

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 7:00pm by Chairperson Garwood.

2. ROLL CALL

Committee Members present: Chairperson Vance Garwood, Gary Israel, Marla Canfield, Dan Colson, Clint Teinert & Peter Fox.

Staff Members present: Les Mangus, Director of Community Development; Julie Boyd, Interim Planning & Zoning Administrator.

3. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 18, 2025 MEETING

Gary Israel made a motion to approve the minutes of November 18, 2025, as presented. Seconded by Peter Fox. Motion passed 6-0.

4. COMMUNICATIONS

A. COMMITTEE & STAFF REPORT

None.

B. POTENTIAL RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT REPORT

5. AGENDA

5.1 MEETING CALENDAR — REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF THE 2026 PLANNING COMMISSION AND BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS MEETING CALENDAR AND APPLICATION DEADLINES

Chairperson Garwood called the first agenda item pertaining to the review and approval of the 2026 Planning Commission & Board of Zoning Appeals meeting calendar and application deadlines.

Julie Boyd stated that the proposed schedule is consistent with schedules adopted in prior years. The Planning Commission and Board of Zoning Appeals will continue to meet on the third Tuesday of each month, and the Subdivision Committee will meet on the second Tuesday of each month. All application submission deadlines will remain 20–30 days prior to the respective meetings. She also noted that, in 2026, no holidays conflict with the meeting schedule.

Marla Canfield made a motion to approve the schedules for the 2026 Planning Commission & Subdivision Committee meetings. Seconded by Gary Israel. Motion passed 6-0.



5.2 Z-A25-0002 — PUBLIC HEARING AND RECOMMENDATION ON AN APPLICATION FOR A CHANGE OF ZONING DISTRICT CLASSIFICATION, FROM THE SF-1 SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL / LOW DENSITY DISTRICT TO THE B-3 RETAIL & SERVICE BUSINESS DISTRICT, ON CERTAIN LANDS GENERALLY LOCATED AT 602 S. DAISY LN., ANDOVER, KANSAS

Chairperson Garwood called the next agenda item pertaining to the public hearing and recommendation on an application for a change of zoning district classification, from SF-1 to B-3, on certain lands generally located at 602 S. Daisy Ln.

The public hearing was opened at 7:04pm.

Julie Boyd stated that this is a case to change the zoning district of the property directly south of Andover Auto Body to match the zoning district that Andover Auto Body itself already has. The subject property, 602 S. Daisy Ln., is currently under the SF-1 Single Family Residential district and previously contained a single-family home. The applicant is here and has purchased the property and wishes to expand his business onto it. Expansion of his business would require the property to be zoned for business, he is seeking to rezone it B-3 to match the current zoning for Andover Auto Body. When the Comprehensive Plan was drawn it used the zoning districts in place at the time to designate the line for the place types, it is normal as time goes on to see this place type seep into another. The neighborhood to the south remains mostly residential, but we have it as a mixed residential neighborhood. Staff does expect more commercial development like this over time.

The owner and applicant Jeff Coykendall was present and spoke at the podium. He stated that his business requires more parking and he is planning to use the lot for this purpose. The area will be fenced off so it is not visible to the surrounding area.

Marla Canfield asked if the former owner of this house was the individual who had some concerns about the construction of the new building at Andover Auto Body. Mr. Coykendall stated that it was correct and they were able to get the situation worked out.

Peter Fox asked if Staff had received any communication from property owners in the area. Julie stated that she did not receive any communication. Mr. Fox also asked about potential lighting in the area. Mr. Coykendall stated that there is already a light pole in the area as well as lights on the building that is currently being constructed.

Marla Canfield asked if the house will be kept on the property. Mr. Coykendall stated that he was not sure. He stated he told Mr. & Mrs. Fishback that they could stay there until they find someplace else, as the housing market is not the greatest right now.

Peter Fox asked if the Site Plan Review Committee would review this at all. Julie stated that they will look at any parking that is placed there as well as lighting and fences.



Darren Burger of 628 S Daisy Ln. was present and spoke at the podium about his concerns relating to the zoning change. He questioned how the proposed zoning change fits within the Andover Comprehensive Plan that designates his neighborhood as "mixed residential" without the explicit mention of commercial use. Julie clarified that the Comprehensive Plan is guidance, not law, and development can lead to changes requiring public hearing. This property is adjacent to the "city center" place type, which is a place type that involved commercial, residential and even industrial. The place types that are further from commercial properties are generally going to be less likely to be redeveloped into commercial properties.

Mr. Burger asked how he was supposed to know about these changes and plan accordingly. Julie stated that staff encourage development of whatever type is happening in that area, but if somebody wants to develop differently than what is encouraged, then they would have to do something like this and have a public hearing and change their zone. Following these meetings and the city council meetings are a good way of knowing what is coming down the pipeline.

