



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; and Clint Teinert.

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

3. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 11, 2025 MEETING

Peter Fox made a motion to approve the minutes of the March 11, 2025 meeting as presented. Motion seconded by Chairperson Marla Canfield. Motion carried 3/0.

4. COMMUNICATIONS

A. COMMITTEE & STAFF REPORT

None.

B. POTENTIAL RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT REPORT

5. AGENDA

5.1 FINAL PUD — REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATION ON THE VISTA RIDGE 1ST REVISED FINAL PUD, ON CERTAIN LANDS GENERALLY LOCATED NEAR 1616 W. CENTRAL AVE., ANDOVER, KANSAS

Ms. Boyd stated that this case is a revised Final PUD, covering roughly half of the Vista Ridge First PUD area. She stated that Staff comments had been addressed when the original Final PUD went through the approval process, and so Staff has no additional concerns with the partial, phased platting.

Brian Linkebak with MKEC Engineering was in attendance. He stated that the financiers for the project had determined that the required Letters of Credit were of too great magnitude when covering the entire PUD area, so they had elected to split the development up in this way.

Mr. Fox asked whether the development would still feature 49 total lots. Mr. Lindebak confirmed as much, and stated that besides the fact that the Final PUD was now split into multiple parts, it was unchanged from the already-approved Final PUD.

Peter Fox made a motion to recommend that the Planning Commission approve the revised Final PUD for the Vista Ridge First Planned Unit Development. Motion seconded by Clint Teinert. Motion carried 3/0.



5.2 Z-PUD25-0007 — REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATION ON THE HERITAGE MIXED-USE PRELIMINARY PUD AMENDMENT, ON CERTAIN LANDS GENERALLY LOCATED AT 401 S. ARCHER DR., ANDOVER, KANSAS

Ms. Boyd began by explaining the area covered by this amendment, which was indicated to be Parcel 7 in the Heritage Mixed-Use PUD. She stated that the amendment reflects boundary shifts that have taken place since the original PUD was approved, and includes definitions and provisions for two new parcels, 7a and 7b. She stated that the applicant had indicated that Parcel 7a was to be developed into a multi-story indoor storage facility, and that the provisions for this parcel had been defined with this in mind. Ms. Boyd stated that Staff's main concern had been that certain provisions would have allowed other uses to vary greatly from the intent of the zoning on the lot, but that the applicant(s) had addressed this concern by limiting those provisions to only apply if the parcel was used for the aforementioned storage facility.

Mr. Lindebak was representing the applicant(s) for this item as well. He stated that the storage facility was a product of a local developer, and that he expects the structure to nearly consume the entire parcel. Mr. Mangus stated that Staff was able to support this because such a use requires very little parking, and so the building footprint can be much larger.

Mr. Fox asked whether parking would still exist for loading and unloading at the complex. Mr. Lindebak confirmed as much, stating that he expected the few parking spots that will be included to be located on the southern side of the structure. Mr. Lindebak added that he expects the building to be a 'good neighbor', due to the low noise level that an indoor storage facility would generate.

Mr. Fox asked whether the facility would resemble the storage structure located at 21st and Webb. Mr. Lindebak confirmed that it would be similar, but would of course match the aesthetic requirements of the greater Heritage development.

Mr. Fox asked what Parcel 7b would be used for. Mr. Lindebak stated that he was not currently aware of an impending project on that parcel.

Peter Fox made a motion to recommend that the Planning Commission approve the amendment to the Heritage Mixed-Use Preliminary Planned Unit Development Motion seconded by Clint Teinert. Motion carried 3/0.

5.3 Z-PUD25-0006 — REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATION ON THE TUSCANY ADDITION PRELIMINARY PUD AMENDMENT, ON CERTAIN LANDS GENERALLY LOCATED AT THE CORNER OF S. ANDOVER RD. AND S.W. 120TH ST., ANDOVER, KANSAS

Ms. Boyd stated that this item was an amendment to the Tuscany PUD, which was tailored to allow the next agenda item to be approved. She stated that the Tuscany Fifth Phase Final PUD originally conflicted with the Preliminary PUD with regard to certain bulk regulations, and so this amendment would solve the discrepancies. Ms. Boyd stated that Staff had originally asked that the application be deferred in order to separate the new bulk regulations from the existing, built out lots. She explained that the applicant had solved this problem by separating Parcel 2 into Parcels 2a and 2b, and that the Fifth Phase would be on the Parcel 2b area.



