

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
August 7, 2018

ROLL CALL

The Planning Commission of the City of Prairie Village met in regular session on Tuesday, August 7, 2018 in the Council Chambers at 7700 Mission Road. Chairman Nancy Wallerstein called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. with the following members present: Jonathan Birkel, Patrick Lenahan, Gregory Wolf, Jeffrey Valentino, and James Breneman.

The following persons were present in their advisory capacity to the Planning Commission: Chris Brewster, City Planning Consultant; Jamie Robichaud, Assistant City Administrator; Ron Nelson, Council Liaison; Mitch Dringman, City Building Official; Keith Bredehoeft, Public Works Director and Joyce Hagen Mundy, Commission Secretary.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Jeffrey Valentino moved for the approval of the minutes of the July 10, 2018 regular Planning Commission meeting as presented. The motion was seconded by Jonathan Birkel and passed unanimously with Mr. Breneman and Mr. Wolf abstaining.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

There were no Public Hearings to come before the Planning Commission.

NON PUBLIC HEARINGS

**PC2018-01 Amended Site Plan Approval
Homestead Country Club**

Tyler Holloman with Frontier Construction, 124 54th Street, Manhattan, KS, stated they are seeking site plan approval for adjustment to the tennis courts that were previously approved for the club. The proposed changes include:

1. Removal of the two platform tennis courts to the north, nearest the parking lot and between the clubhouse and full tennis courts.
2. Placement of six pickle ball courts, in the central area, where two were previously proposed.
3. Relocation of one of the platform tennis courts in association with the two current platform tennis courts to the south.
4. Slight reconfiguration of the sidewalks and access.

This will result in the removal of one half of the raised platform. A revised drainage plan was prepared based on the proposed changes. Public Works Director Keith Bredehoeft confirmed the submitted plan meets the city's drainage criteria.

Chris Brewster stated all of these changes are within the parameters of their approved Special Use Permit, and do not have any significant impacts on the parameters and

conditions of the previously approved site plan. However, they are beyond the scope of changes that staff can administratively approve, and require Planning Commission review and approval. Mr. Brewster briefly reviewed the following criteria:

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

The site plan has the appropriate layout and design per the previously approved plans. The reconfiguration of the courts does not have a significant impact on the previous plans since it is primarily in a central portion of the site. The addition of three courts (6 pickle ball courts instead of 2; and the removal of 1 platform tennis court and the relocation of another) - will not substantially increase the activity and intensity of use on the site. The pickle ball courts are smaller, and the courts are all located within the same general footprint, with the relocation of the platform tennis court presenting the only expansion of this area. These courts will have the same proximity to the south boundary as exists now, but be 3-courts wide instead of two. Two trees will be removed with this proposal, but this area is well screened from the residences to the south based on the previously approved plan. The applicant will be required to show that all plans are within the previously approved drainage study.

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

This is the expansion of an existing building and use, and there have not been any reports of inadequate capacity for any utilities in the area. The proposed revision will have no impact on utilities.

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

The proposed change may present a slight change to runoff per the previously approved plan. The applicant will be required to show that all plans are within the previously approved drainage study.

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

The application does not propose any change to circulation from the previously approved plan, and the addition of four smaller courts in exchange for one larger court will not materially increase the use or intensity of activity on the site.

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

The application is consistent with the previously approved plan, and is proposing a slight change to the configuration and footprint of the "small court" area. This area is well landscaped in relation to the residences to the south, based on the previously approved landscape plan.

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

No changes are proposed to the previously approved building plans. All post-approval submittals are in conformance with the building plans and design concepts approved with the Special Use Permit renewal and previously approved Site Plan.

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

The application supports the development pattern, comprehensive plan and planning policies in the same manner as the previously approved Site Plan.

James Breneman confirmed there were no changes to the outdoor lighting. Nancy Wallerstein asked how long the outdoor lights were on. Dennis Hulsing responded all court lights are automatically turned off at 9 p.m. All of the court lighting faces inward.

Mrs. Wallerstein asked if additional landscaping was needed with the additional court. Mr. Hulsing responded the new court is positioned east to west perpendicular to the existing courts and no additional landscape screening was needed. There will be no change to the greenspace on the south.

