

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
January 8, 2019

ROLL CALL

The Planning Commission of the City of Prairie Village met in regular session on Tuesday, January 8, 2019 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, James Breneman, Patrick Lenahan, Melissa Brown, Gregory Wolf, and Jeffrey Valentino.

The following individuals were present in their advisory capacity to the Planning Commission: Chris Brewster, City Planning Consultant; Jamie Robichaud, Deputy City Administrator; Mitch Dringman, City Building Official, Ron Nelson, Council Liaison, and Adam Geffert, City Clerk/Planning Commission Secretary.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Patrick Lenahan noted that edits should be made to the minutes from the December 4, 2018 meeting, referencing the pickleball structure discussion on pages 4 and 5. The minutes did not reflect that the structure in question was specifically for pickleball and requested that his name be added to page 6, second paragraph to read “as requested by Mrs. Brown and Mr. Lenahan.” James Breneman moved for the approval of the minutes of the December 4, 2018 regular Planning Commission meeting with the suggested amendments. Gregory Wolf seconded the motion, which passed 7 to 0.

Nancy Wallerstein recognized guests in the audience from the Kansas City Christian school.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

No public hearings were scheduled.

NON-PUBLIC HEARINGS

**PC2019-101 Lot Split Approval
4001 and 4005 West 85th Street**

Nancy Wallerstein asked if the applicant was present. As no representative was in attendance, Jamie Robichaud noted that the Planning Commission bylaws state that if an applicant is not present, it is within the purview of the Commission to approve, deny or continue the application to a later meeting.

Greg Wolf made a motion to continue the request to a later meeting due to the applicant not being present. Jonathan Birkel seconded the motion, which passed 7 to 0.

**PC2019-102 Site Plan Approval - Somerset Plaza
4601 W. 90th Street**

Blake Archer, representing Dev, Inc., was present to speak about the project. The company is seeking approval to renovate the façade of the Somerset Shops building. Renovations will include painting the exterior, taking down the existing mansard timber roof, replacing the storefront system with a consistent black storefront, updating tenant signage, and replacing the concrete walk in front of the storefront. Mr. Archer described the project as a “facelift” to the property.

Nancy Wallerstein asked Chris Brewster if there was any additional information to share. Mr. Brewster noted that the property is in the C-2 zoning district, so changes to buildings that in the judgement of the building official create a substantial deviation from the current condition require a site plan review. Staff felt the planned exterior changes were significant enough to trigger site plan review by the Planning Commission. Mr. Brewster noted that the criteria in the staff report have been met, and that there will be no change to the site or building footprint, so approval is recommended. Part of the analysis included reviewing the architectural character of surrounding buildings. Most buildings adjacent to the property are small-scale but do not have a uniform character. There are suggestions regarding the improvement of commercial areas in the Comprehensive Plan, and Mr. Brewster believes the design is consistent with the Village Vision.

James Breneman asked why the design includes painted brick, which will create a continuing maintenance issue. Mr. Archer stated that material is not actually brick, but CMU (concrete masonry units). The CMU is currently a burgundy color, which is planned to be painted a light grey color. The applicant stated that they felt that along with other changes, the new color and wood elements would tie the entire design together, giving it a fresh look. Mr. Breneman asked why the color gray was chosen. Mr. Archer noted that the overall design scheme was an attempt to brighten the area and bring more light to storefronts.

Mr. Breneman also asked about the strip above the windows shown in the rendering. Mr. Archer stated it was a timber rain screen, similar to an awning. The mansard roof over the top of the walkway will be removed, so this 18” element will provide some screening. Mrs. Wallerstein asked about the blue awnings shown in the rendering, which Mr. Archer stated were 24” canvas awnings to cover doorways.

Mr. Birkel asked about wall heights that will be included in the renovation, and whether painting will be needed to cover up the new brick and areas that have been removed. Mr. Archer noted that the only brick to be added would be patched in where a ledger board may have been for the rafters. There will be flashing needed when the roof is removed; however, a total roof renovation is not being done.

Mr. Archer added that the main entrance to Tatsu’s will be covered. Mr. Birkel stated that the awnings seem small and out of proportion in the elevation. He asked if they could be increased in size and lowered to provide more protections over the doors.

Ms. Brown asked whether the application met the minimum requirements of a site plan. Mr. Brewster stated that since there is no work being done to anything but the façade, it does meet the requirements. Ms. Brown suggested the parking lot and streetscape could be improved by adding some green elements to break up the large asphalt parking lot. Mr. Brewster said reminded the Planning Commission that since no changes were being proposed to the parking lot, the Planning Commission could recommend aesthetic improvements but cannot require them as a condition of approval on this site plan application.

Jeffrey Valentino asked if RTU units on the roof will be hidden, and Mr. Archer stated that no matter where someone stands at ground level, they won't be able to be seen. Mr. Brewster noted that city ordinance requires multi-tenant buildings to propose their own sign regulations, which this property has done. Mrs. Wallerstein asked if sign design should be consistent for all tenants. Mr. Brewster stated that the conceptual design gives some flexibility, and that size parameters will be determined later. Staff can approve those signs at a later date as long as they meet the requirements in the city ordinance. Mr. Archer said that no major changes are planned for the monument sign. Mr. Brewster added that any changes to the character or size of signs will come back to the Planning Commission for approval.

