



**PLANNING & ZONING**  
1609 E. CENTRAL AVE.  
POB 295  
ANDOVER, KS 67002  
316.733.1303

**SITE PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE MINUTES**  
**NOVEMBER 3, 2020 | 6:00pm**  
ANDOVER CENTRAL PARK LODGE | 1607 E. CENTRAL AVE.

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

Doug Allison called the meeting to order at 6:01 pm.

**2. ROLL CALL**

Committee Members in attendance: Doug Allison, Homer Henry, Dave Foley, Vu Nguyen, Brandon Wilson, and Todd Woolsoncroft. Staff in attendance: Jennifer McCausland, City Administrator; Lance Onstott, Assistant City Administrator; Les Mangus, Director of Community Development; and Justin Constantino, Assistant Director of Community Development.

**3. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 3, 2020 MEETING**

*Homer Henry made a motion to approve the minutes of the March 3, 2020 meeting as presented. Motion seconded by Todd Woolsoncroft. Motion carried 6/0.*

**4. COMMUNICATIONS**

**A. COMMITTEE & STAFF REPORT**

**B. POTENTIAL RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT REPORT**

**5. SP-2020-10 - REVIEW OF AN AUTO BODY SHOP ON THE PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED AT 115 W. CLOUD AVENUE, ANDOVER, KANSAS**

The applicant, Jeff Coykendall, introduced himself and provided an overview of the proposed business on the subject property.

Don Kimble, representing the applicant, stated that a special use for an auto body shop was granted for the property by the Planning Commission at their October 20<sup>th</sup> meeting, in which the Planning Commission stressed the importance of screening the property to ensure that any vehicle storage be kept behind a screened fence. Mr. Kimble stated that the fencing on the property has been replaced with cedar fencing to ensure proper screening.

Mr. Kimble addressed staff comments, stating that they have added more evergreen species to meet the landscaping requirement. Mr. Kimble stated that the parking space width would be nine feet wide. Mr. Kimble provided the committee with an updated site plan stating that the plan does not currently show the requested landscaping screening in addition to the wall screening, but that he intends to add the additional screening. Mr. Kimble requested relief from the landscaped endcap southwest side of the property adjacent to the dumpster due to the ability of the garbage collector to maneuver in the space. Mr. Kimble confirmed that the property had 200 feet of interior landscaping for every 15 parking spaces as requested by staff. Mr. Kimble stated that the landscaping containing the light poles consisted of two stripe-painted parking spaces to allow for maneuverability of vehicles. Mr. Kimble stated that the site plan has been revised to show the distance of the building from the right-of-way to assist with sign calculation. Mr. Mangus requested that the applicant provide staff with the calculations for the sign dimensions.

Mr. Kimble stated that the building was primarily metal with split-faced concrete blocks and red bollards, with the columns painted red. Mr. Kimble provided a material and color sample for the committee.

Mr. Woolsoncroft asked where the mechanical units would be located and if they would be screened. Mr. Kimble stated that the air compressors would be located inside the building and that the HVAC units for the office area would be located on the roof.

Mr. Henry asked how much of the building material was metal. Mr. Kimble stated that the entire building was metal with the exception of the columns, which also have accent lights.

Mr. Wilson asked about the type of HVAC system that will be used. Bill Johnson, representing the applicant, stated that everything will be located internal to the building.

Mr. Woolsoncroft asked about the slope of the roof. Mr. Johnson stated that the slope was a ½ twelve pitch. Mr. Kimble stated that the building will have one furnace and one condensing unit placed behind the parapet, and that anything visible would be screened.

Mr. Henry asked if the logo of the car had been used elsewhere as it seems familiar. Mr. Kimble stated that the logo of the car on the sign and gates is not the final logo.

Mr. Wilson asked what about the gate material. Mr. Kimble stated that the gate was black metal. Mr. Foley asked if the metal was corrugated. Mr. Kimble stated that the metal would be flat.

Mr. Henry asked if the cedar fencing would be painted. Mr. Kimble said no.

Mr. Wilson stated that there was conflicting information on the plans regarding the canopy length from east to west. Mr. Kimble stated that the canopy length would be the larger of the two measurements. Mr. Wilson asked if a canopy was allowed in the drainage easement and the setback. Mr. Mangus stated that the canopy is allowed in the setback but not in the drainage easement, and that a portion of the easement would have to be vacated if the applicant desired to keep the canopy size as proposed.

Mr. Allison asked what was allowed in Reserve A. Mr. Mangus stated that the reserve allows for signage, landscaping and utilities, but does not allow for parking or a sidewalk.

