I. ROLL CALL

II. APPROVAL OF BZA MINUTES - FEBRUARY 4, 2019

III. PUBLIC HEARINGS

BZA2020-01 Side yard setback variance for garage addition
7801 Rosewood Lane
Zoning: R1-B

IV. OTHER BUSINESS

V. 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 meeting of the Board of Zoning Appeals of the City of Prairie Village, Kansas was held on Tuesday, February 4, 2020 in the Council Chambers of the Municipal Building at 7700 Mission Road. Chair Greg Wolf called the meeting to order at 6:45 p.m. with the following members present: Jonathan Birkel, James Breneman, Patrick Lenahan, Melissa Brown and Jeffrey Valentino.

Also present in their advisory capacity to the Board of Zoning Appeals were: Chris Brewster, Gould Evans; Jamie Robichaud, Deputy City Administrator; Keith Bredehoeft, Director of Public Works; Mitch Dringman, City Building Official, Ian Graves, Council Liaison, and Adam Geffert, City Clerk/Board Secretary.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES
Mr. Lenahan moved for the approval of the minutes of the July 2, 2019 Board of Zoning Appeals meeting as presented. Mr. Breneman seconded the motion, which passed 4-0, with Ms. Brown and Mr. Wolf in abstention.

PUBLIC HEARINGS
None

OTHER BUSINESS

Election of Officers

Mr. Wolf nominated Mr. Lenahan as Board of Zoning Appeals Chair, and Mr. Birkel as Vice-Chair. Mr. Breneman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT
Chair Patrick Lenahan adjourned the meeting of the Board of Zoning Appeals at 6:48 p.m.

Patrick Lenahan
Chair
TO: Prairie Village Board of Zoning Appeals  
FROM: Chris Brewster, Gould Evans, Planning Consultant  
DATE: May 5, 2020

Application: BZA 2020-01

Request: Variance from side yard setback – specifically the requirement for a cumulative setback of 20% of the lot width at the front building line – to allow the addition to a garage.

Action: A variance request requires the Board of Zoning Appeals to evaluate facts and weigh evidence, and a majority of the Board must find that all 5 criteria for a variance have been met in order to approve the request.

Property Address: 7801 Rosewood Lane

Applicant: Robert Dimond, Jr. AIA, for Mark M. McNiel Trust owner

Current Zoning and Land Use: R-1B Single-Family Residential - Single-Family Dwelling

Surrounding Zoning and Land Use:  
North: R-1B Single-Family Residential - Single-Family Dwellings  
East: R-1B Single-Family Residential - Single-Family Dwellings  
South: R-1B Single-Family Residential - Single-Family Dwellings  
West: R-1B Single-Family Residential - Single-Family Dwellings

Legal Description: PRAIRIE RIDGE LOT 18 BLOCK 22 PVC 9752-0034

Property Area: 0.23 acres (9,967.86 s.f.)

Related Case Files: None

Attachments: Application, site plan and building elevations.
Aerial Site

Street Views

Street view – looking south on Rosewood Lane; 7801 in background left.
Street view - front of 7801 Rosewood Lane.

Bird’s eye view
COMMENTS:
The applicant is requesting a variance from Section 19.08.015, Table 19.08A, Side Setback, to allow the addition of a second garage that would be 6.3’ from the north property line. This lot is zoned R-1B, on Rosewood Lane between 77th Terrace and 79th Street. The ordinance requires the side setback to meet 3 conditions –

- be at least 6’ from the property line;
- be at least 20% of the lot width (both sides); and
- be at least 12’ from structures on adjacent property.

The survey submitted with the application shows the proposed expansion would be 6.3’ from the north lot line, and 15’ from the adjacent structure. However, the side setback on the south side of the property is 4.8’ at its closest point. The proposed addition would meet the required minimum setback of 6’, however it would result in the structure not meeting the cumulative required setback of 20% of the entire lot width between both setbacks. The lot is 65’ wide at the front lot line, according to Johnson County AIMS mapping. The survey submitted with the application shows the lot width is approximately 68.9’ at the front building line, where lot width is to be measured according to the ordinance. This is due to the skew of the lot. The required cumulative 20% setback on both sites totals approximately 13.78’. The existing 4.8’ on the south side and the proposed 6.3’ setback on the north side would result in 11.1’ cumulative. The applicant is requesting a variance of 2.68’ in order to meet the 20% requirement.

The proposed garage addition is adding 8.5’ on the north side, extending the existing garage. It is a single story addition with a sloped roof with the lowest profile on the north side resulting in an eave line approximately 9’ high. It would extend approximately 24’ along the north boundary, consistent with the current garage. The garage would be accessed by an existing concrete driveway that is tapered from a narrower drive at the street to provide a 2-car parking pad at the front building line. The existing garage is recessed approximately 12’ from the main mass of the house, and the proposed addition would be aligned with this same point.

