

**PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
AUGUST 4, 2026**

ROLL CALL

The Planning Commission of the City of Prairie Village met in regular session on Tuesday, August 4 at 6:00 p.m. in the council chambers at 7700 Mission Road. Chair Greg Wolf called the meeting to order with the following members present: Jonathan Birkel, James Kersten, Melissa Temple, and Jeffrey Valentino.

The following individuals were present in their advisory capacity to the planning commission: Chris Brewster, Multistudio; Nickie Lee, Deputy City Administrator; Nathan Vallette, Council Liaison; Mitch Dringman, Building Official; Keith Bredehoeft, Public Works Director; Adam Geffert, City Clerk/Planning Commission Secretary.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Birkel made a motion to approve the minutes of the July 7, 2026, regular planning commission meeting. Mr. Kersten seconded the motion, which passed 3-0, with Ms. Temple and Mr. Valentino in abstention.

OLD BUSINESS

None.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

None.

NON-PUBLIC HEARINGS

None.

OTHER BUSINESS

Presentation of the 2027 capital improvement plan

Mr. Bredehoeft gave a presentation on the 2027-2031 capital improvement plan (CIP). He noted that the city council approved the CIP on an annual basis as part of the budget process. The presentation included information about active and completed 2026 projects as well as those approved for 2027 in categories such as street repair, drainage repair, park improvements, and the municipal complex project. Information about funding for planned projects from 2028 - 2031 was also shared.

Mr. Wolf asked for information about how projects are bid out. Mr. Bredehoeft said that generally a set of project plans would be created by public works staff with the assistance of consultants, and then published through a bid notice on both the city's website and legal publications. Some projects, such as street repair, were bid over multiple years with a single contractor.

Mr. Bredehoeft also discussed the 83rd Street from Mission Road to Nall Avenue project, which had recently been approved by the city council. He noted that Village Vision 2.0 identified this section of 83rd Street as a "village connector" and suggested several concepts for the area, such as more green space, on-street parking, pedestrian lighting, and better pedestrian connections. Public works assembled a team of council members and business representatives to help determine what would be best for the corridor.

After reviewing options, the team generally agreed that on-street parking was not necessary and that access needed to be maintained as it currently functioned. The preferred options included adding a pedestrian connection approximately mid-block and adding a large pedestrian island. Mr. Bredehoeft said that staff also recommended minor geometric changes and modified some lengths of the right turn lanes. The team was concerned about the proposed changes and wanted to ensure they did not negatively affect traffic. Staff reviewed the options with the city's traffic engineering consultant, and it was determined that given traffic in the area, the proposed changes would work well. The final design would include details of landscape items as well as the addition of pedestrian level lighting along the north side of 83rd Street and at the pedestrian crossing.

Mr. Valentino expressed disappointment about the outcome of the 83rd Street project, noting that more significant changes recommended in Village Vision 2.0 were not incorporated. In particular, he shared concern about excessive vehicle speeds on major city thoroughfares. Mr. Vallette noted that he had been a member of the subcommittee, and stated that many of the members were hesitant to make some of the suggested changes due to cost, safety concerns, and comments shared by residents in the area.

Discussion of Senate Bill 418

Ms. Lee stated that the Kansas Legislature passed Senate Bill 418, the "by right housing development act", in March 2026, and it became effective on July 1, 2026. The bill impacts how Kansas municipalities regulate and review specific types of housing and affects both building codes and zoning authority. She added that city staff had been reviewing how the bill impacts Prairie Village zoning regulations, and how other local municipalities are reacting to the bill and considering what changes (if any) may be necessary.

The bill includes some things that are clear and have direct connections to how Prairie Village zoning standards, review, and permitting are impacted. However, the bill also includes several other provisions that are either not clear or have no direct connection to how the city currently approaches planning and zoning for specific types of housing.

Mr. Brewster said that the purpose of the meeting was to have a preliminary discussion with the planning commission on SB 418 and its potential effects on planning and zoning in the city. The discussion will focus on three things:

1. How the city's comprehensive plan, Village Vision 2.0, addresses the types of housing that could be affected by SB 418.
2. How the city's zoning regulations currently address the types of housing that could be affected by SB 418 (the city amended several zoning districts in 2024 in response to some of the housing policies in Village Vision 2.0 - primarily R-2, R-3, R-4, and MXD).
3. Preliminary observations and possible responses for compliance with SB 418

SB 418 SUMMARY

Mr. Brewster stated that the following items reflected planning staff's initial observations on how the bill could affect the city's zoning regulations:

- *Housing Types.* The bill addresses "neighborhood-scale" housing, specifically accessory dwellings, detached houses, duplexes, and townhouses. It particularly elevates "single-family housing" considerations within all zoning districts.
- *"By Right Housing."* The bill uses the term "by right housing," which means that housing projects that meet all applicable requirements must be approved administratively by city staff. This is already common practice in Prairie Village, where many housing types can be approved without discretionary review in each zoning district. "By right" does not eliminate local regulations. Instead, it limits the use of discretionary approval processes, such as site plan review by a commission, design review boards, or planned zoning approvals, for certain housing projects. However, questions remain about how the bill would be interpreted, including which local regulations would still apply and which housing types would be covered.
- *Procedural Elements.* The bill intends to streamline review for certain types of housing through the following procedural adjustments:
 - The statutory protest petition is eliminated if a property owner is requesting a rezoning to a single-family district.
 - Some applications have time limits for a city decision, ranging from 15 days to 90 days depending on the type of application.
- *"Qualifying Home."* The bill designates a particular housing type as a "qualifying home" and establishes some specific requirements or limitations on how cities may regulate that type.
 - A qualifying home is:

