

**PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
JULY 1, 2025**

ROLL CALL

The Planning Commission of the City of Prairie Village met in regular session on Tuesday, July 1 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: Jonathan Birkel, Dave Herron, 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; 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 June 3, 2025, regular planning commission meeting as presented. Mr. Birkel seconded the motion, which passed 5-0, with Mr. Kersten in abstention.

OLD BUSINESS

None.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

None.

NON-PUBLIC HEARINGS

PC-25-7	Building line modification 8009 Falmouth Street Zoning: R-1A Applicant: Joe Woods, MOJO Built
---------	--

Mr. Brewster said that the applicant was requesting a building line modification as provided in Chapter 18.18 of the subdivision regulations, to build a new house in place of an existing home. The proposed house would be built approximately 36.5' from Somerset Drive and orient directly to Falmouth Street with a 30' front setback line, rather than a 40' platted building line.

The lot is located on the northeast corner of Somerset Drive and Falmouth Street, and has a platted building line of 40' on the Somerset Drive frontage and 30' on the Falmouth Street frontage. The existing house orients directly to the intersection of Falmouth Street and Somerset Drive, and has a driveway off Falmouth Street near the Somerset Drive corner. There is a similar pattern for two to three corner lots on either side of this lot on Somerset Drive, with similar platted building lines. This is a result of the irregular street, block and lot pattern in the area as Somerset Drive curves as it moves in a general east-west configuration, and some side streets do not connect.

Mr. Brewster said that platted building lines exist in either one or both of the following circumstances:

1. Where there is an irregular block and lot pattern that warrants setbacks different from what the zoning requires.
2. Where homes were built prior to the adoption of the zoning regulations (the existing house was built in 1956). The building lines are platted at the time of original development and placed on the lot by the developer and recorded. Under Prairie Village zoning regulations, the more-strict of the platted building line or zoning setbacks apply, and the planning commission can modify platted building lines (but not zoning setbacks).

The proposal would change the house from an intersection orientation (having two front setbacks on both corner streets and having two side yard orientations on the interior lot lines with no rear yard) to a more standard orientation fronting on Falmouth Street. The specific proposed modification would change the platted building line on Somerset Drive from 40' to 30', which would still be consistent with the required front zoning setback on Falmouth Street, but would exceed the otherwise applicable side-yard setback on Somerset Drive. Street side yard setbacks in the zoning regulations are the greater of 15' or half the setback of the adjacent house frontage if it faces the side street.

Mr. Brewster said that Section 18.18.D of the zoning regulation provided the criteria for the planning commission to consider for building line modifications:

1. That there are special circumstances or conditions affecting the property.

The lot is a corner lot with a corner orientation. There are similar arrangements of corner lots in the area (two to the east and three to the west). However, there are also several different orientations of lots and buildings in the area due to the irregular street, block and lot patterns. All houses on the block to the north face directly on Falmouth Street (except the corner-orientation house immediately to the west) and houses to the south front directly on Somerset Drive (except the house on a triangular lot at the intersection of Somerset Drive and 81st Street).

2. The building line modification is necessary for reasonable and acceptable development of the property in question.

The proposed modification will allow a more conventional rear yard to the east of the proposed home. This addresses the “yard inefficiency” that results from corner-oriented homes where the building footprint is simply skewed differently than the lot pattern.

3. That the granting of the building line modification will not be detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to or adversely affect adjacent property or other property in the vicinity in which the particular property is situated.

Although the platted building lines are similar on adjacent corner lots, and the corner orientation pattern is common to several corner lots on either side, the proposed orientation is not a significant departure. Even with the platted building lines as established, all similarly situated corner lots are not mandated to have a corner orientation, and other configurations are possible within the platted building lines. Further, the pattern is not so prevalent since there are many deviations from in the vicinity and the houses are on larger lots resulting in significant space between buildings. The proposal will still maintain a significant setback from Somerset Drive (at least 30’) and shifts the driveway and garages in from Somerset Drive (on the north side of the lot rather than the existing on the south) which would be consistent with patterns related to other houses north along Falmouth Street.

Mr. Brewster said that if the planning commission found that the project met the three considerations, it should adopt a resolution based on the proposed survey and plot plan that must be recorded with the register of deeds prior to obtaining a building permit.

Mr. Kersten asked whether a 40’ setback was the standard distance on the street. Mr. Brewster said that it was the location of the platted building line, and that the applicant was asking for a 30’ building line on the Somerset Drive side.

Adam Pfeifer with applicant MOJO Built, 12214 West 79th Terrace in Lenexa was present to speak about the project.

Mr. Valentino made a motion to pass a resolution approving the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Ms. Temple and passed 5-1, with Mr. Herron in opposition.

PC-25-12 Site plan for patio with exception to lot coverage standards
7052 Cedar Street
Zoning: R-1B
Applicant: James Warford/Ryan DeSpain

Mr. Brewster said that the applicant was requesting an exception to build a concrete patio/sport court extension to the north of a covered portion of the patio, and an exception to the 40% impervious surface limit. The home was constructed in 2018, and the outside patio structure (approximately 16’ x 30’) was built in 2023, and each meets all applicable

standards. The proposed patio/sport court extension is approximately 200 square feet (18' x 25'), a portion of which is replacing an existing concrete patio (approximately 8.5' x 10'), but combined with other lot coverage exceeds the permitted impervious surface standard of 40% maximum lot coverage. Zoning regulations allow the planning commission to approve exceptions to the impervious coverage standard subject to conditions and according to a review by public works of drainage conditions.