ANAŁYSIS:
Section 19.54.030 of the Zoning Ordinance requires the Board to find that all five of the following conditions are met in order to grant a variance. If the Board finds that even one of these conditions is not met, a variance should not be granted:

A. Uniqueness

That the variance requested arises from such condition which is unique to the property in question and which is not ordinarily found in the same zone or district; and is not created by an action or actions of the property owner or the applicant.

In order for the property to meet the condition of uniqueness, it must have some peculiar physical surroundings, shape, or topographical condition that would result in a practical difficulty as distinguished from a mere inconvenience to utilize the property without granting the variance.

The lot meets all standards for the R-1B zoning district, and is similar to others in the area. Due to the block pattern and the lots position at a slight skew in Rosewood Lane, the lot has an increase in width as you move deeper into the lot to the front building line. Structures on lots to the north are aligned differently than the rest of the block, so this structure reflects a transition in that orientation. As a result, the setbacks on the south boundary vary because the structure is not aligned parallel with the lot lines, and because that elevation has different wall planes. The closest point of the structure is 4.8’ to the south lot line, but the majority of the mass is beyond 6’ on this south lot line as well. This is a legal non-conforming situation that met the required setbacks prior to the recent zoning amendments.
B. Adjacent Property

That the granting of the permit for the variance would not adversely affect the rights of adjacent property owners or residents.

The proposed addition meets all setbacks and separation requirements for adjacent property, and would not impact what potentially can be built on adjacent property as a result of building separation requirements. It is also a lower elevation than what could potentially be built according to the ordinance. (It is one-story and approximately 9’; a structure complying with all setback requirements could be up to two stories and 29’). Additionally, the proposed addition is a garage that is setback from the front elevation of the home, so the extent of the requested variance does not significantly impact the adjacent homes relationship to the streetscape.

C. Hardship

That the strict application of the provisions of these regulations from which a variance is requested will constitute an unnecessary hardship upon the property owner represented in the application.

A structure built according to the ordinance could only add less than 6’ to the the current situation, and would not yield space to park a second car in the garage. The existing garage is also very compact, with storage and internal access competing for space. Most homes in this area have a one-car garage. Two-car garages technically can fit on this lot, and a few homes in the area do have two-car garages. However, due to the configuration of the structure on the lot, and the location of the existing garage, it could only be done through substantial construction or removal of the current structure.

D. Public Interest

That the variance desired will not adversely affect the public health, safety, morals, order, convenience, prosperity, or general welfare.

The proposed garage is single-story and ties into the existing structure with a low, compound roof slope, and is keeping with the design and massing of the home. It is also recessed from the main mass by approximately 12’ and it will not present a substantial massing element on the front of the house in terms of views along the streetscape and in terms of impact on adjacent property. The proposed addition is also consistent with all Neighborhood Design Standards with respect to frontages, garage location and extent, and streetscape. One item to note in relation to the Neighborhood Design Standards, is that this block generally has tree canopy coverage met by substantial trees in the front yards of most homes (not street trees, as required by ordinance, but the acceptable substitute that the ordinance notes.) This particular section of the block on both the east and west portion has a gap in that canopy. The goal is to fill in those gaps when substantial investment occurs, and the Neighborhood Design Standards apply where more than 200 square feet is added. Although not directly related to the variance application, it is recommended that a tree meeting the Prairie Village recommended street tree list be planted in the frontage, within 20’ of the street.

E. Spirit and Intent of the Regulation

That the granting of the variance desired would not be opposed to the general spirit and intent of these regulations.

The intent of the R-1B front setback standards is to create a consistent relationship of buildings along a block. Although the proposed garage would not meet the required 20% of lot width in combination with both side setbacks, it does meet all other building location and separating requirements. The low profile, limited massing, and location of the garage also meet all other elements of the zoning and Neighborhood Design Standards.

EFFECT OF DECISION:

After reviewing the information submitted and considering the testimony during the public hearing, if the Board finds that all five conditions can be met as required by state statutes and Section 19.54.030 of the
Prairie Village Zoning Ordinance, then it may grant the variance. If the Board does approve the variance, it should be subject to the following conditions:

1. That the variance be granted only to the extent shown on the submitted site plans, and specifically only to allow a side setback of 6.3’ on the north side, and to the extent shown in plans (9’ high and approximately 24’ long).

2. A tree be planted in the frontage area meeting the location requirements for street and/or frontage trees.

3. The variance, if approved, be recorded with the County Register of Deeds within 1 year of approval.
1. Applications shall be made on forms prescribed by the Board of Zoning Appeals and filed with the Secretary of the Board.

