



1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Doug Allison called the meeting to order at 6:00 P.M.

2. ROLL CALL

Committee members in attendance: Chairperson Doug Allison; Homer Henry; Kevin Graham; Todd Woolsoncroft; Brian Schwan; and Jeff Adelson.

Staff members in attendance: Les Mangus, Director of Community Development; Jolene Graham, Assistant City Administrator; David Westphall, Zoning Administrator; and Connor Boyd, Planning Technician.

3. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE JULY 2, 2024 MEETING

Todd Woolsoncroft made a motion to approve the minutes of the July 2, 2024 meeting as presented. Motion seconded by Homer Henry. Motion carried 6/0.

4. COMMUNICATIONS

A. COMMITTEE & STAFF REPORT

None.

B. POTENTIAL RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT REPORT

5. AGENDA

5.1 AESTHETIC REVIEW — REVIEW OF THE SITE PLAN FOR RENEW CONSIGNMENT & CAFÉ, GENERALLY LOCATED AT 403 W. CENTRAL AVENUE, ANDOVER, KANSAS

Mr. Westphall began by explaining that this property has an already-approved Site Plan, which the Committee approved at the June Site Plan Review meeting.

The applicant, Rene West, was in attendance. She presented a possible material option for covering the pallet fence on the patio. Ms. West stated that she would prefer this material to the approved cedar planks, as it would be much cheaper to install and maintain, and would promote airflow to the open-air patio. She stated that another option was for reed or bamboo-based fencing. No material sample was provided for this material.

Chairperson Allison asked what the presented mesh material was made out of. Ms. West said that she was not sure, but that it was made for exterior use.

Mr. Henry asked where this mesh material would be installed. Ms. West stated that it would cover the outside of the pallets on the patio.

Mr. Henry reviewed the previously-approved Site Plan, and asked why alternate materials were being presented, when the approved plan includes specific material choices. Ms. West stated that she hoped to gain approval for different materials due to the cost of installation and upkeep of the approved cedar.



Mr. Henry reiterated that an approved Site Plan is already in place, and stated that just as before, he does not care for pallets whatsoever. He continued that the presented materials, as well as the mentioned reed or bamboo, would also require lots of maintenance to keep the appearance up.

Darren Spitzenerger with DSS Engineering Solutions was in attendance to support Ms. West. He asked why the Committee was seeking vertical cedar planks in the first place, as this would fail to cover the pallets anyway. Mr. Henry stated again that that is from the already-approved Plan, and that during discussion at the June meeting, multiple Committee and Staff members has expressed having seen patio fencing of this style in other locations. He added that the cedar material would degrade more slowly.

Mr. Spitzenerger and Ms. West concurred that ongoing maintenance was inevitable.

Ms. West stated that one hurdle to the cedar plank installation was that the pallets are not perfectly aligned, so adding the slats may make them look more askew. Mr. Henry stated that the pallets could just be removed and replaced with other fencing. Ms. West stated that she was not able to install a 'real' fence, as the patio sits atop the parking lot, and she cannot drill down into the asphalt to sink fence posts.

The Committee discussed the previously-litigated structural issues of the patio, which is freestanding, adjacent to the building sidewalk. Mr. Spitzenerger stated that while the patio was freestanding, the pallets were of course connected to one another, just not to the ground.

Ms. West asked the Committee if they had any alternative proposal to what had been so far presented. Mr. Henry stated that in the absence of a new proposal, the existing Site Plan would stand.

Mr. Schwan asked if the cedar plank materials were already on-hand. Ms. West confirmed that they were.

Mr. Graham asked what action the Committee must take, given that the item was presented as an 'aesthetic review'. Mr. Westphall stated that the approved Site Plan and its conditions would stand unless the Committee decided otherwise, and that the applicant had supplied material samples and concepts for discussion purposes.

Mr. Woolsoncroft expressed that he felt that the patio structure would require a more-firm skeleton to which to attach the aforementioned cedar planks.

Mr. Henry asked if the plan was to install the cedar planks over the existing gaps in the pallet wood, and stated that the orientation of the pallets could be changed to achieve visual unity. Mr. Mangus stated that he thought that the approved plan would install the planks as an overlay.

Mr. Spitzenerger asked why a 'horizontal fence' would look better than horizontal pallets.



Chairperson Allison asked how the planks would be attached to the pallets. Ms. West stated that she would either use zip ties, or screw them on. Chairperson Allison then asked if the presented mesh material would be attached in the same way. Ms. West stated that it likely would, and added that the material comes with zip ties that blend into the look and help the mesh to lay as flat as possible.

