

**PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES**  
**September 11, 2018**

**ROLL CALL**

The Planning Commission of the City of Prairie Village met in regular session on Tuesday, September 11, 2018 in the Council Chambers at 7700 Mission Road. Chairman Nancy Wallerstein called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. with the following members present: Jonathan Birkel, Patrick Lenahan, Gregory Wolf, Jeffrey Valentino, Melissa Brown 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; Wes Jordan, City Administrator and Joyce Hagen Mundy, Planning Commission Secretary.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Gregory Wolf moved for the approval of the minutes of the August 7, 2018 regular Planning Commission meeting as presented. The motion was seconded by James Breneman and passed unanimously with Mrs. Brown abstaining.

**PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**PC2018-05 Proposed zoning revisions applicable to R-1a and R-1b Zoning Districts adding "Neighborhood Design Standards" amending Chapters 19.02, 19.06, 19.08, 19.34 and 19.44**

Chris Brewster, City Planning Consultant with Gould Evans, presented the proposed revisions of additional Neighborhood Design Standards. He briefly reviewed the process followed for the proposed revisions and the process followed for the Phase 1 revisions completed in 2016. The proposed revisions proposed in Phase 2 address the following strategies:

- Street Tree Requirements
- Minimum frontage greenspace
- Break up massing on larger wall planes
- Require minimum percentage of windows and doors
- Limit the extent, projection and massing of garages on front elevations
- Add total lot impervious surface limit
- Clarify/revise standards for accessory structures
- Refine/limit current standards on setback encroachments
- Create non-variance process and criteria to "design standards"
- Require notice to neighbors for teardowns or new structures

At the August 6 meeting, the City Council directed that the Planning Commission specifically consider three topics in making their formal recommendation to the City Council:

- The street tree requirement and specifically any economic impacts on applicants, difficulties in administering it, and overall protection of both public trees and trees on private property.
  - No change has been made to the proposed revisions.
- The total lot greenspace standard, specifically how we are defining greenspace and whether other landscape materials, such as mulch and river rock, should be included in the definition, and reviewing when that standard should apply.
  - This standard has been changed to “Total Lot Impervious Surface Coverage” and moved to the development standards that deal with the entire lot. Mr. Brewster reviewed the key elements of this standard.
- The situation where lots appear to be graded up for new buildings when viewed in relation to adjacent houses.
  - staff recommends a combination of the previous approach (regulation by existing first floor elevation, but modified with a reasonable allowance for raising up to 1 foot) and the current approach (setting a reasonable tolerance for the amount of foundation that could be exposed)

The recommended changes to be considered by the Planning Commission at the public hearing are summarized below. These changes are to the R-1A and R-1B zoning districts. Each are similar but have subtle differences in the standards due to the larger lot sizes required in the R-1A district.

**A. Reformat Development Standards** (setbacks, height, lot sizes and coverage standards)

This change generally proposes no substantive change and incorporates all of the 2016 amendments. It does reformat several ordinance sections of text in a simpler format for ease of use. The main substantive change is the addition of a total lot impervious surface coverage standard.

**B. Relocate Several Existing Related Standards** (accessory buildings, garages, and exceptions for building elevation and coverage)

The proposed regulations also relocate several related sections of the current regulations into this section for better formatting; ease of use and interpretation, and to simplify the standards. These involve several sections in the “accessory use” chapter and in the “height and area exceptions” chapter. There are no substantive changes except where noted below.

- Relocate standards allowing for detached garages and for setback exceptions for attached garages on corner lots into this section.
- Include all residential accessory building standards here. This reformatting consolidates several sections and clears up a current interpretation issue on the number of accessory buildings that are allowed within the principal building setbacks, which has caused some interpretation issues in the past. It also adds flexibility for minor accessory structures on larger lots and on lots with institutional uses. All of these structures would still be subject to the 30% lot coverage and 35% impervious surface coverage limits as well.