Gregory Wolf moved the Planning Commission approve the amended site plan for 4100 Homestead Court subject to the following conditions:

1. All conditions of the previously approved site plan and special use permit reviewed by the Planning Commission on May 1, 2018, and approved by the City Council on May 21, 2018 remain in effect.
2. The applicant will be required to show that the proposed revised plan is within the previously approved drainage study, and submit sufficient documentation to Public Works for approval.

The motion was seconded by James Breneman and passed unanimously.

**PC2018-115 Building Line Modification Approval
7718 Canterbury**

James Kersten, 7718 Canterbury, stated he is requesting a building line modification to build a carport on the southeast corner of his current home. The proposed carport is associated with interior renovations of the existing home and converting the current garage to livable space. Mr. Kersten noted he has provided letters of support from the adjacent property owners.

Chris Brewster noted the lot is located three lots south of 77th and Canterbury, and has a platted front building line of 35 feet fronting on Canterbury. The house orients to Canterbury Drive, but is skewed on the lot and has a 2-car side-entry garage on the north side of the lot, accessed by an existing driveway and front parking area. The house meets all zoning setbacks for the R-1A zoning district, as well as the required platted setbacks, but the southeast corner of the proposed carport would extend approximately 5 feet into the platted setback at the deepest point, and taper off back into compliance with the platted setback due to the skew of the existing and proposed structure. The addition of the carport would use the existing driveway and parking pad, and place a slightly sloping, flat-roofed structure in line with the existing roof eave line. The structure would remain open and unenclosed with the exception of a partial wall on the north side, which complies with zoning and platted setbacks.

The closest affected lot is to the south. This home is not skewed and has a consistent orientation to Canterbury at approximately 35 feet along the frontage. The nearest side of this home is a single-car garage. The applicant's home is setback approximately 10 to 15 feet beyond this adjacent home nearest the common lot line, due to its skew. The proposed carport is unenclosed on this side and would comply with all zoning and platted setbacks, except for the portion slightly in from the lot line and setback.

Mr. Brewster reviewed the following staff analysis of the application per the criteria provided in Section 18.18.D for consideration of building line modifications:

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

The lot is an interior and generally rectangular lot; however, the existing building is skewed and oriented to the northwest, facing Canterbury Street. The lot is fairly typical of other lots in the area, except that only a few of the lots have the principle building skewed. In addition to the larger setback resulting from the platted building line, the skew of the existing home impacts the buildable area differently than other lots when considering a renovation and addition to the existing home.

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

Although the lot is typical of other R-1A lots and lots in the vicinity, the buildable area of the lot is reduced because of the platted setbacks and the skew of the existing home. While the lot is large and there is a reasonable amount of buildable area under the platted setbacks, the platted building lines are more constraining than the zoning setbacks. The placement of the existing building would mean that only a small addition could comply with the building line, since a majority of the home (both existing and proposed) is setback substantially further than even the 35 feet platted building line.

3. 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 carport addition is a low, single-story addition in scale with the current building. It is proposed over an existing driveway and would not significantly impact the access and layout of vehicle circulation on the lot. The structure would remain significantly unenclosed, particularly nearest the most impacted property to the south, so impacts on the streetscape - both directly and as perceived by the neighbor to the south - would not be significant. Several homes in the vicinity have a similar architectural style and character, with low and horizontal scale and massing, and some of which include carports.

Jonathan Birkel asked how large the carport was. Mr. Kersten replied it accommodates one vehicle and a small storage area. Mr. Birkel asked what material was being used for the façade. Mr. Kersten stated the material has not been selected. Mr. Birkel felt the structure needs to match the house design and materials. Mr. Kersten replied it would be similar to others in the neighborhood. Mr. Breneman asked the orientation of the carport. Mr. Kersten replied it is east/west and parallel to the storage area.

Nancy Wallerstein questioned what would happen if at a future date the structure were to become fully enclosed. Mr. Brewster replied that an enclosed building would be allowed per the zoning regulations. The exception is to the subdivision regulations and based on the documents provided in the application which depicts a carport. However, he noted a stipulation could be added to the approval.

Mr. Birkel suggested a condition be added that if the structure were to become enclosed it would come back to the Planning Commission and that the carport match the existing home.

James Breneman moved the Planning Commission adopt a resolution approving a building line modification from the platted building line of 35 feet to 30 feet along Canterbury as depicted on the site plan dated June 12, 2018 subject to the following conditions:

1. The Resolution be recorded with the register of deeds prior to obtaining a building permit;
2. The carport finishes match the existing home;
3. The carport remain open and unenclosed. For the carport to become fully enclosed, it must get approval of the Planning Commission.

