

**PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES  
JUNE 3, 2025**

**ROLL CALL**

The Planning Commission of the City of Prairie Village met in regular session on Tuesday, June 3 at 7:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers at 7700 Mission Road. Chair Greg Wolf called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. with the following members present: Jonathan Birkel, Dave Herron, Melissa Brown, and Jeffrey Valentino.

The following individuals were present in their advisory capacity to the Planning Commission: Chris Brewster, Multistudio; Nickie Lee, Deputy City Administrator; 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 April 1 2025, regular planning commission meeting as presented. Mr. Herron seconded the motion, which passed 4-0, with Mr. Birkel in abstention.**

**OLD BUSINESS**

None.

**PUBLIC HEARINGS**

None.

**NON-PUBLIC HEARINGS**

PC-25-6	Site plan for installation of temporary lighting 7500 Mission Road Zoning: R-1A Applicant: Kent Glaser
---------	---

Mr. Brewster said that the applicant was proposing to use temporary lighting on the northwest field at Shawnee Mission East High School for athletic practices. The need is generated by health and safety concerns for athletes during heat events and is in furtherance of a Kansas State High School Athletic Association (KSHSAA) policy. The applicant anticipates needing to use lighting in August and September when weather conditions would prevent practice during normal after school times (3:00 p.m. to 6:00

p.m.). During these periods, early morning practices are most favorable to the health and safety of the student athletes and would meet the KSHSAA policy.

The limited periods where risk is the highest is based on a combination of heat and humidity (“wet globe” bulb temperature), when readings exceed 87.8 degrees; restrictions on normal practice begin at readings of 84.7 degrees. Mr. Brewster said that the applicant had supplied anticipated utilization based on past years’ records and was requesting to use the lights between 5:40 a.m. and 7:40 a.m. on excessive heat days (noting that sunrise is typically around 6:30 a.m. during this period and lights may not be needed long after the sun rises).

Mr. Brewster noted that the application was a renewal of a similar site plan request for temporary lighting that was approved at the July 2024 planning commission meeting for the 2024 summer and fall practice season. The city received one complaint from an adjacent neighbor during a lighting event and the applicant adjusted the lighting in response to the complaint. There were no further complaints after this adjustment.

Key specifications for the proposed light units are:

- EPA Tier 4 engine - Yamar 2TNV
- Average sound 60dB(A) at 7 meters away
- 4 320W LED bulbs
- 211,200 LM - Luminous flux (power at the light source)
- 9,436 square meter illuminated area (1 lux)
- 27.34 max height (8,834 mm)

These specifications generally produce an effective lighting range of approximately 200’ from the source and direction of the light fixture according to typical industry specifications.

Mr. Brewster said that zoning regulations used performance criteria for all outdoor lighting, which required light levels to not exceed 0.0 footcandles when adjacent to a residential zoned district and 0.2 footcandles with adjacent to a non-residential zoned district, measured five feet above grade at the property line. A variety of standards for specific types of lighting also impact what types of lights may be permitted within this broad performance standard. The standards also have two exceptions which are applicable to this specific circumstance. Outdoor sports facilities and park lighting is independently reviewed by the planning commission, which may approve lights that do not strictly conform to the standards. Additionally, temporary outdoor lighting that does not conform to the standards may be permitted by the planning commission subject to three specific criteria:

1. Public and/or private benefits from the lighting
2. Any annoyance or safety problems that may result
3. Duration of temporary nonconforming lighting

Mr. Brewster stated that the proposal would include four temporary lighting units located at each diagonal corner of the field facing inward. The lightning is supported by a generator unit and the lights extend to approximately 27' high. The closest of the proposed locations is approximately 175' from the property line and approximately 280' from the nearest residence (west across Delmar), and more than 300' from most other residences. Additionally, further to the south on Delmar and north across 75<sup>th</sup> Street is partially screened from this area by grades between the street and the field.

Specific lighting plans, and this particular exception to the lighting standards, require a site plan reviewed by the planning commission. The following are the site plan review criteria, supplemented with the specific lighting standards where applicable:

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 said that the applicant had proposed only using the lights in limited situations when the health and safety of student athletes could be at risk based on KSHSAA policies. The proposed lighting is a significant distance from the perimeter of the property, and light levels and sound levels from the generators appear to be within industry standards and comparable to city ordinances measuring both light and noise. Additionally, the temporary and mobile nature of the proposed plan could allow for adjustments in the use of the equipment, should lighting or noise have any unexpected impacts beyond what the ordinance or limited exceptions would allow. Further, the applicants proposed use of the lights would be limited to the lower field area, between the hours of 5:40 a.m. and 7:40 a.m., and only to facilitate practices on days that exceed heat conditions during normal practice hours according to the KSHAA policy (likely in August and September).