- The exception processes and criteria for building elevation and coverage have been removed, as they are included in an expanded form with more specific criteria in the new neighborhood design section

### **C. Neighborhood Design Standards**

These new recommended sections were the focus of the committee meetings and public engagement. The committee prioritized the following elements as key contributors to Prairie Village neighborhood character that could be addressed by zoning standards:

- Streetscape aesthetics - recommended standards for landscaped greenspace in the front, and requirements for street trees.
- Building Scale and Mass in relation to the streetscape and in relation to the overall lot; specifically:
  - Limiting the extent and prominence of garages along lot frontages;
  - Prioritizing human-scale elements such as windows, doors and entry features on frontages; and
  - Breaking up larger wall masses so that they appear smaller and/or have more variation or setbacks along interior lot lines.
- Refining the standards related to grading and top of foundation.

The proposed neighborhood design standards are focused on basic massing standards and how those standards introduce more human-scale design elements to the building, and prioritizing the relationship to neighborhood streetscapes.

### **D. Exceptions**

The proposed standards include a specific exception section that allows the Planning Commission to consider projects that do not meet the standards. Key to the exception provisions are: the intent statements for the Neighborhood Design Standards generally; the introductory objective stated for each particular standard; and the criteria for when the Planning Commission should approve an exception. The basic principle is that whenever a design solution equally or better meets the intent of the design standards, and does not undermine other standards, it should be approved. This exception process only applies to the neighborhood design standards and the impervious surface standards by reference, as noted above.

### **E. Height and Area Exceptions**

The proposed changes are to better coordinate with some of the new building massing standards, or to clear up current interpretation issues. These primarily deal with how common building elements such as decorative architectural features, porches and entry features, or bay windows and window wells can encroach into the side setback, and the orientation of buildings on corner lots. No substantive changes are associated with these updates.

### **F. Public Notice**

A new notice provision is recommended for any new building or teardown, which would require applicants to communicate the nature of the project, who the primary contacts are, and how neighbors can get information on plans submitted to the City.

Chris Brewster reviewed the actions available to the Commission in its recommendation to the City Council. The Council then has the option to approve, amend, or deny the Planning Commission's recommendation. To amend or deny the Planning Commission's recommendation, the City Council would need to do so with a 2/3 majority vote. The Council may also return the ordinance to the Commission for further consideration.

Chairman Nancy Wallerstein opened the public hearing at 7:50 p.m. for comments advising individuals they would have 3 minutes to speak and their names would be called from the sign-in sheet.

Chris Rendall, 5212 West 72<sup>nd</sup> Street, expressed concern with the misperception being given stating that 83% of the residents support the proposed design standards; when actually it is 83% of the 625 responses received not of the 21,447 residents of Prairie Village. He also expressed concern with the survey methodology and does not believe the responses to be a good representation of residents. He does not think residents realize the impact these changes will have.

Nancy Morgan, 7311 Canterbury, stated she was appalled by the size of the homes being built on small lots, supports some of the changes proposed, and has concerns with others. She does not want to see small homes overpowered and the streetscape of Prairie Village changed.

Chris Smart, 4717 West 64<sup>th</sup> Terrace, noted many of the homes in Prairie Village are beyond their economic life. They are too small, costly to maintain, and do not meet the needs of today's families. He feels the 65% impervious surface requirement is too great and hoped a compromise could be reached. Mr. Smart quoted a study stating the best neighborhoods combine old and new homes; the young and the old, people with different backgrounds. This will not be lost in Prairie Village when people are allowed to build what they want.

Melissa McGillicuddy, 4902 West 69<sup>th</sup> Terrace, felt if people want bigger houses there were areas outside of Prairie Village they could build. There is no going backwards. She expressed concern that if people are allowed to do whatever they want, how will the city be in 10 years.

Katie Aaronson, 4031 West 72<sup>nd</sup> Terrace, expressed concern with what massive buildings will do to neighborhoods. She noted one side of 71<sup>st</sup> Street has mansions and the other side has quaint Prairie Village homes. She has experienced an increase of \$50,000 in taxes over the past two years. This would have been a significant hardship on her mother who previously lived on this property.

Michael LaMonica, 7124 Cherokee, a design professional spoke in support of the guidelines and felt a good architect would be able to work within the guidelines.