2. A deposit of seventy-five dollars ($75.00) shall accompany each application. If this sum is inadequate to cover incurred expenses; additional money will be required.

3. The applicant shall furnish, at the time of filing the application, a certified list of all the owners of property (not just occupants) located within two hundred (200) feet, excepting public streets and ways, of the area for which the Appeal / Variance has been requested, obtained from the County Clerk’s Offices at the Johnson County Courthouses in Olathe or from a title company. The applicant shall also furnish a sketch, plan or information showing details of the variance requested. The applicant shall submit a written statement in response to the five criteria necessary for granting a variance. For an appeal, the applicant shall submit a written statement providing information justifying the appeal requested.

4. All applications shall be set for a public hearing before the Board of Zoning Appeals.

5. Notice of such hearing shall be published in one issue of the official newspaper of the City of Prairie Village; such notice to be published not less than twenty (20) days or more than forty (40) days, exclusive of the days of publications and hearing, prior to the date of said hearing of the Board.

6. The applicant shall mail, by certified mail, return receipt requested, a copy of the notice of hearing to all owners of property as set out in #3 at least twenty (20) days prior to the hearing, thus providing an opportunity to all interested persons to be heard.
The Board may grant a variance only upon finding that the requirements of PVMC 19.44.070 have been met. The following is intended as a simplified discussion of the criteria considered in the request for a variance and is provided for your convenience and assistance in making your request. While this discussion is intended to be helpful, the Board is governed by its interpretation of PVMC 19.44.070 as applied to the facts and circumstances of your case and the following simplified discussion is not intended to be an exhaustive analysis of all applicable principles.

Criteria #1 – That the variance requested arises from such condition which is unique to the property in question and which is not ordinarily found in the same zone or district, and is not created by an action or actions of the property owner or applicant.

The variance must arise from a condition of the property. That condition must be unique to the property. That does not mean that the condition is “unique” but rather that it is “unique to the property;” that is, the condition relates solely to the property and not to external factors, structures, etc. The condition must not be ordinarily found in the zone or district; i.e., the condition must not exist with respect to a number of properties. Its occurrence must be infrequent. The owner/applicant cannot have done anything to the property which cased the condition. This does not refer to what the owner proposes with the variance, but some act done with the property; for example, subdividing a lot, that causes the condition from which relief is sought.

Criteria #2 – That the granting of the permit for the variance will not adversely affect the rights of adjacent property owners or residents.

The variance may not adversely affect the rights of adjacent property owners. The crucial terms here are “adversely” and “rights”. While objections of adjacent property holders will be heard and considered, the variance proceeding is not a plebiscite. The Board will consider whether or not any impact on adjacent property holders constitutes an adverse affect on their rights.
Criteria #3 – That the strict application of the provisions of this title of which variance is requested will constitute unnecessary hardship upon the property owner represented in the application.

A variance may be granted where strict application will result in unnecessary hardship. Unnecessary hardship shall be considered to mean that the property owner cannot do with his property that which others can ordinarily do and/or that which is a reasonable expectation for a similar property owner and/or where special circumstances of the particular property exist.

Criteria #4 – That the variance desired will not adversely affect the public health, safety, morals, order, convenience, prosperity, or general welfare.

The variance may not adversely affect the public interest. The Board shall consider the impact of the requested variance upon the concerns of the public; such as fire protection, environmental impact, police protection, vision, safety and morals.

Criteria #5 – That granting the variance desired will not be opposed to the general spirit and intent of this title.

The variance must not conflict with the intent and spirit of the zoning regulation. The Board shall consider that the zoning regulation was adopted for a purpose; such as, green space, traffic safety, light and air, neighborhood conformity, etc. Therefore, the Board will evaluate whether or not the variance requested will conflict with that purpose.
VARIANCE APPLICATION
BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS

CITY OF PRAIRIE VILLAGE, KANSAS

For Office Use Only
Case No:________________________
Filing Fee:_______________________
Deposit:_________________________
Date Advertised:__________________
Public Hearing Date:_______________

APPLICANT:________________________ PHONE:_____________________
ADDRESS:________________________ ZIP:_______________________

OWNER:________________________ PHONE:_____________________
ADDRESS:________________________ ZIP:_______________________

LOCATION OF PROPERTY:________________________

LEGAL DESCRIPTION:________________________

Variance Requested 20% Side Yard Setback variance of 2.68'

ADJACENT ZONING AND LAND USE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Single Family Residence</td>
<td>R-1B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Single Family Residence</td>
<td>R-1B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Single Family Residence</td>
<td>R-1B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Single Family Residence</td>
<td>R-1B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Present use of Property: Single Family Residence

Proposed Use of Property: Single Family Residence

Utility lines or easements that would restrict proposed development:
None

Please complete both pages of the form and return to:

City Clerk
City of Prairie Village
7700 Mission Road
Prairie Village, Kansas 66208
Please indicate below the extent to which the following standards are met, in the
applicant’s opinion. Provide an explanation on a separate sheet for each standard
which is found to be met.

