



1 CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Garwood called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M.

2 ROLL CALL

Committee members in attendance: Chairperson Vance Garwood; Vice Chairperson Marla Canfield; Secretary Gary Israel; David Foley; Peter Fox; and Dan Colson.

Staff members in attendance: Jolene Graham, Assistant City Administrator; Les Mangus, Director of Community Development; and Julie Boyd, Interim Planning & Zoning Administrator.

3 APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 18, 2025 MEETING

Marla Canfield made a motion to approve the minutes of the March 18, 2025 meeting as presented. Motion seconded by Gary Israel. Motion carried 6/0.

4 COMMUNICATIONS

A. COMMITTEE & STAFF REPORT

None.

B. POTENTIAL RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT REPORT

5 AGENDA

5.1 SPECIAL USE — PUBLIC HEARING AND RECOMMENDATION ON AN APPLICATION FOR A SPECIAL USE PERMIT TO ALLOW FOR PET GROOMING AND PET BOARDING, ON A PROPERTY ZONED B-4 CENTRAL BUSINESS/MIXED USE DISTRICT, AND GENERALLY LOCATED AT 301 W. CENTRAL AVE., ANDOVER, KANSAS

Chairperson Garwood opened the public hearing at 7:04 P.M.

Ms. Boyd stated that the applicant intends to open a pet grooming business, and may in the future offer pet boarding as well. She stated that these uses are not actually listed as potential Special Uses for the B-4 zoning district in the Unified Development Manual (UDM), but that the UDM does allow for Special Use applications which fit the intent of the district to be considered. Ms. Boyd stated that Staff therefore supports the proposed Special Use, as it would fit within the intent and spirit of the B-4 district without issue.

Chairperson Garwood closed the public hearing at 7:06 P.M.

Mr. Israel asked if adequate outdoor space exists on the property for boarded pets to have access to. Ms. Boyd stated that the applicant will be installing a fence in the rear yard of the property for this purpose, and that a permit for this fence was currently active.

Ms. Canfield asked for clarification about the Staff report for this item. She asked if the applicant would be required to return yearly to renew this Special Use permit. Mr. Mangus clarified that the applicant would have one year to act upon the Special Use authorization, but that after utilization it would remain in effect.



PLANNING COMMISSION & BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS MINUTES

APRIL 15, 2025 | 7:00 P.M.

ANDOVER CITY HALL | 1609 E. CENTRAL AVE.

STAFF ITEMS

1. Do adequate sewage disposal and water supply and all other necessary public facilities include access exist or can they be provided to serve the uses that would be permitted on the subject change in zoning were approved?

STAFF | The subject property is served with public streets, water, and sewer.

2. If the special use request was approved, would the subject property need to be platted or require in-lieu-of dedications made, in order to provide needed rights-of-way, easements, building setbacks, and access control?

STAFF | The property is already platted.

3. If the special use request was approved, would the subject property need a screening plan for potential uses?

STAFF | The applicant will be installing a fence on the rear of the building to screen any outdoor storage that may be associated with the business.

4. What fact-based information in support of or in opposition to the requested zoning change has been received?

STAFF | None at this time.

5. If there has been an error in the application of these Zoning Regulations to the subject property, would the requested zoning change correct the error?

STAFF | No errors are known to exist.



STAFF & COMMISSION/COUNCIL ITEMS

6.	How suitable or unsuitable is the subject property for its current use?
STAFF	The subject property is currently a multi-tenant retail location, and is suitable for its district.
PLANNING	Concur.
COUNCIL	
7.	Is the length of time the subject property has been vacant or undeveloped under its current zoning the special use request?
STAFF	No.
PLANNING	Concur.
COUNCIL	
8.	How reasonably well-suited will the requested special use of the subject property be with the surrounding nearby properties.
STAFF	The proposed use would be well-suited; it would be similar in intensity to the surrounding uses.
PLANNING	Concur.
COUNCIL	
9.	Has the special use been requested because conditions in the area of the subject property have been changing? If so, what is the nature and significance of these conditions?
STAFF	No.
PLANNING	Concur.
COUNCIL	
10.	What are the current land uses, character and condition of the subject property and the surrounding neighborhood?
STAFF	The subject property is surrounded by similar retail and service businesses, as well as density two-family homes to the south. The character of the subject property is not substantially change if the Special Use were approved.



PLANNING COMMISSION & BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS MINUTES

APRIL 15, 2025 | 7:00 P.M.

ANDOVER CITY HALL | 1609 E. CENTRAL AVE.

PLANNING COUNCIL	Concur.
11. Would the proposed special use of the subject property allow land uses which might have detrimental effects on nearby properties, and if so, how?	
STAFF	No.
PLANNING COUNCIL	Concur.
12. How would the requested special use conform with the City's Comprehensive Plan and other adopted master plans and policies?	
STAFF	The requested Special Use would fit well into the City Center place type, which encourages medium to higher intensity retail and service business uses near main access corridors such as Central Ave.
PLANNING COUNCIL	Concur.
13. Do any professional persons knowledgeable on conditions that affect this special use request have information or recommendations to provide, which would be helpful in its evaluation?	
STAFF	Staff supports the proposed Special Use application.
PLANNING COUNCIL	Concur.
14. How would the potential loss in value or hardship imposed on the Applicant compare to the relative gain to the public health, safety and welfare, if there is a change from the current use to the requested use?	
STAFF	The change would have no foreseeable adverse impact on public health, safety or welfare.
PLANNING COUNCIL	Concur.



