



**1. CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 6:01pm by Chairperson Todd Woolsoncroft.

**2. ROLL CALL**

**Committee Members present:** Chairperson Todd Woolsoncroft, Brian Schwan, Andrew Jarvis, Homer Henry & Jessica Friedrichs

**Staff Members present:** Jolene Graham, Assistant City Administrator; Les Mangus, Director of Community Development; Kevin Graham, Assistant Director of Public Works; Julie Boyd, Interim Planning & Zoning Administrator; Dylan Carroll, Interim Planning Technician

**3. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 4, 2025 MEETING**

Homer Henry made a motion to approve the minutes of the November 4, 2025, meeting as presented. Second, by Jessica Friedrichs. Motion passed 5-0.

**4. COMMUNICATIONS**

**A. COMMITTEE & STAFF REPORT**

Julie Boyd mentioned that Kevin Graham has accepted a position at the City of Andover and can no longer serve on the Site Plan Review Committee. Les Mangus and Julie Boyd further stated that the Mayor has a few people in mind he would like to ask.

**B. POTENTIAL RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT REPORT**

**5. AGENDA**

**5.1 MEETING CALENDAR —APPROVAL OF THE 2026 SITE PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING AND SUBMISSION DEADLINE CALENDAR**

Chairperson Woolsoncroft called the first agenda item pertaining to the approval of the 2026 Site Plan Review Committee Meeting and Submission Deadline Calendar.

Julie Boyd introduced the item by stating that this is the normal calendar for the committee meeting dates and submission deadlines for 2026. This year, there are no holidays that interfere with the normally scheduled 6pm on the second Tuesday slot. In addition, the submission deadlines are set roughly 30 days give or take before the next meeting.

Homer Henry made a motion to approve the 2026 meeting and submission deadline calendar. Seconded by Brian Schwan. Motion passed 5-0.



**5.2 SP-A23-0016 — REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF THE REVISED SITE PLAN FOR THE PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED AT 646 E. CLOUD AVE., ANDOVER, KANSAS**

Chairperson Woolsoncroft called the next agenda item pertaining to the review and approval of the revised site plan for the property generally located at 646 E. Cloud Ave.

Julie Boyd introduced the item by stating that the site plan was approved in 2023, but at the time the outer mechanical and electrical units for the building did not have a finalized location. These units weren't depicted on the site plan and no screening for them was put into place during that process. Since the approval, there have been some electrical components that are installed on the southern portion of the building facing Cloud Ave. Staff have reached out and asked in this case that the architect company prepare some screening for it, they have decided on a fence. They have been working closely with Evergy and believe that they have found a way to install a 6-foot fence to screen the equipment while maintaining access. They will do their best to match the paint as closely as possible to the building itself and it should easily screen the electrical equipment from the public view.

Chairperson Woolsoncroft asked if the fence would encroach on the sidewalk at all. Julie Boyd responded that it would not encroach on the sidewalk as there is already a small strip of grass between the equipment and the sidewalk.

Homer Henry asked if the 6-foot-tall fence would fully cover the equipment. Julie responded that the equipment does extend a bit higher than 6 feet, but 6 feet is the limit of height for fences. Requiring them to put in a tree there for example would require that they rip out the sidewalk and move lights poles etc. Staff feel this is the most screening that can be placed on the site without causing extreme changes to the building or site itself.

Homer Henry led a discussion with Staff about the best ways to prevent this from happening in future. Les Mangus stated that generally when Staff see plans, there are about 80% complete, most of the time they don't have the details down like placement of this electrical raceway or sometimes even HVAC units. Staff must go back during construction and remind them that all those must be screened by some means.

Homer Henry made a motion to approve the revised site plan for the multi-tenant retail building generally located at 646 E. Cloud Ave. Seconded by Andrew Jarvis. Motion passed 5-0.