Bruce Wendlandt, 4400 West 71<sup>st</sup> Street, as a resident and builder felt the design guidelines would have a positive impact on the community but acknowledged there

needs to be adjustments on both sides. His biggest concern was with the 65% impervious surface requirement, which he felt was too onerous for small lots and would squelch positive re-greening. He felt going from the current 38% impervious surface to 65% is a knee jerk reaction and was fearful of the unintended consequences of such a severe increase.

Lynneah Gregory, 3906 West 69<sup>th</sup> Street, did not feel the proposed standards are representative of what the City wants to achieve. She presented slides of 21 homes owned by City Council and Commission members. Of these 21 homes, only two homes would meet the proposed guidelines. She does not feel the City Council has been provided the whole story to take action of the proposed guidelines.

Larry Mayerle, 6503 West 78<sup>th</sup> Street, an architect with Boyle & Mayerle distributed an elevation for the home at 4622 West 69<sup>th</sup> Terrace to reflect his concerns with the regulations on building mass for all planes over 500 square feet. He also noted a home at 4805 West 78<sup>th</sup> Street that added a second car garage, six years ago which could not be done under the proposed standards related to garages.

Mark Eddy, 4101 Prairie Lane, as a resident and builder felt some of the proposed standards are too onerous and would result in unintended consequences. He felt the standards should also address materials. What makes Prairie Village great is how it was laid out and how people have reinvested in the community. He does not want to see that blocked by a knee jerk reaction. He was involved in the Phase 1 discussions in 2015 and feels the same individuals should have been involved in the Phase 2 discussions. He encouraged the City to step back and make sure the proposed standards will not block reinvestment in neighborhoods.

Allen Gregory, 3906 West 69<sup>th</sup> Street, continued Lynneah Gregory's presentation noting their neighbor's home would not be able to be built under the proposed standards. He felt massing and drainage issues were addressed by Phase 1 guidelines. The proposed guidelines will impact residents' ability to remodel their homes. He urged the City to be careful and look to the future with a broad perspective. He stated to do nothing should be considered as an appropriate action on the proposed design standards.

Catherine Dayton, 4808 West 79<sup>th</sup> Street, said she appreciated the level of care the City has taken on this issue. She felt the process has been great with ample time for residents to get involved. She believes the proposed standards are reasonable and supports them.

Bob Bliss, 2804 West 74<sup>th</sup> Street, stated he had two concerns. The first concern was that the homes blend into the community. Does not like ultra-modern shoebox homes. He feels most of the rebuilds constructed do blend.

Laura Stark, 7135 Cherokee Drive, likes the variety of homes within Prairie Village. She supports some of the standards, but feels the standards are not strong enough for homes being built on smaller lots. She stressed, as a designer "context" is a huge

factor. You have to take into consideration the existing surroundings in designing a home.

Bryce Gahagan, 4107 Prairie Lane, believes in some design restrictions, but he does not want to discourage people from reinvesting in their homes. He felt many assumptions had been made in the development of the proposed standards.

John Fudge, 7059 Granada Lane, asked what has been the effect of similar regulations in other cities. He recommended the City get an answer to that question before taking any action. He does not believe anyone wants to slow or stop redevelopment and residents from reinvesting in their homes.

Doug VanAuken, 3719 West 71<sup>st</sup> Terrace, felt the City was looking for perfection and noted that nothing is perfect. He urged the City to move forward.

Dennis O'Rourke, 5007 West 63rd Terrace, felt the redevelopment within the city is improving the community. The size of homes was addressed in the Phase 1 changes. Phase 2 changes are an effort to scale down further. The street canopy, almost more than homes, reflect the character of Prairie Village. They are important. He felt lot coverage was manageable. Overall lot coverage has been discussed as a concern by many. The average home being built in the United States is 2500 square feet. He asked does Prairie Village want to be the community that tells people you cannot have common amenities. Current impervious lot coverage is 40%. He feels the proposed impervious lot coverage is off significantly and urges it be changed. The threshold on massing needs to be raised slightly and noted setback is only one of several ways to address massing. He would like to see Fairway's exception for massing be adopted.

Susan Forrest, 6837 El Monte, spoke in support of the proposed standards. She is seeking predictability for new construction. The standards proposed are a step in the right direction. She acknowledged Mr. Brewster's work to address concerns. She liked the garage restrictions and greenspace regulations as they recognize the impact construction has on other properties.

