

**PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
DECEMBER 6, 2022**

ROLL CALL

The Planning Commission of the City of Prairie Village met in regular session on Tuesday, December 6, at 6:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers at 7700 Mission Road. Chair Greg Wolf called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. with the following members present: Jon Birkel, James Breneman, Patrick Lenahan, Melissa Brown, Nancy Wallerstein and Jeffrey Valentino.

The following individuals were present in their advisory capacity to the Planning Commission: Chris Brewster, Multistudio; Nickie Lee, Deputy City Administrator; Greg Shelton, Council Liaison; Mitch Dringman, Building Official; Wes Jordan, City Administrator; Adam Geffert, City Clerk/Planning Commission Secretary.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Breneman moved for the approval of the minutes of the October 11, 2022, regular Planning Commission meeting. Mrs. Wallerstein seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Mr. Breneman moved for the approval of the October 25, 2022, Planning Commission work session meeting summary. Mr. Birkel seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

None

NON-PUBLIC HEARINGS

PC2022-126	Lot Split 2211 W. 71 st Street Zoning: R-1B Applicant: Kevin Green, Kevin Green Homes
------------	---

Mr. Brewster stated that the applicant was requesting to split an existing lot into two lots to allow two single-family structures to be built. The existing lot is approximately 125.5' wide by 130' deep, resulting in a lot that is greater than 16,000 square feet. The proposal would split the lot down the middle for two lots that are 62.74' wide, and approximately 8,156 square feet each. The existing house would be torn down to allow for two new

houses. Mr. Brewster noted that the lot was platted prior to adoption of the Prairie Village zoning ordinances and subdivision regulations, and that other lots in the area ranged in width from 60' to 100', with some irregular lots being larger. Additionally, there are several lots to the west and east on the adjacent block that are 60' wide. The property is zoned R-1B, which has a minimum lot width of 60'.

Mr. Brewster said that the applicant had submitted a survey as part of the application which specified that the lot would be divided into two equal lots. Each resulting lot would be capable of being developed according to R-1B zoning standards. Mr. Brewster added that staff recommended approval of the lot split subject to the following conditions:

1. The lots are assigned addresses and lot identification numbers acceptable to the Johnson County Land Records requirements
2. Prior to recording, a note be added to the survey plat that the existing structure over the proposed lot line is to be demolished, and the split is subject to approval and execution of a demolition permit

Applicant Kevin Green from Kevin Green Homes, 6610 Royal Street, Pleasant Valley, MO, was present to discuss the application. Mr. Green stated that he agreed to the conditions for approval.

Mrs. Wallerstein asked why the application needed to be approved by the Planning Commission if it met all required criteria. Mr. Brewster stated that zoning regulations required the Planning Commission to approve all lot splits.

Mr. Valentino made a motion to approve PC2022-126 with the conditions listed by staff. Mr. Breneman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

PC2022-127 Site Plan for Monument Sign
5250 W. 94th Terrace
Zoning: CP-1
Applicant: Lee Mendenhall, Kansas City Signs

Mr. Brewster said that the applicant was requesting approval of a monument sign for a 1.11-acre office building on 94th Terrace, just northeast of 95th Street and Nall Avenue. The proposed sign would replace an existing sign in a large lawn area to accommodate the primary business and additional tenants.

Mr. Brewster noted that all new monument signs required approval by the Planning Commission, and that zoning regulations required the following specific standards for signs in non-residential districts:

- One sign per street lot
- 20 square feet size maximum
- 5' height maximum

- 3' setback from all property lines or 12' from street, whichever is greater, with associated landscape
- Base on at least 75% of plan, and materials that complement the building or other site elements

The proposed sign would sit approximately 6.5' beyond the sidewalk and 16' from the street curb. It is less than 20 square feet (19.36 square feet sign area) and sits on a 4.8' wide by 5' high black aluminum cabinet with aluminum skirt base. It has a white background and includes a main sign for the primary tenant and eight replaceable spaces for additional tenants. There are no plans for the sign to be illuminated.

Mr. Brewster said that the application generally met all standards, and recommended approval subject to the following condition:

1. All replaceable signs have a consistent appearance according to Section 19.48.080(d) of the City's zoning regulations, and ideally a white background, consistent font, and the same dark lettering.

Applicant Lee Mendenhall with Kansas City Signs, 8248 NW 101st Terrace, Suite 13, Kansas City, MO, was present to discuss the application.

Mrs. Wallerstein noted that there was no landscaping around the sign and asked that a condition be added requiring a landscape plan to be submitted for review by the City's landscape architect along with the sign permit application. Mr. Mendenhall agreed to the additional condition.

