I. ROLL CALL

II. APPROVAL OF PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES - NOVEMBER 5, 2019

III. PUBLIC HEARINGS
None

IV. NON-PUBLIC HEARINGS

PC2019-123 Site Plan Review - Revision to Monument Sign Dimensions
Mission Chateau - 4100 W. 85th Street
Zoning: R-1A
Applicant: NSPJ Architects

V. OTHER BUSINESS

Consider Approval of 2020 Meeting Dates

VI. ADJOURNMENT

Plans available at City Hall if applicable
If you cannot be present, comments can be made by e-mail to cityclerk@pvkansas.com

*Any Commission members having a conflict of interest, shall acknowledge that conflict prior to the hearing of an application, shall not participate in the hearing or discussion, shall not vote on the issue and shall vacate their position at the table until the conclusion of the hearing.
ROLL CALL
The Planning Commission of the City of Prairie Village met in regular session on Tuesday, November 5, 2019 in the Council Chambers at 7700 Mission Road. Chair 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 and Greg Wolf.

The following individuals were present in their advisory capacity to the Planning Commission: Chris Brewster, Gould Evans; 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
Mr. Lenahan moved for the approval of the minutes of the October 1 regular Planning Commission meeting as presented. Mr. Wolf seconded the motion, which passed 5-0, with Mr. Birkel in abstention.

PUBLIC HEARINGS
None

NON-PUBLIC HEARINGS
PC2019-121 Site Plan Application - Exception to Neighborhood Design Standards - 19.08.025 Subsection E - Building Foundation Height 2211 W. 73rd Street

Mr. Brewster stated that the applicant was seeking to tear down the existing structure and replace it with a new home with a higher foundation for proper drainage. Home elevations are addressed in Section 19.08.025.E of the Neighborhood Design Standards, and allow 6 to 24 inches of exposed foundation. Additionally, a new home that has a foundation height greater than one foot more than the previous home must come to the Planning Commission for an exception through site plan approval. The Commission may grant exceptions to any of the Neighborhood Design Standards, including the foundation height standards, subject to the site plan process.

Mr. Brewster noted that the applicant was requesting a foundation top 2.34 feet higher than the current top of foundation, which was more than the 1-foot increase allowed by regulation. He added that the proposal met the criteria for the Planning Commission to grant an exception and recommended approval subject to the following conditions:
1. The exception is limited to the plans included in the application and specifically the proposed top of foundation at the proposed 996-foot elevation contour.

2. The applicant receive all necessary drainage permits and impervious surface approvals from Public Works prior to obtaining building permits.

Brian Kuhn representing BK Builds was in attendance, and stated that he had no concerns with the staff report or conditions.

Mr. Birkel noted that some of the provided drawings showed the home sitting 3 feet higher than the garage floor. Mr. Kuhn stated he was unsure why the distance was so high, and would need to check with the engineer who developed the drawings. Mr. Dringman asked the applicant if the current house was slab-on-grade, and Mr. Kuhn stated that it was. Mr. Dringman said that for a slab-on-grade home, he regarded the finished floor as the top of foundation. This means that the starting point for the exception measurement would actually be one foot above the current finished floor. As a result, the applicant only needed approximately 0.34 feet more than what was permitted by regulation.

Mr. Wolf made a motion to approve the site plan subject to the conditions recommended by staff. Mr. Breneman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

PC2019-122 New Monument Sign Application
CFD#2 - 7810 Mission Road

Paul Hontz with Architectural Stone Products, the manufacturer of the sign, was present, along with Consolidated Fire District #2 Chief Tony Lopez. Mr. Brewster stated that the sign was for the new fire station adjacent to City Hall. He noted that the lot was non-conforming, and did not have direct access to Mission Road. An access easement was obtained from the property to the east that fronts Mission Road. The sign would be located to the west of the parking pad in the easement entry to the lot. Because the sign is an irregular shape, interpretations had to be made to ensure it was less than the 20 square feet maximum described in zoning regulations.

Staff recommended approval subject to the following condition:

1. The easement allowing a sign at this location (or other permission or grant by the property owner) be verified prior to final permits.

