

CITY OF ANDOVER
SITE PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE
February 7, 2017
MINUTES

The Site Plan Review Committee met for a regular meeting on Tuesday, February 7, 2017 at Andover City Hall located at 1609 E. Central Ave., Andover, Kansas. Chairman Doug Allison called the meeting to order at 6:02 p.m. Members present were Chairman Allison, Dennis Bush, Phil White and Todd Woolsoncroft. Members Brandon Wilson, Don Kimble and Nate Hinson were absent.

Staff in attendance: Les Mangus, Director of Public Works and Community Development; Mark Detter, City Administrator and Daynna DuFriend, Administrative Assistant.

Review the minutes of the January 3, 2017 meeting.

Chairman Allison made a motion, seconded by Dennis Bush, to approve the minutes of the January 3, 2017 meeting as presented. Motion carried 4/0.

Andover Unified Development Manual update from Foster Design Associates, LLC.

David Foster and Debra Foster, Foster Design Associates, LLC presented a power point program informing the Site Plan Review Committee of the progress for the Andover Unified Development Manual update.

David Foster explained that they have been working with City staff and the goal is to simplify and consolidate the information needed to develop projects in Andover. The three things they would like to review with the committee tonight are, 1. Give an overview of progress on the UDM process and explain where the Site Plan information fits in, 2. Review Section 105 that sets up the Site Plan approval process, 3. Review and breakdown the standards. Input and direction from the committee members is what they are looking for. Documents have been reviewed to update for current statutory and legal requirements and consistency. Draft copies will be brought to the committee for the meetings in May and June.

Les Mangus clarified that Section 105 gives the authority for the Site Plan Review Committee. Projects must have Site Plan approval by law. By separating off the standards they don't have to go through a public hearing process.

ANDOVER ZONING DISTRICTS			
CURRENT		PROPOSED	
AGRICULTURAL DISTRICT			
A-1	Agricultural Transition District	Agricultural Transition	A-1
RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS			
R-1	Single-Family Residential District	Single-Family Residential / Low Density	SF-1
R-2	Single-Family Residential District	Single-Family Residential / Medium Density	SF-2
R-5	Single-Family / Zero Lot Line Residential District	Single-Family Residential / Zero Lot Line	SF-3
R-3	Multiple-Family Residential District	Attached Single-family Residential	MF-1
R-4	Multiple-Family Residential District	Multiple-Family / Mixed Residential Use	MXR
R-6	Condominium Residential District	(eliminated)	—
MH-1	Manufactured Home Park District	Manufactured Home Park	MH-1
MH-2	Manufactured Home Subdivision District	(eliminated)	—
BUSINESS DISTRICTS			
B-1	Office Business District	Office Business	B-1
B-2	Neighborhood Business District	Neighborhood Business	B-2
B-3	Central Shopping District	Retail and Service Business	B-3
B-4	Central Business District	Central Business / Mixed Use	B-4
B-5	Highway Business District	Highway Corridor Mixed Use Business	B-5
INDUSTRIAL DISTRICTS			
B-6	Business District	Mixed Industrial / Commercial	MXI
I-1	Industrial District	Industrial	I-1
SPECIAL PURPOSE DISTRICTS			
—	—	Andover Road Corridor Overlay	ACO
—	—	Neighborhood Transition/ Mixed Use	MXN
PUD	Planned Unit Development District	Planned Unit Development	PUD
P-O	Protective Overlay District	Protective Overlay	PO
FP	Flood Plain District	(Replaced with Floodplain Management Regulations; model adopted by Ordinance)	—

11

Foster Design Associates LLC

David Foster described the zoning district changes.

Debra Foster noted that the four existing documents, the standards and the three guidelines, have now been combined. Some of the material is redundant and that is what will be discussed.

David Foster discussed with the committee the need for keeping the estimated cost under \$10,000 requirement. A dollar amount is very simplistic and easily understood.

Dennis Bush suggested keeping a dollar amount as it the simplest way to discriminate the projects. Small projects should still follow these guidelines. The intent was to not delay the smaller projects.

Chairman Allison suggested possibly having it be a requirement that a design professional is required by law when Site Plan approval is needed. And expressed concern for the requirement to have the affirmative vote of at least four members of the Site Plan Review Committee.

Les Mangus advised that on the projects of \$10,000 or less it could be a staff decision to make a modification to the standards.

Debra Foster asked for clarification on whether the Zoning Administrators' designated representative has the authority to do anything that is done by the Zoning Administrator or just a specific task.

Les Mangus said that this must be by task due to the liability protection.

David Foster asked for discussion and definition for when a site plan is still being considered and hasn't been approved, is the controlling factor that they will not receive a zoning permit or they will not receive a certificate of occupancy or they will not receive a building permit. Currently the wording is very confusing.

Dennis Bush said that it could be any of the three because the Zoning Administrator may allow certain construction to go on even though the project has not been through the Site Plan Review Committee because they may not have started that part of the construction. Once it goes to the Site Plan Review Committee those exceptions would be removed.

Les Mangus stated that there is nothing currently that legally allows for a conditional permit pending Site Plan approval. But this does frequently come up. There needs to be the option for a conditional permit.

David Foster asked if Landscape Inspection needed to be in the approval section.

Les Mangus replied that it does, because it is law. If the landscape is not finished they can put up an assurance amount (125% of the cost of landscaping work). This occurs often when a project finishes in January and the landscaping cannot be finished. That forces us to give them a temporary certificate of occupancy and creates a problem because it is difficult to enforce once they are inside the doors.

Debra Foster noted that what this doesn't say is that if the building owner decides they want to they can leave the 125% cost of landscape work with the City and never landscape. And it doesn't specifically say that the City can then go in and do the work. Does this need to be put in?

Les Mangus stated that it should be put in.

Debra Foster asked if the committee wants to see preliminary project plans or should they be sent to Les.

Les Mangus said that preliminary plans are encouraged, particularly on the larger projects.

David Foster explained that this process needs to be sorted out for submitting preliminary and final plans. He then asked if the committee preferred to review a document that has everything on it or do they want to have separate drawings that are required to include potential conflicts. This could possibly be a burden for the applicant.

Chairman Allison said that they normally see drawings separately but can understand the concept of having it combined.

Dennis Bush added that having photos of neighboring properties submitted would be helpful for the committee review.

David Foster asked if the checklist information should be included.

Les Mangus said that it is helpful for the applicant to understand what the committee is looking for.

Member items-

There were no member items.

Adjourn

Chairman Allison adjourned the meeting at 8:18 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted by

Daynna DuFriend
Administrative Assistant

Approved this 7th day of March, 2017 by the Site Plan Review Committee, City of Andover.