

**PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
MAY 5, 2026**

ROLL CALL

The Planning Commission of the City of Prairie Village met in regular session on Tuesday, May 5 at 7:40 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, David Herron, James Kersten, Melissa Brown, and Melissa Temple.

The following individuals were present in their advisory capacity to the planning commission: Chris Brewster, Multistudio; Nickie Lee, Deputy City Administrator; Nathan Vallette, Council Liaison; Mitch Dringman, Building Official; Cliff Speegle, Public Works Project Manager; Adam Geffert, City Clerk/Planning Commission Secretary.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Temple made a motion to approve the minutes of the April 7, 2026, regular planning commission meeting. Mr. Birkel seconded the motion, which passed 6-0.

OLD BUSINESS

None.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

PC-26-1 Rezoning from R-1A to RP-1B and final plat
 4200 W. 79th Street
 Zoning: R-1A
 Applicant: Price Brothers

Mr. Wolf informed those in attendance that the public hearing for the application would be continued to the June 2 planning commission meeting, and that no formal action would be taken at the current meeting.

Mr. Brewster stated that the applicant was requesting to rezone approximately 4.5 acres from R-1A Single-Family Residential to an RP-1B Planned Single-Family Residential district to build 20 detached dwellings. The property was used as the YMCA up until 2024, which is a permitted use in the R-1A zoning district. The proposal includes a “planned” designation of R-1B for specific deviations from the standards of R-1B, primarily regarding the minimum lot width. The applicant is also submitting a corresponding final plat to divide the property into 20 residential lots, plat a private common access for the lots, and

designate common space fronting the park on the north and providing a north/south connection from 79th Street.

Mr. Brewster noted that the applicant had not submitted all requirements or clearly demonstrated that the application meets all criteria, and there were some aspects of the plan submittals that could potentially allow development that would not meet the required criteria. He added that staff recommended continuing the application to allow the applicant to submit further details that support and strengthen the planning concepts.

Applicant Bart Lowen with Price Brothers, the owner of the property, was present at the meeting. He stated that application team agreed to the continuance in order to make sure the application met all criteria, and to make some additional modifications.

Mr. Wolf opened the public hearing at 7:47 and noted that the hearing would remain open to the June meeting for additional comment.

Karen Chapman, 4314 W. 78th Terrace asked if residents could get copies of the city's staff report prior to the June meeting.

Mr. Wolf said that the staff report would be published with the meeting packet the Friday before the next meeting.

Mr. Birkel made a motion to continue the public hearing for PC-26-1 to the June 2 planning commission meeting. The motion was seconded by Ms. Temple and passed 6-0.

Ms. Temple made a motion to continue the associated application for final plat approval, PC-26-11, to the June 2 planning commission meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Birkel and passed 6-0.

NON-PUBLIC HEARINGS

PC-26-7 Site plan review for fence/wall with exception
7500 Sagamore Road
Zoning: R-1B
Applicant: Nick Hanaway

Mr. Brewster stated that the applicant was applying for an exception to construct a street side yard fence that does not meet the side fence standards. The property is a corner lot on the southwest corner of 75th Street and Sagamore Road. The home orients to Sagamore Road and has a side lot line along 75th Street. There is also a significant grade change between the higher street level and lower lot level, and a large retaining wall, railing, and sidewalk improvement was built in association with a stormwater project. The lot is otherwise typical of R-1B lots, measuring 75' wide and 115' deep.

The applicant is requesting an exception to the fence standards to permit an 8' high fence to allow better screening and noise protection of the property from 75th Street.

The zoning ordinance requires the following for fences:

- Street side of the corner lot be at least 18” from a public sidewalk or on private property
- 6’ height limit in side or rear yards (up to 8’ only allowed if within the building envelope / building setbacks)

The proposed fence would replace an existing 4’ chain link fence that encloses the back yard with a wood privacy fence. It would comply with the fence standards at all points other than the portion along 75th Street, which is requested to be 8’ high. The fence would be measured from grade and would be entirely on the private lot. This would situate the fence approximately 3’ in from the retaining wall (which is approximately 3’ to 4’ high along the property line) and the railing (which is another 4’ on top of the retaining wall).

Mr. Brewster said that the standards allow the planning commission to consider exceptions to the fence standards through site plan review and subject to specific criteria.

The following specific section is the subject of this application:

(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. [Section 19.44.025(c)(1)].

(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. [Section 19.44.025(c)(1)].

Mr. Brewster said that the intent of the applicable fence standards is 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. Height and location limits for rear yard privacy fences on street side lots aim to preserve views of streetscapes and to prevent large barriers abutting public sidewalks.

