

**PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
APRIL 1, 2025**

ROLL CALL

The Planning Commission of the City of Prairie Village met in regular session on Tuesday, April 1 at 6:30 p.m. in the Council Chambers at 7700 Mission Road. Chair Greg Wolf called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. with the following members present: Jonathan Birkel, Dave Herron, James Kersten, Melissa Brown, 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; Mitch Dringman, Building Official; Terry O'Toole, Council Liaison; Adam Geffert, City Clerk/Planning Commission Secretary.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Valentino made a motion to approve the minutes of the March 4, 2025, regular Planning Commission meeting as presented. Ms. Brown seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

OLD BUSINESS

None.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

None.

NON-PUBLIC HEARINGS

PC-25-5	Site plan for pool, patio, and garage with exception to lot coverage 6528 Granada Drive Zoning: R-1A Applicant: Dwayne Hodges / Sarah Clutter
---------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Mr. Brewster said that the applicant wished to build a detached garage and pool in the rear yard, as well as cover an existing patio with a roof, and was requesting an exception to the 40% impervious surface limit. The application included a 15.5' x 40' pool and a 16' x 24' detached garage. The existing home was built in 2015, prior to the neighborhood design standards and prior to the lot impervious coverage limits.

The property is located mid-block on the south side of Granada Drive between Mission Road and Roe Avenue, and is zoned R-1A. The block features larger R-1A lots, 110' to 130' wide and approximately 16,000 to 20,000 square feet. The subject lot is 17,380 square feet, and has a drainage easement and paved drainage channel along the back of the lot that runs along the rear lot lines of all lots on the south side of Granada Drive. This adds to the impervious surface calculation of the lot and also reduces the amount of the lot to be used for typical back yard functions.

Mr. Brewster said that based on a plan review of the proposed pool and deck area, the application did not meet the 40% lot coverage limit, as it totals 43.96% (lot size = 17,380 s.f.; existing impervious coverage 6,636 s.f.; proposed pool/garage = 1,004 s.f.). However, he noted that public works had a policy to exclude drainage channels from the impervious calculation, which results in the removal of 381 s.f. from the existing impervious coverage. As a result, the effective impervious total for the request is 7,259 s.f., (41.7%), or 307 s.f. above the permitted amount.

Section 19.06.015(b)(2)b of the City's zoning regulations provides that the Planning Commission may grant exceptions to the total lot impervious surface standards based on the neighborhood design exception criteria, and provided that public works approves a drainage study. Mr. Brewster said that a drainage permit associated with this application had already been approved by public works. The criteria state the following:

- (1) The exception shall only apply to the design standards in this section, and not be granted to allow something that is specifically prohibited in other regulations.
- (2) Any exception dealing with the placement of the building is consistent with sound planning, urban design and engineering practices when considering the site and its context within the neighborhood.
- (3) The placement and orientation of the main mass, accessory elements, garages and driveways considers the high points and low points of the grade and locates them in such a way to minimize the perceived massing of the building from the streetscape and abutting lots.
- (4) Any exception affecting the design and massing of the building is consistent with the common characteristics of the architectural style selected for the building.
- (5) The requested exception improves the quality design of the building and site beyond what could be achieved by meeting the standards - primarily considering the character and building styles of the neighborhood and surrounding properties, the integrity of the architectural style of the proposed building, and the relationship of the internal functions of the building to the site, streetscape and adjacent property.
- (6) The exception will equally or better serve the design objectives stated in section 19.06.025(a) and the intent stated for the particular standard being altered.

Mr. Brewster stated that the specific exceptions for lot coverage primarily impact criteria (2), and the additional requirement for public works to approve a drainage study. The lot impervious coverage standard is primarily to address stormwater issues. In contrast, the "building coverage" standard addresses the building footprint and scale of structures in relation to the overall lot size and in relation to adjacent lot and building patterns. He

added that the building coverage of the lot is below 30% even with the addition of the detached garage and the covered patio (existing building coverage = 3,652 s.f., or 21%; proposed building coverage = 4,370 s.f., or 25.14%). Therefore, approval of the drainage permit is the more critical criteria for lot coverage exceptions, and in this case public works has approved a drainage permit associated with this application.

The following site plan review criteria are generally reviewed in conjunction with the specific neighborhood design exception criteria:

A. Generally.

- 1. The plan meets all applicable standards**
- 2. The plan implements any specific principles or policies of the comprehensive plan that are applicable to the area or specific project.**
- 3. The plan does not present any other apparent risks to the public health, safety, or welfare of the community.**

Mr. Brewster stated that the application met all standards other than the 40% impervious coverage standard. The home was built in 2015, prior to the adoption of the neighborhood design standards and lot impervious coverage standards. In addition, the impervious coverage standards anticipated circumstances similar to this application and include a specific process and criteria for the Planning Commission to consider exceptions.

