



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

SITE PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE MINUTES

SEPTEMBER 3, 2024 | 6:00 P.M.

ANDOVER CITY HALL | 1609 E. CENTRAL AVE.

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Allison called the meeting to order at 6:21 P.M.

2. ROLL CALL

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

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

3. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 6, 2024 MEETING

Homer Henry made a motion to approve the minutes of the August 6, 2024 meeting as presented. Motion seconded by Kevin Graham. Motion carried 4/0.

4. COMMUNICATIONS

A. COMMITTEE & STAFF REPORT

None.

B. POTENTIAL RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT REPORT

5. AGENDA

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

The applicant's agent, Dave Wells with SPT Architecture, was in attendance. He explained the changes to the Buffalo Ridge project, which incorporated comments from the previous Site Plan Review meeting, and from Staff. He stated that from the original plan, more parking stalls and private garages had been added, the pool had been moved from inside the clubhouse to outside, and the entry gate on the north side of the property had been removed. He stated that secondary fire access had been moved from the south side of the property to the east, due to the ongoing nearby street projects. He continued by describing the changes to the building exteriors that were discussed at the last meeting, with the outside of each building changing from bluish EIFS to painted siding of various types, and the stonework had been changed to bricks. He added that the clubhouse would feature exterior columns with the original style of stonework, but that said stonework would not be present anywhere else.

Chairperson Allison asked if all of the siding would be painted the same color, echoing the discussion from the previous Site Plan Review meeting. Mr. Wells stated that there were two different tones for the siding plan. Chairperson Allison asked if they would be amenable to mixing in more colors to increase visual interest, and noted that the clubhouse plan features a different color on the doors that may be a good option. Mr. Wells stated that this would be considered.



Mr. Graham stated that the original, bluish design looked more “dynamic”, and that the Committee wished to avoid approving a large, white wall facing US-54. Mr. Henry agreed, stating that much of the issue stems from the lack of visual interest on the rear of the buildings.

Chairperson Allison asked if the siding included three different products, as multiple textures were depicted in the Site Plan. Mr. Wells confirmed as much, and stated that one of the types is only present near the top of each building.

Chairperson Allison asked if the shake siding could be changed to another color, given its distribution across the buildings. Mr. Wells stated that it would be considered, but he expressed concerns that changing just this tone may prove to look “spotty”. Chairperson Allison was sympathetic, and stated that perhaps certain ‘pop out’ areas that already provide visual interest may be the best place for differently-colored siding.

Mr. Henry returned to the issue of the backs of each building, stating that he is not in favor of the large plane being all the same color. Mr. Wells stated that this lighter-color style with dark trim and brickwork is becoming more popular in the market, when compared to the more colorful original plans. Mr. Graham confirmed that the overall color scheme was the primary point of discussion at the August meeting.

Mr. Henry asked if all of the original landscaping was still the same. Mr. Wells stated that it was.

Chairperson Allison asked again if SPT was willing to implement some shifts in color.

A resident, who later identified herself as Julie Armstrong, living at 333 S. Pitchers Court, asked why the planned fence on the northern side of the property had been removed. She stated that litter from the road and, presumably, apartment complex had been blowing into her yard. Chairperson Allison entertained her comments. Mr. Mangus stated that instead of the original fence, a 6-foot berm had been constructed along the north end, but that it had not yet been landscaped.

Mrs. Armstrong then asked why the pool was moved outside. Chairperson Allison continued to entertain. Mr. Graham stated that the pool was actually in the same location as before, the clubhouse roof simply no longer covered it. Mrs. Armstrong asked if there would be a fence around the pool. Mr. Wells stated that there would be. Mrs. Armstrong asked if there would be a fence around the playground. Mr. Wells stated that no fence was planned to go around the playground, but that it may be considered in the future.

Mr. Henry asked if, with the removal of the northern ornamental fence, there was indeed no fence at all on the north end of the property. Mr. Mangus confirmed as much, and stated that the aforementioned 6-foot berm was in fact taller than the original fence had been, and would eventually feature trees on top to further increase the height and screening. Mr. Graham asked if the berm and its landscaping were part of the ongoing street improvement project. Mr. Mangus stated that the berm was, but that the landscaping was the responsibility of the apartment complex.



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

SITE PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE MINUTES

SEPTEMBER 3, 2024 | 6:00 P.M.
ANDOVER CITY HALL | 1609 E. CENTRAL AVE.

Mrs. Armstrong asked when the original zoning case was approved, that allowed for the project to appear at the Site Plan Review meeting. Chairperson Allison continued to entertain. Mr. Mangus stated that he believed it to have been back in 2020, though he was not certain. Mrs. Armstrong stated that she was unaware of this in 2020, that no residents in her neighborhood were aware of the current Site Plans, and that she was concerned about apartment residents and visitors parking nearby and shining their headlights toward her house.

Mr. Henry asked what the width is of the nearby right-of-way. Mr. Mangus stated that it is 75 feet. Mrs. Armstrong stated that LED headlights are more than powerful enough to cross this distance and still be very bright. She added that she believes that the apartment complex will reduce her property values, and that it will be "trashy".