1. **UNIQUENESS**
   
   **Yes** Yes **No**
   
   The variance requested arises from conditions which are unique to the property
   in question, which are not ordinarily found in the same zoning district, and which
   are not caused by actions of the property owners or applicant. Such conditions
   include the peculiar physical surroundings, shape, or topographical condition of
   the specific property involved which would result in a practical difficulty or
   unnecessary hardship for the applicant, as distinguished from a mere
   inconvenience, if the requested variance was not granted.

2. **ADJACENT PROPERTY**
   
   **Yes** Yes **No**
   
   The granting of the variance will not be materially detrimental or adversely affect
   the rights of adjacent property owners or residents.

3. **HARDSHIP**
   
   **Yes** Yes **No**
   
   The strict application of the provision of the zoning regulations from which a
   variance is requested will constitute an unnecessary hardship upon the applicant.
   Although the desire to increase the profitability of the property may be an
   indication of hardship, it shall not be sufficient reason by itself to justify the
   variance.

4. **PUBLIC INTEREST**
   
   **Yes** Yes **No**
   
   The variance desired will not adversely affect the public health, safety, morals,
   order, convenience, or general welfare of the community. The proposed
   variance shall not impair an adequate supply of light or air to adjacent property,
   substantially increase the congestion in the public streets, increase the danger of
   fire, endanger the public safety, or substantially diminish or impair property
   values within the neighborhood.

5. **SPIRIT AND INTENT**
   
   **Yes** Yes **No**
   
   Granting the requested variance will not be opposed to the general spirit and
   intent of the zoning regulations.

6. **MINIMUM VARIANCE**
   
   **Yes** Yes **No**
   
   The variance requested is the minimum variance that will make possible the
   reasonable use of the land or structure.

**SIGNATURE:** ___________________________ **DATE:** 03.23.2020

**BY:** Robert L Dimond Jr AIA

**TITLE:** Architect
Minimum Required Information (to be shown on the site plan)

The site plan shall be legibly and accurately drawn on paper suitable for reproduction. The plan shall be drawn to a scale of 1 inch to 50 feet or less. Architect’s drawings will also be acceptable. The plan shall contain the following information:

1. The name and address of the person filing the application
2. The date, scale, and north arrow
3. Property lines, building lines and easements
4. Streets, sidewalks and alleys
5. Existing and/or proposed structures or improvements
   (i.e. trees, patios, driveways, etc.)
6. Existing structures within 20 feet of the property
7. Accurate dimensions of the property and all structures involved

Elevations

Elevations shall be submitted for all sign applications, new additions, alterations to existing structures, new accessory structures, and fences. They shall contain the following information:

1. Dimensions including height, width, length and area
2. In the case of sign, the elevation should also indicate the exact appearance of the sign, whether or not it is illuminated, and the type of illumination.

Other

Any other information deemed necessary by the code official or building official should be stipulated below:

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

Checked by: ________________________________  Date: ________________
March 23, 2020

VARIANCE APPLICATION
BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS

Single Family Residence
Proposed Garage Addition
7801 Rosewood Lane
Prairie Village, Kansas

Variance Request Overview

Mark McNiel (applicant/property owner) is requesting a variance from Section 19.08.030 to add a 2-car garage in place of the existing 1-car garage on the north side of the home. The front north side of the expanded garage would be 6'-4" (6' min set back) from the side lot line and allows the proposed garage to be 15 feet from the existing home to the north. The propose garage addition is a single -story addition with a sloped roof with a standard 16’x 8’ insulated glass door in place of the current 8’x7’ insulated glass door.

The proposed garage expansion adds 8.5 feet of width to the existing structure leaving a side yard setback of 6'-4" and a usable interior garage width of 19'-10" feet which would be typical of a smaller 2-car garage. For reference the width in the existing garage is 11'-4". Also impacting the useable space in the existing garage are the stairways leading to the basement and to the main floor of the living area of the house. It is not reasonable to relocate or modify the stairs and there is insufficient interior space to construct the garage addition without the variance.

The proposed addition complies with all R-1B zoning standards with exception of the 20% total side yard setback requirement. The required 20% side yard setback dimension shown on the submitted site plan is 13.78’. The resulting total side yard setback resulting from the proposed garage addition is 11.1’ or a difference of 2.68’ from the required side yard setback. This is the requested side yard variance dimension.

