



1. **CALL TO ORDER**

Chairperson Canfield called the meeting to order at 5:30 P.M.

2. **ROLL CALL**

Committee members in attendance: Chairperson Marla Canfield; Peter Fox; Gary Israel; and Clint Teinert.

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

3. **APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 12, 2024 MEETING**

Clint Teinert made a motion to approve the minutes of the November 12, 2024 meeting as presented. Motion seconded by Peter Fox. Motion carried 3/0/1. Gary Israel abstained.

4. **COMMUNICATIONS**

A. **COMMITTEE & STAFF REPORT**

None.

B. **POTENTIAL RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT REPORT**

5. **AGENDA**

5.1 **PUD AMENDMENT — REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATION ON THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE CORNERSTONE 5TH ADDITION, GENERALLY LOCATED AT N. SAVONA ST, ANDOVER, KANSAS**

Mr. Westphall introduced the case, stating that it was in effect a continuation of a previous amendment to the same area, applying the setback and building spacing requirements to

5.2 more of the lots within the Cornerstone 5th Addition. Mr. Mangus concurred, stating that the Committee had heard a case for the amendment on the east side of the subject properties previously, and were now simply bringing the west side to much the same standards..

5.3 Phil Meyer with Baughman Co. was in attendance as the applicant's agent. He concurred with the Staff report, stating that it was simply not feasible to amend all of the lots at once.

Mr. Roosevelt asked if the 4 foot separation detailed in the amendment was between buildings (4 feet wall-to-wall), or from the wall(s) to the property line (for a total of 8 feet wall-to-wall).

Mr. Mangus stated that it was to be between the extent of each structure- since overhangs like eaves could encroach into the side yard setbacks, this separation kept the overhangs apart 4 feet.

Mr. Graham asked if the side yard setbacks would be the same all across the addition. Mr. Meyer stated that the inconsistent shapes and sizes of the lots, as well as the presence of the proposed covered rear patios, made them inconsistent.



Mr. Mangus reiterated that some overhangs may encroach on the side yard setbacks, and that the International Fire Code did allow for such encroachment, adding that this topic was litigated last time the similar amendment was heard by the Committee.

Mr. Roosevelt stated that even with the listed 1-hour walls, penetrations like windows could pose a hazard.

Mr. Meyer stated that an exhibit showing the distances between structures would be prepared for the Planning Commission when the case was taken before them.

Gary Israel made a motion to recommend that the Planning Commission approve the amendment to the Cornerstone PUD, on the condition that the mentioned exhibit showing the distances between structures be supplied ahead of the Planning Commission meeting. Motion seconded by Clint Teinert. Motion carried 4/0.

PRELIMINARY AND FINAL PUD — REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATION ON THE VISTA RIDGE FIRST PRELIMINARY AND FINAL PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT, GENERALLY LOCATED AT 1616 E. CENTRAL AVE., ANDOVER, KANSAS

Mr. Westphall stated that the subject property, as well as its sibling under the next agenda item, are located just north of City Hall, along the incoming Yorktown extension project, next to the Crescent Lakes subdivision. He stated that the area will follow the SF-2 Single Family Residential / Medium Density District zoning guidelines, with modifications to side yard setbacks, maximum lot coverage, and street widths. He added that utilities can be readily extended to the proposed lots, which will be served by Everygy and Rural Water District #5.

Brian Lindebak with MKEC was in attendance as the applicant's agent. He stated that in addition to what was present in the Committee's packet, a revised drainage plan has been prepared and submitted (*this was received the morning of the meeting*).

Kevin Graham with PEC, the contracted City Engineer, stated that he had provided a great deal of feedback on the first drainage plans, but had not had much time to review the new submission. He stated that the impact that the Yorktown extension would have on the site drainage did not appear to be very explicitly discussed in the report, adding that the two new culverts that would be added with Yorktown should be demonstrated to hold an appropriate amount of water for the given flow calculations.

Mr. Teinert noted that the subject property was very near an existing waterway, and asked what backup drainage solutions had been considered. Mr. Graham stated that the existing culverts under Central already discharge some water in cases of heavy rain, and he did not wish to see this get worse with the newly-diverted drainage to the south of the subject property. Mr. Graham added that he also did not wish to see the existing Crescent Lakes subdivision affected by the changes.