The motion was seconded by Gregory Wolf and passed unanimously.

PC2018-116 Site Plan Approval 3710 West 73rd Terrace

Kimball Hales with Finkle Williams Architects, and Jon Rowley, 4012 West 73rd Terrace, owner of 2020 Fitness, appeared before the Commission to request site plan approval to renovate and place an addition on their existing building. They are also seeking to reconfigure the parking and circulation to provide cross access to the large parking lot to the north. The renovations are for an existing use. Mr. Rowley noted his business has been in Prairie Village for four years and he is seeking to make improvements by creating a space where his clients can gather before and after classes, a common lobby area. They are seeking to add space by enclosing the loading dock. The goals are to 1) beautify the old post office (particularly the loading dock area); 2) better meet the needs of their clients; and 3) be able to grow and remain in Prairie Village.

Chris Brewster noted this property is zoned C-O, and previous interpretations determined the existing use was a “wellness center” which is an allowed use in the C-O district. The proposed renovation and expansion is within the same operation parameters of the existing use.

The building is the old post office. It is situated on or near the west property boundary. The C-O district requires a side setback between 10 and 20 feet, depending on the building height. This building and the lot boundary location existed prior to the adoption of the zoning ordinance, so it is a legal non-conforming situation. The addition and remodel does not affect this portion of the site and building, so there is no expansion of the non-conforming portion of the building.

The property is zoned C-O, Office Building District. The application is a renovation of an existing building, which, except as mentioned above, meets all standards of the C-O District (30' front setback, 10-20' side setback, 35' rear setback, and 35' height). There are use and performance standards for this district that all future tenants will be required to meet, including limitations on outside uses. Since this application includes an addition and substantial change to the exterior of the building, it requires site plan review and approval of the Planning Commission.

Mr. Brewster presented the staff analysis of this application per Section 19.32.030 of the Prairie Village Zoning Regulations as follows:

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

The site plan meets the development standards of the C-O district except for the legal non-conforming setback on the west boundary. The application does not affect or expand this situation. The site adequately accommodates the building, as the 2-story addition (approximately 5,800 square feet) is to the east in the central portion of the lot where the current loading and mechanical area is. All work is occurring on existing impervious surfaces so there is no impact on the drainage or landscape of the site. The plan does propose a new landscape island and tree at the northeast corner of the building in association with the parking reconfiguration, and a concrete planter/wall is proposed along the existing curb extending from the current building entrance to the street.

The ordinance requires 1 parking space for 250 square feet, and based on the new addition, the site would need 57 parking spaces. The reconfigured parking area includes 45 spaces; however, a new cross-access easement is proposed to the large parking area to the north. The applicant has also entered into a shared parking agreement with this property owner for up to 20 additional spaces (total of 65 available for this site). Further, the applicant's own survey of parking needs demonstrate that the 45 spaces on site should be sufficient for most times, and that the peak demand would only be 45 spaces plus employee parking. (This would only occur in instances where three concurrent sessions of 12 to 15 people maximum overlap, which would only be for approximately 15 minutes, and this overlap is not typical.) Based on this information, and the ordinance requirement of 57 spaces, the applicant anticipates that the 45 on-site spaces and 20 off-site spaces is more than sufficient to handle typical parking needs, as well as occasional or unanticipated high demands.

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

This is the expansion of an existing building and use, and there have not been any reports of inadequate capacity for any utilities in the area.

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

The site does not propose any increase in impervious surfaces as all work is over existing paved areas. There have been no reports of inadequate stormwater management in the area. Concurrence of Public Works with the stormwater analysis and approval of any grading and facility construction shall be required prior to permits.

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

The renovations will not impact any existing vehicle ingress and egress on 73rd Terrace. The applicant will utilize the existing “loop” access to the 10 parking spaces between the building and 73rd Terrace. The remainder of the parking will use the existing access on the east edge of the lot from 73rd Terrace. The proposed configuration maintains a 24 feet wide access lane through to the rear parking. Additionally, a cross access easement to the parking area to the north is proposed. This parking area has access to 73rd Terrace and Mission Road. The Fire District has requested that the applicant submit “Auto-turn” data showing how this circulation will accommodate their design vehicle, however, it is anticipated that the new cross access easement should improve traffic flow and circulation, and staff is not aware of any issues with the current configuration.