Chairperson Allison asked why the 'basketweave' pattern, that was presented as an alternative solution, was not being considered. Ms. West stated that the concept image showed a much more expensive fence with metal components. Chairperson Allison asked why metal had to be used instead of wood. Ms. West stated that it was for durability reasons. Mr. Spitzenberger stated that newly-installed wood would last as long as any other.

Mr. Graham noted that the patio 'flooring' was already comprised of cedar. He stated that he prefers vertical slats for the cedar, but that the approved Site Plan states that horizontal slats are to be installed.

Mr. Spitzenberger again raised the issue of airflow if the gaps in the pallets were to be blocked by the cedar slats.

Chairperson Allison stated that he supports the 'basketweave' design, and that the cedar would look nice. Ms. West stated that instead of the cedar slats, she could use vinyl with a wood look.

Mr. Henry once more stated that he is not in favor of keeping the pallets whatsoever, and would prefer a 'real' fence.

Chairperson Allison stated that he enjoys the look of mixed materials.

Mr. Henry referenced one of the presented solutions, which included greenery covering part of each pallet, and asked if it would continue to look the same into the winter months. Mr. Schwan asked if the plants were artificial. Ms. West responded that they were artificial, and that she prefers the presented mesh material.

Mr. Mangus interjected to state that in his experience, the mesh material was good for about 2 years.

Mr. Schwan stated that the patio was in direct sunlight, which would bleach any material. Mr. Henry agreed, stating that any solution will require upkeep to maintain the aesthetic.

Mr. Mangus asked if the Committee would entertain simply having the pallets painted or stained to match the building facia. Mr. Henry asked how often the facia is replaced or re-stained. Ms. West answered that she believed it to be approximately every 5 years. She suggested a hybrid solution, installing the cedar planks and undergoing an overall painting or staining of the pallets. Mr. Henry stated that he would like to see what this solution would look like before approving it.



SITE PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE MINUTES
AUGUST 6, 2024 | 6:00 P.M.
ANDOVER CITY HALL | 1609 E. CENTRAL AVE.

Ms. West reminded the Committee that, per the conditions of the approved Site Plan, she only has until August 30th to implement a solution, and that the next meeting is after this deadline.

Mr. Schwan asked how often the fake plants would have to be replaced. Ms. West estimated every 2 years.

Mr. Schwan stated that the 'basketweave' design would look nice, but may not be feasible, and asked the Committee to keep in mind the goal of coming to a solution.

Chairperson Allison expressed his skepticism about the fake plant solution. Mr. Graham agreed, stating that it is hard to visualize, especially since the provided pictures do not show its implementation on the building facia. He continued that the existing Site Plan would keep its deadline in place unless the Committee decided to change it.

Ms. Graham concurred, stating that in the absence of any modification the Committee may simply allow the approved Site Plan and its conditions to stand.

The Committee discussed the preference for horizontal or vertical planks, eventually confirming that the approved plan allowed for horizontal slats. Mr. Graham stated that the orientation of the slats was not important to him.

Kevin Graham made a motion to amend the previously-approved Site Plan, keeping all conditions but allowing for the cedar slats to be installed horizontally or vertically. Motion seconded by Brian Schwan. Discussion continued.

Mr. Mangus reminded the Committee that the provision for painting or staining to match the building had also been discussed.

Kevin Graham amended his motion, adding that the pallets be painted or stained to match the building, and the cedar may either be painted to match, or given a clear seal like the patio flooring. Motion seconded by Brian Schwan. Motion carried 6/0.

5.2 SP-A24-0007 — REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF THE REVISED SITE PLAN FOR BUFFALO RIDGE APARTMENTS, GENERALLY LOCATED AT 800 W. HWY 54, ANDOVER, KANSAS

Mr. Westphall stated that this project also features an approved Site Plan, which passed through the Committee at the April meeting. He stated that the changes to the plan address some feedback from the Fire Department, in removing the median at the front entrance to the complex, adding some extra parking stalls, and removing a perimeter fence that had been rendered obsolete by the landscaping plan, including the construction of a large berm to the south.

Mr. Graham asked for clarification as to the location of the removed fence. Mr. Westphall pointed it out on the provided materials, stating that it was to be a perimeter fence.



SITE PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE MINUTES
AUGUST 6, 2024 | 6:00 P.M.
ANDOVER CITY HALL | 1609 E. CENTRAL AVE.

Mr. Graham noted that across the street, the property abuts residential lots, featuring single-family homes. He asked if the screening requirements were heightened due to the difference in land uses. Mr. Mangus replied that apartments and single-family homes are both considered residential uses, so the screening that was required was not so drastic. He added that the Planned Unit Development which governs the property already requires landscaping greater than that which is required.

Mr. Graham asked if a fence would be included along Founders Parkway. Mr. Mangus stated that this area features a large berm and the backyard fences of residents, in addition to the aforementioned landscaping.