Mr. Mangus stated that the overall drainage area is very large, reaching almost to the existing Terradyne Planned Unit Development. Mr. Lindebak stated that the proposed drainage changes should not meaningfully affect the total runoff from the property.



Mr. Teinert asked after the size of the proposed culverts. Mr. Graham answered that the plans mentioned 8 by 4 culverts, which seemed to him to be sufficient.

Mr. Lindebak stated that the PUD plan was being updated to accommodate the requirements put forth by Evergy during their review, including adding a 15 foot easement for their line work. He stated that Reserves A and C would likely feature this easement, and noted that the reserves were intended to be used purely for landscaping, so they were working to accommodate Evergy while retaining as much landscaping as possible.

The Committee and Staff noted that the prepared Staff report and agenda only listed the approval as for the Preliminary PUD. It was clarified that this approval is for the Preliminary and Final (*author's typo on agendas*).

Clint Teinert made a motion to recommend that the Planning Commission approve the Vista Ridge First Preliminary and Final Planned Unit Development plans. Discussion continued.

Mr. Israel asked if there was any precedent for the proposed maximum lot coverage of 60%. Mr. Mangus stated that there was, in other Planned Unit Developments, and that these lots were large in size. Mr. Lindebak concurred, stating that some were over .5 acres. He added that he did not yet have a product to show, but that the intention was to construct larger patio homes on the lots.

Motion seconded by Gary Israel. Motion carried 4/0.

**PRELIMINARY PUD — REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATION ON THE VISTA RIDGE
2ND PRELIMINARY PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT, GENERALLY LOCATED AT
1616 E. CENTRAL AVE., ANDOVER, KANSAS**

Mr. Westphall stated that this PUD would follow the SF-2 Single Family Residential / Medium Density District requirements similarly to the First, with reduced side yard setbacks and a 75 foot minimum lot width. He stated that the property would have one access point.

Mr. Mangus corrected the final point, stating that there would be two access points to Yorktown. He added that Reserve D has the possibility of becoming a third access point, intended to connect to a future development on the property to the east.

Mr. Israel asked if the potential buyers for Lots 19 and 21, abutting Reserve D, would be made aware of this possibility. Mr. Mangus stated that the Final PUD would need to include language that stated as much. He added that by the time the homes on those lots are up for sale, there may already be a street right-of-way easement in place.

Mr. Graham stated that a street in that reserve would have to contend with the floodplain in the area. Mr. Mangus stated that it would likely feature a contingent dedication for this reason.

Mr. Graham noted that the Preliminary PUD depicted an incorrect lot width for Reserve D. Mr. Meyer stated that the width was correct in reality, and that he would have it corrected to the necessary 64 foot street easement width on the PUD document.



Mr. Israel noted that the depicted cul-de-sacs seemed very close to Yorktown, and asked what measures would be taken to ensure that residents did not hop the curb as a shortcut home. Mr. Meyer stated that the aerial map was misleading, and that in fact 30 to 35 feet would separate the cul-de-sacs from Yorktown. He added that landscaping would be in place to further separate the streets.

Mr. Israel noted a 15 foot easement on Lot 52, and asked if it ran across the properties to the south. Mr. Meyer stated that it did not, and was simply in place due to that lot being a corner, which needed space for the required vision triangle area.

Mr. Israel asked if the two access roads were wider than the others in the development. Mr. Graham stated that they were 58 feet each, which meant that they were indeed wider.

Mr. Israel asked if a monument sign would be included. Jeff Mullins with Ritchie, the developer, stated that it would not, and any sign would be placed in the Vista Ridge First area.

Clint Teinert made a motion to recommend that the Planning Commission approve the Vista Ridge 2nd Preliminary Planned Unit Development plan. Motion seconded by Gary Israel. Motion carried 4/0.

6. MEMBER ITEMS

Mr. Israel referenced the minutes for the February 4th Site Plan Review Committee meeting, asking if the new Chipotle would be sharing a drive with the adjacent bank. Mr. Mangus confirmed as much.

7. ADJOURN

Gary Israel made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Motion seconded by Chairperson Marla Canfield. Motion carried 4/0.

Meeting adjourned at 6:20 P.M.