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

The site plan deals primarily with existing elements with the main change being the addition and façade renovation discussed in subsection F below. This work does involve relocation of the transformer from the east side of the existing building, to the south side between the building and 73rd Terrace. The plan proposes a perforated metal screen between the parking and the sidewalk and building at this location, where the transformer will be located. The screen wall is not dimensioned, but by other scale elements on the south elevation, it appears to be approximately 7 feet. Other than the transformer, there are no other building or site elements that would require screening of this area, so the remainder of this screen wall element could be considered ornamental. This detail is related to the new primary entrance being included with the new addition and located on the north elevation.

The most significant change to the current site plan and existing site layout is the reconfiguration of the parking and circulation mentioned in Section D above.

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

This is a renovation and addition to an existing building. The existing building is the former post office, and is predominantly blond brick with some stone and metal panel accents. There are few windows and doors on the existing building, but there are some canopies associated with the south entrance and service areas to the east. There are few changes proposed to the existing building, other than painting existing brick and trim.

The addition is proposed on the east elevation towards the central portion of the site. This does move the building closer to the residences to the east, but improves the area that is primarily service bays and mechanical equipment. The addition involves a narrow two-story component (26' 6" from the lowest existing grade and slightly higher than the roof deck of the existing building). The second story has access to a roof deck on top of the lower level of the main addition. The two-story portion of the addition is proposed to be prefinished corrugated metal panels, with a large window bank on the

south elevation and on the upper stories, providing interior light and adding some transparency not present on the existing building. The remainder of the addition (one-story portion) is proposed to be masonry veneer, but painted to match the brick finish of the existing building.

The greatest detail of the addition is on the north elevation associated with the new main entrance. It includes vertical wood siding on the lower level near the entrance, and metal pipe railing associated with the entry deck and access ramps. It is unclear if this entrance completely replaces the entrance on the south elevation, or if that entrance will remain as a secondary access to the building.

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

Village Vision identifies this area as a Commercial Improvement area in the Conceptual Development Framework. There are no specific policies, plans or concepts for this area.

The general policies for Commercial Improvement areas suggests that periodic upgrades are necessary for the City's commercial areas to remain attractive and retain tenants, including façade changes, signage or landscape improvements with particular attention on how they relate to surrounding neighborhoods and property. Specific concepts emphasized in the plan are:

- Ensuring that buildings relate to streets and public spaces with windows, and doors;
- Establishing a healthy mix of dwellings, restaurants, stores, offices and civic uses.
- Promoting smaller, independent businesses,
- Providing public spaces within commercial areas.
- Enhancing accessibility, particularly for walking or biking.
- Promoting pedestrian scale design.

This modest change to an existing use and building does not present the opportunity to advance the more significant of these comprehensive plan policies, which are reflective of a more substantial redevelopment. However, in general the site and facade improvements reflect many of the principles with respect to the maintaining and improving existing commercial centers.

Mr. Brewster stated staff recommends the approval of this application and reviewed the conditions of approval suggested by staff.

Jonathan Birkel asked for clarification on "outside activities". Mr. Brewster responded the zoning district does not allow any scheduled outside activities such as classes. Mr. Rowley noted the site plan includes proposed rooftop space for potential later use as an outside event area or putting green. This is included in the site plan for bidding purposes and not planned at this time. Mr. Brewster clarified there is not prohibition against outside spaces, but programmed activities in outdoor space. Staff has no

problem with the proposed rooftop space, as long as it is not used for programmed activities.

James Breneman noted the parking agreement is for a one year period and asked what happened after this period. Mr. Rowley noted the agreement is set to renew after one year. Mr. Breneman replied he would like to see a longer term lease agreement for parking. Mr. Rowley stated he would be happy to enter into a longer term agreement. The primary use of this parking area is between the hours of 5 a.m. to 6:30 a.m. He will seek to get a longer term agreement. Mr. Brewster noted that shared parking areas is a common tool for addressing these concerns.

Mr. Breneman asked if they were keeping the existing entrance to the building on the south. Mr. Rowley responded this would be primarily an entrance for staff. Mr. Breneman felt the proposed wall was overkill. Mr. Rowley replied the wall is to screen the KCP&L transformer in the front of the building from the public. He added that they have talked with KCP&L regarding the possibility of relocating the transformer. Nancy Wallerstein stated that she was not comfortable with the wall by the doorway and viewed it as a potential safety concern. She would like the doorway to be open with perhaps an L-shaped wall. Mr. Breneman asked the height of the wall. Mr. Rowley replied it was five feet. Mr. Kimball noted that with the parking agreement in place most of the clients will park in the back with the back door becoming the more used entrance.