Andy Zoppo, 4616 West 69<sup>th</sup> Terrace, supports smart regulations. However, he feels the City would be remiss to take action without considering the economic and tax implications resulting from the proposed regulations.

Susan Murphy, 4623 West 70<sup>th</sup> Street, strongly supported the proposed design guidelines. The Prairie Village neighborhoods cannot be created in other cities. She supports reinvestment in the community, when homes are constructed that are too large for their lots and the neighborhood, it changes the neighborhood.

Katie Aquilera, 2912 West 74<sup>th</sup> Street, was supportive of the regulations.

David Walsh, 4314 West 70<sup>th</sup> Terrace, wants to build his forever home in Prairie Village, but fears he will not be able to do so because of the onerous restrictions. He echoed Mr. Fudge's request for information on what the impact of these changes have been on

other communities with similar restrictions. Village Vision encourages vibrant communities with a variety of homes. He acknowledged the difficulties that come with new construction, but noted the need to put up with short-term tradeoffs for long-term investment.

Angela Schieferecke, 4508 Tomahawk, said teardowns affected her adversely by additional stormwater drainage problems and dramatically increased property taxes. She would not be able to purchase her home today. She appreciates the City's recognition of the issues and their efforts to address them.

Patricia Cox, 5105 West 73<sup>rd</sup> Street, stated she live on the middle lot of a cul-de-sac with the smallest lot. The type of homes being built will not fit on her property.

Chairman Nancy Wallerstein closed the public hearing at 8:47 p.m. and called for a five-minute recess for the Commission.

The Planning Commission was reconvened at 8:55 p.m.

James Breneman stated the standard that seems to stand out as being off base is the 65% impervious lot coverage. He feels it is too high. Jeffrey Valentino agreed and noted the correspondence received suggest this standard may force residents to build two story homes rather than smaller one and a half story homes. He feels this would be counter intuitive to what most residents seem to prefer. Jonathan Birkel noted the implication for older residents who want to add on to their homes and do not want to have stairs.

Patrick Lenahan asked for direction from the staff noting from the staff report stated the original recommendation was for "60% greenspace" (or 40% impervious surface limits). After discussion and direction by the City Council, and prior to the public open houses, a motion was approved to change this to "65% greenspace" (or 35% impervious surface limits."

Mr. Brewster responded that originally the committee was not considering this standard at all, as they were dealing with scale and massing. They considered the lot coverage and felt the existing 30% was appropriate. The other lot coverage considered was the front streetscape. The impervious surface issue was added later by Public Works. This was originally addressed as "Total Lot Greenspace" but changed to "Total Lot Impervious Surface Coverage" and moved to the development standards that deal with the total lot. This is the amount of a lot that could be covered by buildings, non-building structures, or hard surfaces that do not infiltrate stormwater. During this process, this standard was discussed as total lot "greenspace." However, staff recommends the term "impervious surface coverage" to better define the standard, reflect the drainage objective of this standard, and to distinguish it from the recommended street tree and "frontage greenspace" standards, which are related to landscape aesthetics and streetscape design. Staff feels it makes better sense to include this standard with the overall lot development standards rather than the new neighborhood design standards.

Public Works Director Keith Bredehoeft stated that currently the focus in issuing drainage permits has been on on-site lot retention. The City's stormwater system is designed to accommodate 40%, which is what the standard was based on. During discussion with the City Council, it was noted that the APWA has a requirement of 35% for undeveloped residential land and the Council desired to change to that standard

Mr. Lenahan stated the standard would be a challenge to meet on smaller lots in R-Ib. Gregory Wolf asked if a different standard was considered for R-Ia and R-Ib Districts. Mr. Bredehoeft replied that originally staff looked at different requirements for lots under and over 10,000 square feet. Mrs. Wallerstein stated she was more comfortable with 40% than 35%.

Jeffrey Valentino stated the category percentages made sense to him; however, he questioned the 50% front lot coverage. He is concerned this is creating a situation that will result in a significant number of requests for exception to the Commission. Mr. Brewster replied, in his experience, there are seldom exception requests made for streetscape. Mr. Valentino felt every cul-de-sac/pie-shaped lot in the City would apply. Mr. Brewster noted pie-shaped lots are generally measured at the front building line. Typical Prairie Village lots are 65' wide. Staff analysis was done on the few narrowest lots of 60 feet. These were at the 35% to 38% impervious surface, which is why the base was set at 40%. He added these generally include an 18' - 20' wide driveway that could be reduced to easily meet code.