Mr. Burger also expressed concerns that the rezoning of the property would reduce property values in the area and make the neighborhood less desirable. He further questioned the city's ability to protect property values while balancing the need for business growth. The Commission agreed and acknowledged the concerns of the residents but stated that they cannot strictly focus on individual property values.

Chairperson Garwood stated that anything built on this lot would need to pass through the stringent requirements of the Site Plan Review Committee before being built.

Mr. Burger stated that the fence that was previously talked about had already been built before the approved zoning change. Julie Boyd stated she was aware the fence was going to be constructed but was not aware any parking was already taking place on the lot. She further stated that a screening plan which may include a fence would go before the Site Plan Review Committee to ensure that it meets the requirements for being adjacent to residential properties.

Mr. Burger presented photos of the constructed fence and parking to the Commission. Clint Teinert stated he would like to see city staff take a look at the photos presented.

Gary Israel asked Les Mangus how many people lived in Andover in 1992. Les Mangus stated that he moved to Andover in 1989 and there was approximately 3,700 people. Gary Israel stated he moved to Andover in 1992 and now we are over 17,000 people, all of which are looking for more amenities, more opportunities to shop and do business in Andover. He stated he understands why businesses want to be on Andover Rd as it is a main thoroughfare.

There was a discussion amongst the Committee and Staff about mixed residential neighborhoods and their definition. Les Mangus stated that mixed residential neighborhoods typically serve as a transition between lower density development and higher intensity commercial of mixed-use center.



Mr. Teinert stated that he understands the residents' concerns regarding encroachment; however, he noted that the area was historically agricultural and has changed over time. Mr. Teinert then asked staff about the parking and fence currently located on the lot. Julie responded that the current zoning does not permit commercial parking and that a fence would require a permit prior to construction, which has not been issued at this time. She noted that the fence is a separate matter from the proposed zoning change.

The Committee continued discussion regarding property values and the City's role in protecting them. Mr. Colson stated that if the property values of nearby residents are being considered, the value of the applicant's property should also be taken into account. Les Mangus stated that in his 37 years working for the City of Andover, he has frequently heard concerns about diminishing property values but has never seen evidence provided by a qualified professional to substantiate those claims.

Mr. Burger expressed concern about the project progressing prior to approval.

Carl Monkhouse and Karlie Wolff, 640 S. Daisy Lane, were present and spoke at the podium. They expressed concerns about the encroachment of commercial properties into the neighborhood and questioned where such expansion would stop. They also stated that the neighborhood feels isolated from the rest of Andover and expressed concern about preserving the character of the neighborhood.

Les Mangus stated that based on the surrounding land uses, it appeared logical for commercial development to occur within a few hundred feet of Cloud Avenue, with a transition from commercial uses into the residential neighborhood.

Jeff Coykendall responded to the public's comments. He stated that no additional lighting would be added to the lot and that the proposed fence is intended to screen vehicles from public view. He explained that his goal is to prevent visibility of vehicles from the roadway, similar to conditions at the existing shop. Regarding property values, Mr. Coykendall stated that he owns both 601 S. Daisy Lane and the subject property and paid well above market value for each. He noted that he is not seeking to create conflict, but that additional parking space is needed due to a new building on the site. He stated there would be no increase in traffic on Daisy Lane, as the Fishback family will continue to reside at the home for the time being.

Gary Israel asked whether Mr. Coykendall intended to convert 601 S. Daisy Lane to commercial use. Mr. Coykendall responded that the property is already zoned commercial.

The public hearing was closed at 7:42 p.m.

STAFF ITEMS

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



STAFF	The property is already served by sanitary sewer and water lines.
2 If the zoning change request was approved, would the subject property need to be platted or replatted, or have in-lieu-of dedications made, in order to provide needed rights-of-way, easements, building setback lines, or access control?	
STAFF	The subject property is already platted; however, additional dedication of right-of-way will be required. An additional 12 feet of right-of-way along S. Daisy Ln. must be dedicated by the property owner.
3 If the zoning change request was approved, would the subject property need a screening plan for existing or potential uses?	
STAFF	Yes. The property would move to a Business use, and it abuts several residential properties. The applicant has installed a screening fence for the time being, but will go before the Site Plan Review Committee for final approval of all necessary screening for any structures on the property.
4 What fact-based information in support of or in opposition to the requested zoning change has staff received?	
STAFF	None.
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 error is known to exist.

STAFF & COMMISSION/COUNCIL ITEMS

6. How suitable or unsuitable is the subject property for its current zoning?	
STAFF	The subject property is suitable for its current residential zoning.
PLANNING	Concur
COUNCIL	
7. Is the length of time the subject property has been vacant or undeveloped under its current zoning a factor in the zoning change request?	
STAFF	No.