Jeffrey Valentino questioned the current location of the transformer. The current transformer is on the east side of the building approximately 16 feet from the south wall. They are moving the transformer from inside the building to outside to provide more space while staying within the easement. Mr. Valentino proposed alternate locations for the location of the transformer at the east side of the building behind the projection of the new addition or the southwest corner of the building near the west property boundary. Mr. Birkel noted it could be moved to the left or right, away from the doors. He suggested that they work with a civil engineer on an alternate location, give them an easement and have it drawn up and given to KCPL to review.

Nancy Wallerstein confirmed the locations of the ADA parking spaces and asked about the location of the trash enclosure. Mr. Rowley replied it is currently on the east side and is a single bin.

Mr. Valentino asked about exterior lighting. Mr. Kimball responded there is a light on the north property line and on the east side of the driveway - two street lights and building light. Mrs. Wallerstein asked how late they were open. Mr. Rowley replied 7 p.m. She felt that lighting would be needed in the north parking lot. James Breneman suggested they add lights to the retaining wall to provide additional lighting to the parking area. Mrs. Wallerstein suggested they replace the existing lights with directional lighting.

Mrs. Wallerstein confirmed the applicant was in agreement with the recommended staff conditions of approval. Mr. Brewster noted the applicant has submitted an "Auto-Turn" drawing for parking lot circulation, which has demonstrated sufficient turning and navigation of fire equipment and has been approved by Consolidated Fire District #2.

Based on discussion, the Planning Commission added conditions 7 through 11 for approval of the site plan.

Gregory Wolf moved the Planning Commission approve PC2018-116, granting site plan approval for 3710 West 73rd Terrace subject to the following conditions:

1. A drainage permit, or other similar permits associated with the work, be approved by Public Works, including a determination that no negative impacts on stormwater will result.
2. All future signs shall require a separate sign permit meeting the general sign standards for the City.
3. Additional details on the existing south entrance be provided, including the rationale for the large screen wall on this elevation. Some consideration to materials and details similar to the entrance on the north elevation should be given to maintain a human-scale relationship to the public streetscape on 73rd Terrace, while still maintaining the screening function for the relocated transformer.
4. The applicant submit an “Auto-turn” drawing for the parking lot circulation and cross access easement, to be approved by the Consolidated Fire District #2 and demonstrating sufficient turning and navigation for their design vehicle.
5. The species and planting specifications for the landscape area and tree at the northeast corner of the building be submitted to the City, for review and approval by the planning consultant’s landscape architect, prior to building permits.
6. No structured or organized regular activities shall occur outside, except as otherwise allowed by the zoning ordinance through special permits, or conditional or temporary uses.
7. Approval is conditioned on a shared parking agreement for 20 spaces with the property to the north. The applicant shall attempt to secure a term longer than one-year, and a renewable lease. If at any point the agreement lapses and/or a parking issue develops that impacts neighbors with business-related parking on 73rd Terrace, staff may enforce this condition as a violation of the zoning ordinance.
8. The applicant shall propose alternative locations for the transformer, with priority given to the east side of the building behind the projection of the new addition or the southwest corner of the building near the property’s west boundary.
9. The screening of the transformer, whether in the proposed location or the new recommended location be reduced in height in order to not present a visual barrier, and the screening wall associated with the employee entrance and emergency egress on the south elevation be reduced or removed accordingly.
10. A trash enclosure shall be located behind the building and meet the provisions of 19.34.I. of the zoning ordinance, including enclosure and screening materials that complement the building and site.

11. Wall-mounted lighting be located on the east elevation to provide decorative accents to the building and provide safety and security features to the parking area. Any work impacting existing lights on the site shall consider directional lighting away from adjacent property. All new lighting shall meet the requirements of 19.34.050 of the zoning ordinance.

The motion was seconded by James Breneman and passed by a vote of 5 to 1 with Mr. Lenahan voting in opposition.

Update on Neighborhood Design Standards

Jamie Robichaud reported public forums were held on July 9, July 11, and July 17 to get feedback from residents on the proposed Neighborhood Design Phase II regulations with over 160 people attending. A survey was also published on the City's website and social media pages from June 27 through July 18 to gather feedback from residents who could not attend the public forums. Letters were sent to the presidents of all homes associations and a list of developers and contractors who primarily work on residential projects in Prairie Village.