- Single-family homes less than 2,500 square feet of livable area (excluding garage and basement)
- Constructed on its own separate lot or parcel
- Meets all zoning codes and land use restrictions
- Does not require federal or state discharge permits or stormwater studies
- No net increase in impervious surface that would worsen drainage into special flood hazard area
- Not located in a historic district
- The following special preemptions apply to qualifying homes:
 - Use of the 2018 International Residential Code (IRC)
 - Permitted on lots as small as 3,000 square feet, except for application of reasonable setbacks
 - May only require one-car garages
 - Can only apply one-side of architectural finish

Mr. Brewster said that staff estimated approximately 1/3 of homes typically being built in Prairie Village would be considered qualifying homes in a given period, and that these homes are typically built on lots smaller than 8,000 square feet. He added that platting, subdivision standards, floodplain restrictions, stormwater permitting and other infrastructure standards were not preempted by the bill.

Mr. Brewster provided a summary of the Village Vision 2.0 comprehensive plan, and compared the developmental principles and policy plans to the provisions of the bill. He noted the following clear impacts of the bill on housing in the city, and how they related to existing regulations:

1. The city must apply the 2018 building code to all “qualifying houses” (under 2.5K square feet).	<i>Through other parallel efforts the city has elected to adopt the 2018 code for all residential development, with some local amendments.</i>
2. The city can no longer allow a protest petition against a proposed rezoning to a single-family district.	<i>The zoning ordinance currently applies the state-required protest petitions to any rezoning; staff will interpret this as no longer applicable to any rezoning action for R-1A and R-1B.</i>
3. The city must allow detached houses (“single family”) in any residential district.	<i>The Prairie Village zoning ordinance currently allows this in all districts except the R-4; the code should be amended to allow “detached houses” in the R-4 district.</i>

Mr. Brewster also shared other ways that the bill could affect the city’s approach to housing in the city, and noted options for each point:

1.	Where do we need to allow detached houses ("single-family") on 3K square foot lots?	<i>The ordinance currently allows 3K s.f. lots in the R-3 and MXD districts, and in other districts through planned zoning applications.</i>
2.	Do we need to allow accessory living quarters ("accessory dwelling units") on all lots where detached houses are allowed, and what other standards or limitations can apply?	<i>The ordinance currently allows ALQs in all districts that permit detached houses, but they are subject to several additional limitations.</i>
3.	Do we need to allow duplexes and townhouses (also defined as "single-family" in SB 418) in any district where detached houses are permitted?	<i>The ordinance currently prohibits duplexes in R-1A & R-1B; it allows townhouses by planned zoning in R-2, and prohibits them in R-1A and R-1B.</i>
4.	Do we need to allow detached houses in commercial districts? (i.e. Since we allow mixed-use residential, we now also need to allow "single-family" housing in that district.)	<i>The ordinance currently only allows residential on upper stories of buildings with ground-level non-residential uses in C-1 & C-2.</i>

1. Where does the city need to allow detached houses ("single-family") on 3,000 square foot lots?

Options:

- Do nothing or address if any circumstances arise
 - Add detached houses and 3,000 sq. ft. minimum lots to the R-4 district
 - Reduce the R-2 duplex lot to 6,000 sq. ft. minimum and allow 3,000 sq. ft. detached houses in R-2
 - Reduce R-1A and R-1B minimum lot sizes for qualifying homes
2. Does the city need to allow accessory living quarters ("accessory dwelling units") on all lots where detached houses are allowed, and what other standards or limitations can the city apply?

Options:

- Do nothing or address if any circumstances arise
 - Consider removing some ALQ limitations:
 - Allow ALQs in detached buildings
 - Allow larger detached buildings (greater than 576 sq. ft.)
 - Allow non-family members to live in ALQs
 - Remove the owner occupancy requirement
 - Add ALQs to duplex and townhouse build types
3. Does the city need to allow duplexes and townhouses (also defined as "single-family" in SB 418) in any district where detached houses are permitted?

Options:

- Do nothing or address if any circumstances arise
- Add duplexes to the R-4 district and on 6,000 sq. ft. minimum lots

- Add duplexes to R-1A and R-1B for qualifying homes
 - Add townhouses to R-1A and R-1B for qualifying homes
4. Does the city need to allow detached houses in commercial districts (since mixed-use residential is allowed, the city would now need to allow “single-family” housing in that district)?

Options:

- Do nothing or address if any circumstances arise
- Remove mixed-use residential from C- districts and/or allow it only through a planned development review
- Recharacterize “mixed-use” building as a non-residential use, and position residential units only as an accessory commercial use
- Add detached houses and duplexes to C- districts; consider maximum lot sizes to ensure compact, walkable formats

After discussion, Mr. Brewster said that next steps for staff would include continuing to monitor peer community responses, further review and discussion of options, and consideration of policy direction from the city council. Any potential updates would be returned to the planning commission in a study session or public hearing.

Ms. Lee stated that the only metro-area city that was currently making changes based on the bill was Roeland Park, whereas other cities were still in the consideration phase.

Mr. Birkel asked whether any approved changes to the regulations would need to be changed again if state laws were amended in the future. Mr. Brewster said that it was unclear at the present time how future legislation could affect changes made because of the bill.

Mr. Kersten asked if Mr. Brewster was aware of any litigation against the bill. Mr. Brewster said that he was not aware of any yet, and noted that the bill was still fairly new.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to come before the commission, Mr. Wolf adjourned the meeting at 7:27 p.m.

Adam Geffert
City Clerk/Planning Commission Secretary