



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

## **SITE PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE MINUTES**

**NOVEMBER 5, 2024 | 6:00 P.M.**

ANDOVER CITY HALL | 1609 E. CENTRAL AVE.

### **1. CALL TO ORDER**

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

### **2. ROLL CALL**

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

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 OCTOBER 1, 2024 MEETING**

*Homer Henry made a motion to approve the minutes of the October 1, 2024 meeting as presented. Motion seconded by Kevin Graham. Motion carried 5/0.*

### **4. COMMUNICATIONS**

#### **A. COMMITTEE & STAFF REPORT**

None.

#### **B. POTENTIAL RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT REPORT**

### **5. AGENDA**

#### **5.1 SP-A24-0019 — REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF THE SITE PLAN FOR ANDOVER AUTO BODY, GENERALLY LOCATED AT 123 W. CLOUD AVENUE, ANDOVER, KANSAS**

The applicant, Jeff Coykendall, was in attendance. Mr. Coykendall explained that he is wanting to add another shop building to his property, which already features a main shop and a parts building, the latter of which being added later. He stated that the new building would be primary used for suspension repair work.

Chairperson Allison asked if the new building would be replacing anything currently present on the property. Mr. Coykendall stated that it would not. Chairperson Allison then asked if any addition had been made to the older buildings. Mr. Coykendall replied that the original shop building had been expanded by about 5000 square feet, several years ago.

Mr. Henry stated that the applicant had been before the Site Plan Review Committee four times now, for the original building, its addition, the parts shed, and now for this suspension shop.

Chairperson Allison asked for clarification on the use of the new structure. Mr. Coykendall stated that the building would not be open to the public, and would feature two garage doors and lifts in order to work on vehicles.

Chairperson Allison asked if the building was a pre-engineered metal structure. Mr. Coykendall replied in the affirmative. Chairperson Allison then asked if a skin would be applied to the



exterior to modify the aesthetic of the building. Mr. Coykendall stated that the building would look very similar to the others on the property, noting the supplied pictures of the existing parts shed and main shop. Chairperson Allison then asked if the roof would be flat. Mr. Coykendall stated that it would be flat like the main shop. Chairperson Allison noted that the supplied elevations depict a sloped roof with a high peak. Mr. Westphall stated that some changes had been made from the presented plans in response to Staff comments, but that this was not portrayed in the agenda packet. Mr. Henry asked the applicant if he would be okay with changing the plans to show a flat roof, and Mr. Coykendall stated that he would be fine with that.

Mr. Henry mentioned that there is an existing 6 foot fence around the entire property. Chairperson Allison stated that the building looked to be at least 14 feet tall. Mr. Henry asked how tall the existing parts shed is; Mr. Coykendall replied that he believed it to be approximately 10 feet. Mr. Woolsoncroft asked if the extra height on the new building was to accommodate vehicle lifts, and Mr. Coykendall confirmed.

Mr. Woolsoncroft stated that he would like to see a set of plans depicting the roof with a lesser slope, and asked Staff why the plans presented were marked 'revise and resubmit'. Mr. Mangus stated that while Staff comments had been provided, no updated plans had been returned in response. Mr. Henry asked for a summary of what changes would need to be made to the plans for a resubmittal. The Committee discussed.

Mr. Henry asked if the paving would have to be concrete, or if asphalt would be acceptable. Mr. Mangus stated that either was permitted.

Mr. Henry asked Chairperson Allison if he would be comfortable entertaining a motion that featured multiple conditions for approval, related to the roof pitch, lighting, building aesthetics, and paving. Chairperson Allison stated that he would defer to the greater Committee's will, but would personally like to review an updated set of plans before moving forward.

Mr. Woolsoncroft asked if the building would feature mechanical equipment for heating or air conditioning. Mr. Coykendall stated that the building would be heated and air conditioned, and that he was not completely sure, but believed that the units would be located on the rooftop. Mr. Henry asked if they could be located at ground level and, if so, where around the building they would be. Mr. Coykendall stated that the southwest corner of the building, which is near the southwest corner of the property, would be ideal. He added that this location was already well-screened from street frontages on all sides. Mr. Mangus concurred, referring to the existing 6-foot fence. Mr. Graham stated that he agreed this would be a viable solution, stating that the plans would just need to depict this change.

Chairperson Allison repeated his discomfort with approving plans that seemingly need so many changes. Mr. Mangus stated that a few small changes to the presented plans could fix the majority of issues, noting that the roof elevations could be easily revised, and that the materials detail simply needed the phrase "to match existing" or equivalent. Mr. Henry asked if these changes could be left up to Staff approval, or if the Committee wished to see this all



once more. Chairperson Allison stated that he would like to see the plans brought back before the Committee. Mr. Woolsoncroft concurred, stating that too many things need to be revised for the Committee to issue even conditional approval.

Chairperson Allison asked for details on the proposed light fixtures. Mr. Coykendall explained that they would be wall packs. Mr. Mangus added that they would be down-shaded, not floodlights.