**5.3 SP-A23-0034 — REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF THE REVISED SITE PLAN FOR ANDOVER AUTO BODY, GENERALLY LOCATED AT 115/123 W. CLOUD AVE. AND 602 S. DAISY LN., ANDOVER, KANSAS**

Chairperson Woolsoncroft called the next agenda item pertaining to the review and approval of the revised site plan for Andover Auto Body, generally located at 115/123 W. Cloud Ave & 602 S. Daisy Ln.

Julie Boyd introduced the agenda item by stating that the applicant has acquired a piece of property that is directly south of the existing Andover Auto Body parcels and he would like to



expand the business onto the new lot. The applicant is in the process of getting the zoning change, it has already been through Planning Commission and will be going to the City Council for the final approval. Because the applicant intends to use this previously residential property for commercial uses, an updated site plan for the entirety of the site, specifically focusing on the new commercial area is required. Since this property would be changed to commercial, it currently still has its residential zone, it would be abutting residential properties specifically to the south, the UDM requires extensive screening. In this case, the applicant has a fence up and has provided plans that show more landscaping will be added as well. Julie mentioned that at the time of publishing the packet, the new plans had not been submitted yet. To avoid confusion, the new plans and photos were printed out and left in front of your seats.

Chairperson Todd Woolsoncroft asked if the screening requirements would remain the same as what is in place currently. Julie responded that before the property was acquired, it was the same screening situation as the property to the north. Julie further stated that it was her understanding that the Site Plan Review Committee at the time did give some relief from some of the site plan requirements, specifically the width of the landscape buffer.

Homer Henry asked specifically what relief was given in the past and if the applicant is asking for the same relief in this case. Julie responded that they were granted relief when it came to the width of the landscape buffer. Generally, there is a 20-foot landscaped buffer between single family residential and a business zone, they were granted a reduced 10-foot landscape buffer. Mr. Henry then followed up and asked where the fence will be placed.

Jeff Coykendall from Andover Auto Body was present and spoke at the podium to address any questions from the committee.

Mr. Coykendall stated that the people he bought the property from will continue to stay in the house for the near future and the back portion of the property will be fenced in for car parking relating to his business.

Mr. Henry stated it appears the fence is already built. Les Mangus stated that the fence is in place, they applied for a permit with this property being zoned residential and it was granted as a 6-foot fence is permitted in a residential district. Mr. Mangus continued by stating the reason that this case here tonight is the site plan requirements for parking. He stated that we cannot call this storage because outdoor storage is not permitted in the B-3 zoning district. The applicant is parking cars in this space that are in queue for repairs in the main shop building. This is not public parking; it is employees who would be moving a car out there to park it while they wait for parts or to get in queue to be worked on later. It is the opinion of staff that the site plan requirements for lighting, for a landscaped median and so forth are not applicable. Staff does feel that the perimeter screening buffering is required because of that interface between the B-3 and SF-1 single family residential zone.

Homer Henry asked if we are still requiring trees. Les Mangus responded that we are requiring trees and they could be on either side of the fence.



Homer Henry sought clarification on which requirements are being waived and which are not. As it appears that staff is not requiring handicapped stalls, medians, etc., but trees are required. Les Mangus & Julie Boyd stated that this is the case because the landscape buffer in the UDM specifically states that trees are required.

Chairperson Woolsoncroft asked if there were any security concerns by reducing the amount of lighting in the area. Les Mangus stated that he talked with the Police Chief over the phone before the meeting tonight to get his opinion on the situation. The Police Chief did not have any real concerns because there is a 6-foot privacy fence around the vehicles. Staff feels that the lighting of this lot is more of an intrusion on the neighborhood than were it not to be lighted.

Jolene Graham pointed out to the committee using the aerial photos what a proper landscaped buffer looks like. Les Mangus gave some backstory regarding the Zip's Car Wash that is located adjacent to the subject property. He stated there is more than the minimums required because of the lights, the noise and the water spray of a car wash that was built 20 feet from the property line to a single-family residence.

Chairperson Woolsoncroft asked about the fence and its placement relating to the property line and whether the trees could be planted on the other side of the fence. Mr. Coykendall stated he believes the fence is 2 feet onto his property.

