

**PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
OCTOBER 7, 2025**

ROLL CALL

The Planning Commission of the City of Prairie Village met in regular session on Tuesday, October 7 at 6:40 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, 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; Cliff Speegle, Public Works Project Manager; Adam Geffert, City Clerk/Planning Commission Secretary.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Birkel made a motion to approve the minutes of the September 9, 2025, regular planning commission meeting as presented. Mr. Kersten seconded the motion, which passed 6-0, with Mr. Wolf in abstention.

OLD BUSINESS

None.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

None.

NON-PUBLIC HEARINGS

PC-25-15	Site plan - exception to neighborhood design / windows 6528 Granada Drive Zoning: R-1A Applicant: Sarah Clutter
----------	--

Mr. Brewster said that the applicant was requesting an exception to the window percentage requirement in Section 19.06.025(e) of the neighborhood design standards to build a proposed attached outbuilding that does not meet the rear window percentage requirements. While the window percentage requirements generally apply to each

elevation as a whole, when a portion of the building facade is offset by more than 12' from other portions of the facade, the interpretation has been that that offset portion of the elevation needs to meet the percentage independently. The proposal is for the south (rear) elevation of the outbuilding to have 7.38% window coverage rather than the required 15%.

Mr. Brewster noted that the application was related to PC-25-05, an exception for lot impervious coverage approved by the planning commission in April 2025. That proposal involved a detached garage on the southwest portion of the lot, approximately 16' by 24', and located 5' from the west property line. The size of the structure and the setback complied with zoning regulations applicable to accessory structures. That plan did not have windows on the south and east elevations, and they were not required by the regulations. The overall plan exceeded impervious coverage limits, requiring an exception. The planning commission approved an exception for lot coverage up to 43.95% with an additional 120 s.f. allowance for paving between the existing pool deck and patio (44.64%).

Since approval of the prior application, the applicant changed plans due to homeowners association input. The new proposal is to reduce the size of the garage to 14' by 24', locate it 10' from the west property line, and attach it to the principal structure by a covered breezeway. This subjects the proposed building to principal building standards, including the design standards. The applicant is requesting an exception to allow a lesser window percentage on the rear elevation of the outbuilding. The application is still within the prior impervious coverage exception at 43.79%.

The property is located mid-block on a 17,380 s.f. lot on the south side of Granada Street between Mission Road and Roe Avenue, and is zoned R-1A. The block features larger R-1A lots, generally 110' to 130' wide and approximately 16,000 to 20,000 s.f.

Section 19.06.025.(d)(1) of the neighborhood design standards includes the following regarding building massing:

1. Windows and Entrances. All elevations shall have window and door openings covering at least:
 - a. Fifteen percent on all front elevation or any street-facing side elevation; and
 - b. Eight percent on the other side elevations; and
 - c. Fifteen percent on rear elevations

Any molding or architectural details integrated with the window or door opening may count for up to three percent of this percentage requirement.

Mr. Brewster said that in conjunction with other massing standards that deal with projections and offsets, staff has interpreted that any elevation offset more than 12' from a primary elevation must meet the design standards independently. The intent is to guard against large blank walls on more prominent elevations, and to not allow distinct portions

of the building to have large blank walls where other more remote elevations exceed the percentage requirement.

Specifically, the rear elevation must have 15% window coverage and the side elevation must have 8% window coverage. The south (rear) elevation includes a 13 s.f. window on a 176 s.f. elevation, which is 7.38% of the elevation. Up to 3% additional coverage can be counted with the window and trim, but this brings the eligible percentage to 10.38% rather than the required 15%. The window and trim is 22 s.f., or 12.5% of the elevation, but only up to 10.38% contributes to the requirement per the ordinance.

Mr. Brewster added that all other components of the proposed plan meet the development and neighborhood design standards, and the attached outbuilding meets the window percentage requirements independently on the other three sides.