A total of 625 responses to the survey were received and 163 people attended the three public forums. Of the 625 respondents who completed the survey, an average of 83% said they were in support of all of the proposed regulations. 97% of those who filled out the survey said they were city residents, and 7% of survey respondents said they were a developer, contractor, or design professional. Mrs. Robichaud stressed that although a large number of responses were received, the survey should not be viewed as being statistically valid, but as a tool.

If adopted, the changes would apply to any new structure; any addition of more than 200 square feet of the building footprint and construction activity that alters the form or massing of the front elevation or roof structure. The regulations would not be applicable to non-conformances that aren't subject to construction activity, except street tree regulations.

The City Council did authorize a public hearing on the proposed design standards before the Planning Commission in September. It will be at the September 11th meeting and will be held in the Council Chambers.

Mrs. Robichaud reviewed the responses on each of the proposed design standards and comments raised by the City Council.

Proposed Street Tree Requirement - 88% supported; 12% opposed

Council members expressed concern with the financial and maintenance impact of the additional trees. Concerns were also raised regarding the impact of these trees on the implementation of the bike/pedestrian plan, as well as whether there should be regulations for protecting trees on private property.

Proposed Frontage Green Space Requirement - 85% supported; 15% opposed

Lot Greenspace Requirement - 81% supported; 19% opposed

- o Originally recommended at 60% by the Committee; changed to 65% by the City Council before public forums were held.

Mrs. Robichaud stated that the original recommendation from the committee was 60% greenspace; however, the City Council changed the requirement to 65% before the public forums were held. Mrs. Robichaud added that some Council members raised concerns regarding the ability for homeowners to add outdoor amenities under this requirement. It was also noted there are currently no greenspace regulations. Keith Bredehoeft noted the purpose of the requirement is based on what is needed to ensure new development won't exceed the capacity of the city's storm drainage systems.

Breaking Up Large Wall Planes - 83% supported; 17% opposed

Window & Door Openings - 82% supported; 18% opposed

Garage Door Width & Height - 83% supported; 17% opposed

Garage Width on Front Elevation - 83% supported; 17% opposed

Garage Setbacks & Side Entry - 80% supported; 20% opposed

- The original recommendation from the committee was that no more than two bays (2-single or 1 double door) shall be permitted on the front elevation. Any site or building configuration that permits three garage bays on the front shall require at least one to have a side orientation. City Council sent it back to committee with the committee amending its recommendation to
 - A third car garage that is permitted within the required setbacks shall be set back an additional two feet from the front façade or shall require side entry.

Mrs. Robichaud stated that the committee's original recommendation was to allow no more than two forward-facing bays on the front elevation. The City Council sent this requirement back to the committee this spring to re-examine that particular standard, and the committee amended its recommendation to allow a third car garage on the front elevation as long as it was set back an additional two feet. At their August 6 meeting, the City Council changed the recommendation back to the original recommendation from the committee for homes located in R-lb zoning districts with homes, while homes in R-la districts would still be allowed to have the third garage subject to the additional two-foot setback or with a side entry as proposed.

Garage Massing & Projections - 81% supported; 19% opposed

Limit the size of forward-facing garages based on how much of the garage projects in front of the main structure

Mrs. Robichaud noted the survey also included two existing requirements as they play in a direct role in teardown/rebuilds.

Current City Lot Coverage - 58% Supported; 19% Increase; 23% - Decrease

Current Height Maximums - 52% Supported; 10% Increase; 38% Decrease

Based on feedback received in the surveys and at the public forums, staff recommended making the following changes to the design guidelines as previously presented:

- Provide an exception to the total lot greenspace requirement for lots that are 10,000 square feet or less to have up to a 300 square foot deck or patio that would not count towards the total lot greenspace requirement. This exception would allow those on smaller lots to still enjoy a high-quality outdoor living space without being negatively impacted by the lot greenspace requirement. Staff recommends this due to the increase in greenspace requirement from 60% to 65%.
- Apply the 65% lot greenspace requirement to all lots, regardless of size, instead of the sliding scale for larger lots as previously presented.
- Add a requirement to the City's Citizen Participation Policy that any teardown/rebuild project must issue notice and hold a neighborhood meeting prior to building permits being issued. One of the comments we heard frequently is the disruption these projects cause to a neighborhood, and requiring the contractor to notify neighbors and hold a neighborhood meeting before work begins may address some of these issues our residents are experiencing.