Mr. Wolf made a motion to approve the site plan subject to the condition recommended by staff. Mr. Breneman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

OTHER BUSINESS

Consider Approval of Zoning Regulation Interpretations
Mr. Brewster said that while staff had been reviewing the Neighborhood Design Standards, questions arose over how to interpret several specific standards. He added that the standards were being presented to the Planning Commission to ensure members were in agreement with staff interpretations. A document focusing on the following five items was included in the meeting packet:

**Wall planes**
The wall plane for standards addressing the side elevation includes the basic mass nearest the side property line. It may exclude the following: any wall plane more than 12 feet from the facade closest to the property line; any portion of an exposed foundation; portions of pitched roofs; fascia, sill plates or other ornamental trim; unenclosed projections such as porches and patios, provided wall planes associated with roof or low walls would count, and any enclosure of the projection whether screen, window or wall would count.

**Window and entrance percentages**
This standard requires at least 8% window openings on side elevations, and applies to the wall plane closest to the side lot line, which includes all of the wall plane elements within 12 feet of that wall plane nearest the side lot line. Additionally, up to 3% of the total of this requirement may include ornamental features such as trim or ornamental details grouping openings together. Faux openings and garage doors do not count.

**Additional setback**
The additional setback in Section D.2.b. is different than projections or offsets in Section D.2.a. “Additional setback” is a measure that applies to the relationship to the side lot line, based on the overall massing and volume of the building. “Projections” and “offsets” are measures that apply to a wall plane based on its size, regardless of how near or far it is from the lot line. Therefore, Section D.2.b has the following effect:

- 100% of any elevation may be established at 4 feet beyond the minimum side setback, regardless of size.
- 100% of any elevation with a wall plane less than 800 square feet may be established at any place behind the minimum side setback.
- For wall planes larger than 800 square feet, 75% of the wall plane can be placed at the minimum side setback or within 4 feet beyond the required side setback, but the remaining 25% must be setback an additional 4 feet beyond the minimum setback.

**Architectural details**
Projections and offsets are measures that apply to a wall plane based on its size, regardless of how near or far it is to the lot line. Therefore, Section D.2.a has the following effect:

- Wall planes that are 500 square feet or less require no features (other than the percentage of windows and doors).
- Wall planes over 500 square feet must be broken into distinct masses of at least 20% of total wall plane (projections, offsets, bay windows and other architectural
elements that provide at least 1.5 feet projecting and 2 feet offset of differentiation in the wall plane).

**Side setback**
The setback requirements have the following effect:

- All buildings shall meet the minimum required width setback on both sides.
- Where lots are wider than the minimum, the required setback is greater based on 20% of the lot width.
- The width is measured at the front setback line (or platted front building line, if applicable).
- The required setback, to the extent a lot requires more than the minimum, may be apportioned in any way so that the cumulative side setback is 20% between both sides.

Mrs. Robichaud stated that there had been confusion among builders and architects based on their interpretations of the standards. She added that if the Planning Commission agreed to the interpretations presented by staff, a training session would be scheduled in the next few months for builders and architects to better understand the regulations.

All Commission members endorsed the interpretations. No formal vote was required.

Mrs. Robichaud said a Planning Commission work session had been tentatively scheduled for December 17 to discuss Village Vision 2.0.

**ADJOURNMENT**
With no further business to come before the Commission, Chair Nancy Wallerstein adjourned the meeting at 7:47 p.m.

Nancy Wallerstein
Chair
Application: PC 2019-123

Request: Site Plan for Monument Sign

Action: A Site Plan requires the Planning Commission to apply the facts of the application to the standards and criteria of the ordinance, and if the criteria are met to approve the application. Monument have specific approval and exception criteria.

Property Address: 4100 W. 85th Street

Applicant: NSPJ Architects, for Mission Chateau

Current Zoning and Land Use: R-1A Single Family Residential – Dwellings for senior adults SUP

Surrounding Zoning and Land Use: North: R-3 Garden Apartment District – Apartments
                              East: R-1A Single Family Residential District – Single-family Homes
                              South: R-1A Single Family Residential District – Dwellings for senior adults SUP (twin villas)
                              West: R-3 Garden Apartment District - Apartments

Legal Description: MISSION CHATEAU LT 1 (abbreviated)

Property Area: 6.76 acres (293,999 s.f.)