PLANNING	Concur
COUNCIL	
8. How reasonably well-suited will the requested zoning change of the subject property be with the current zoning of nearby properties.	
STAFF	The change would be reasonably well-suited—while it would place a commercial use adjacent to residential-use properties, this is already the case with the existing Andover Auto Body property. The overall character of the neighborhood is not expected to substantially change.
PLANNING	Concur (Dan Colson dissented)
COUNCIL	
9. Has the zoning change been requested because conditions in the area of the subject property have changed or are changing? If so, what is the nature and significance of these conditions?	
STAFF	The applicant has purchased the subject property and modified it physically to be used for an expansion of their business.
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 adjacent to the existing Andover Auto Body property, as well as to multiple other residential properties.
PLANNING	Concur
COUNCIL	
11. Would the proposed zoning change of the subject property allow land uses which might have detrimental effects on nearby properties, and if so, how?	
STAFF	The subject property would be moving to a more intensive use, and this move brings an increase in noise, activity, and lighting to the area. These conditions can be mitigated via screening, which would be assured and approved by the Site Plan Review Committee.



PLANNING	<p>The Committee discussed the potential impacts on nearby properties, noting that while some effects may occur, they were uncertain whether those effects would be detrimental.</p> <p>Dan Colson asked what all land used would be allowed under this zoning. Peter Fox read the B-3 Retail & Service Business District zoning description.</p> <p>Do not fully concur.</p>
COUNCIL	
12 How would the requested zoning change conform with the City’s Comprehensive Plan and other adopted master plans and policies?	
STAFF	<p>The change is reasonably well-suited to the Comprehensive Plan, which designates the Andover Auto Body property with the City Center place type. The boundaries of this place type were drawn to correspond with the zoning of nearby properties. The corridor along and near Andover Rd. is increasingly moving into mixed-use residential, as would be the case here.</p>
PLANNING COUNCIL	<p>Concur (Dan Colson dissented)</p>
13 Do any professional persons knowledgeable on conditions that affect this zoning change request have information or recommendations to provide, which would be helpful in its evaluation?	
STAFF	<p>Staff supports the proposed change in zoning district classification.</p>
PLANNING	<p>Concur</p>
COUNCIL	
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 zone to the requested zone?	
STAFF	<p>If the zoning change were not approved, the applicant would not be able to utilize the property for the intended expansion of their business. This expansion is not expected to substantially impact the public health, safety, or welfare of the surrounding neighborhood, as long as the expected increase to noise and light levels are sufficiently mitigated by approved screening methods.</p>



PLANNING	Concur
COUNCIL	

Dan Colson had a question about whether specific statements of fact needed to be voted on and if the Committee had indeed reached full conclusions on the findings of fact. Julie stated that the Commission is free to discuss any of the factors as much as they would like, the script is simply there to help keep everyone on track. Les Mangus stated that those factors are for consideration and not a scorecard. The motion to approve or disapprove is to be based on any one or all those factors.

Chairperson Garwood reminded the audience that no matter what happens tonight, any further action would happen at the City Council and if approved, the decision can be protested.

The Committee continued to discuss #8 & #11 and their conclusions. Les Mangus interjected and stated that there are effects of commercial business, lighting, traffic and noise. However, the site plan review process and buffering requirements within the zoning regulations that require fencing, landscaping, separation and maximum lighting levels are there to mitigate any effects that there might be.

Marla Canfield asked if the Planning Commission could make the motion include a clause that the residents in that area will be notified when the Site Plan Review Committee will be reviewing the project. Julie stated they could add whatever conditions they might like. The only things Staff are required to notify for by state law are zoning cases, but we can certainly send more letters out.

Gary Israel spoke about Andover Auto Body and how it is a thriving business that needs to grow. Marla Canfield asked about the brick building located at the corner of Bells & Andover Rd. Les Mangus stated that it is the AT&T switch station and has been located there for decades.

Clint Tienert made a motion to recommend to the Governing Body that case number Z-A25-0002 be modified and approved based on the finding of the Planning Commission on findings #7, # 9, #12 & #14 with the following instructions attached to the recommendation: all residents must be notified of the Site Plan Review Committee evaluation. Seconded by Gary Israel. Motion passed 5-1, Dan Colson dissented.

RECESS THE PLANNING COMMISSION AND CONVENE THE BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS

Gary Israel made a motion to recess the Planning Commission and convene the Board of Zoning Appeals at 8:05pm. Seconded by Marla Canfield. Motion passed 6-0.