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

No specific changes to access and parking are proposed with this plan. The proposed lighting units are mobile and temporary, powered by their own generator and engines and do not require any utility connections.

### 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

There are no building plans associated with this plan.

### 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

Mr. Brewster stated that the proposed equipment is mobile and temporary and is not significantly different than other accessory equipment commonly used by the school for operations and co-curricular activities. Therefore, no specific site design, landscape, or screening is required. However, it is anticipated that due to the temporary nature of this proposal lights will be lowered when not in use, and equipment will be stored in a discrete location when not in operation and removed or stored in a structure when not in season.

Mr. Brewster said that staff recommended approval of the site plan for temporary outdoor lighting at 7500 Mission Road subject to the following conditions, which matched those from the prior year:

1. The use of the lights is only to facilitate practices during heat events that limit practice in normal hours according to the KSHSAA policy
2. The anticipated use of the lights is during the following periods (although some use outside of these parameters could be permitted if meeting the overall intent of the exceptions):
  - a. Days where forecasted temperatures (or other combination of conditions) exceed 87.8 degrees or otherwise arise to the "red" or "black" conditions of the KSHSAA policy during the normal practice hours of 3:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m.
  - b. Hours of operation are limited to morning hours between 5:00 a.m. and 7:40 a.m.

- c. Anticipated months of operation are August 18<sup>th</sup> through the end of September, although use later than that date could occur based on weather
3. The location of the lights shall be on the lower field as shown in the application, or any other locations that are at least 300' from the property lines
4. The applicant shall take all measures to direct light to the fields and away from adjacent property - particularly for any light location that is less than 300' from the property line
5. The applicant shall work with surrounding residents should any unexpected impacts of noise or lighting occur - particularly those that could exceed the light standard of the ordinance at the property lines or noise level according to the noise ordinance, including other reasonable limitations on the location, operation of facilities, or direction and performance of the lighting units.
6. The equipment be stored out of sight from surrounding property or removed from the site in prolonged periods of non-use (i.e., out of season), and lowered and located to minimize visibility from adjacent property in other non-operational periods (i.e., days not needed during season).

Kent Glaser, Director of Athletics and Activities with the Shawnee Mission School District, and Ryan Johnson, Shawnee Mission East High School Athletics Director were present to discuss the application. Mr. Glaser noted that only one complaint about the lighting had been received in 2024 from a resident to the north on 75<sup>th</sup> Street across from the field. Both he and Mr. Johnson spoke to the resident and adjusted the lighting to the resident's satisfaction. He added that the lighting was used a total of six times in 2024 due to heat.

Mr. Wolf asked whether the applicant would need to request approval annually from the planning commission. Mr. Brewster stated that the planning commission could choose to allow staff to approve future applications if conditions remained the same and no complaints were received.

**Mr. Valentino made a motion to approve the application with the conditions listed, as well as adding a seventh condition noting that city staff may authorize the use of the lighting system in future years without requiring additional planning commission approval. The motion was seconded by Mr. Birkel and passed 5-0.**

PC-25-8                      Site plan - exception for exposed foundation  
7900 Canterbury Street  
Zoning: R-1A  
Applicant: Whitney Coulas

Mr. Brewster said that the applicant was requesting an exception to the exposed foundation limits of the neighborhood design standards in Section 19.06.025.(e), and to build an addition that extends the current condition with an exposed foundation over 24" above grade. The proposed plan includes a two-story addition to the rear lower portion of a split-level house. The south elevation of the home has a two-story profile and includes a garage on the lower level and living areas on the upper level. The lower level is a "foundation" in that it extends to the entire portion of the structure including the single-

story living portion of the split-level to the north. The south elevation is exposed CMU block on the lower level and board and batten siding on the upper level. Each is painted in a scheme that matches all other materials on the building, including painted brick on the front elevation. The plan extends this same two-story elevation approximately 10' to the rear of the home.

Mr. Brewster noted that Section 19.06.025.(e) of the neighborhood design standards included the following regarding foundations:

4. Any elevation that has more than 24" of foundation exposed due to grade changes shall cover the foundation by extending the siding to within 24" of finished grade, or by covering the foundation with decorative materials such as stone or brick that compliments the principal materials of the building.

The design objective of this standard is to give a finished look to all visible elevations, and this standard exists within an entire subsection on foundations that has the intent of maintaining the scale and mass of two-story homes by limiting either "grading up" to gain additional habitable space on lower levels or raising the overall profile of homes with greater exposed foundations. Neither is the case in this situation.