James Breneman asked for clarification on the contradicting language that standards do not apply on additions of less than 200 square feet, yet a site plan is required for teardowns of more than 10%. Mr. Brewster responded the site plan is required for submittal to the Building Official for review for compliance in conjunction with a building permit application. Site plan approval by the Commission applies only to changes to non-residential structures located in a residential zoning district. Mr. Brewster noted Section III of the ordinance is a new section; the previous language was carried over from the existing code.

Nancy Wallerstein expressed concern with the 200 square foot threshold particularly in the R-Ib District. She felt it was too small and asked if other sizes were considered. Mr. Brewster responded there was not much discussion on this. The number was based on when there would be a significant investment that would influence a design element or when would there be action that would fall under the massing or other conditions addressed by the design standards.

Melissa Brown noted she questioned the 200' size in committee, but after further discussion, she feels it is acceptable. Mr. Breneman noted, "The design standards shall only apply to the extent of the proposed construction activity, and any portion of the building or site that does not conform to these standards but is existing and not part of the application may remain".

Mr. Lenahan confirmed that all city sidewalks are located on city property and are not included in calculations of impervious surface. Mr. Birkel asked about areas with anomalies. Mr. Breneman felt they would be covered through the exception process.

Mr. Brewster confirmed that and added these could be covered at the staff level and not sent through the Commission. Things in the right-of-way are a non-factor, items in a common area, such as a homes association sign/monument, would also be excluded from the calculation.

Nancy Wallerstein asked if changes to a driveway would be included. Mr. Brewster replied the design standards are generally triggered by investments to the structure. The impact on impervious surface would be addressed by the impervious surface review conducted for the drainage permit. Mr. Brewster reviewed the difference between the "Development Standards" and the "Neighbor Design Standards".

Mrs. Wallerstein noted one of the comments submitted on-line was regarding handicapped accessibility. She asked if the height of the garage was sufficient for mobility vehicles. Mr. Lenahan stated the ADA requires an 8'2" door height clearance and suggested the 8' height restriction be increased to 8'2" to be in compliance, even though ADA requirements are not applicable for residential homes.

Mrs. Wallerstein noted the proposed language regarding street trees does not address maintenance and replacement. Mr. Brewster responded this is similar to the landscape ordinance with the assumption that if it is required, it must be maintained. Mrs. Robichaud added this would be addressed by the municipal code and enforced by Code Enforcement. Mr. Bredehoeft added most trees have a one-year warranty and confirmed that long-term maintenance is the responsibility of the property owner.

Patrick Lenahan asked if the intent of the streetscape regulations was to establish regular and consistent spacing of trees throughout the City. He does not believe this will happen as there is not sufficient redevelopment occurring to create a streetscape of right-of-way trees, especially in areas where one does not currently exist. There are neighborhoods where the original development was very diligent in the design of where trees were placed and others with no tree plan. He understands the desire to maintain a street tree pattern where one exists. He feels it should be applied to neighborhoods with street lined trees to preserve that feature.

James Breneman stated the proposed ordinance states: "In the absence of a clearly established line on the block, the following locations shall be used, where applicable and in order of priority" giving three options for location of trees.

Melissa Brown stressed the value street trees add to Prairie Village communities. They are an integral part of the character of "old PV". When talking about preserving character, it is essential that you address street trees.

Chris Brewster responded the committee felt trees were a crucial feature of the city's character. If there is an established tree line, it needs to be maintained. If not, the required trees can be placed in alternate locations. They felt it would be beneficial to have a uniform approach. The Commission felt the reference to order of priority on tree location should be removed and all options should be available when there is no established street tree line.

Nancy Wallerstein asked about the required notice and adding notice to homes associations. Jamie Robichaud replied the required notice only applies to “teardowns”. The City already provides notice to homes associations when building plans are submitted. She stressed the zoning ordinances specifically state the City will enforce city regulations but will not enforce homes association restrictions.