Mr. Henry asked why the Plan added more parking spaces. Mr. Westphall stated that a slight change in the overall occupancy requires slightly more parking stalls. Mr. Henry asked if the previous Plan was not compliant in its number of parking stalls, and if so, why it was approved. Mr. Mangus stated that the new owner wished to install ADA-compliant covered parking garages, and does not intend to have a security gate at the front entrance.

Mr. Henry recalled another recent amendment to the Site Plan regarding the swimming pool. Mr. Mangus confirmed that the Committee had approved a modification that allowed for the pool to be indoors instead of outside.

Mr. Woolsoncroft asked what the materials would be for the mechanical and trash screening enclosures. Mr. Mangus stated that the materials were not given in the supplied plans. Mr. Woolsoncroft noted that the plans mention 'metal', but are not specific.

Chairperson Allison noted that the previously-approved Site Plan showed the buildings as being much more colorful, with blue sections on the exterior. Mr. Mangus confirmed, and pointed out the supplied color samples. He added that the trash enclosure was to be surrounded by 'siding', again nonspecific.

Chairperson Allison asked if the roofing material would be changing. Mr. Mangus stated that it would not.

Mr. Graham noted the monotone neutrality of the new color scheme.

Chairperson Allison asked if the demonstrated brick would continue along the front and rear of each building, and be visible from Kellogg Avenue. Mr. Westphall showed that this would be the case.

Mr. Henry asked for clarification as to what was meant by the 'front' elevation, asking if that referred to the north side of the building. Mr. Graham stated that it seemed to be the side that faces the interior parking lot.

Mr. Henry asked where the mechanical elements would be located. Mr. Mangus pointed out that they would be at ground level.



Chairperson Allison suggested that the siding could be broken up with different orientations to create more visual interest. Mr. Westphall confirmed that this was indeed the plan. Mr. Mangus added that 3 siding patterns were shown on the rear elevations, all the same color.

Mr. Henry stated that he preferred the original color scheme, and asked if disapproval or continuation of the item would hold up construction. Mr. Mangus replied that it is up to the Committee's discretion to continue the item until such time that the applicant can attend the meeting.

Mr. Woolsoncroft mentioned that the original color scheme can still be achieved by painting the new siding.

Homer Henry made a motion to table the item until the September 3rd, 2024 meeting. Motion seconded by Brian Schwan. Motion carried 6/0.

Chairperson Allison asked if the concerns of the Committee would be transmitted to the applicant. Ms. Boyd stated that the applicant would be informed of the Committee's concerns the very next day.

5.3 SP-A24-0013 — REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF THE SITE PLAN FOR POINT 9, GENERALLY LOCATED AT 1539 N. ANDOVER ROAD, ANDOVER, KANSAS

Aaron Harnden with Baughman Co. was in attendance. He stated that the project is on a vacant lot along the Redbud Trail, on which the owner intends to install a restaurant and meeting place for trailgoers and others. Mr. Harnden continued that the lot would feature 2 access points, and that the Planned Unit Development governing the property had already been fully approved.

Mr. Henry asked what Staff comments had been addressed, as it was noted that not all comments had been addressed before the meeting. Mr. Harnden replied that certain dimensioning was modified, but that the primary missing element was a Lighting Plan.

Mr. Henry asked if the property would feature sidewalks of average width. Mr. Mangus confirmed, stating that 4-foot sidewalks would be along the road, with 5- and 6-foot sidewalks in the interior of the property. Mr. Mangus added that some of the lot parking was along Harrison Street, per the PUD provisions.

Mr. Henry asked if a fence would be installed along the west and south edges of the property. Mr. Harnden confirmed that they would, and stated that these areas would be landscaped as well.

Mr. Woolsoncroft asked what type of lighting would be used. Mr. Harnden replied that it would be building-mounted, down-firing lights.

Mr. Henry asked if the property would be lit at night. Mr. Mangus stated that it would, but that a Lighting Plan was required, and added that floodlights were not allowed to be used.



Mr. Henry asked if there were any drainage concerns. Mr. Mangus stated that the nearby storm sewer would be adequate.

Chairperson Allison asked where the mechanical features would be installed. Mr. Harnden stated that he believed they would be on the roof, but he was not entirely sure.

Mr. Henry asked if Staff was okay with the amount of metal used in the building exterior, noting that one of the reasons for the establishment of the Site Plan Review Committee was to reduce the number of cheap-looking metal buildings in town. Mr. Mangus replied that this implementation was acceptable due to the use of architectural metal siding that was aesthetically pleasing, adding that the surrounding neighborhood featured a wide mix of building materials already. Mr. Henry asked if this metal siding would continue to look good in 2 to 5 years. Mr. Mangus replied that this type of siding normally has a 20 to 50 year warranty.