B. Site Design and Engineering.

- 1. The plan provides safe and easy access and internal circulation considering the site, the block and other surrounding connections, and appropriately balances vehicle and pedestrian needs.**
- 2. The plan provides or has existing capacity for utilities to serve the proposed development.**
- 3. The plan provides adequate stormwater runoff.**
- 4. The plan provides proper grading considering the prevailing grades and the relationship of adjacent uses.**

The site is currently served by streets and utilities, and this plan does not affect any access or utility issues. The site includes a drainage easement and paved drainage channel on the rear of the property, which according to public works policy can be excluded from the impervious coverage calculation, reducing the extent of the exception. The applicant submitted a drainage permit which has been approved by public works.

C. Building Design.

- 1. The location, orientation, scale, and massing of the building creates appropriate relationships to the streetscape and to adjacent properties.**
- 2. The selection and application of materials will promote proper maintenance and quality appearances over time.**

3. The architectural design reflects a consistent theme and design approach. Specifically, the scale, proportion, forms and features, and selection and allocation of materials reflect a coordinated, unified whole.
4. The building reinforces the character of the area and reflects a compatible architectural relationship to adjacent buildings. Specifically, the scale, proportion, forms and features, and materials of adjacent buildings inform choices on the proposed building.

The proposed accessory structure and roof addition to the patio are located on remote portions of the site, are consistent with all building design standards, and complement the existing building. The application does not need an exception for any of the building design standards or criteria other than impervious surface coverage, and does not have a negative impact on the building design criteria permit.

D. Landscape Design.

1. The plan creates an attractive aesthetic environment and improves relationships to the streetscape and adjacent properties.
2. The plan enhances the environmental and ecological functions of un-built portions of the site.
3. The plan reduces the exposure and adverse impact of more intense activities or components of the site or building.

Other than the impervious surface requirements, the pool and proposed detached garage meet all other standards and all proposed elements are on the rear portion of the lot. The application would not have significant impacts on the streetscape or surrounding property, and do not impact the landscape design criteria.

Mr. Brewster said staff recommended approval of this site plan with the lot coverage exception based on the following considerations:

- The limited nature of the exception (approximately 1.7% or 307 s.f. from the standard) and the negligible impact it will have on overall stormwater policies for the City.
- Public works has approved a drainage permit for the project.
- The property has a drainage easement and drainage channel in the back yard reducing some of the usable space.
- The original house was built in 2015 prior to the implementation of both the neighborhood design standards and lot impervious coverage standards, and the application meets the scenarios that were anticipated to warrant consideration of exceptions to those standards based on an approved drainage permit.

Applicant and property owner Sarah Clutter was present to discuss the application.

Mr. Kersten asked if a concrete seating area or deck would be built around the proposed swimming pool. Ms. Clutter said that there was an existing patio near the pool, but there would be grass between the patio and the pool.

Mr. Valentino asked if the proposed pool size was typical relative to other pools. Mr. Dringman said that it was similar in size to other pools that had been approved by the City.

Mr. Valentino asked whether Ms. Clutter would need to come back before the Planning Commission if she decided to install a pool apron or deck in the future. Mr. Brewster said that further impervious surface additions would require approval from the Planning Commission.

Ms. Brown noted that having a concrete surface between the pool and patio would be preferable to grass, and in order to avoid having to come back to the Planning Commission again, the applicant should consider adding it as part of the current project.

Mr. Herron suggested that a 40' x 3' concrete addition between the pool and patio, totaling 120 square feet, would be appropriate. Mr. Brewster noted that adding it would only increase the coverage exception being requested by 0.7%.

After further discussion, Ms. Temple made a motion to approve the lot coverage exception to the extent shown on the site plan submitted with the application, with an allowance of up to 120 square feet of additional impervious surfaces beyond what was represented in the site plan. The motion was seconded by Ms. Brown and passed unanimously.

OTHER BUSINESS

Annual review of Planning Commission bylaws

Mr. Geffert stated that per Article 6, Section 3 of the bylaws, the Planning Commission “shall review, amend, and approve” the bylaws each year. He said that amendments had last been made in 2023.

Mr. Valentino asked about holding meetings virtually when necessary. Ms. Lee noted that state statute required that a physical space, such as the council chambers, needed to be made available for the public to attend a meeting, even if the meeting was virtual. Ms. Brown added that allowing out-of-area applicants to attend remotely should be considered. Ms. Lee said that virtual attendance was an option for applicants, though it was not specifically addressed in the bylaws. Mr. Wolf asked that language be added to the bylaws regarding virtual participation by both applicants and commission members when necessary. He suggested adopting a hybrid-meeting process similar to the one used by the Johnson County Board of County Commissioners.

Ms. Lee stated that staff had also considered moving the meeting start time from 7:00 p.m. to earlier in the evening. She noted that other cities in the region currently held Planning Commission meetings both before and after 7:00 p.m., and said staff recommended beginning meetings at 6:00 p.m. If a BZA application needed to be

considered, the meeting would still begin at 6:00 p.m., and the Planning Commission portion of the meeting would start after the conclusion of the BZA meeting.

Ms. Lee said that a review of fence regulations and exceptions would also be considered at an upcoming meeting based on the request of commission members. Mr. Valentino stated that a review of massing, especially for structures near lot lines, should be reviewed as well.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to come before the commission, Mr. Wolf adjourned the meeting at 7:21 p.m.

Adam Geffert
City Clerk/Planning Commission Secretary