Mr. Graham addressed the litter concerns, stating that the original fence would not have helped either, given that it was an ornamental, wrought-iron fence with large gaps. He stated that the Planning Commission meeting back in 2020 would have been the appropriate time for public comments related to the screening and landscaping requirements of the property. Mrs. Armstrong stated that since the meeting happened during the lockdown period of the COVID-19 pandemic, she was unable to attend and voice her concerns.

Mr. Mangus stated that the landscaping requirements of the property are prescriptive from the original zoning case, and that a very high amount of screening and landscaping was being installed for this property compared to other projects. He added that the berm had not yet been landscaped because it was so new, having been completed approximately a month prior.

Mr. Henry asked if the details of this zoning case could be provided to the residents. Mr. Mangus and Mr. Westphall stated that they would provide that information.

Chairperson Allison asked if trees were planned to be planted on top of the berm. Mr. Wells confirmed as much. Mrs. Armstrong stated that the berm was not 6 feet tall, and was barely above the sidewalk grade. Chairperson Allison continued to entertain. Mr. Mangus stated that the 6-foot measurement was made from the northern subject property line. Mrs. Armstrong stated that she disagreed with the conclusion that the berm was of sufficient height, and that in her experience, apartment complexes are generally surrounded by some kind of fence on all sides.

Chairperson Allison returned to the topic of the building color, asking if the applicant was open to considering some color shifts, as it would help to break up the elevations with more visual interest. Mr. Henry stated that the original colors were much more visually interesting. Mr. Wells stated that they would generate some exhibits showing said color shifts for consideration. Mr. Graham agreed that this would be preferable, and stated that the original bluish color was not required. Mr. Henry asked if these new colors would need their own Site Plan approval. Chairperson Allison stated that they would.

Homer Henry made a motion to table the discussion until the applicant provides exhibits showing more color and visual interest on the building exteriors. Motion seconded by Kevin Graham. Motion carried 4/0.



5.2 SP-A24-0018 — REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF THE SITE PLAN FOR 115 W. ALLISON STREET, ANDOVER, KANSAS

Chris Hagan of Hagan Construction and Nathan Strecker of Discrete Build were in attendance as the applicant's agents. Mr. Strecker stated that the proposed structure is a 3000-square foot metal building. He continued that they had implemented comments from Staff and engineering, and included a concept of a similar building to show the color and materials of the structure. He stated that there would be an overhead door on the front side (facing Allison Street), and a single bathroom, but otherwise it would be an empty storage structure.

Mr. Henry asked if the building to the west, owned by the same applicant, would match the new structure. Mr. Hagan confirmed that it would.

Mr. Henry stated that he was confused by the Staff comments related to the landscaping. Mr. Mangus clarified that the formula that all Site Plans are required to use for tree calculations was not utilized. Mr. Henry asked if all of the required trees had to be on the property, rather than in the right of way. Mr. Mangus confirmed as much. Mr. Graham noted that the landscaping plan in the agenda packet was dated 08/30, and asked if Staff had been able to review it yet. Mr. Mangus stated that at least he had not.

Mr. Hagan stated that the small size and unusual shape of the property made fitting more landscaping a challenge.

Mr. Graham stated that a change in variety may be all that is needed, as one third of all screening trees are required to be evergreens.

Mr. Henry stated that he is in favor of the provided color samples, stating that Allison Street today looks very bland.

Chairperson Allison asked if a grading plan had been submitted. Mr. Mangus replied in the negative.

Chairperson Allison asked if any details had been provided on the lighting fixtures. Mr. Mangus replied that no details had been given, but added that floodlights are not permitted within the city. Mr. Henry asked if the light would need to be raised to meet the lighting minimums required by the Unified Development Manual. Mr. Mangus stated that this was an option, and that the other option was to use pole lights.

Mr. Henry asked if the numerical requirements for landscaping and site lighting were available in the UDM. Mr. Mangus confirmed that they were.

Mr. Henry asked what color the doors would be. Mr. Hagan stated that they were not yet sure, but were open to suggestions, and that the doors at least would not be painted white.

Homer Henry made a motion to approve the site plan for 115 W. Allison Street with the condition that a revised lighting plan, revised landscaping plan, erosion control plan, and grading plan be submitted. Motion seconded by Jeff Adleson. Discussion continued.



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

SITE PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE MINUTES

SEPTEMBER 3, 2024 | 6:00 P.M.
ANDOVER CITY HALL | 1609 E. CENTRAL AVE.

Chairperson Allison stated that he would prefer to have the grading plan in-hand before issuing even conditional approval, and asked if Staff felt comfortable reviewing and approving all of the aforementioned documents. Mr. Henry stated that he felt that Staff was capable of doing so, noting that the lighting and landscaping plans only required very small revisions. Mr. Mangus concurred that Staff would be comfortable and capable in this capacity.

Motion carried 4/0.

6. MEMBER ITEMS

Mr. Henry wished to remind everyone that Greater Andover Days is coming up, and to be on the lookout for news and updates.

7. ADJOURN

Homer Henry made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Motion seconded by Kevin Graham. Motion carried 4/0.

Meeting adjourned at 7:15 P.M.