Mrs. Robichaud stated the requirement for the City's Citizen Participation Policy apply to teardown/rebuild projects before a city permit is issued was recommended by staff. Council liked the concept and communication with the neighbors, but they expressed concern that a meeting might become confrontational and not bring about good neighborhood relations. They requested that notification be required to be sent to property owners within 200' prior to a building permit being issued.

Mrs. Robichaud stated the Governing Body has requested the Planning Commission to specifically consider the following areas of concern in their review of the proposed design guidelines:

- Street Trees, existing tree protections on private property, and applicability
- Building Height - first floor elevation and grading issues
- Greenspace definition and applicability

Nancy Wallerstein asked for clarification on when the standards would not apply. Chris Brewster responded the design standards shall only apply to the extent of the proposed construction activity, and any portion of a building or site that does not conform to these standards but is not being improved, may remain the same.

The Commission agreed that building height caused by first floor elevation and grading needs to be addressed. It was noted there is no standard on what is finished grade. The City measures from the top of foundation, so if the grade and foundation are raised, so is the height of the home. Mr. Breneman noted the change was made to address drainage issues. Jonathan Birkel added that garages are being flipped from the low side of the lot to the high side resulting in the need to raise the grade approximately two and a half feet.

Mr. Brewster noted some members of the Council want the lot greenspace standard to apply only to teardown and rebuilds. It is written to apply to all. The concern expressed was with a resident's ability to add backyard living space to their properties. Mrs. Wallerstein asked if dry riverbeds would be considered greenspace. Mrs. Robichaud replied by the current definition it would not, and the Council has asked the Commission to consider the definition of greenspace and make any necessary changes.

Jeffrey Valentino expressed concern with the number of requests for exception that may be generated by the design guidelines. Mr. Brenemen added that he would like to see some staff recommendations at the next meeting regarding how to address the City Council's concerns. The rest of the planning commissioners agreed.

Mrs. Robichaud noted the next step in the process will be the public hearing before the Planning Commission on September 11th. The Planning Commission recommendation will go to the City Council on October 1st. The Council will have the options of adopting the Planning Commission's recommendation, changing the recommendation with a 2/3 vote, or returning the item to the Planning Commission for further consideration.

With the anticipation of numerous individuals attending and wanting to speak at the public hearing, the Commission recommended the moving the start time from 7 p.m. to 6:30 p.m. Commission members also requested to receive a copy of the proposed guidelines earlier than usual to have adequate time to review.

Discussion on Commercial Landscaping Requirements

Chris Brewster provided an update on the proposed landscape requirement presented to the Commission in May. Staff was directed at that time to look at maintenance and enforceability, parking lot landscaping and foundation plantings. Staff feels the proposed regulations as written can be enforced and no changes have been made.

In regard to parking lot landscaping, the Commission preferred perimeter rather than island landscaping. A tier system has been set with parking lots with less than 80 spaces not required to have islands; parking lots with 80 spaces or more shall require at least 1 island per 40 spaces. The island may stand alone within the parking lot or may project into the parking area from the perimeter buffer.

The Gould Evans landscape architect reviewed the concerns expressed on foundation plantings. The proposed language requires plantings to be located within 20' of the building or within planting beds at least 8' deep and along at least 50% of the building. This provides lots of options to break up the building walls. Mr. Brewster noted the 20' mainly deals with the planting of trees. He acknowledged comments from the Commission and noted adjustments can be made.

Mrs. Robichaud advised that staff will be bringing recommendations for changes to the sign regulations to the Commission in October.

NEXT MEETING

The secretary reported the filing deadline for the September meeting is August 10th. No applications have been filed; however, staff has had communication with potential applicants. Anticipating a lot of public comment at the public hearing on the design standards, the commission members suggested beginning the meeting at 6:30 p.m. and limiting the amount of time allowed per individual for comment. It was agreed to begin the meeting at 6:30 p.m.

Mrs. Wallerstein expressed concern with the incompleteness of the application that came before the Commission. She thanked the Commissioners for the valuable input and comments made on the application. She noted she is not comfortable approving application without seeing updated information.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to come before the Commission, Chairman Nancy Wallerstein adjourned the meeting at 9:15 p.m.

Nancy Wallerstein
Chairman