The following factors that affect this situation:

- There is a substantial grade change between the street level and the lot, making a fence compliant with the height standards less effective for screening.
- 75th Street is a busy street with potential noise and visual impacts affecting the utilization of the rear yard.
- A public retaining wall and railing exists along this property and is a comparable height as the proposed fence.
- The fence would be off set from the retaining wall and railing and would not present a barrier along the public sidewalk.
- The fence is only enclosing the rear yard and only extends along approximately half of the property line, leaving views to the block and Sagamore Road streetscape open.

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.

This fence/wall exception impacts three of these criteria (all but the stormwater criteria for which there is no impact). The proposed fence location will allow better utilization of the site based on the corner location, the nature of 75th Street, and the grade of 75th Street relative to the property.

Public works has reviewed the plans and confirmed that the proposed fence will not create any obstructions within the required sight distance triangles.

Mr. Brewster said that staff recommended approval of the site plan with the exception to the fence height based on the above factors affecting the lot and based on the location, extent, and fence design plans in the submitted application.

Mr. Birkel asked if the retaining wall was on public property or private property. Mr. Brewster said the retaining wall was on public property, and the existing chain-link fence was on the applicant's property line.

Applicant and property owner Nick Hanaway was present to discuss the application. He stated the request for the fence exception was to provide privacy and reduce noise from traffic on 75th Street.

Ms. Temple made a motion to approve the fence exception as presented. Ms. Brown seconded the motion, which passed 6-0.

PC-26-9 Design exception - side elevation windows
8432 Linden Lane
Zoning: R-1A
Applicant: Matt Brunner

Mr. Brewster said that the applicant was requesting an exception to the requirement that side elevations have window and door openings of at least 8%, exclusive of garage openings. The plan includes a small footprint addition to the rear and north side of the house to expand to a three-car garage and additional living space to the rear, and a more prominent second level addition to this single-story home. The elevations have 1.5 story profiles from the front, and a mix of one-story and two-story profiles on the side and rear elevations. The north elevation (right side) is primarily an addition to the existing two-car garage, and then an offset addition to the living space in the rear that is more than 12' further back from the north elevation building line for the garages.

Under this situation staff interprets the neighborhood design standard to apply to each facade component independently, meaning the one-story profile that includes the existing two-car garage, and the proposed new additional garage would need to have windows, and that the portion more than 12' removed from this elevation would also need windows. In this case, the wall plane that is entirely garage doors would be required to have windows and entrances, and garage doors are specifically excluded from counting to the required percentage of openings. Therefore, the applicant is requesting a design exception to have this elevation excluded and allowed to have no window openings. The portion of the elevation that is set back more than 12' from the garages includes a first-story window and patio door entrance and meets the design standard independently.

Section 19.06.025.(d) of the neighborhood design standards includes the following regarding windows and entrances:

1. Windows and Entrances. All elevations shall have window and door openings covering at least:
 - a) 15% on all front elevation or any street facing side elevation
 - b) 8% percent on other side elevations
 - c) 15% percent on rear elevations

Elsewhere in the design standards, garage openings are specifically excluded from counting from this standard based on the intent to not reward larger and more prominent garages. However, this does not account for the circumstance when garage doors are side facing, as is the case on this application. Additionally, when portions of an elevation are more than 12' removed from another portion, staff has interpreted those as not contributing to the overall elevation window percentage since it is a distinctly different mass. In this case, that interpretation results in the one-story garage elevations on the north elevation of these planes needing to meet the 8% window requirement.

Mr. Brewster said that the design objective of the standard is to minimize the prominence of garages and car-related building elements on public streetscapes, and to give all elevations a finished appearance with appropriate connections to outside spaces and limited blank wall space. The proposed site plan and elevation accomplishes each of these design objectives by locating the garage doors to the side of the building (existing and expanded) and by using combinations of one-story, 1.5-story, and two-story elevations that are broken up with the massing and footprint of the building, and which contain appropriate window and door entries on each component.

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.
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, and the integrity of the architectural style of the proposed building, and the relationship of 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 staff believes the design exception meets the above criteria and furthers all six of the design objectives that apply to the neighborhood design standards, primarily because:

- a) The design of the addition is compatible with the existing architectural style of the building, and uses a combination of one-story, 1.5-story, and two-story elevations that break up the massing.
- b) The existing building and the garage addition are oriented to the side and are not prominent along the neighborhood streetscape.
- c) The building has a compatible massing and design as other buildings in the neighborhood.
- d) All elevations have appropriate connections to outside spaces and appropriate relationships to the lot and adjacent lots and buildings so that no elevations are large or contain large blank walls.

Mr. Brewster stated that staff recommended approval of the exception as presented in the submitted plans.

Applicant and property owner Matt Brunner was present to discuss the application.

Mr. Birkel made a motion to approve the design exception as presented. Ms. Temple seconded the motion, which passed 6-0.

OTHER BUSINESS

None.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to come before the commission, Mr. Wolf adjourned the meeting at 8:11 p.m.

Adam Geffert
City Clerk/Planning Commission Secretary