Related Case Files: PC 2019-101 Lot Split for Separate ownership of Duplex
                     PC 2018-123 Lot Split for Separate ownership of Duplex
                     PC 2018-107 Site Plan Modification (outside amenity area)
                     PC 2016-119 Final Plat for Mission Chateau – Replat of Lot 2
                     PC 2015-110 Preliminary and Final Plat
                     PC 2015-08 Special Use Permit for Adult Senior Dwellings & Final Development Plan
                     PC 2013-127 Preliminary Plat
                     PC 2013-126 Site Plan Approval for Adult Senior Dwellings
                     PC 2013-11 Special Use Permit for Adult Senior Dwellings
                     PC 2013-05 Special Use Permit for Adult Senior Dwellings
                     PC 2013-114 Site Plan Approval for Adult Senior Dwellings
                     PC 2004 Monument Sign
                     PC 1995-104 Site Plan Approval for Expansion of Mission Valley Middle School

Attachments: Application, Plans
Street view at 8500 Mission Road looking southwest at entry.
BACKGROUND:

The applicant is requesting approval of a monument sign associated with a facility for adult senior living. This property is part of an overall development project for Adult Senior Dwellings that includes a Special Use Permit and Final Development Plan. The Planning Commission recommended approval of a Special Use Permit, Site Plan approval and a Preliminary Plat at a Special Meeting on July 29, 2015. The City Council approved both recommendations on August 17, 2015 (PC 2015-08).

As part of the final development plan approval, and approval of the final landscape plan, the Planning Commission approved the following at the March 2016 meeting: a trellis landscape feature, stone monuments and a monument sign, seating areas, and coordinated stone entry signs were approved in association with the coordinated streetscape design on Mission Road. However, the specific monument sign approved in that plan was approximately 4’-8” high and 9’ wide. The overall size of the sign was approximately 34 square feet. Although this is larger than typically permitted, the Planning Commission is authorized to grant exceptions to the monument sign standards, particularly as part of a planned development through the final development plan. Additionally, there are no specific size and location standards for subdivision identification signs, which are subject to Planning Commission approval.

A permit was issued for this sign according to the previous Planning Commission approvals, however upon inspection, City Staff discovered the actual sign size is approximately 4” higher and 1’-4” wider, and thus approximately 9 square feet larger than the sign that was approved. [Note: the applicant’s drawings supporting this application show a sign area of 28.5 square feet, however that is the bounded area on the sign. According to the ordinance, the monument sign is measured by the entire surface on which the sign is mounted, except the base, which in this case is the stone. The calculation of the wall area upon which the sign is mounted is approximately 43 square feet.] Staff determined that these dimensions were beyond the administrative deviations from approved site plans that staff is authorized to approve [19.32.040].

ANALYSIS OF PROPOSED SIGN STANDARDS:

Civic and institutional buildings permitted in residential districts are permitted up to two signs identifying the property (wall or monument), and limited to the citywide monument sign standards. [19.48.020.A.1.] Similarly, residential neighborhoods are permitted project identification signs, with the design, size and location subject to approval of the Planning Commission. [19.48.020.B.] Although most monument signs are subject to the generally citywide monument sign standards, subdivision and residential project
identification signs are not necessarily. However, the final development plan for this project did include size standards as indicated below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td>20 s.f.</td>
<td>PC approval</td>
<td>34 s.f.</td>
<td>43 s.f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Height</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structure Sign</strong></td>
<td>5’</td>
<td>PC approval</td>
<td>7’ – 4”</td>
<td>7’ – 10”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4’ – 8”</td>
<td>5’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Width</strong></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>PC approval</td>
<td>9’</td>
<td>10’ 4”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Setbacks</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>From curb</strong></td>
<td>12’ 3’</td>
<td>PC approval</td>
<td>22’ – 10” 16’</td>
<td>22’ – 10” 16’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>From property</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the sign as built is larger than the previously approved plan and issued permit, it remains well integrated into the overall streetscape and other stone monuments for the project. The sign is setback substantially from the property line and any entrances, and does not present any visibility issues. Overall the sign is approximately 10% larger in width, and 7% larger in height than what was previously approved, which is not significant along the approximately 800’ frontage of the property.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval of the revised monument signs as presented to account for the increase in size that was built beyond the sign permit size.
CITY OF PRAIRIE VILLAGE
The Star of Kansas