The property is on the northwest corner of Cedar Street and 71st Street and is zoned R-1B. The lot is 90' wide by 101' deep and slightly skewed to longer dimensions on the rear and side due to coordination of other lots and the block. The block features other similar-sized R-1B lots, but all are deeper and narrower with the exception of the corner lot on the opposite north corner of the block which has a similar configuration.

Mr. Brewster said Section 19.08.015(b)(2)b 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. He noted that a drainage permit associated with the application had already been approved by public works. The criteria are:

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 19.08.025(a), and the intent stated for the particular standard being altered.

Mr. Brewster said that the exception for lot impervious coverage primarily impacted criteria #2, and the additional requirement for public works to approve a drainage study. The lot impervious coverage standard exists primarily to address stormwater issues. The existing impervious coverage is approximately 4,102 square feet, or 39.9% (including administratively approved covered patio); the proposed impervious coverage would equal 4,344 square feet, or 42.3%. The building coverage of this lot is below 30%, even with the addition of the covered patio. Therefore, the approval of the drainage study is the more critical criteria for impervious coverage exceptions, and in this case public works has reviewed the drainage study associated with this application.

Mr. Brewster said that the following conditions from Section 19.32.030 are the site plan review criteria, and are generally reviewed in conjunction with the specific neighborhood design exception criteria as indicated above:

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.

This application meets all standards other than the 40% impervious coverage standard. The impervious coverage standards anticipated circumstances similar to this application and includes a specific process and criteria for the planning commission to consider exceptions. There are no other planning, design or public health, safety, or welfare issues impacted by the application, other than the stormwater issues analyzed in Section B (below) and the landscape/adjacent property relationships analyzed in Section D (below).

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.

This site is currently served by streets and utilities, and this plan does not affect any access or utility issues. The applicant submitted a drainage study to support the updated application and exception request. Public works has reviewed the study and is satisfied with the impervious area. The layout conforms to the original drainage study intent and does not impact adjacent properties. Runoff flows to Cedar Street via a side yard swale on the north side and flows south to 71st Street on the south side.

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 application does not include any building designs. All building elements related to the project were approved through prior permits and meet all applicable standards.

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.

The lot is a corner lot with the building situated as a “reverse corner” lot, meaning that it faces the end-grain or short side of the block (Cedar Street), similar to other houses to the north on Cedar Street, but different from other houses west on 71st Street. As a result, the building is located in the northwest portion of the lot, and although it meets all conventional front and side setbacks, it has two larger front yards on Cedar Street and 71st Street,

but has a very limited rear yard to the west (rear) of the house. This is unlike all other lots on this block except the opposite corner lot to the north.

The proposed design is appropriate for the lot since it contributes compatible relationships to the streetscape (setback, building orientation, and landscape/streetscape) on both Cedar Street and 71st Street. Considering this, use of the rear yard as more structured and formal outside living space results in better utilization of the space for the applicant. The applicant is preserving the 9' to 10' setback and existing tree line, landscape, and fence at these locations to provide appropriate relationships to adjacent property. The design and the situation of each property to the west and the north results in relationships comparable to other side-yard to side-yard relationships of other lots on the block.

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

- The limited nature of the exception (approximately 2.3% or 237 square feet from the standard) and the negligible impact it will have on overall stormwater policies for the City.
- Public works has reviewed a drainage permit for the project and does not believe the proposed plan will cause drainage issues on adjacent property and will not negatively impact public stormwater management.
- The property is a corner lot with large frontages on both the east and south sides, leaving a smaller back yard with little utility; a constructed formal patio and outdoor gathering space allows for better utilization of this area. The design is proposed in a way that has little impact on adjacent properties.

Mr. Birkel noted that drainage was being directed to the north of the property, and suggested that some of it could be sent to the south as well. Mr. Brewster said runoff from the covered patio did drain to the south, and that the proposed patio would drain to a swale to the north that takes water out to Cedar Street. He added that public works had approved the drainage plan.

Mr. Birkel said that the neighborhood meeting notes referenced an alternative drainage solution utilizing a French drain and underground reservoir tanks, and asked if they were part of the proposal.

Architect Jim Warford with ICON Architecture, 3107 Roanoke Road, Kansas City, MO, and property owner Ryan DeSpain were present to discuss the project. Mr. Warford noted that neither a French drain nor reservoir tanks would be used in the project.

Mr. Valentino expressed concern that water draining to the north might build up due to a lack of sunlight on the north side of the home. Mr. DeSpain stated that there was an

existing drainage box on the north side of the home that collected water and delivered it to a pop-up drain in the front yard on Cedar Street.

Mr. Birkel made a motion to approve the application with the condition that no French drain and/or reservoir tank shall be used to address drainage on the property. The motion was seconded by Mr. Valentino and passed 6-0.

OTHER BUSINESS

None.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to come before the commission, Mr. Wolf adjourned the meeting at 6:47 p.m.

Adam Geffert
City Clerk/Planning Commission Secretary