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

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

In this case, the design objectives in Section 19.08.025(a) most relevant to this exception include:

2. Promote building and site design that enhances neighborhood streetscapes
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
5. Enhance the quality, aesthetic character and visual interest within neighborhoods by breaking down larger masses and incorporating human scale details and ornamentation

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

Section 19.96.025(d) of the zoning regulations notes that the intent of the massing standards (including the window requirements) is to break down the volume of the buildable areas and height into smaller scale masses to improve the relationship of the building to the lot, adjacent buildings, and the streetscape, and shall apply in addition to basic setback and height standards.

The proposed exception is justified based on the following:

- The outbuilding is generally compatible with the principal structure in terms of massing, materials, roof forms, architectural style, and windows and doors on other elevations
- The window percentage would not otherwise apply to this portion of the structure if either (a) it was not attached to the principal structure by a covered walkway; or (b) the elevations were not off-set by more than 12' from the principal structure
- The remote nature of the outbuilding on the lot and the limited extent of the elevations requesting the exception (one story with gable, 14 linear feet wide on the rear elevation); and the limited nature of the exception (7.38% window coverage, 10.38% with trim exception, rather than the required 15%)
- The proposed building meets several of the design objectives and does not undermine any of the other design objectives or criteria for exceptions

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 exception is subject to an associated variance request (cumulative side yard setback) being approved by the BZA
3. The applicant receives all further necessary permits from public works and the building official demonstrating compliance with all other applicable standards, including the lot impervious coverage standards being consistent with and within the parameters of an exception granted by the planning commission in PC-25-05

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

Ms. Brown made a motion to approve the application subject to the conditions listed by staff. Mr. Birkel seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

PC-25-17 Site plan - exception to foundation elevation
2706 W. 71st Terrace
Zoning: R-1B
Applicant: Karman Williams, Koenig Building and Restoration LLC

Mr. Brewster said that the applicant was requesting an exception to the neighborhood design standards related to the construction of a new house at 2706 W. 71st Terrace. The lot is zoned R-1B, and the neighborhood design standards are applicable to all R-1B lots. Specifically, the applicant is asking for an exception to Section 19.08.025.E. regarding foundations. This section requires the following for new residential structures:

- The top of foundation between 6” and 24” above finished grade along the front facade
- No new structure more than 12” above the top of foundation of a previous existing structure
- An additional 6” in height may be allowed for each five additional feet of setback

In this case, the applicant is requesting that a new top-of-foundation (proposed 1,004.5’) be 2.8’ above the top of foundation of the prior existing house (existing 1,001.7’), which is approximately 1.8’ above the top of foundation allowed by the zoning regulations (Section 19.08.025(e)(2) limits to no more than 1’ above a prior home).

The applicant submitted a drainage permit study dated June 4, 2025 that notes the following:

- The drainage on the block flows to the rear of lots on 71st Terrace and out 71st Street and Belinder Avenue to the east
- The property slopes southwest to northeast (approximately 9’ of grade change according to the submitted plot plan)

This takes the current flow through the building foundation area, therefore the applicant is requesting to raise the top-of-foundation to 1,004.5’, to account for proper site drainage and engineering relative to the foundation.

Mr. Brewster stated that the proposed new structure is 8.1’ from the side property line on the east (lowest side) and 10.5’ from the side property line on the west side (highest side). The home to the west has a similar elevation and grade change resulting in a raised foundation on this side. While the minimum side setback in R-1A is 7’ on any one side, the cumulative required setback based on lot width is 14 feet (20% of 70’ lot width). The application proposes setbacks slightly greater than required, but not enough to be eligible for the raise in foundation provisions in the neighborhood design standards (6” for each additional 5’ setback).

The applicant submitted elevations demonstrating compliance with all other zoning regulations and neighborhood design standards, and further confirmation of meeting these standards will occur through the regular permitting process. The proposal will have 29% building coverage (30% limit), 38.9% impervious surface coverage (40% limit), and a 28.25’ building height (29’ limit), and maintains a 1.5 story appearance on the front elevation.