Planning Commission Application

For Office Use Only
Case No.: 2019-123
Filing Fee: $100.00
Deposit: $100.00
Date Advertised: 
Date Notices Sent: 
Public Hearing Date: 

Please complete this form and return with
Information requested to:

Assistant City Administrator
City of Prairie Village
7700 Mission Rd.
Prairie Village, KS 66208

Applicant: NSPJ Architects
Phone Number: 913.831.1415

Address: 3515 W. 75th Street
E-Mail: kmartinovic@nspjarch.com

Owner: Mission Chateau Property LLC
Phone Number: 913-444-0600

Address: 7611 State Line Road
Kansas City, MO
Zip: 64114

Location of Property: Mission Chateau, 4100 W. 85th Street

Legal Description: Lots 1 & 2, Mission Chateau, A subdivision of Land in Prairie Village,
Johnson County, Kansas

Applicant requests consideration of the following: (Describe proposal/request in
detail)

Revisions to monument sign dimensions per as-built conditions.

AGREEMENT TO PAY EXPENSES

APPLICANT intends to file an application with the PRAIRIE VILLAGE PLANNING COMMISSION or
the PRAIRIE VILLAGE BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS of the CITY OF PRAIRIE VILLAGE, KANSAS
(City) for Mission Chateau Signage

As a result of the filing of said application, CITY may incur certain expenses, such as publication
costs, consulting fees, attorney fees and court reporter fees.

APPLICANT hereby agrees to be responsible for and to CITY for all cost incurred by CITY as a
result of said application. Said costs shall be paid within ten (10) days of receipt of any bill
submitted by CITY to APPLICANT. It is understood that no requests granted by CITY or any of
its commissions will be effective until all costs have been paid. Costs will be owing whether
or not APPLICANT obtains the relief requested in the application.

Applicant’s Signature/Date 11/8/2019

Owner’s Signature/Date 11/8/2019
# City of Prairie Village
Planning Commission/Board of Zoning Appeals
Meeting and Submittal Schedule
2020

Applications that are incomplete and do not include all the supporting Documentation may not be published or placed on the agenda.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>January</th>
<th>February</th>
<th>March</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Date</td>
<td>01/07/2020</td>
<td>Meeting Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filing Deadline</td>
<td>12/06/2019</td>
<td>Filing Deadline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail Notices By</td>
<td>12/17/2019</td>
<td>Mail Notices By</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publish By</td>
<td>12/17/2019</td>
<td>Publish By</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Date</td>
<td>04/07/2020</td>
<td>Meeting Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filing Deadline</td>
<td>03/06/2020</td>
<td>Filing Deadline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail Notices By</td>
<td>03/17/2020</td>
<td>Mail Notices By</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publish By</td>
<td>03/17/2020</td>
<td>Publish By</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>July</th>
<th>August</th>
<th>September</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Date</td>
<td>07/07/2020</td>
<td>Meeting Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filing Deadline</td>
<td>06/05/2020</td>
<td>Filing Deadline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail Notices By</td>
<td>06/16/2020</td>
<td>Mail Notices By</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publish By</td>
<td>06/16/2020</td>
<td>Publish By</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>October</th>
<th>November</th>
<th>December</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Date</td>
<td>10/06/2020</td>
<td>Meeting Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filing Deadline</td>
<td>09/04/2020</td>
<td>Filing Deadline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail Notices By</td>
<td>09/15/2020</td>
<td>Mail Notices By</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publish By</td>
<td>09/15/2020</td>
<td>Publish By</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>