Mr. Wilson asked about the drainage on the property. Mr. Mangus stated that he requested that information from the project's civil engineer and did not receive an answer. Mr. Mangus stated that additional utility easements may be required outside of the subject parcel for the sanitary sewer extension. Mr. Wilson asked if the utility easement process has been started by the applicant. Mr. Johnson stated that the process has not yet been started as the contract is pending. Mr. Wilson stated that a sanitary sewer line was coming out of the southeast corner and asked if there were any other lines going to the building. Mr. Johnson said no. Mr. Wilson asked if there were any drains located in the warehouse or shop area. Mr. Johnson stated that he does not remember.

Mr. Wilson asked how the drainage elevation contours relate back to the architectural elevations. Mr. Kimble stated that was something that the civil engineer would be able to review. Mr. Mangus stated that there was no percentage of grade given on the parking lot and that percentages of slope need to be noted on the plan showing the distance between elevation spots.

Mr. Wilson asked about the height of the light poles. Mr. Kimble stated that the poles were 20 feet high. Mr. Wilson stated that the height of the light poles are shown higher than 20 feet on the elevation drawings. Mr. Wilson stated that the location of the light pole at the southeast corner of the property may conflict with the proposed shade tree in that location.

Mr. Wilson stated that any landscape island should be 10 feet in width. Mr. Kimble stated that they will not have any interior landscape islands and that the parking spaces near the endcaps require a two-foot strip to allow for exit from the vehicle when parked.

Mr. Wilson stated that the north parking stalls on the landscape plan should have a continuous three-foot-tall screening. Mr. Wilson said that if the applicant maintains 16 parking spaces on the north side of the property, there needs to be a landscape island for every 15 stalls. Mr. Wilson stated that several shade trees are too large due to their proximity to the pavement and require eight feet separation from the pavement in both directions. Mr. Kimble stated that the applicant cannot meet that requirement.

Mr. Allison asked if the building canopy contained only two trusses. Mr. Kimble stated that the trusses have not been designed yet but that they will be steel tubes.

Mr. Allison asked if the trim design will wrap around the entire perimeter. Mr. Kimble said yes.

Mr. Wilson passed out photos of the surrounding buildings near the subject property and asked how about the design of the building and its relationship to buildings in the area. Mr. Wilson stated that while other buildings in the area use metal siding, this would be the only building that uses metal siding that faces an arterial street.

Mr. Wilson asked if the committee would be able to vote on an incomplete document. Mr. Mangus stated that any motion would have to contain a list of the requested changes, and that due to the number of requested changes, the committee has the option to vote to table the plan.

Mr. Wilson stated that if you compare the materials of the subject building to the surrounding buildings that the surrounding buildings all have higher end materials including concrete and masonry. Mr. Mangus discussed the nearby AutoZone, stating that the building has split-faced accents and color changes.

Mr. Woolsoncroft stated that the design of the building is not harmonious to the surrounding environment in his opinion.

Mr. Allison stated that he appreciates the approach of the elevation along Cloud Avenue and that the applicant should consider upgrading the upper panel to break up the architecture and potentially modify the east elevation.

Mr. Johnson stated that the contract for the property is pending on site plan approval and that he has an issue that one of the site plan committee members bid on the same project. Ms. McCausland stated that the City of Andover requires elected and appointed officials to recuse themselves when they have a financial interest to gain from a decision that is made one way or another but that does not apply to officials that seek business and do not get it. Mr. Wilson asked if there were any items on the staff comments that were opinions versus requirements from the regulations. Mr. Mangus said no.

Mr. Johnson stated that the applicant has a contract that he has to execute and that the applicant needs to get into the building by a particular date.

*Brandon Wilson made a motion to table SP-2020-10. Motion seconded by Todd Woolsoncroft.*

Mr. Henry stated that discussion regarding building design can be subjective but that discussion regarding the design elements, particularly regarding the east elevation, hold true.

*Motion carried 6/0.*

**6. MEMBER ITEMS**

Mr. Wilson asked about a pre-manufactured home north of the old historical society. Mr. Mangus stated that the area is zoned residential and that the home on the property is a residential design manufactured home that is allowed in the zoning district.

Mr. Wilson asked if the new walking path along Andover Road requires the review of the Site Plan Committee. Mr. Mangus stated that the new sidewalks do not require Site Plan Committee approval unless staff is instructed to bring the item to the Site Plan Committee.

Mr. Wilson asked about streetlights going out on Yorktown Parkway. Ms. McCausland stated that it was a technical issue and that Mr. Mangus was working with Evergy.

Mr. Wilson asked about the engineering issues that the committee discussed and Mr. Mangus stated that the City had recently hired PEC for engineering services going forward.

**7. ADJOURN**

*Homer Henry made a motion to adjourn. Motion seconded by Todd Woolsoncroft. Meeting adjourned at 7:21 pm.*

---

Respectfully submitted by:

Justin Constantino  
Assistant Director of Community Development

Approved on the \_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2020 by the Site Plan Review Committee, City of Andover.