The neighborhood design standards note the following in Section 19.08.025.(a), relevant to this exception:

A. Design Objectives. The design objectives of the neighborhood design standards are to:

1. Maintain and enhance the unique character of Prairie Village neighborhoods
2. Promote building and site design that enhances neighborhood streetscapes
3. Reinforce the existing scale and patterns of buildings in neighborhoods for new construction
4. Manage the relationship of adjacent buildings and promote compatible transitions
5. Enhance the quality, aesthetic character and visual interest within neighborhoods by breaking down larger masses and incorporating human scale details and ornamentation
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

To further this intent, the foundation elevation standards are to prevent larger masses from elevating over nearby homes based on grades, massing, and proximity; particularly if this is used to gain extra interior space rather than proper drainage.

The neighborhood design standards allow for exceptions in specific cases. In considering an exception, the planning commission considers the criteria in Section 19.08.025.(f). Mr. Brewster noted that Sub-sections 2 and 3 were most relevant to the application:

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 said that staff recommended that the exception be approved based on the grade and drainage situation noted in the drainage study, and based on the application meeting the intent of the standards with regard to setbacks, building design, and the relationship of the house to adjacent houses.

Mr. Birkel noted his concern about the raised height relative to the home to the east.

Mr. Valentino asked if a drainage study for the proposal had been completed by public works. Mr. Brewster said that a study was performed and the proposal had been approved by public works.

Applicant Scott Koenigsdorf, 4722 W. 68th Street, was present to discuss the application. He stated that he had asked the project architect to make the top-of-wall height the same as the home to the east. He added that there was a swale between the two properties as well as a retaining wall which would slow the flow of the water toward the home to the east. Lastly, he noted that the existing home had a slab-on-grade foundation, resulting in a very steep grade to the north, whereas the new home would have a daylight foundation with a reduced grade, which would also help slow water flow.

Mr. Dringman said that he was unaware the house being demolished had a slab-on-grade foundation, so the site would need to be remeasured. Mr. Brewster said that even if the existing foundation height needed to be recalculated, the exception request itself would not change, and that the amount of the exception would likely be lower.

Mr. Valentino made a motion to approve the application with the condition that staff confirm the amount of variance being granted. Mr. Birkel seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

PC-25-19 Site plan for patio with exception to lot coverage standards
4121 W. 73rd Street
Zoning: R-1B
Applicant: Morgan Brouillette, High Prairie Outdoors

Mr. Brewster said that the applicant was seeking to expand an existing outdoor patio and include a detached covered accessory structure and pergola, and was requesting an exception to the 40% impervious surface limit. The home was constructed in 2021 and includes an approximately 12' x 12' concrete patio on the southeast portion of the home. The proposal includes a 22' x 14' expansion of the patio with a 14' x 14' detached covered structure on the south end, and a 4.66' x 14' pergola in the center portion (an approximately 308 s.f. expansion, 233 s.f. of which would be building coverage).

The patio material is proposed to be a permeable resin, but is calculated as impervious surface. The proposal results in a 29.9% building coverage for the lot, which meets the 30% limit, but an approximately 45.95% impervious coverage for the lot, which exceeds the 43.7% limit for this lot (40%, plus 300 s.f. exception granted for all lots under 10,000 s.f.).

The city's zoning regulations allow the planning commission to approve exceptions to the impervious coverage standard based on criteria and according to review of drainage conditions by public works. The property is on the south side of 73rd Street and is zoned R-1B. The lot is 65' wide by 125' deep; the block features other similar-sized R-1B lots, ranging from 60' to 80' wide based on the curvature of the overall block .

The development standards in Section 19.08.015 apply to this property, and specifically:

- Lot Width: 60' minimum
- Lot Depth: 100' minimum
- Building Coverage: 30% maximum
- Impervious Surface Coverage: 40% maximum + 300 s.f. for lots under 10,000 s.f.

Because the lot is less than 10,000 s.f., the zoning regulations allow an exception for up to 300 additional s.f. of impervious coverage for an uncovered deck or patio (3,550 s.f. of permitted coverage: $8,125 \text{ s.f.} \times .40 + 300 \text{ s.f.} = 3,550 \text{ s.f.}$). Exceptions beyond this limit are provided within the regulations and require planning commission approval.

