

**ANDOVER PLANNING COMMISSION
SUBDIVISION COMMITTEE
September 11, 2007
Minutes**

The Andover City Subdivision Committee met for a regular meeting on Tuesday, September 11, 2007 at 909 N. Andover Road in the Andover Civic Center. Chairman Lynn Heath called the meeting to order at 5:33 p.m. Other members present were Jan Cox and John Cromwell. Others in attendance were Director of Public Works and Community Development Les Mangus, Administrative Secretary Joan Yunker, and City Clerk/Administrator Jeff Bridges. All members present.

Review the minutes of the August 14, 2007 Subdivision Committee.

Call to order
Review minutes
of the August
14, 2007.

Jan Cox made a motion to approve the minutes as presented. John Cromwell seconded the motion. Motion carried 3/0.

Communications:

Communications

Review the City Council minutes from the July 31, 2007 and August 14, 2007 meetings. The minutes were received and filed.

Review the minutes of the July 17, 2007 Planning Commission meeting. The minutes were received and filed.

Review the Site Plan Review Committee minutes of the August 7, 2007 meeting. The minutes were received and filed.

Review the Potential Residential Development Lot Report.

LS-2007-01: Review the proposed lot split of Lot 6, Block 1, Autumn Ridge Subdivision.

LS-2007-01:
Lot 6, Block 1,
Autumn Ridge
Subdivision.

Les stated that he supports the lot split, the lot is platted at 102.67' wide what they have done is given 19' of lot 6 to lot 5. Lot 6 will meet both minimum lot area for the both of the duplexes.

Lynn Heath asked if the applicant or agent was present. Since there is no representation from the applicant or agent present, there will be no action taken on LS-2007-01 Autumn Ridge Subdivision.

Review the final PUD Plan of the Cottonwood Point

Review the

Addition – Phase 2.

Kenny Hill of Poe and Associates, represented the applicant. This is the 2nd Phase of the Preliminary PUD that was approved several years ago. We have proposed 30 lots in the 2nd Phase, and the original PUD there was 36 lots in this same area. We have made the lots bigger and we have added one reserve. The lots before were 75' frontage and now they average 90'. We have done a letter map revision to establish the flood way and flood plain which is shown on the plat. One of the questions was the right of way width on Wren Field Drive, you require 66' and we have shown 70', the reasoning that we have done this is that there is a 8' sidewalk on one side of the street and that makes the grades work better with wider sidewalk by offsetting the streets so that we have the same distance between the curb and the sidewalk that we would have with a normal 5' sidewalk.

Final PUD Plan
of the
Cottonwood
Point Addition
– 2.

Kenny stated that the developer will comply with all of Bickley Foster comments and Les Mangus comments. Debie Bush has supplied Les Mangus with the Homeowners Association Covenants and wanted to add the wording that the swimming pool would not be built until 50% of the Phase 2 is completed.

Lynn asked how much of Phase 1 is completed. Les responded 53% have C of O's, 63% with building permits.

Lynn asked what does 70.20 and the 71.12 mean on Wren Field Drive right of way? Kenny responded that this is the line that we have established as the center line 70.20 on the north end and 71.12 on the south end, due to the line is intersecting at an angle. We could split those up to show the distance on each side of the center line. Jan Cox stated, all we would need is an explanation.

Jan Cox asked how many phases will there be. Kenny responded there will be 3 phases.

Jan asked what will happen to the hedgerow.

Kenny responded the hedgerow will remain, the only cuts is if there is any trees in the drainage area, we may have to do some grading which may require a tree to be taken out.

Lynn asked Les if all of his comments been address. Les responded, yes.

John Cromwell made a motion to approve the Final PUD for Phase 2 of the Cottonwood Point Addition to go the Planning Commission with Bickley Foster comments to be address by the applicant, they do not have to be corrected by the Planning Commission, due to the time. Jan Cox seconded the motion. Motion carried 3/0.