Criteria Summary

1. UNIQUENESS
The variance requested arises from conditions which are unique to the property in question, which are not ordinarily found in the same zoning district, and which are not caused by actions of the property owners or applicant. Such conditions include the peculiar physical surroundings, shape, or topographical condition of the specific property involved which would result in a practical difficulty or unnecessary hardship for the applicant, as distinguished from a mere inconvenience, if the requested variance was not granted.

The variance requested arises from a condition which is unique to the property which is not ordinarily found in the same zone or district and was not created by the actions of the owner/applicant.
The practical difficulty of complying with the existing ordinance is a result that the existing house has been built off center in the lot and lies within the required minimum 6’ side yard setback on the south property line and is on an irregular shaped lot. It appears that the house placement on the lot may have been for the future expansion of the garage. The existing garage contains stairs to access the basement and main living level of the house which reduces the useable space. The property owner has not contributed to these existing conditions. The property in its current as-built state is non-conforming per the zoning ordinance requirements and therefore is deemed a practical difficulty and unnecessary hardship to the Owner.

2. ADJACENT PROPERTY
The granting of the variance will not be materially detrimental or adversely affect the rights of adjacent property owners or residents.
There are not any adverse affects to the rights of the adjacent property owners or residents as a result of this proposed addition. The distance from the existing structure to the existing structure to the south is 17.5 and to the existing structure on the north is 15’. The proposed addition will not have a negative impact on adjoining properties sightlines or contribute to drainage issues.

3. HARDSHIP
The strict application of the provision of the zoning regulations from which a variance is requested will constitute an unnecessary hardship upon the applicant. Although the desire to increase the profitability of the property may be an indication of hardship, it shall not be sufficient reason by itself to justify the variance.
If the proposed garage addition is built using the current minimum side yard setback of 20% of the lot width at the building line then the resulting interior width of the new garage would be 16.35’ which is not adequate for a functional two car garage. For reference, a typical public parking lot parking space is 9’ wide. Also impacting the useable space in the existing garage are the stairways leading to the basement and to the main floor of the living area of the house. It is not reasonable to relocate or modify the stairs. Therefore, a strict application of the zoning regulations will be such that the proposed addition cannot be constructed for its intended use.

4. PUBLIC INTEREST
The variance desired will not adversely affect the public health, safety, morals, order, convenience, or general welfare of the community. The proposed variance shall not impair an adequate supply of light or air to adjacent property, substantially increase the congestion in the public streets, increase the danger of fire, endanger the public safety, or substantially diminish or impair property values within the neighborhood.
The proposed variance for this proposed addition will not affect, impair, reduce, diminish or endanger adjacent properties or their values in any way. The proposed addition is consistent with the architectural character of the existing house and is of a similar scale to other houses in the neighborhood. This proposed project will not increase the danger of fire, maintains adequate space between adjacent houses for access to air and light, will alleviate the need to leave vehicles parked outside in the drive or parked on the street thereby reducing congestion on the street and will add value to the neighborhood.
5. SPIRIT AND INTENT
Granting the requested variance will not be opposed to the general spirit and intent of the zoning regulations.

By granting this requested variance there is not any opposition to the general spirit and intent of the zoning regulations. The proposed garage addition maintains the front yard green space and other aspects of the zoning ordinance.

6. MINIMUM VARIANCE
The variance requested is the minimum variance that will make possible the reasonable use of the land or structure.

This request is for the minimum variance that is required to make this proposed project functional as a two car garage and maintains the zoning ordinance intent of maintaining neighborhood conformity.
CERTIFICATE OF SURVEY

DATE: 3/4/2020
JOB NUMBER: 34855
PREPARED FOR: MARK MCNEIL

SECTION 21  TWP. 12  RGE. 25
CO. JOHNSON  STATE KANSAS

LEGAL DESCRIPTION
Lot 18, Block 22, Prairie Ridge, a subdivision of land in the City of Prairie Village, Johnson County, Kansas.

NOTES:
1. Basis of bearings: Kansas State Plane, North Zone.
2. No title information was provided as a part of this survey.
3. All measured distances agree with record measurements per the Plat of Prairie Ridge unless otherwise noted.

LEGEND
- FOUND BAR AS DESCRIBED
- (ORIGIN UNKNOWN)
- SET ½" X 24" REBAR WITH PLASTIC KS CLS S3 CAP

THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT ON THE 28TH DAY OF FEBRUARY 2020, THIS FIELD SURVEY WAS COMPLETED ON THE GROUND BY ME OR UNDER MY DIRECT SUPERVISION AND THAT SAID SURVEY MEETS OR EXCEEDS THE "KANSAS MINIMUM STANDARDS" FOR BOUNDARY SURVEYS PURSUANT TO K.A.R. 66-12-1.