The existing and proposed impervious cover includes:

- Existing principal building: 2,229.1 s.f.
- Driveway / walks: 925 s.f.
- Side yard deck: 76.9 s.f.
- Window wells: 15.7 s.f.
- Existing patio: 161.2 s.f.
- Total: 3,407.9 s.f. (excluding landscape walls of 83.95 s.f.)
- Proposed patio: 325.8 s.f.
- Proposed total: 3,733.7 s.f.
- The proposed impervious cover in this project is an additional 325.8 s.f., or 183.7 s.f. beyond the permitted limit of 3,550 s.f.

Mr. Brewster said that Section 19.08.015(b)(2)(b) stated 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. The criteria area:

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

The exception for lot impervious coverage primarily impacts criteria #2, and because this standard is to primarily address drainage and stormwater issues, there is an additional requirement for public works to approve a drainage study.

Mr. Brewster stated that the application included a drainage plan that included five downspouts and an EZ Flow Drain. Four of the downspouts are directed to the center portion of the rear yard, one downspout directs to the side yard, and the EZ Flow Drain directs to the back of the lot. He added that public works provided a drainage review that notes the proposed plan is acceptable for the impervious coverage. The applicant has proposed a pervious patio surface project but the patio is still being counted as part of the impervious percentage calculation. Drainage downspouts are being routed to not impact adjacent properties, and a French drain is being added on the east side of patio.

The following are the site plan review criteria found in Section 19.32.030. They 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 include a specific process and criteria for the planning commission to consider exceptions. There are no other planning, design, public health, safety, or welfare issues impacted by this application, other than the stormwater issues analyzed in Section B 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 the proposal 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 okay with the impervious area. The layout conforms to the original drainage study and determined the drainage will not impact adjacent property.

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 involve any building designs for the primary structure and all accessory structures meet the development standards and are compatible with the principal building.

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 unbuilt portions of the site
3. The plan reduces the exposure and adverse impact of more intense activities or components of the site or building

All proposed improvements are in the rear yard and not visible from the frontage or streetscape along the block, which includes significant landscape. The proposed improvements meet all development standards for surface and accessory structures in the side or rear yard, other than the 40% impervious coverage standard.

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 183.7 s.f. beyond what is permitted for the lot) 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 or negatively impact public stormwater management
- The applicant has proposed design and drainage strategies that minimize any potential drainage impacts
- All other improvements and structures are in the rear of the property and meet all development standards for surface and accessory structures

Cliff Speegle, Public Works Project Manager, noted that he had worked with the designer and reviewed the drainage plan. He stated that the material used for the patio was counted as impervious surface, but was actually permeable. Lastly, a French drain was also being installed as part of the project.

Applicant Morgan Brouillette with High Prairie Outdoors, 6116 Johnson Drive, Mission, KS, was present to discuss the application.

Mr. Valentino made a motion to approve the application as presented. Mr. Birkel seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

PC-25-20 Property specific sign plan
Corinth Quarter Phase II - 3901 W. 83rd Street
Zoning: C-2
Applicant: Andrea Hildago, GRI Corinth South, LLC

Mr. Brewster said the application was a sign plan for property-specific sign standards. In 2019, the city updated its sign ordinance to streamline procedures, add flexibility, and improve standards for larger commercial properties. Historically, nearly all commercial or “multi-tenant” properties were under property-specific sign standards; however, this became very difficult to administer because: (1) over time applicants submitted specifications for particular signs in their applications, rather than general sign standards; (2) approvals had to be processed as an ordinance amendment; and (3) as tenants or sign needs changed, a full review process was required for even routine changes since the property was bound by specifications for particular signs.