Mr. Breneman made a motion to approve PC2022-127 with the condition listed by staff as well as Mrs. Wallerstein's additional condition. Mr. Lenahan seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

PC2022-128	Site Plan Exception for Fence 7433 Village Drive Zoning: R-1B Applicant: Susan Robinson and Kyle Hill
------------	--

Mr. Brewster said that the applicant was requesting to replace an existing fence that did not conform to zoning standards. Specifically, the request is for an exception to the required setback on Village Drive, allowing the construction of a new black steel picket fence in the same location (ranging from approximately 6' to 8' from the property line along the street rather than 17.5' back).

Mr. Brewster noted that the property is a corner lot on the southwest corner of a short cul-de-sac in the 7400 block of Village Drive. The cul-de-sac (also named Village Drive) serves four houses that sit back off the main Village Drive; one corner lot fronts the cul-de-sac on the west side, and the subject corner lot fronts the main Village Drive on the east side, with the side and rear yard abutting the cul-de-sac.

According to zoning regulations, this is defined as a street-facing side yard that abuts the front yard of the adjacent house to the southeast, which requires that the fence to be set back the greater of 15' or half the adjoining lot's front setback. In this case, the adjoining lot's front setback is 35', requiring the fence to be set back 17.5'. The fence that existed prior to the reconstruction on the lot was approximately 6' to 8' from the property line on that side, and approximately 11' to 13' from the curb edge of the cul-de-sac. Since the proposed fenced area is in the side and rear there are no restrictions on the design of the fence, other than the general height and design standards.

Mr. Brewster said that the proposed fence location would allow better utilization of the side and rear yard based on the corner location and the orientation of the house. Further, when comparing the proposed location to the location required by the ordinance, there would be no significant negative impacts on the public streetscape or the property most impacted to the southeast. The application would otherwise meet all site plan review criteria and fence standards applicable to the site. As a result, Mr. Brewster said that staff recommended approval of the fence site plan with the exception.

Property owners Susan Robinson and Kyle Hill were present to discuss the application.

Mr. Birkel asked if the location of the driveway would change with the construction of the new home. Mr. Dringman said that it would.

Mr. Valentino made a motion to approve PC2022-128 as presented. Mr. Lenahan seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

OTHER BUSINESS

Approval of 2023 Meeting Dates

Mr. Birkel made a motion to approve the 2023 meeting date calendar as presented. Mr. Breneman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Discussion of Ad-Hoc Housing Committee Recommendations

Mr. Brewster stated that based on the commission's direction at its October 25, 2022 work session, the topics to be prioritized for discussion at the meeting included the following:

- Key terms and common understanding
- R-3, R-4, MXD and C-district zoning
 - Current situation
 - Options and opportunities
- Options for public engagement
- Additional discussion

Mr. Brewster began by defining the terms being used in the housing discussion that were taken from the Village Vision 2.0 comprehensive plan, as well as the City's current zoning regulations and general planning and policy resources.

- “Attainable” or “affordable” housing: Terms that reflect the concept that housing costs should take up less than 30% of a household's gross annual income. Several categories are then gauged on rent or mortgage costs compared to the area median income (AMI) of a particular geographic area (i.e., the midpoint of all incomes). A more complete framing includes the following housing price points:
 - Extremely low: less than 30% AMI
 - Very low: 30% to 50% AMI
 - Low: 50% - 80% AMI

Village Vision 2.0 defines “workforce housing” as below 80% AMI, but the term often includes the “attainable” category in some markets or covers the 50% to 120% range:

- Attainable: 80% -120% AMI
- Moderate price: 120% - 200% AMI
- High price: 200%-300% AMI

The ranges are based on housing price points and are independent of any housing type or building type (i.e., a detached house can be in the “very low income” category, and an “apartment unit” can be in the “luxury” category). Amounts fluctuate over time based on market conditions, income trends, housing age and condition, housing and community amenities, and real estate values. Additionally, the ranges of categories may differ by market and are typically defined regionally or locally to reflect specific policy targets or priorities.

Mr. Brewster said that there were currently no policies or targets for any category established in Prairie Village. In Village Vision 2.0, the stated goal of the policy is to “diversify housing in terms of size, type, and price point,” with the understanding that doing so improves the ability for the overall housing stock to cover more of these ranges over time.

- “Missing middle housing”: A term used to describe a range of small-scale, multi-unit residential buildings within the following parameters:
 - Height: 2 to 4 stories
 - Lot size: 1,500 to 14,000 square feet
 - Units: 2 to 12

Village Vision 2.0 categorizes “missing middle” based on the following building types:

- Duplex - small lot: A residential building with a scale and massing consistent with a detached house, with two principal dwelling units. Each may share a common entrance, or where there are separate entrances, they are either coordinated in a single entrance feature, or one is subordinate to the other to maintain the scale and massing of a house.