Mr. Mangus added that the Fifth Phase needed these amendments in order to fit the six additional lots that it contains over the Fourth Phase Final PUD (which covers the same area).

Mr. Fox asked what Reserve A would be used for. Will Clevenger with Garver read out the Reserve uses on the PUD, and stated that he expected it to be mostly comprised of landscaping.

Ms. Boyd and Mr. Mangus explained that the street and utility designs for the Fifth Phase were unchanged from the Fourth. Ms. Boyd stated that the listed modification in the Committee's motion was simply to add a bit of text to the PUD that clarifies some of the lot width minimums.

Chairperson Marla Canfield made a motion to recommend that the Planning Commission approve the amendment to the Tuscany Preliminary Planned Unit Development, with the modification recommended by Staff. Motion seconded by Clint Teinert. Motion carried 3/0.

5.4 FINAL PUD — REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATION ON THE TUSCANY 5TH PHASE FINAL PUD, ON CERTAIN LANDS GENERALLY LOCATED N. OF S. VINTAGE DR. AND W. TUSCANY DR., ANDOVER, KANSAS

Ms. Boyd reiterated that this project was the Parcel 2b area from the previous agenda item. She stated that this plat was otherwise perfectly cromulent, and that the Preliminary PUD just needed to be molded to match.

Chairperson Marla Canfield made a motion to recommend that the Planning Commission approve the amendment to the Tuscany Preliminary Planned Unit Development, with the modification recommended by Staff. Motion seconded by Clint Teinert. Motion carried 3/0.

5.5 Z-PUD25-0008 — REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATION ON THE LAFAYETTE ADDITION PRELIMINARY PUD AMENDMENT, ON CERTAIN LANDS GENERALLY LOCATED IN THE 300 BLOCK OF W. LAFAYETTE ST., ANDOVER, KANSAS

Ms. Boyd began by explaining that this property was originally platted for single family development, but this was never completed. Instead, a new owner had taken possession of the property, and wished to install duplexes. Ms. Boyd stated that the amendment would change the underlying zoning of the PUD area, and modify the maximum allowable density and number of dwelling units, in order to allow for duplexes, but that the applicant did not wish to redraw any property lines. She stated that while the lots were unusual for duplexes, Staff felt that the applicant could find a building placement that would allow for the structures without issue.

Mr. Teinert asked for clarification as to the location of this development. Staff provided.

Mr. Fox stated that he was in support of a duplex development in the area, as many such dwellings were located nearby. Mr. Mangus concurred.



Ms. Boyd stated that Staff had several comments from the Fire Marshal, mostly regarding water service to the properties, as well as requiring that a 'No Parking / Fire Lane' sign be installed along the private access drive.

Clint Teinert made a motion to recommend that the Planning Commission approve the amendment to the Lafayette Addition Preliminary Planned Unit Development. Motion seconded by Peter Fox. Motion carried 3/0.

5.6 LS25-0002 — REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATION ON AN APPLICATION FOR A LOT SPLIT, ON CERTAIN LANDS GENERALLY LOCATED AT 800 S. RUTH AVE., ANDOVER, KANSAS

Ms. Boyd stated that the applicant has applied to split their residential lot into two, which would create two lots that could abide by all bulk regulations for the SF-1 district. She stated, however, that doing so would immediately create a nonconforming lot to the south. Ms. Boyd explained that the property features an existing house (addressed 800 S. Ruth Ave.), and an existing accessory structure (addressed 806 S. Ruth Ave.). She continued that the accessory structure cannot be located on a residential lot without a dwelling to be accessory to, and thus, Staff was not in support of splitting the lot. Ms. Boyd added that, from previous discussion with the applicant, she understood that the intention was for the applicant to continue using the accessory structure for personal storage after the split, which is not a permissible use for the district.

Clint Teinert made a motion to recommend that the Planning Commission disapprove the Lot Split at 800 S. Ruth Ave. Motion seconded by Peter Fox. Motion carried 3/0.

6. MEMBER ITEMS

Mr. Teinert drew attention to his new haircut (*it looked nice*).

7. ADJOURN

Chairperson Marla Canfield made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Motion seconded by Peter Fox. Motion carried 3/0.

Meeting adjourned at 6:04 P.M.