One of the amendments was to allow property owners to more easily propose and have approved property specific sign plans. Three aspects were key to the improvements:

- The applicant’s sign plans should include design attributes that coordinate signs on larger commercial properties and multi-tenant sites

- Based on a coordinated plan, the planning commission could approve deviations from the generally applicable sign standards
- Within the parameters of an approved sign plan (general standards and not specifications for a particular sign), staff could more easily administer sign permits that met the plan as tenants changed out over time

Mr. Brewster noted that the applicant was proposing a sign plan for Corinth South, Phase II. The property has had new construction, site plans, and some building and parking improvements in the past several years, as part of Phase I. Some of the applications included conceptual sign approvals, that while not elevating to a comprehensive or coordinated sign plan for the entire property, did provide enough coordination to allow tenants to get functional signs. However, absent a larger and more coordinated sign plan, all tenants would be subject to the generally applicable city-wide plan. As a result, it was the applicant's intent to bring a more comprehensive sign plan back to the planning commission.

The city's zoning regulations state the following with regard to property-specific sign plans:

Shopping centers, office parks, or other multi-tenant projects with three or more buildings or four or more acres may propose a property specific sign plan. The sign package shall be based on the intent, types of signs, and standards of this chapter, but the planning commission may approve deviations to these standards where they find that the plan:

- a. Promotes a unique character for the area, and improves the image and identity of the project as it relates to the surrounding community
- b. Presents uniform designs to coordinate multiple components of the project, and where there are distinctions in the type and design of the signs, they are well-coordinated in light of the overall plan
- c. The plan has clear and explicit standards for the size, location, design and quality of signs, and it anticipates future tenants or changes in tenants without requiring amendments to the sign plan
- d. The property owner or landlord has authorized the plan, and any changes to the plan will require the property owner or landlord to submit a new application to be approved by the planning commission

The plan proposed for the Corinth South, Phase II shops includes the following:

Sign Type	Quantity	Standards	Comparison to General City Standards
Steel Angle Mounted - Halo Lit	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 50 square feet - mounted slightly above eave on pitched roof areas 1.66" high letters; 3" deep; front lit Only letters - no logos Back aluminum casing to match steel tube mounting 	<p>Comparable to general wall allowance in size; 50 s.f. may be slightly larger than 5% general limit in some cases due to store front area measurements.</p> <p>Quantity exceeds per building / wall limit due to multi-tenant, storefront configuration.</p>
Wall-mounted / Halo Lit	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 50 square feet maximum - on center in wall element Mounted on wood panel or wood horizontal planks May include background panel color subject to size limitations 33% logo / icons Reverse channel halo lit letters 3" deep (no raceway mounting; mounting to match backing color) 	<p>Comparable to general wall allowance in size; 50 s.f. may be slightly larger than 5% general limit in some cases due to store front area measurements.</p> <p>Quantity exceeds per building / wall limit due to multi-tenant, storefront configuration.</p>
Under canopy	1 per tenant	<p>3 s.f each; 8.75 feet clearance</p> <p>White acrylic field plate; black aluminum mounting bracket</p> <p>Corinth Quarter logo located within</p>	Comparable to pedestrian sign allowance
Corner sign	1	<p>Acrylic white panel wrapping corner at specified location</p> <p>3.5 x. 2.5 on each corner - 8.75 s.f. each</p>	Comparable to pedestrian sign allowance
Other signs		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Window signs Temporary signs Leasing information signs 	All defer to generally applicable city standards or permitted exemptions from permit.

The proposed sign plan presents some consistent elements among comparable sign types on the building and with elements of signs permitted in Corinth South Phase I. It is comparable to permitted city-wide standards, except where noted and provides expectations for permitting future signs for this specific site.

Mr. Brewster said that staff recommended approval of the sign plan, subject to all future signs requiring a city-issued sign permit to review for compliance with the plan and other applicable city codes.

Andrea Hildago, First Washington Realty, 7200 Wisconsin Avenue, Bethesda, MD, and architect Connor McRae, 911 Main Street, Kansas City, MO, were present to discuss the application.

Ms. Temple made a motion to approve the application subject to the conditions noted by staff. Mr. Valentino seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

OTHER BUSINESS

None.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to come before the commission, Mr. Wolf adjourned the meeting at 7:25 p.m.

Adam Geffert
City Clerk/Planning Commission Secretary