Mr. Brewster stated that there was no effort to raise the profile of the home, and that split-level homes do the opposite by blending single-story elements with two-story habitable spaces. Additionally, the portion of the existing house and proposed addition with the exposed foundation material would be painted to coordinate the design with the overall appearance of the house. A final grading plan had not been completed, but will be addressed through permitting; however, the grade and orientation of the house results in a comparable or less extent of foundation being exposed, and this portion of the lot is not prominently visible from the streetscape and adjacent areas.

All other components of the proposed plan meet the development and neighborhood design standards, or will be confirmed to meet those standards through permitting.

The proposed exception is justified based on the following:

- It is a continuation of an existing condition, compatible with the overall design of the existing home
- The plan and exception meet the intent of the design standards
- The application involves a split-level home which presents different design and foundation issues than other typical model homes

Section 19.06.025.(f) provides that the planning commission may grant exceptions to any of the Neighborhood Design Standards, including the foundation standards, subject to the site plan process. It includes the following criteria relevant to this specific application:

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
6. The exception will equally or better serve the design objectives stated in Section 19.08.025.A and the intent stated for the particular standard being altered

In this case, the design objectives relevant to this exception include:

3. Reinforce the existing scale and patterns of building in neighborhoods for new construction
4. Manage the relationship of adjacent buildings and promote compatible transitions
6. Locate and orient buildings to maintain the existing grade of the street, block and lot frontages and design them in a manner that reduces the perceived massing from the streetscape and abutting lots

Additionally, the building foundation section also has the following criteria for exceptions to the foundation standards:

- A. the design of the building elevations, and specifically any design details that reduce the scale and massing of the building compared to what could otherwise be built under the zoning standards
- B. The relationship of the proposed dwelling to existing structures, and whether their grading, elevation and design is appropriate for the context
- C. Any special considerations of the lot with respect to the existing grades, propose appropriate grades and the drainage patterns in relation to adjacent properties and the proposed structure

Mr. Brewster said that all of the above design objectives and criteria were applicable to this case, and the application demonstrated consistency with the exception criteria. The proposed home will meet all other applicable design standards.

Mr. Brewster said that staff recommended approval of the exception, subject to the following conditions:

1. The exception is limited to the plans included in the application
2. The applicant receives all further necessary permits from public works and the building official demonstrating compliance with all other applicable standards

Applicant and property owner Whitney Coulas was present to discuss the application.

Mr. Herron asked what would be placed in the expanded CMU area under the main floor. Ms. Coulas said that it would be an unfinished area used for storage. She added that she wished to use CMU on the addition to maintain the appearance of the existing home by using the same material.

**Ms. Brown made a motion to approve the application with the conditions listed. The motion was seconded by Mr. Birkel and passed 5-0.**

PC-25-10

Site plan review for a fence/wall with an exception  
8714 Mission Road  
Zoning: R-1A  
Applicant: Matthew Browne

Mr. Brewster said that the applicant was applying for a fence/wall exception to construct a perimeter fence, including around the front yard, which did not meet the front yard fence standards. The property is a large corner lot on the southwest side of Mission Road and Alhambra Street. The lot generally fronts Mission Road but has a slight corner orientation to both streets. In this configuration, the front yard includes all of the Mission Road lot line, a large portion of the Alhambra Street lot line, and a smaller portion of the shared lot line of the abutting lot to the south. He noted that zoning regulations only allowed decorative fences in the front yard that are limited to 10' from the right-of-way line and 2.5' in height.

Mr. Brewster said that the fence standards in Section 19.44.025 applied to this property, and the following specific section is the subject of this application:

b. Design.

4. Decorative Fences. Decorative fences shall be designed so they are at least 50 percent open and do not exceed two and a half feet in height. Split rail and wrought iron fences are examples of this type of fence

c. Location.

1. Fences located in the front yard are limited to decorative fences no closer than ten feet from the street right-of-way line
2. Fences located on the side street of a corner lot shall be on private property and at least 18" from any public sidewalk, whichever is greater, except that if an adjacent lot faces the side street, the fence shall be setback from the right-of-way line a distance of 15' or not less than one-half the depth of the front yard of an adjacent building, whichever is the greater setback

The proposal is for an exception to authorize a fence that would be 5' in height and 18" from the public sidewalk on Mission Road. This requires exceptions to two standards: the requirement that front fences be "decorative" and only 2.5' high and the requirement that front fences be 10' from the front property line. The fence is proposed to be 10' from the curb on Alhambra Street, which requires exceptions to the same two standards for the portion that is considered in the front yard (in front of the extended front building line) and requires an exception to the street-side fence standards for the remainder portion along Alhambra Street (15' from right-of-way or at least 50% of the adjacent houses' front setback, whichever is greater).