Homer Henry had questions and concerns about the requirement of trees inside of the fence and the placement of the fence. Julie Boyd stated that the fence does not have to go around the entirety of the parcel as they do not have to screen between parts of their own property. Les Mangus stated the house is now owned by the applicant and is in the process of being zoned B-3. Julie Boyd responded that Staff is not requiring the applicant to place the trees inside of the fence, that is just how they have chosen to do it.

Homer Henry asked if the trees are really needed and the specific required number of trees. Julie responded that they are required by the UDM, but the committee can choose not to require it. Kevin Graham responded that the number of trees is calculated based on the length of the shared frontage between the two properties. It is calculated by taking the length of frontage and dividing it by 40.

Todd Woolsoncroft asked if there was a requirement that this lot be paved because it is for parking. Jeff Coykendall stated that the entire area will be concreted soon. Les Mangus stated that the regulations would not require these spaces to be paved as these are above and beyond what is required for the patrons and employees of this business.

Chairperson Woolsoncroft asked Les Mangus if the main determination the committee needed to make was if they were okay with waving the requirement for site lighting. Les Mangus stated that it was correct. Kevin Graham chimed in and stated that anything done in the future to the house or the property would require the applicant to come back to Site Plan to get approved.



Homer Henry asked if there was a tree line along the property previously. Les Mangus responded that there was a solid evergreen tree row down the entire property line in addition to the fence.

Jeff Coykendall asked the committee for relief in regard to the landscape buffer, he asked for a 10-foot buffer instead of the regular 20 foot.

Todd Woolsoncroft asked if the 10-foot buffer gives adequate space for the trees long term. Kevin Graham stated it should be fine for a tree of that size as typically you would see 8 to 9 feet of space.

Todd Woolsoncroft asked about the drainage of this site. Kevin Graham stated that the proposed parking lot is draining back to the north and then he believes it drains to the west. It is not pushing water onto the adjacent residential properties.

Andres Jarvis led a discussion about the placement of the trees relative to the fence. He wanted to ensure that the trees do not eventually grow into the fence and become a problem.

Homer Henry made a motion to approve the revised site plan for the Andover Auto Body Shop generally located at 602 S. Daisy Lane with the buffer being 10 foot wide but still providing enough space for the tree to be fully grown. Seconded by Brian Schwan. Motion passed 5-0.

#### **5.4 SP-A25-0023 — REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF THE SITE PLAN FOR A DUPLEX DEVELOPMENT GENERALLY LOCATED AT 420 W. MIKE ST., ANDOVER, KANSAS**

Chairperson Woolsoncroft called the next agenda item pertaining to the review and approval of the site plan for a duplex development generally located at 420 W. Mike St.

Julie Boyd introduced the agenda item by stating that the committee has previously seen the preliminary site plan for this development, which is a collection of duplexes over at 420 W. Mike St. These duplexes will be located next to the Terradyne Golf Course and in that area, there is a bunch of multifamily residential development in that area so this proposal would fit right in. The property owner has chosen to work with Kaw Valley Engineering, and an agent is present to address the committee. The committee and staff provided a good number of comments when this was brought forward back at the November 4th, 2025, meeting and staff does not feel that the new submittal has addressed enough of those comments, including several from out fire marshal who could not be in attendance tonight. Staff recommend that the applicant and their agent be given more time to work through the comments that were provided.

Homer Henry asked what the drainage of this property looks like. Kevin Graham stated that they have proposed a concrete pilot channel along the west side of the property that would convey runoff to the north around the north side of the site and then it would go east. Mr. Henry then asked what is to the North & East of this property. Julie responded that there are other multi family developments, including duplexes and triplexes. Les Mangus further stated that the Hodges edition duplexes that were platted a few years ago are located next to the property and there is a drainage swale along the common property line.



Homer Henry asked if the land is going to be raised at all from its current height.