The proposed effective date of January 1, 2019, only allows 60 to 90 days for projects to be submitted and grandfathered. Jonathan Birkel noted additions and custom design projects generally have a significant design period and felt a four to five-month grace period would be more appropriate. Mrs. Robichaud replied a 60 to 90 period was allowed for the implementation of the Phase 1 standards. These standards have been discussed for more than six months. The feedback staff has received from the City Council is the sooner these are in place, the better. Mr. Birkel replied someone wanting to build a home would not wait six plus months while a committee discusses possible changes to begin their design process. They may be half way through their design process. He asked how someone could get a placeholder that would grandfather them.

Commission members agreed more time was needed between the adoption of the regulations and their effective date. The Commission recommended the effective date be four months following the adoption of the regulations by the Governing Body.

Mr. Breneman noted the proposed ordinance states accessory buildings must be located behind the principal building in other areas it states in the rear yard. It was agreed to change “behind” to “at the rear of” in Sections 19.06.020 and 19.08.020.

Jeffrey Valentino asked if the 15% window coverage on rear facades is cumulative. Mrs. Brown noted the proposed language reads like each façade, not the entire façade. The Commission felt the language need clarification. Mr. Brewster suggested the terminology “façade” be changed to “elevation”.

Mr. Valentino questioned the required 4’ offset. He felt the intent of the regulation to break up the mass would be achieved by the 2’ offset. Mr. Birkel noted for the first 500’ of wall plan a 2’ offset is required. The 4’ offset is cumulative. Mr. Brewster added that the 2’ offset does not have to be a pushback; it could be a bump out as well. Mr. Lenahan confirmed the intent of the regulation was that the larger the mass of the wall, the greater the offset to protect the adjacent property owners from the impact of a large façade. He felt that 4’ was adequate but noted the word “additional” should be removed in paragraph 2b, as it is not an add-on.

Mr. Brewster stated the committee’s intent was to address larger homes and the total offset not simply to break-up the wall plane. Mr. Lenahan stated with that understanding the language as written was acceptable.

Patrick Lenahan asked the Commission if they had any concerns with the reference to the previous foundation height in foundation calculations. He asked about a teardown where the previous foundation height is unknown. Mitch Dringman responded that is a

very rare condition. Mrs. Wallerstein asked about homes built on a slab. Mr. Birkel replied the top of the slab would be considered the top of foundation. The Commission approved the regulation that no more than 24” of exposed foundation without extending siding or covering with decorative material.

Chairman Nancy Wallerstein reviewed the following recommended amendments to the proposed ordinance discussion by the Commission:

1. Increase impervious coverage limit from 35% to 40%
2. Increase the total garage height permitted from 8 feet to 8 feet, 2 inches to match ADA requirements
3. Remove the wording “in order of priority” from Section C.1 (d) from the neighborhood design standards as it relates to street trees (within 5 or 15)
4. Change the effective date of the new regulations from January 1, 2019 to four months from the date of City Council approval
5. Change the word “façade” to “elevation” in Section 19.06.025 and 19.08.025
6. Change the word “behind” to “at the rear of” in Section 19.06.020 and 19.08.020

Gregory Wolf moved the Planning Commission recommend the City Council adopt the proposed amendments to the Prairie Village Zoning Regulations adding Neighborhood Design Standards for R-1a and R-1b and other recommended revisions with the six revisions made by the Planning Commission. The motion was seconded by Melissa Brown and passed unanimously.

## **NON PUBLIC HEARINGS**

### **PC2018-117 Site Plan Approval - Antenna Replacement 7700 Mission Road**

Emily Roseberry with Selective Site Consultants representing Sprint requested approval for the replacement existing antenna on the communications tower at 7700 Mission Road with smaller antenna.

Chris Brewster stated the application meets all the requirements of the current special use permit, and the renewal and lease amendments from 2017. It is consistent with the existing antenna on the tower, and will not visibly increase the intensity of the installation when viewed from the streetscapes or adjacent properties. A structural report dated July 20, 2018 analyzing the existing facilities and effect of the proposal, and found that the existing structures are adequate as proposed.