Mr. Brewster said that the intent of the applicable fence standards was to protect the front yard and streetscape views of lots along streetscapes and to preserve the ability to reasonably screen property from adjacent lots and other private areas. The street-side standards anticipate fences that are "privacy fences", typical of rear yards and guarding against a situation in which a rear yard fence could impact the front yard and/or streetscape view when abutting lots face the side street.

The following factors affect this situation:

- The lot is a unique circumstance due to (a) a corner situation; (b) large lot and corner orientation with an extensive “front yard” limiting allowed perimeter fence designs; and (c) fronting on a busy street
- The fence maintains an ornamental design and is highly transparent despite the location and height exceptions
- The ornamental design and open profile does not negatively impact any streetscape views or the views of public streetscapes from adjacent property
- There are instances of similar fence arrangements on nearby property, including the two opposite this house on Alhambra Street

In addition to the site plan review criteria, the following are the specific criteria the planning commission shall consider for exceptions to the fence standards:

- Results in a design that is more compatible
- Provide better screening
- Provides better storm drainage management
- Provides more appropriate utilization of the site

The proposal impacts all of these except the stormwater criteria. The proposed fence location will allow better utilization of the site based on the corner location, orientation of the house, and preserve views of the streetscape. The ornamental and open nature of the proposed fence meets the intent of the standards.

Mr. Brewster said that staff recommended approval of the site plan with the exception to the fence/wall height based on the above factors affecting this proposed application, subject to the following:

1. The fence along Mission Road be located on private property and at least 18” from the public sidewalk
2. The fence along Alhambra be located the greater of 1’ on private property or 10’ from the curblin
3. That Prairie Village code officials stake these permitted locations in accordance with the fence permit and prior to construction

Mr. Herron stated that he felt the proposed location of the fence on Mission Road was too close to the existing sidewalk. He noted the property to the north had a similar fence that was several feet away from the sidewalk. Mr. Valentino and Ms. Brown agreed that the fence should be pushed back on the property to provide more space for pedestrian safety. Mr. Birkel added that there should be a proportional distance between the height of the fence and the distance from the sidewalk.

Applicant and property owner Matthew Browne was present to discuss the application. He noted that he was requesting the fence for the safety of his children and pets in the

yard, due to its proximity to Mission Road. He added that he was comfortable with the fence being located farther from the sidewalk.

Ms. Brown suggested that condition #1 be modified to place the fence at least 5' from the sidewalk rather than 18". All commissioners and the applicant agreed to the change.

**Ms. Brown made a motion to approve the application with the conditions listed, but with the amended first condition requiring a distance of at least 5' from the public sidewalk. The motion was seconded by Mr. Herron and passed 5-0.**

## OTHER BUSINESS

Amendments to planning commission bylaws regarding meeting times and remote participation

Ms. Lee said that the agenda item was a follow-up to the discussion that took place at the April 1 planning commission meeting, at which time staff recommended moving the start time of planning commission meetings from 7:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. on the first Tuesday of every month. She noted that if applications to the board of zoning appeals are to be considered, the board meeting will begin at 6:00 p.m., and the planning commission meeting will begin immediately after its conclusion.

Additionally, text was added to the following two sections of the bylaws regarding remote participation by both commission members and applicants:

### Article 4, Section 1:

*"In-person meeting participation is preferred and encouraged. However, in certain circumstances, such as illness or travel, commission members may attend meetings via remote participation. If situations arise in which inclement weather may impact the ability for commission members to travel to the municipal building safely, the Chair, at their discretion, may call for a meeting to be held entirely remotely. In such cases, city staff will provide a space in the municipal building for the public to watch the meeting via livestream."*

### Article 5, Section 11:

*"Applicants may attend the meeting via remote participation if they reside outside of the Kansas City metropolitan area, and/or if travel would be burdensome."*

Ms. Lee noted that if the commission approved the changes, Council Policy 001, which listed the meeting start time would also need to be amended and approved by the city council.

Mr. Wolf suggested that applicants should be required to let staff know in writing prior to the meeting if they would be joining remotely. Ms. Lee stated that she and Mr. Geffert would discuss methods to ensure that communication with applicants included this requirement.

Mr. Valentino made a motion to approve the amendments to the bylaws as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Birkel and passed 5-0.

## ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to come before the commission, Mr. Wolf adjourned the meeting at 8:01 p.m.

Adam Geffert  
City Clerk/Planning Commission Secretary