MATTHEW R. COLBURN
PROFESSIONAL SURVEYOR

SCALE: 1"=30'

CITIZEN INGINEERS
LAND SURVEYORS - LAND PLANNERS
120 E. WATER STREET
CLAYTON, MISSOURI 63105
PHONE 314-725-8000

14 N. PEORIA
JEFFERSON CITY, MISSOURI 65101
PHONE 573-882-1266
FAX 573-882-1268

© 2018 CITIZEN ENGINEERS, INC.
All rights reserved.
### Buffer Results

200 foot buffer (5.05 acres)  
Buffer search returned 34 properties  
[Download as Mailing Labels](#)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Property ID</th>
<th>Area (ft²)</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Situs Address</th>
<th>Owner1</th>
<th>Owner2</th>
<th>Owner Address</th>
<th>City, State Zip</th>
<th>Billing Name</th>
<th>Billing Name2</th>
<th>Billing Address</th>
<th>Billing City, State Zip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>OP490000 002 0027</td>
<td>7.84</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>7809 ROSEWOOD DR</td>
<td>AUDRA C GIER LIVING TRUST</td>
<td>7809 ROSEWOOD DR</td>
<td>PRAIRIE VILLAGE, KS 66208</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>OP490000 002 0031</td>
<td>8.27</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>7729 ROSEWOOD DR</td>
<td>GIBSON, ANDREW T. MCNIECE, JAMIE C.</td>
<td>7729 ROSEWOOD DR</td>
<td>PRAIRIE VILLAGE, KS 66208</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>OP490000 002 0030</td>
<td>8.27</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>7733 ROSEWOOD DR</td>
<td>BARNES, ARIENNE</td>
<td>7733 ROSEWOOD DR</td>
<td>PRAIRIE VILLAGE, KS 66208</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>OP490000 002 0029</td>
<td>8.27</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>7801 ROSEWOOD DR</td>
<td>KRAMER, LIBBY</td>
<td>7801 ROSEWOOD DR</td>
<td>PRAIRIE VILLAGE, KS 66208</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>OP490000 023 0017</td>
<td>8.71</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>7800 ROSEWOOD LN</td>
<td>BLAU, DEREK BLAU, COURTNEY</td>
<td>7800 ROSEWOOD LN</td>
<td>PRAIRIE VILLAGE, KS 66208</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>OP490000 022 0020</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>7729 ROSEWOOD LN</td>
<td>HOOPER, SANDRA L.</td>
<td>7729 ROSEWOOD LN</td>
<td>PRAIRIE VILLAGE, KS 66208</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>OP490000 022 0007</td>
<td>8.27</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>7816 ROSEWOOD DR</td>
<td>LOWE, DENNIS P LIVING TRUST</td>
<td>7816 ROSEWOOD DR</td>
<td>PRAIRIE VILLAGE, KS 66208</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>OP490000 022 0002</td>
<td>9.58</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>7728 ROSEWOOD DR</td>
<td>WOLFORD, LINDA M. TRUSTEE</td>
<td>7728 ROSEWOOD DR</td>
<td>PRAIRIE VILLAGE, KS 66208</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>OP490000 022 0017</td>
<td>8.71</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>7805 ROSEWOOD LN</td>
<td>REESE, JAMES T</td>
<td>7805 ROSEWOOD LN</td>
<td>PRAIRIE VILLAGE, KS 66208</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>OP606000 000 0046</td>
<td>10,890 5</td>
<td>7811 ASH ST</td>
<td>SHEEHAN, KATHLEEN A.</td>
<td>7811 ASH ST</td>
<td>PRAIRIE VILLAGE, KS 66208</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>OP490000 022 0023</td>
<td>8,712 0</td>
<td>5207 W 77TH TER</td>
<td>PACEY LIVING TRUST</td>
<td>5207 W 77TH TER</td>
<td>PRAIRIE VILLAGE, KS 66208</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>OP490000 023 0014</td>
<td>9,583 2</td>
<td>7728 ROSEWOOD LN</td>
<td>BRENT W KEENER TRUST NO 1</td>
<td>7728 ROSEWOOD LN</td>
<td>PRAIRIE VILLAGE, KS 66208</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>OP490000 022 0001</td>
<td>10,019 3</td>
<td>5203 W 77TH TER</td>
<td>DAVIS, MARLENE</td>
<td>5203 W 77TH TER</td>
<td>PRAIRIE VILLAGE, KS 66208</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>OP490000 023 0019</td>
<td>8,712 0</td>
<td>7808 ROSEWOOD LN</td>
<td>MARTEN REAL ESTATE HOLDINGS LLC</td>
<td>3965 W 83RD ST STE 298</td>
<td>PRAIRIE VILLAGE, KS 66208</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>OP490000 023 0018</td>
<td>8,712 0</td>
<td>7802 ROSEWOOD LN</td>
<td>COLLINS, DENNIS J. COLINS, KAREN L.</td>
<td>7802 ROSEWOOD LN</td>
<td>PRAIRIE VILLAGE, KS 66208</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>OP490000 022 0022</td>
<td>8,712 0</td>
<td>5211 W 77TH TER</td>
<td>NGUYEN, THY MINH LACOUR, LUCINDA LOUISE</td>