Kobe Pietro from Kaw Valley Engineering was present and spoke at the podium to address comments from the committee. In response to Mr. Henry, he stated that overall, the grading is going to remain about the same. He stated he believes they plan to raise the buildings about a half a foot to a foot from the original elevation. The elevation will be similar to the multifamily buildings directly to the east of the property. Kobe mentioned that the existing site is already pretty flat and there wasn't a whole lot of drainage, so they had to raise it a bit to get the water to run off but there are not excessive slopes on the site by any means.

Chairperson Woolsoncroft had questions relating to the tree line/hedge row that is present on the property and if they were confident that the trees could be trimmed back enough. Kobe stated that determination will mostly come from field time and starting work on the site. The tree line is basically the property line, and they will try to pull the tree line back about 20 feet. He stated that as this is an old hedge row, some trees may need to be replanted throughout the process to maintain or reestablish the tree line.

Kobe Pietro stated that he had talked with Fire Marshal Mike Roosevelt about the plan review and was given email approval at the time that everything looked up to code. Kobe further stated that it is his belief that if an approved fire turnaround was to be required, then it would make this site unbuildable due to how much space a cul-de-sac would take up. Fire code states that if a road is over 150 feet, than an approved turnaround must be installed. Mr. Pietro asked that the committee approve the plan with staff comments and disregard the comments relating to fire.

In response, Mr. Mangus stated that conversation was not one that Staff was included on and that there are comments on the plans stating that the proposed plan does not meet all fire code requirements.

Kevin Graham asked Kobe Pietro if they had explored the idea of attempting to link the development to the development to the east. He stated this could be a potential option depending on how the discussion with the fire department goes. There is an access drive that could potentially be linked creating a loop, negating the need for an approved turnaround.

Homer Henry asked if this solution would be like a shared access drive. Kevin stated it would effectively be like a shared access drive that would loop through both sites.

Chairperson Woolsoncroft stated that looking at the comments relating to combustible, noncombustible materials, fire rated stairs etc. he is in favor of tabling this case until there is a resolution to the comments made by the fire department.

Homer Henry made a motion to table the discussion until the next meeting, on the site plan for duplexes generally located at 420 W Mike St. Seconded by Brian Schwan. Motion passed 5-0.



**5.5 SP-A25-0024 — REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF THE SIGN PLAN FOR EDWARD JONES, GENERALLY LOCATED AT 826 E. FOUNDERS PKWY. STE. 200, ANDOVER, KANSAS**

Chairperson Woolsoncroft called the last agenda item pertaining to the review and approval of the sign plan for the Edward Jones, generally located at 826 E. Founders Pkwy. STE 200.

Julie Boyd introduced the item by stating that this is a wall sign installation for a tenant finish at the north tenant space located next to Andover Optometry. The signs for the optometry place have already been approved. In this case, the applicant intends to install wall signage on the front and back of the building (West & East sides). This is a small sign and it is nowhere near the maximum wall coverage requirements including those Andover Optometry signs.

The applicant, Anders Herposheimer was in attendance and spoke at the podium.

Homer Henry made a comment about how much he loves the look of the Andover Optometry signs, especially at night. Mr. Henry then asked about lighting for the sign. Anders responded that the signs are going to illuminate white light at night.

Homer Henry asked if there were any concerns that the trees planted along Yorktown would grow above the sign. The consensus was that the trees will absolutely cover the sign in the future. Kevin Graham stated that those trees were part of the Heritage infrastructure development. Homer Henry further asked if we are requiring the sign on the back of the building or if they just decided to place one there. Julie responded that the sign on the rear of the building is not required, they just chose to place one there.

Chairperson Todd Woolsoncroft made a motion to approve the sign plan as presented for 826 E. Founders Pkwy Ste 200. Seconded by Homer Henry. Motion passed 5-0.

**6. MEMBER ITEMS**

None.

**7. ADJOURN**

Homer Henry made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Seconded by Brian Schwan. Motion passed 5-0.

Meeting adjourned at 6:45pm.