Mr. Breneman asked if signs will be lighted, and Mr. Archer stated that they will not be based on the current design. Tony Krsnich, 2315 W. 65th Street, also a representative of Dev, Inc., said that tenants and neighbors have signed off on this plan. Mr. Birkel expressed concerns about the background color on the sign and felt that the sign would be hard to read with the background color as proposed. Ms. Brown noted that the commission would like a more consistent look at retail centers across the city. Mr. Lenahan stated that the rendering shows consistent signage, and, that in presenting consistent signage in the application, this is what the commission would be approving.

Mr. Archer said that there is concern about changing the color of the signs. Staff recommended approval on the color that was proposed by the applicant, and Mr. Archer stated that the applicant would like to keep that original color. Mrs. Wallerstein asked if the signs would be backlit, and Mr. Archer stated that they would not. Mr. Birkel noted that these signs will be difficult to read with the selected colors.

Mrs. Robichaud said that it was the opinion of staff that requiring a specific color for the sign and building is beyond the scope of the Planning Commission's authority, as there are no requirements for building materials or color specifications in the zoning regulations. It is within the Planning Commission's authority to require consistency amongst all signs, but requiring specific colors would be beyond the scope of the Planning Commission's role in reviewing site plans. Additionally, landscape recommendations to the parking lot can be made, but cannot be required for approval since changes to the parking lot are not being proposed. Mr. Brewster added that material recommendations can also be made, but there is no material standard in the zoning regulations that the applicant would be required to meet in order to gain approval of their site plan.

Mrs. Wallerstein stated the following recommendations for approval had previously been made by staff:

1. The sign designs are approved in concept. All future signs shall require a separate sign permit meeting the general sign dimension and location standards for the City and shall be consistent with the sign design package submitted by the applicant with their site plan.
2. Any future significant changes to the site, landscape or other non-building portions of the site shall require appropriate permits through typical City processes.

Additionally, three new recommendations were added:

3. Enlarge canvas awnings to cover entrances on the north side of the building
4. Replace orange color on signs with a different color, such as bronze or brown
5. Increase landscaping in parking area

Mr. Lenahan stated that he was not in favor of the last three recommendations, and would prefer to proceed with the staff recommendation. Greg Wolf agreed with Mr. Lenahan and moved to approve the site plan with the two staff recommendations as edited. The motion was seconded by Mr. Lenahan, and approved 6-1 with Mrs. Wallerstein dissenting.

PC2019-103 Site Plan Approval - Antenna Replacement 3921 W. 63rd Street

The applicant, Darryl Cain, representing T-Mobile, was present. This project will add 3 antennas to the existing monopole structure at the fire station located at 63rd and Mission Rd. The antennas will be added to the existing shroud, and will therefore not be visible. Equipment will also be added behind the existing fence enclosure. Several other carriers are currently tenants at the tower. Mr. Breneman asked if the equipment would fit completely within the existing canister, and Mr. Cain stated that it would. There are currently four bays, and T-Mobile will be taking the fifth bay. There will be no more bays available after this project is completed.

Mr. Brewster stated that the structural analysis has been verified, and the tower was designed to support this amount of equipment. Mr. Breneman asked where the nine remote control radio units would be installed, and Mr. Cain indicated that they will also be in the canister behind the antennas. Mr. Breneman asked Mr. Brewster whether the new antennas will replace existing antennas or if they are new. Page 6, Paragraph E of the staff report notes that they will be replaced, but the application shows six new antennas. Mr. Brewster noted this was an error and that all antennas being proposed are new.

Greg Wolf moved to approve the site plan with staff recommendations. The motion was seconded by Mr. Breneman, and approved with a vote of 7-0.

OTHER BUSINESS

Election of Officers

Mrs. Wallerstein noted that a Chair and Vice-Chair need to be selected for the upcoming term. Ms. Brown nominated Mrs. Wallerstein for Chair, and Mr. Birkel seconded the motion. Mr. Breneman nominated Mr. Wolf for Vice-Chair, and Ms. Brown seconded the motion. Both motions were approved unanimously.

NEXT MEETING

Mrs. Robichaud stated that there is only one application for the February meeting, which is a residential site plan review on a retaining wall that has already been constructed and discovered by our code enforcement officers. Additionally, Gould Evans has finished work on the community profile and data collection, so the first phase of the Comprehensive Plan will be presented. The plan will then be taken to City Council on February 18, after which phase 2 will begin. Mrs. Robichaud also intends to address zoning regulation changes, and the lot split issue will be presented again as well. Mr. Breneman noted that the lot split plan shows downspouts pointing to adjacent properties, which will need to be reviewed.

Clarification will also need to be made regarding what the Planning Commission can and cannot require when reviewing a site plan, particularly in relation to signage, color, materials, and whether particular recommendations are enforceable.

The filing deadline for the March 5 meeting is Friday, February 1. No applications have been filed to date; however, staff anticipates receiving a tower application and another lot split at Mission Chateau.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to come before the Commission, Chairman Nancy Wallerstein adjourned the meeting at 8:10 p.m.

Nancy Wallerstein
Chair