<td>5211 W 77TH TER</td>
<td>PRAIRIE VILLAGE, KS 66208</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>OP490000 023 0013</td>
<td>8,712 0</td>
<td>7724 ROSEWOOD LN</td>
<td>MILLER, WILLIAM B. MILLER, JOHN B.</td>
<td>7724 ROSEWOOD LN</td>
<td>PRAIRIE VILLAGE, KS 66208</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>OP490000 022 0015</td>
<td>9,148 1</td>
<td>7817 ROSEWOOD LN</td>
<td>MAY, JEFFREY L.</td>
<td>5309 W 79TH ST</td>
<td>PRAIRIE VILLAGE, KS 66208</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>OP490000 022 0016</td>
<td>8,712 0</td>
<td>7809 ROSEWOOD LN</td>
<td>LUSSO, MARGARET C. LUSSO, DAVID A</td>
<td>7809 ROSEWOOD LN</td>
<td>PRAIRIE VILLAGE, KS 66208</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>OP490000 022 0004</td>
<td>8,276 9</td>
<td>7800 ROSEWOOD DR</td>
<td>SMART, ROBERT L JR SMART, JULIE TOWNSEND</td>
<td>7800 ROSEWOOD DR</td>
<td>PRAIRIE VILLAGE, KS 66208</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>OP490000 022 0021</td>
<td>11,326 6</td>
<td>5215 W 77TH TER</td>
<td>RUNYAN, PETER</td>
<td>5215 W 77TH TER</td>
<td>PRAIRIE VILLAGE, KS 66208</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel Number</td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Township</td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>Legal Description</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>City, State, Zip</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OP490000</td>
<td>022 0006</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>ROSEWOOD DR</td>
<td>RAMZY, MICHAEL R AND RAMZY, SHERRY L REV TRUST</td>
<td>7808 ROSEWOOD DR</td>
<td>PRAIRIE VILLAGE, KS 66208</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OP490000</td>
<td>022 0005</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>ROSEWOOD DR</td>
<td>DAHMS, BRYAN DAHMS, PAULA</td>
<td>7804 ROSEWOOD DR</td>
<td>OVERLAND PARK, KS 66213</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OP490000</td>
<td>022 0005</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>ROSEWOOD DR</td>
<td>SHARON H GREATHOUSE LIVING TRUST</td>
<td>7804 ROSEWOOD DR</td>
<td>PRAIRIE VILLAGE, KS 66208</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OP490000</td>
<td>023 0020</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>ROSEWOOD LN</td>
<td>BOULEVARD PROPERTIES - MARTHA ULMER</td>
<td>21300 W 106TH ST</td>
<td>OLATHE, KS 66061</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OP490000</td>
<td>022 0003</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>ROSEWOOD LN</td>
<td>TERRIL, MARY L. TRUSTEE TERRIL, MARY L. TRUST</td>
<td>7732 ROSEWOOD LN</td>
<td>PRAIRIE VILLAGE, KS 66208</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OP490000</td>
<td>022 0013B</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>ROSEWOOD LN</td>
<td>KLAMM, STEPHANIE A</td>
<td>7821 ROSEWOOD LN</td>
<td>PRAIRIE VILLAGE, KS 66208</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OP490000</td>
<td>023 0015</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>ROSEWOOD LN</td>
<td>STUBBS, CHRISTOPHER A. STUBBS, MIRNA K.</td>
<td>7732 ROSEWOOD LN</td>
<td>PRAIRIE VILLAGE, KS 66208</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OP606000</td>
<td>000 0045</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>ASH ST</td>
<td>GEBHART, JEFFREY C.</td>
<td>PO BOX 8503</td>
<td>PRAIRIE VILLAGE, KS 66208</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OP490000</td>
<td>023 0016</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>ROSEWOOD LN</td>
<td>JONES, KELLY A.</td>
<td>7736 ROSEWOOD LN</td>
<td>PRAIRIE VILLAGE, KS 66208</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OP490000</td>
<td>022 0019</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>ROSEWOOD LN</td>
<td>KNOWLES, PORTER C. KNOWLES, MARY</td>
<td>13827 EBY ST</td>
<td>OVERLAND PARK, KS 66221</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OP490000</td>
<td>022 0008</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>ROSEWOOD LN</td>
<td>TUTTLE, DOUGLAS R. TUTTLE, ROBYN E.</td>
<td>7820 ROSEWOOD LN</td>
<td>PRAIRIE VILLAGE, KS 66208</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OP606000</td>
<td>000 0044</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>ASH ST</td>
<td>MCCLELLAN, DENISE M.</td>
<td>7801 ASH ST</td>
<td>PRAIRIE VILLAGE, KS 66208</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Area of Parcels: 7.13 acres (310,583 ft²)