Mr. Graham stated that he felt that the issues related to the building code would be worked out by Staff regardless of the Committee's involvement, and that only the roof style depicted in the elevations and the location of the mechanical equipment were within the Committee's purview. He added that a possible motion could include a condition that Staff may send the item back to the Committee anyway if certain items are not resolved satisfactorily. Mr. Woolsoncroft agreed with the assessment, but stated that the issue of the elevations was very important. Mr. Graham agreed with that, and stated that a motion could contain any number of conditions.

Mr. Henry asked if the applicant had prepared his own drawings and plans. Mr. Coykendall stated that he had hired an outside firm to prepare them on his behalf. Mr. Henry stated that this firm should be referred to the Unified Development Manual in order to resubmit a satisfactory set of plans. Mr. Coykendall stated that he was unaware of any Staff comments until very close to the meeting. Mr. Westphall stated that Staff had had many discussions with the various contractors that submitted documents for this project.

Mr. Coykendall stated that this project is 'just a metal building', adding that he would fulfill any requirements in order to start moving on the construction. Mr. Henry responded that the city is trying to move away from constructing more 'just a metal building's, adding that the property can be seen from the main corridor of Andover Rd.

Mr. Coykendall stated that in the future he may wish to expand this building to the north, adding some frontage along the street, and that this section of the building would certainly look nicer.

*Homer Henry made a motion to approve the site plan for Andover Auto Body, with the following conditions met: all current Staff comments addressed, a hard paving surface around the building, a 2-tone finish on the exterior to match the original shop, the flat roof as discussed, Staff approval of the photometric plan, and all HVAC equipment located on the ground next to the building. Motion seconded by Kevin Graham. Discussion continued.*

Mr. Woolsoncroft asked if this meant the roof would be the same as on the main shop building. Mr. Henry stated that yes, that was his intention. Mr. Woolsoncroft went on to state that this would basically introduce a third architectural style among the three buildings on the property.

Mr. Mangus suggested adding some EIFS to the side(s) of the building that would be visible from the street.



Mr. Woolsoncroft stated that the motion may need to be revised to specify the roof slope that the Committee is wanting.

*Homer Henry withdrew his motion. Kevin Graham assented.*

*Homer Henry made a motion to table discussion of the site plan for Andover Auto Body until the next meeting. Motion seconded by Todd Woolsoncroft. Motion carried 5/0.*

Mr. Coykendall asked if this meant he would need to return to the December Committee meeting. Mr. Henry confirmed as much, stating that a revised submittal would be required for the Committee to reconsider the case.

**5.2 SP-A24-0026 — REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF THE SIGN PLAN FOR ATWOODS, GENERALLY LOCATED AT 426 S. ANDOVER ROAD, ANDOVER, KANSAS**

Mr. Wesphall stated that the Atwoods store on Andover Rd. wished to change the star in its main sign to an ampersand, and add a Stihl cabinet sign to the side of the building.

Mr. Henry asked if another Stihl sign had been approved lately. Mr. Westphall confirmed, stating that the Committee had approved an application for such a sign at Ace Hardware.

*Todd Woolsoncroft made a motion to approve the sign plan for Atwoods. Motion seconded by Homer Henry. Motion carried 5/0.*

**5.3 SP-A24-0023 — REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF THE SITE PLAN FOR THE CENTRAL PARK LODGE, GENERALLY LOCATED AT 1607 E. CENTRAL AVENUE, ANDOVER, KANSAS**

Ryan Craft and Jeff Best with LK Architecture were in attendance. Mr. Craft explained that the Lodge was designed to match the amphitheater and City Hall aesthetically, with many materials matched to those present on the City Hall and library exteriors. He added that the plans had incorporated a large number of Staff comments, and that the issue of the ground-level EIFS was going to be addressed in one of two ways depending on costs (metal or stonework).

Mr. Best stated that the building would be 4.5 feet above grade, and that berms would be added to either side of the structure for drainage and landscape purposes. He continued that the plan includes steps up from the nearby parking lot, and 2 ADA-accessible parking stalls. He addressed the landscape plantings in the area, stating that multiple trees would be added alongside small shrubs near the patio. Mr. Best stated that he had made significant revisions to the planting schedule in response to the Fire department comments on firewise planting.

Mr. Henry asked what firewise plants were. Mr. Best explained that they are plants which are less prone to igniting and burning in the case of a nearby fire. Mr. Best stated that despite this, he added some favored grasses on the property, but located them away from the structure.



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

## **SITE PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE MINUTES**

**NOVEMBER 5, 2024 | 6:00 P.M.**  
ANDOVER CITY HALL | 1609 E. CENTRAL AVE.

Mr. Best stated that the storm sewer line which currently runs directly under the proposed building would be relocated, and so would 2 light poles. He stated that smaller bollard lights would be placed near paths.

Mr. Henry asked if moving the light poles was the most cost effective solution. Rick Lanzrath, Director of Public Works, stated that it was necessary due to the geometry of the project.

Mr. Craft stated that the depicted elevations were added per Staff comments. He stated that the structure would have a low slope roof, and architectural metal paneling similar to that found on City Hall. Mr. Craft stated that the stone on the sides of the building and on the depicted columns would match the stone in use at City Hall and the library.