Having considered the evidence at the hearing and the factors to evaluate the application, Gary Israel made a motion that the Planning Commission recommend that case Z-SU25-0001 be approved based on findings 6, 8, 10, and 12. Motion seconded by David Foley. Motion carried 6/0.

5.2 ANNEXATION — REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATION ON A PETITION FOR ANNEXATION OF CERTAIN LANDS GENERALLY LOCATED AT 13086 S.W. BUTLER RD., ANDOVER, KANSAS

Ms. Boyd explained that the subject property is a small piece of land which is intended to be a part of the Southern Hills 1st Addition Final Plat, encompassing part of a platted Reserve and a small part of Lots 5 and 6, on the western side of the subdivision. She stated that this annexation was missed during the platting process, and is simply an administrative 'clean up'-type item.

David Foley made a motion to recommend approval of an ordinance authorizing the annexation of 13086 S.W. Butler Rd. Motion seconded by Peter Fox. Motion carried 6/0.

5.3 FINAL PUD — REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF THE FINAL PUD FOR THE VISTA RIDGE 2ND ADDITION- FIRST PHASE, ON CERTAIN LANDS GENERALLY LOCATED AT 1616 E. CENTRAL AVE., ANDOVER, KANSAS

Ms. Boyd introduced the case, a final plat for a portion of the Vista Ridge 2nd. She stated that the first phase includes 36 total lots and two Reserves, connected to the forthcoming Yorktown Pkwy. extension.

Mr. Fox asked after the Staff notes which stated that some corrections were required on the plat. Ms. Boyd clarified that the notes are on small, mostly textual clean-up for the plat, and that none of the actual content of the plat map or provisions would be changing (*for example, a line of text on the Final PUD referred to the document as a Preliminary PUD plan in error*).

Gary Israel made a motion to approve the Vista Ridge 2nd First Phase Final Planned Unit Development, with the condition that the modifications suggested by Staff be addressed. Motion seconded by David Foley. Motion carried 6/0.

5.4 COUNTY ZONING — REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATION ON AN APPLICATION FOR A CHANGE OF ZONING DISTRICT CLASSIFICATION MADE TO BUTLER COUNTY, ON CERTAIN LANDS GENERALLY LOCATED AT 2612 E. HWY 54, ANDOVER, KANSAS

Ms. Boyd stated that this and the following agenda item relate to a property for which another County case had been considered, at the previous Planning Commission meeting. She stated that the owner has applied to rezone the parcel into the RE (residential) and C (commercial) districts. Ms. Boyd stated that Staff's recommendation from the last time stands: asking the case to be remanded to the City of Andover so that the property may be annexed, platted, and zoned before development.

Mr. Israel asked if the applicant would be willing to have their property annexed into the corporate limits of the City. Mr. Mangus stated that Staff had been told by the Butler County Zoning Administrator department that the applicant did not wish to be annexed; he added that the County's Comprehensive Plan states that the case should be referred to the City for annexation already, given that the subject property lies within Andover's extra-territorial jurisdiction.



Mr. Israel asked if the applicant had been in contact with the City of Andover. Mr. Mangus replied in the negative.

Dan Colson made a motion to require that the Butler County Planning Commission remand the application for a change of zoning district classification on 2612 E. HWY 54 to the City of Andover for annexation and development of the subject property. Motion seconded by Peter Fox. Motion carried 6/0.

5.5 COUNTY LOT SPLIT— REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATION ON AN APPLICATION FOR A LOT SPLIT MADE TO BUTLER COUNTY, ON CERTAIN LANDS GENERALLY LOCATED AT 2612 E. HWY 54, ANDOVER, KANSAS

Ms. Boyd explained that for this case, the applicant intends to split the lot before rezoning, and potential sale of one part.

Mr. Mangus stated that, since this property is within the City's extra-territorial jurisdiction, the County lacks authority to even consider the Lot Split.

Chairperson Garwood asked where the current road access point was on the property. Ms. Boyd stated that the existing house is served by a nearby access point to US-54. Mr. Mangus stated that, if and when the parcel was platted with the City of Andover, the plat would be forwarded to the Kansas Department of Transportation for comment, in order to determine the proper location of any new access points. He added that a median crossing is located just south of the property, which would likely be the location of the access.

Ms. Canfield asked what the next step would be for the applicant. Mr. Mangus stated that Staff recommends that the property owner petition the City for annexation, apply for a change of zoning district classification, and submit a plat.

Chairperson Garwood asked if the existing home was served by any public utilities. Mr. Mangus stated that it was not, and that public utilities had not been extended to the area.

Dan Colson made a motion to require that the Butler County Planning Commission remand the application for a lot split at 2612 E. HWY 54 to the City of Andover for annexation and development of the subject property. Motion seconded by Peter Fox. Motion carried 6/0.

6 MEMBER ITEMS

Mr. Israel wished to remind everyone to watch for bicycles when driving.

7 ADJOURN

Marla Canfield made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Motion seconded by Gary Israel. Motion carried 6/0.

Meeting adjourned at 7:30 P.M.