

CITY OF ANDOVER
SITE PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE
May 5, 2009
MINUTES

The Site Plan Review Committee met for a regular meeting on Tuesday, May 5, 2009 at the Andover Central Park Lodge located at 1607 E. Central, Andover, Kansas. Chairman Doug Allison called the meeting to order at 6:03 p.m. Members present were Jason Mohler, Don Kimble, Fred Deppner, Clark Nelson and Dennis Bush. Others in attendance were Les Mangus Director of Public Works and Community Development, Sasha Stiles City Administrator, Shane Coelho Assistant City Administrator and Kandace Hunt Administrative Secretary. Members absent were Stephanie Melsheimer and Chad Stearns.

Call to order

Review the minutes of the April 7, 2009 Site Plan Review Committee meeting.

Review the minutes of the April 7, 2009 Site Plan Review Committee.

Clark Nelson made a motion to approve the minutes as presented. Jason Mohler seconded the motion. Motion carried 6/0.

Communications:

Communications

Review the minutes of the March 10, 2009 and March 31, 2009 City Council meetings. The minutes were received and filed.

Review the minutes of the March 17, 2009 Planning Commission meeting. The minutes were received and filed.

Review the minutes of the March 10, 2009 Subdivision Committee meeting. The minutes were received and filed.

Review the Potential Residential Development Lot Report.

SP-2009-07- Review and approve the site plan for Mercy Home Care located at 822 N. Andover Road.

SP-2009-07

From Les Mangus' Memo: The site plan for the proposed Mercy Home Care office at 822 N. Andover Road meets all of the bulk regulations for the district, but because of the long narrow shape of the lot, virtually half of the lot is undeveloped. This situation coupled with the developed environment all around the site make grading for drainage difficult, so the designer has opted to take the majority of the run-off from the building and parking lot to the

storm sewer in Andover Road. The architecture of the building fits well with the residential character of the neighborhood, and the required parking is minimal. No details have been provided for the monument sign or lighting plan. Other than the satisfaction of those two items, staff supports the plan.

Jason Mohler disqualified himself from the discussion and vote in order to act as agent for the applicant.

Agents for the applicant Jason Mohler of Crafton Tull Sparks and Ed Kurts of Design Group Architects as well as applicant John Gray were present to represent the application.

Mr. Mohler explained the property is located on the east side of Andover Road between 13th and Central in the existing Church of Christ Addition. The lot is less than an acre at 357 feet deep with an Andover Road frontage of 118 feet. Construction will take place on less than 50 percent of the lot. The existing tree row on the east side of the property will remain as will the existing berm and landscaping along Andover Road. Mr. Mohler continued by saying the plat allows for one new driveway to serve the lot. After considering all their options the developer has agreed to a shared access point with the church. Mr. Mohler provided Committee members with site photometric plans and monument sign details. The monument is approximately 23 square feet on each side with a sandblasted face. The base will be constructed of faux stone veneer with brick trim and ground lights on each side.

Mr. Kurts said the building will be a 2,400 square foot professional office. The office will have 12 parking spaces and grading will meet City requirements. The front elevation of the building will be constructed of a hardboard fascia and soffit systems with a tan faux stone veneer. The sides and back of the building will be constructed of a hardboard fascia and soffit systems with hardboard horizontal lap siding with eight inch exposure. The windows will be beige vinyl units and the roof will have 8/12 and 6/12 pitches covered with asphalt composition shingles.

Don Kimble asked how the trash truck would get in and out of the site. Mr. Gray said he does not know how the church handles its trash service but this company will produce little to no trash. Les Mangus said the applicants are not required to have trash service. Don Kimble said he would like the plans to have a note stating there will be no trash service. Dennis Bush said he would like the applicants to provide a plan including a dumpster with proper

screening in case it was ever needed.

Don Kimble said he likes the plan that has been submitted including the aesthetics of the light fixtures, but wants the photometric plan to be signed and sealed by an electrical engineer when the applicants submit plans for a building permit.

Chairman Allison asked how many exits the building is required to have. Mr. Kurts said no more than two exits are required.

Chairman Allison asked if there should be a link to the public way from the rear exit. Les Mangus said a second exit to the public way is a plan review issue handled by the City Building Official Kirk Crisp. The worse case scenario would be to have to wrap a sidewalk around either side of the building, which would also address the request for a trash cart rout.

Dennis Bush asked if the site and facility will be handicap accessible for patients. Mr. Gray explained that no patients would be coming to the facility; all of the care is done in the home.

Chairman Allison noted the plans call for the removal of some maples along the west side of the site; he asked if this was because they were in poor condition or for construction purposes. Mr. Mohler said the maples are not in great condition and are also growing into the pear trees.

Chairman Allison asked if all of the east side of the site will be fill dirt. Mr. Mohler said yes because the finished floor is dictated by the drainage plan of the plat. Chairman Allison asked if there was any concern over the killing the existing trees in there area. Mr. Mohler said in is opinion the trees will be fine.