Mr. Craft stated that LK had spoken with an acoustic engineer about the choices in materials and design, and had made some very slight adjustments in order to reduce auditory reflections.

Mr. Craft explained that both sides of the building would feature mechanical HVAC equipment, with the nearby parapets scaled in order to provide screening.

Mr. Henry asked if the mechanical units were screened all the way around. Mr. Craft confirmed that they were.

Mr. Woolsoncroft asked if the Staff comments regarding ADA-accessible parking spaces, grades, and access control had been adequately addressed. Mr. Mangus stated that Planning Staff had only just received the updated plan set a few hours before the meeting, but added that the ADA compliance issues had seemingly been addressed. Mr. Graham stated that both main paths looked to meet ADA requirements.

Mr. Woolsoncroft asked what the plan was for the existing patio area in front of the amphitheater. Mr. Lanzrath stated that a plan for this area was in the conceptual stages, but that in the future it may house a commercial kitchen structure.

Mr. Woolsoncroft asked if the Lodge would be a FEMA hard storm shelter. Mr. Lanzrath stated that it would not, adding that this was considered, but that it would have cost too much to be viable. Mr. Mangus chimed in that the restroom west of the playground is one such shelter, and that other shelters are available in City Hall and in the library, both of which are nearby.

Mr. Henry asked if any consideration had been made for decorative seasonal lights on the structure, like what is present at City Hall. Mr. Lanzrath stated that there would be install locations for such lights, and that this setup would be handled in-house.

Mr. Woolsoncroft asked what color the material on the columns would be, noting that the provided plans were unclear. Mr. Craft stated that the final selection was not in place, but that they would work to match the nearby structures. Mr. Mangus stated that the amphitheater columns were a very dark metal, so this may be the eventual choice, given the proximity of the Lodge.



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

## **SITE PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE MINUTES**

**NOVEMBER 5, 2024 | 6:00 P.M.**

ANDOVER CITY HALL | 1609 E. CENTRAL AVE.

Mr. Craft added that the southern side of the structure would feature low emissivity windows.

*Todd Woolsoncroft made a motion to approve the site plan for the Central Park Lodge, on the condition that the remaining Staff comments be satisfactorily addressed. Motion seconded by Homer Henry. Motion carried 5/0.*

### **6. MEMBER ITEMS**

Mr. Woolsoncroft asked Staff why such an incomplete submittal as that for Andover Auto Body had been brought before the Committee. Mr. Mangus stated that many of the outstanding items were things that Staff had been entrusted to review and approve independently in the past.

Mr. Graham stated that as far as he was aware, if an applicant submitted for Site Plan Review, they would be placed on the next available agenda, so long as they have met the application requirements. Mr. Mangus concurred.

Mr. Henry stated that while there were many issues with the plans as submitted, the packet was enough to be reviewed by the Committee. Mr. Henry asked if a minimal submittal was something the Committee was not interested in seeing.

Mr. Woolsoncroft contrasted the requirements to be on the agenda with those of the State, stating that it seemed like Andover's guidelines were too vague.

Mr. Mangus stated that much of what was in the plan packet was submitted piecemeal after the initial submittal, due to communication from Staff.

Chairperson Allison stated that motions with a long list of conditions should not be the norm.

Mr. Woolsoncroft asked if the City still maintained a Site Plan Review application checklist. Mr. Mangus confirmed as much, stating that the checklist is available on the City website.

Mr. Boyd stated that in this case, the applicant's original submittal was determined to be insufficient to be brought before the Committee, otherwise the case would have been heard the previous month. He added that Staff felt that what was presented was a 'minimum viable product' that could be discussed by the Committee, despite the many shortcomings of the plans.

Mr. Westphall stated that Staff had worked with multiple contractors who had been hired by the applicant, refining a single full submittal over time. He added that the Unified Development Manual requirements had been supplied numerous times to the various parties.

Mr. Woolsoncroft noted that the subject property lies within the US-54 Corridor Study area, and asked if the City code contained any language that enforced the findings of the Study. Mr. Westphall stated that the idea was for the Site Plan Review Committee to be the stewards of these design requirements. Mr. Mangus added that the Study was completed in 2012, implemented into the Comprehensive Plan since, and considered during Staff review of such properties.



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

**SITE PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE MINUTES**  
**NOVEMBER 5, 2024 | 6:00 P.M.**  
ANDOVER CITY HALL | 1609 E. CENTRAL AVE.

Chairperson Allison stated that he appreciated Mr. Henry withdrawing his motion during the discussion of that agenda item. Mr. Henry stated that he was persuaded by Chairperson Allison and Mr. Woolsoncroft, adding that he was not in favor of 'just a metal building'.

Mr. Henry stated that despite his reservations, the existing main shop of Andover Auto Body is very aesthetically pleasing from the street.

**7. ADJOURN**

*Homer Henry made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Motion seconded by Chairperson Doug Allison. Motion carried 5/0.*

Meeting adjourned at 7:21 P.M.