

Mr. Piper referenced the city’s comprehensive plan noting the city’s aging housing stock, its landlocked condition limiting growth without redevelopment and the need to update existing properties to better meet the needs of today’s home buyers.

Chairman Nancy Wallerstein stopped Mr. Piper and advised him that this type of presentation before the Planning Commission should come with an application. Mr. Brewster noted that if the applicant submits a rezoning application, there is no other avenue for this discussion other than in conjunction with that application. Mrs. Wallerstein stated that this should be discussion in conjunction with an application and that she felt it was inappropriate for the Commission to be having this presentation. Mr. Wolf agreed with Mrs. Wallerstein and advised Mr. Piper to come back with a formal application.

**NEXT MEETING**

The October Planning Commission meeting will consider the final development for the Senior Living Component of the Meadowbrook project.

Wes Jordan reported that Mr. Brewster has begun work on the zoning regulations and will be coming before the City Council at the Council Committee of the Whole meeting on September 18th to clarify zoning regulations vs. comprehensive plan as discussion on Phase II to look at the scale and mass and to get direction as well as ensure the Council, the Commission and staff are all on the same page and have the same expectations.

Mrs. Wallerstein suggested that Mr. Piper may get input from joining in those discussions with other builders and developers. Mr. Jordan stated that the city continues to have consistent teardowns and rebuilds.

The Planning Commission is involved with the comprehensive plan. The vision of the Commission and City Council as presented in the comprehensive plan. It was noted that many of the items discussed in the comprehensive plan that was created approximately ten years ago have moved forward. Chris Brewster stressed that a review of the comprehensive plan should not be reactionary. Mrs. Wallerstein noted related discussions should be held at a committee level and encouraged any commissioners who wanted to be involved in those discussions to let her or Mr. Jordan know. She is looking forward to those discussions.

**ADJOURNMENT**

With no further business to come before the Commission, Chairman Nancy Wallerstein adjourned the meeting at 9:10 p.m.

Nancy Wallerstein

Chairman