- Multi-unit house: A residential building with the scale and massing like a detached house with three or four principal dwelling units. Each may share a common entrance, or where each has a separate entrance, they are either coordinated with a single entrance feature, or others are more discrete to maintain the scale and massing of a house.
 - Row house: A series of attached dwelling units, each with their own separate frontage and entrance, typically orienting to the same common lot frontage or open space.
 - Apartment - small lot: A small-scale, residential building with multiple dwelling units that share a common entrance oriented to the front of the building and lot.
 - Live / work: A building with separate residential and non-residential areas that share a common wall or floor between the residential and non-residential areas, and where the non-residential portion makes up no more than 50% of the floor area.
 - Mixed-use - small lot: A small-scale, non-residential building with ground level commercial or office uses, and dwelling units as accessories to the principal non-residential uses on the upper floors or behind the ground level commercial or office uses.
- “Accessory Living Quarter” - The zoning ordinance currently defines this as: “a subordinate dwelling unit within a single-family dwelling that provides basic requirements for cooking, living, sleeping, eating and sanitation. ALQs may not be subdivided or otherwise segregated in ownership from the primary unit.” ALQs are allowed in R-1A and R-1B zones subject to specific standards in the zoning regulations. This definition is similar to the one typically used for “Accessory Dwelling Units” other than the requirement that the dwelling unit be attached or “within” a single-family unit.
 - “Accessory Dwelling Unit” - A subordinate dwelling unit that is associated with and on the same lot as the principal dwelling unit, that may be attached to the principal building, internal to the principal building (i.e. attic or basement apartment), or in a permitted detached building.

Mr. Brewster next provided information about R-3 and R-4 zoning districts, noting the following:

- Current zoning regulations require the following:
 - Minimum lot size:
 - R-3: 2,500 square feet per unit
 - R-4: 3,500 square feet per unit
 - Most existing 3 and 4-unit houses are on larger lots and result in two larger attached houses
 - No specific building type or design standards in R-3 and R-4
- Opportunities to create more options:

- Reduce the per-unit lot size (i.e., allow 3 or 4-unit buildings on 6,000 to 10,000 square foot lots)
- Include maximum lot sizes (i.e., require more compact formats in some areas)
- Apply neighborhood design standards or similar design for compatibility

Mr. Birkel asked how transportation is addressed in the proposed recommendations. Mr. Brewster stated that the Center for Neighborhood Technology had a transportation affordability metric which could be helpful. Mr. Birkel also asked for clarification on the goals of the conversation. Mr. Brewster responded that the goals were in line with those found in the comprehensive plan, which are to diversity housing options and maintain the integrity of Prairie Village neighborhoods.

Mr. Wolf asked if there would be a parking requirement for smaller lots. Mr. Brewster said that the current requirements would still be in place, though the recommendation would be to place parking areas in a location that is not visible from the street.

Mr. Lenahan noted that the information presented was likely too technical for the public and suggested that using pictures instead of illustrations would be helpful.

After further discussion, Mr. Brewster shared information about C-0, C-1, C-2 and MXD zoning districts, noting the following:

- Current zoning regulations require the following:
 - C-0 allows residential buildings subject to R-1 through R-3 standards; no specific mixed-use building standards
 - C-1 and C-2 districts do not permit residential uses
 - MXD subject to discretionary plan review
- Opportunities to create more options:
 - Incorporate all other R-3 and R-4 options in C-0 districts
 - Allow small-scale and multi-unit buildings in C-1 and C-2
 - Create standards for different scales of mixed-use buildings
 - Investigate smaller application of MXD zoning (i.e., infill within current commercial zoning)
 - Improve criteria or consider baseline standards for smaller-scale mixed-use buildings in MXD

Mr. Valentino stated that sharing detailed maps and visual examples of each zoning district during public comment sessions would be helpful for residents to better understand what is being proposed.

Mrs. Wallerstein asked what the current process is if a developer was seeking to put a residential project in a commercial district. Mr. Brewster stated that no such proposals had been received, but that staff would let the developer know that a rezoning to a residential or mixed-use district would be required first. He added that staff would advise developers if a proposed project would be difficult to get approved by the Planning

Commission and City Council. Ms. Brown said that rezoning would likely not be seen in a favorable light by residents. She asked if staff could provide examples of other cities that had made similar changes, and what processes were used to accomplish them.

Mr. Wolf noted that the Planning Commission was not a legislative body, and that the options being considered needed to be sanctioned by the Council rather than simply making zoning changes to allow for different types of development in specific areas. He added that the cost of land in the City made it difficult for developers to build more affordable housing without economic incentives.

Mr. Jordan suggested that a joint work session of the Planning Commission and City Council could be beneficial to discuss goals more thoroughly. Mr. Wolf asked if any commissioners were supportive of a work session with the Council, and all agreed with the proposal. Mr. Jordan stated that staff would provide potential dates for the work session, after which a public input session would be scheduled.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to come before the Commission, Mr. Wolf adjourned the meeting at 7:52 p.m.

Adam Geffert
City Clerk/Planning Commission Secretary