Selected Property
Neighborhood Meeting Minutes
Re: Board of Zoning Appeals Case #BZA2020-01
McNiel Residence Garage Addition
7801 Rosewood Lane
Prairie Village, Kansas 66208

Date: April 27, 2020
Location: Zoom Video Communications

Meeting called to order at 6:30 PM

4 people were in attendance:
Mark McNiel, Bob Dimond, Peggy Couch, Margie Lundy

Mark McNiel introduced himself as the Owner of the property and explained what his plans were regarding the proposed garage addition and that the current house is offset on the lot in a way that would have allowed the proposed garage addition to be built in conformance with the previous zoning ordinance. He also added that the neighbor to the north which would be most affected by the proposed garage addition is supportive of the project. Mark also shared that he has received supporting e-mails from neighbors and that he will be soliciting signatures from neighbors that support his project.

Bob Dimond introduced himself as the Architect working on the project and went on to describe the need for a variance which is required because the proposed garage addition doesn’t meet the 20% side yard setback requirements of the current zoning ordinance by less than 2’. However, the proposed garage addition does conform to all other requirements.

There was a brief discussion regarding rain water drainage but it was determined that the run-off is not going to be an issue as all storm water is controlled to remain on the property

Peggy couch and Margie Lundy are on the Neighborhood Association board and were complimentary of the existing property and thought that the proposed garage addition would be a beneficial asset. They stated that they would support the proposed project as presented.

There were no other questions so the meeting was adjourned at 7:00 PM

Meeting notes respectfully submitted by:
Robert Dimond, Jr AIA – Architect
Hi Diane

I am writing to request the support of the Prairie Ridge Home Owners Association for a proposed garage addition for 7801 Rosewood Lane, Prairie Village, KS. 66208.

A neighborhood meeting will be held on April 27th at 6:30 p.m. and I am inviting you all to attend. This meeting will be conducted remotely via Zoom in compliance with the current stay-at-home orders. The purpose of this meeting is to explain the proposed project and to answer any questions and/or concerns you may have regarding the proposed garage addition. Images of the existing garage and proposed garage addition are attached for your review.

An application has been filed with the Board of Zoning Appeals Case #BZA2020-01 related to a proposed garage addition and the hearing is scheduled for Tuesday, May 5 at 6:30 p.m. via another Zoom meeting, so I would appreciate your attendance to the neighborhood meeting.

Please provide me your email addresses for the board members and I will send you a Zoom invite. You are also welcome to give myself or my architect Bob Dimond a call with any questions.

Please advise at your earliest opportunity before Monday 4/27. I appreciate your support in advance.

Warm regards,
Mark

Mark McNiel
913-269-4122

---

Hello Mark,
I received your messages yesterday. Thank you for contacting me.
I am no longer on the PRHA board but have copied this note to the current board members. I did look at the pictures and see your garage addition as an asset to your home. In the past we have generally agreed with the PV codes as they are in line with our changing times.
I will defer to the current board and their opinions
Regards
Dianne Pallanich
Thank you Diane

And hello Jeremy, Margie and Peggy. Please let me know if you would like Bob and I to set up a separate Zoom meeting for you or if you would like to attend the zoom meeting this coming Monday. At present I have not heard anything back from the neighbors, other than verbal approval from them. I plan to get their signatures of approval to the plans in addition to the zoom meeting

Please advise at your earliest opportunity

Thank you

Mark McNiel
M: 913.269.4122

On Apr 26, 2020, at 10:57 AM, Margie <kansaspiggy@kc.rr.com> wrote:

I drove by yesterday...your property is attractive. So with your addition you would take down tree and addition would go right up to where there is a rock ledge along property line?
Margie

On Apr 27, 2020, at 2:45 PM, Jeremy Nelson <jdnelsonke@gmail.com> wrote:

Mark,
This looks like a nice improvement to your home - I really appreciate the way you have integrated it into the style of the house so it looks like a part of the original design. I agree with Margie and Peggy, and I am happy to add my support on the variance as described in the attachment you sent. My one concern was stormwater management due to a tight side yard and increased building footprint, but it seems you are addressing this per your application (no drainage impact to property or neighbor's property), and your decision to use a pervious brick walk in the side yard should aid in this effort. This seems like a smart approach.

Thank you for taking the time to engage your neighbors and neighborhood association. Making that extra effort makes a difference in the long term.
Best,
Jeremy