Mr. Brewster noted the application must comply with all 11 conditions of the existing special use permit. The staff report provided an analysis of the criteria for site plan approval.

Gregory Wolf moved the Planning Commission find the criteria for site plan approval have met approve the proposed site plan (PC2018-117) for 7700 Mission Road antenna replacement subject to the following conditions:

1. That the additional antenna be installed as shown on the proposed site plan.
2. That all conditions of the most recent renewal of the special use permit continue to be met.

The motion was seconded by James Breneman and passed unanimously.

**PC2018-118 Site Plan Approval - Antenna Replacement  
7231 Mission Road**

Emily Roseberry with Selective Site Consultants representing Sprint requested approval of a revised site plan to do the following for an existing on-building wireless telecommunications installation owned by the Roman Catholic Archdiocese and operated as St. Ann's Catholic Church:

- Replace 3 existing antenna (approximately 63" x 12" x 5") with 3 new antenna (approximately 38" x 20" by 7")
- Remove 3 existing RRUs (remote radio units) which are not visible from street
- Install 1 cable per antenna (approximately .5 to 1" diameter, from antenna to existing ground equipment compound behind the screening wall).

Chris Brewster stated the proposed antenna is an on-building installation, incorporated into the design of the steeple structure that is consistent with the existing antenna on the building, and will not visibly increase the intensity of the installation when viewed from the streetscapes or adjacent properties. A structural report dated July 19, 2018, analyzing the existing facilities and effect of the proposal, and found that the existing structures are adequate as proposed. The application must comply with all 13 conditions of the existing Special Use Permit. The staff report provided an analysis of the criteria for site plan approval.

Gregory Wolf moved the Planning Commission find the criteria for site plan approval have been met and approve the revised site plan (PC2018-118) for 7231 Mission Road subject to the following conditions:

1. That the additional antenna be installed as shown on the proposed site plan.
2. That all conditions of the most recent renewal of the Special Use Permit continue to be met, and particularly condition number 10, requiring that all facilities use a design that integrates the equipment into the architectural features of the building so it is not readily apparent to the general public. The new antenna shall employ painting, shrouding, or other similar disguising designs for all antenna or cable in a similar or better way than the existing antenna.

The motion was seconded by James Breneman and passed unanimously.

**PC2018-119 Site Plan Approval - Antenna Replacement  
3921 West 63<sup>rd</sup> Street**

Emily Roseberry with Selective Site Consultants representing Sprint requested approval of a revised site plan to do the following on an existing monopole wireless telecommunications installation owned by the Consolidated Fire District No. 2 of Johnson County:

- Replace 3 existing antenna (approximately 63" x 12" x 5") with 3 new antenna (approximately 38" x 20" by 7")
- Remove 3 existing RRUs (remote radio units) which are not visible from street
- Install 1 cable per antenna (approximately .5 to 1" diameter, from antenna to existing ground equipment compound behind the screening wall).

Chris Brewster stated the application meets all the requirements of the current special use permit. It does not substantially change the installation. The proposed antenna is a monopole built for multiple providers, with all equipment internal to the pole and shroud structure. The application is consistent with the existing antenna on the tower, and will not visibly increase the intensity of the installation when viewed from the streetscapes or adjacent properties. A structural report dated August 2, 2018 analyzing the existing facilities and effect of the proposal, and found that the existing structures are adequate as proposed. The application must comply with all 23 conditions of the existing special use permit. The staff report provided an analysis of the criteria for site plan approval.

Gregory Wolf moved the Planning Commission find the criteria for site plan approval have been met and moved the Planning Commission approve the proposed site plan (PC2018-119) for 3921 West 63<sup>rd</sup> Street subject to the following conditions:

1. That the additional antenna be installed as shown on the proposed site plan.
2. That all conditions of the most recent renewal of the special use permit continue to be met, and particularly condition number 13, requiring that all facilities be installed internal to the tower and shroud.

The motion was seconded by Jonathan Birkel and passed unanimously.

#### **NEXT MEETING**

One application has been submitted for site plan approval for antenna replacement at 7700 Mission Road by AT&T for the October 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

With no further business to come before the Commission, Chairman Nancy Wallerstein adjourned the meeting at 10:25 p.m.

Nancy Wallerstein  
Chairman