Review the Final PUD Plan of the Ami Lane Addition.

Kris Rose of Baughman Company, P.A. represented the applicant, Mr. Rose address Les Mangus comments first.

- Comment #1: Title we changed it to “Ami Lane Addition Final Plan Unit Development”. We do want to leave the Final Plat, the reason why we do this is because we can not delicate road easements without it being a plat. We can not do this as a plan, so we wanted to make sure everyone is of notice that this is a plat and a final plan unit development. This is required by the state law.
- Comment #13: This will be checked and corrected.
- Comment #16: The K.G.&E easement along the south line, I have talked to Westar and they are reviewing us having a 20' utility easement along 10' into their easement and 10' off their easement. We are waiting for Westar response. Les stated that we have not received any comments back.
- From Les's comment: (Tile Report) There is not any conflicts with the right of way for rural water district.
- From Les's comment: (The Grading & Drainage Plan creates an area around and north of Dyna Dr., which appears to drain unchecked off the end of the pavement and/or down the rear lot drainage swale). We will work with Les.
- From Les's comment: (At the end of Amber Court, along the lots on the east side of Amber Court, which drain offsite without retention/detention or channel improvements). We have decreased the run off by 90%, we will let it sheet drain across on the other property since it goes there today.
- From Les's comment: (The City has a Standard raised top area inlet that we use, not flat grated tops). We will change.
- From Les's comment: (Confusion on to which pond is A or B, north or south). We will change.
- From Les's comment: (The City Drainage Standards are based on no increase in the rate of run-off at the 25 year

Review the Final PUD Plan of the Ami Lane Addition.

storm, include all the hydrology for the storm). We did provide this to Les today. Les responded, yes.

- From Les's comment: (Provide a sidewalk plan). We provided this to Les. Les responded, yes.

Mr. Rose is addressing Bickley's comments:

- Comment #1: This will be clarified and discussion.
- Comment #2: Amber Court in Preliminary in the PUD mentions that it is going to be 750' long because of the property.
- Comment #3: We have made the changes.
- Comment #4: Talks about a minimum pad, there is no flood plain on this property.
- Comment #5: I have changed this note to read, Fences shall be allowed within the drainage easement provide, however that the fence shall not impede the flow of surface drainage.

Bickley's comments Sheet 1 of 2:

- Comment #1: We will work with Les.
- Comment #2: We will work with Les.
- Comment #3: We did change it to read "City of Andover Zoning Regulations."
- Comment #4: Changed it to be "Ami Lane Addition Final Plan Unit Development".
- Comment #5: We changed it.
- Comment #6: We will work with Les.
- Comment #7: We will work with Les.
- Comment #8: Talks about the park. The park is not in this, but we assumed that you would want this on every phase, to be aware of a public park. I did remove the Reserve H.
- Comment #9: We will work with Les.
- Comment #10: Changed Homeowners Association to one word, and added City Andover Site Plan Review Committee.
- Comment #11: We will change.
- Comment #12: As stated. We will match to what Bickley's wants.
- Comment #13: We will work with Les.

Mr. Rose commented that he will work with Les and Bickley on all the comments.

Jan Cox asked about the screening, would the developer consider a wall or some kind of screening against the residents on Andover Road.

Mr. Rose responded that the developer feels the tree line is adequate.

John Cromwell made a motion to approve the Final PUD Plan of the Ami Lane Addition to go to the Planning Commission and that Bickley's and Les's comments are addressed. Jan Cox seconded the motion with reservations because of the screening. Motion carried 3/0.

Member items.

John Cromwell asked about the Butler Road study.

Les responded that it is progressing, they have met with both of the school districts and all of the major developers. This should be finished in fall sometime.

Member items.

Jan Cox made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 6:53 p.m. John Cromwell seconded the motion. Motion carried 3/0.

Joan Yunker
Administrative Secretary

Approved this 9th day of October 2007 by the Andover City Planning Commission/ Board of Zoning Appeals, City of Andover.