Mr. Henry asked if the Site Plan approval also included the depicted signs, or if a separate sign plan would be brought to the Committee in the future. Mr. Mangus confirmed that the signage was included. Mr. Henry then asked if there would be a monument sign on the property. Mr. Harnden replied that they are only installing wall signs. Mr. Graham asked if the signs would be lighted, and Mr. Mangus confirmed that those on the north and east side would be; the rest would be painted.

Mr. Henry asked what amenities would be present for bicycles. Mr. Harnden replied that many of the bicycle racks would be indoors.

Homer Henry made a motion to approve the Site Plan for 1539 N. Andover Road, on the condition that Staff receive and approve a Site Lighting Plan. Motion seconded by Kevin Graham. Motion carried 6/0.

5.4 SP-A24-0014 — REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF THE SIGN PLAN FOR VIP SMOKE SHOP, GENERALLY LOCATED AT 229 N. ANDOVER ROAD, ANDOVER, KANSAS

Mr. Westphall introduced the item, a fairly normal wall sign for a new business. He added that the property is under a Variance, approved in 2008, that allowed for increased overall wall coverage. He stated that after this sign is installed, approximately 79 square feet of wall space will be available for other wall signage.

Mr. Woolsoncroft asked if the coverage requirements were broken down by tenant space. Mr. Westphall stated that no, the coverage is for the entire building frontage. Mr. Mangus added that the City cannot control the proportion of signs on a given building, only enforce the overall coverage; thus, the part taken up by a given tenant is between them and the landlord, or other tenants.

Mr. Woolsoncroft asked if this sign was consistent in size with others on the building. Mr. Mangus replied in the affirmative.



Mr. Henry mentioned seeing another 'mirrored' sign at a different smoke shop in town, and asked if that was a concern here. Mr. Mangus replied in the negative.

Mr. Henry asked what the 'I' in 'VIP' was made up of in the sign. Mr. Westphall stated that it appeared to be a vertically-oriented cigar.

Todd Woolsoncroft made a motion to approve the sign plan for VIP Smoke Shop. Motion seconded by Homer Henry. Motion carried 6/0.

5.5 SP-A24-0016 — REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF THE SIGN PLAN FOR THE WESLEY ANDOVER ER, GENERALLY LOCATED AT 221 W. HWY 54, ANDOVER, KANSAS

Kevin Himes with Luminous Neon was in attendance. He stated that this plan is for modified signs from the original Site Plan, moving several signs including the pylon to have better visibility when accounting for the upcoming US-54 (Kellogg) project.

Mr. Henry noted the presence of large trees to the west of the property, and asked if these would block the pylon. Mr. Mangus replied that the main goal is visibility from the highway.

Mr. Henry asked what constitutes a 'pylon sign'. Mr. Himes replied that his company does not use a set definition, but that it would be a tall sign that is not a pole sign (as these are forbidden in the city).

Mr. Graham noted that the proposed monument sign would be 8 feet tall, and asked about the structural support it would require, noting that it looked to be atop a storm sewer line. Mr. Himes replied that the previous day he had been on site with Deje, the inspector, to locate this line and avoid it with the monument sign support beam.

Mr. Henry asked if Staff had any concerns about the lighted signs. Mr. Mangus replied that LED signs have very specific and stringent requirements in the city, and all regulations had been accounted for.

Kevin Graham made a motion to approve the sign plan for the Wesley Andover ER, with the condition that a landscaping plan be received and approved by Staff featuring landscaping around the monument sign. Motion seconded by Brian Schwan. Motion carried 6/0.

5.6 SP-A24-0017 — REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF THE SIGN PLAN FOR LIVINGSTON'S CAFÉ, GENERALLY LOCATED AT 400 S. HERITAGE WAY, ANDOVER, KANSAS

Mr. Westphall explained that this wall sign would be located in the Heritage Commons area, and was a very straightforward wall sign for the restaurant.

Mr. Woolsoncroft, noting the size of the sign, asked if a Variance applied to this property as well to allow for increased wall sign coverage. Mr. Mangus replied that there was no such Variance, but it likely would not be necessary, as the entire wall elevation was considered for coverage calculations.



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

SITE PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE MINUTES
AUGUST 6, 2024 | 6:00 P.M.
ANDOVER CITY HALL | 1609 E. CENTRAL AVE.

Todd Woolsoncroft made a motion to approve the sign plan for Livingston's Café. Motion seconded by Kevin Graham. Motion carried 6/0.

6. MEMBER ITEMS

None.

7. ADJOURN

Homer Henry made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Motion seconded by Todd Woolsoncroft. Motion carried 6/0.

Meeting adjourned at 7:44 P.M.