5.3 BZA-CU25-0004 — PUBLIC HEARING ON AN APPLICATION TO PERMIT AN ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT ON A PROPERTY ZONED SF-1 SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL / LOW DENSITY DISTRICT, AND GENERALLY LOCATED AT 1904 E. CENTRAL AVE., ANDOVER, KANSAS

Chairperson Garwood called the next agenda item pertaining to the public hearing on an application to permit an accessory dwelling unit on a property zoned SF-1 and generally located at 1904 E. Central Ave.

The public hearing was opened at 8:06pm.

Julie Boyd stated that the owner of 1904 E Central Ave., which is the recently approved and annexed The Green Meadow Addition, is seeking to move an existing cabin from its location in Wichita to his property located here in Andover and install it as an accessory dwelling unit on the property. The moving of the structure was already approved last week by the City Council, and the Board of Zoning Appeals will need to authorize its use as an accessory dwelling unit. The cabin will be placed to the south of the waterway and closer to Central Ave., an accessory dwelling unit is a conditional use in the SF-1 zoning district, which this property is currently zoned. Staff do not feel this ADU would materially impact the density of the area, and the property is nearly 40 acres total. The cabin will be placed on a foundation with a basement included.

Marla Canfield asked where the cabin was currently located. Chairperson Garwood responded that it is currently located off Central Ave. in Wichita.

Gary Israel asked about the use of the cabin and if it could be used for Airbnb. Julie responded that the property owner would need to obtain a special use for short term rentals first.

Peter Fox asked about the cabin and if it was used as a dwelling. Julie stated that it was correct and that the cabin was inspected by Les Mangus and Micky Farris (Code Enforcement Officer).

The public hearing was closed at 8:10pm.

1!	The proposed conditional use complies with all applicable regulations, including lot size requirements, bulk regulations, use limitations and performance standards; unless a concurrent application is in process for a variance.	
STAFF	Yes. The lot is very large for the SF-1 district, and the cabin would be placed with respect to all applicable bulk regulations.	
BZA	Concur	
1!	The proposed conditional use will not cause substantial injury to the value of other property in the neighborhood.	



STAFF	No injury is expected. The cabin would be installed a large distance away from any other dwelling units on nearby properties.
BZA	Concur
1i	<p>The location and size of the conditional use, the nature and intensity of the operation involved in or conducted in connection with it, and the location of the site with respect to streets giving access to it are such that the conditional use will not dominate the immediate neighborhood so as to prevent development and use of neighboring property in accordance with the applicable zoning district regulations. In determining whether the conditional use will so dominate the immediate neighborhood, consideration shall be given to:</p> <p>a. The location, nature, size and height of building, structures, walls and fences on the site; and</p> <p>b. The nature and extent of landscaping and screening on the site.</p>
STAFF	Installation of a small cabin is not expected to dominate the surrounding neighborhood. It is a commensurately intensive use with other nearby large-lot residential properties.
BZA	Concur
1i	<p>Off-street parking and loading areas will be provided in accordance with the standards set forth in Article 5 of these regulations. Such areas will be screened from adjoining residential uses and located so as to protect such residential uses from injurious effects.</p>
STAFF	The cabin is expected to have its own private drive, but will not feature a substantial parking area.
BZA	Concur
1i	<p>Adequate utility, drainage and other such necessary facilities have been installed or will be provided by platting, dedications and/or guarantees.</p>
STAFF	The subject property was recently platted with this Conditional Use in mind. Utilities are available for connection to the Accessory Dwelling Unit.
BZA	Concur
2	<p>Adequate access roads, entrance and exit drives and/or access control is available or will be provided by platting, dedications and/or guarantees and shall be so designed to prevent traffic hazards and to minimize traffic congestion in public streets and roads.</p>



STAFF	The subject property was recently platted with this Conditional Use in mind. There is an existing street access point on the property, connecting to E. Central Ave., which will be maintained.
BZA	Concur

Marla Canfield asked Staff about the fire hydrant concerns that were discussed when this plat was approved and whether it had been addressed. Julie Boyd stated that the property owner and the Fire Marshall have been in communication on how to take care of the issue.

Chairperson Garwood abstained from voting.

Dan Colson made a motion to authorize the Chairperson to sign a resolution granting the conditional use. Seconded by Marla Canfield. Motion passed 5-0.

ADJOURN THE BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS AND RECONVENE THE PLANNING COMMISSION

Gary Israel made a motion to adjourn the Board of Zoning Appeals and reconvene the Planning Commission at 8:15pm. Seconded by Peter Fox. Motion passed 6-0.

6. MEMBER ITEMS

None.

7. ADJOURN

Gary Israel made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Seconded by Marla Canfield. Motion passed 6-0.

Meeting adjourned at 8:18pm