Chairman Allison asked if the monument sign meets City regulations. Les Mangus said yes.

Don Kimble made a motion to approve SP-2009-07 as presented with the following conditions: 1. the electrical engineer provide a signed and stamped photometric plan as part of the submittal to City staff, if the plan is different then what was submitted to the Committee staff has the option of approving or returning the plan for approval; 2. indicate a future screened dumpster site on the plan which staff has the option of approving or returning to the Committee for approval. Clark Nelson seconded the motion. Chairman Allison asked if there was any further discussion. There was none. Motion carried 5/0.

SP-2009-08- Review and approve the site plan for Arby's located at the southeast corner of Highway 54 and Andover Road. **SP-2009-08**

From Les Mangus' Memo: The proposed Arby's fast food restaurant location across Cloud Avenue from the new Dillon's store is a prototypical layout for the franchise. The typical counterclockwise traffic circulation and frontage on both US-54 and Cloud Avenue, makes the location a bit of a challenge aesthetically. The plan meets the requirements, but in staff's opinion lacks creativity in addressing the aesthetics from both street frontages. Two issues remain unanswered: drainage from the site is directed towards two locations, which don't have any stormwater appurtenances or easements for drainage, and no connection has been provided to the public sidewalk on Cloud Avenue, which would cause any pedestrian traffic to walk in the busy single driveway access. Without answers to these important issues staff will withhold judgment.

Andy Benning of Arby's was present to represent the application.

Mr. Benning explained the Arby's will be located at Andover Road and Highway 54 in front of the new Dillon's Market Place. Access to the site will be off of Cloud Avenue with the possibility of a cross lot connection from the front in the future. The building will be constructed of Acme Royal Oak "Tan" brick with Acme Crimson Blend "Red" accent brick and Bright Red metal roofing. Mr. Benning said this will be the first building in the Wichita market with this design.

Don Kimble said he only sees two relief scuppers on the plans. Mr. Benning said the building has interior down spouts.

Don Kimble noted the site plan does not show where the refrigeration units will be located. Mr. Benning said the units will be inside.

Don Kimble said he does not think enough space has been provided to allow the trash truck to backup to the dumpster. Mr. Benning said the developers have provided Les Mangus with an auto turn showing the trash truck pulling in, backing up, picking-up trash and pulling out. Don Kimble said he would not want to park his car next to the trash can for fear the trash truck would hit it in the process. Mr. Benning said trash pick-up will be completed before business hours. Fred Deppner asked if the applicants would be putting concrete pavement in front of the dumpster. Mr. Benning said yes.

Don Kimble asked if Les Mangus' comment about the water draining to nowhere had been addressed. Les Mangus said no. Mr. Benning said the developers could generate an easement showing that the water can go across the property. Les Mangus said as long as the owner of the vacant property to the east is ok with the drainage and there is an easement and plan for the water, he is ok with it. Don Kimble asked why the water was not directed north to the Highway 54 ditch. Les Mangus said that would require more engineering and permits from KDOT. He continued by saying the drainage plan MKEC generated shows all of the drainage from this site going straight east into the retention ponds rather than north into the Highway 54 ditch, down the ditch and into the retention ponds. Don Kimble asked if there is an easement way from the east to the pond. Les Mangus said not at this point. Jason Mohler noted there is an inlet on Cloud Avenue not far from this property. Sasha Stiles asked if it is typical for a site to sheet drain. Les Mangus said according to the civil engineer the site is set up to sheet drain with the run off ending up in the ponds. Mr. Benning said the applicants have developed many out parcels like this site where there are three or four uses that go to a storm collection site. It is common for the sites to sheet drain across the parking lots until they hit the collection site. He continued by saying he is waiting for a draft showing a storm drainage easement from the developer. Les Mangus said he is confident the civil engineer, Arby's and the developer can work out the drainage issue, and no construction documents will be approved until that happens.

Don Kimble made a motion to approve SP-2009-08 as presented with the condition of the drainage easement concerns being addressed by staff during the building review process. Jason Mohler seconded the motion. Chairman Allison asked if there was any further discussion. There was none. Motion carried 6/0.

Member Items: Les Mangus informed Committee members he had provided the Site Plan Review Committee Criteria and Procedure Updates Subcommittee with a document separating criteria issues into two categories, those related to the process and those that affect the end product, and provide staff suggestions for resolving each issue. He suggested the subcommittee either stay after the adjournment of the evenings meeting or setup a separate meeting date to discuss these suggestions. Don Kimble suggested reviewing staff's comments with all members present.

Member Items

From Les Mangus' Memo: As a follow up to the input from stakeholders in the Andover Site Plan Review Committee Criteria

and Procedures Update I thought it would be best to separate the issues into two categories: those related to the process, and those that affect the end product.

In my opinion the process issues are those, which could be enhanced by a policy or regulation that is administered by the City of Andover staff such as submittal schedule, process information or thresholds for review by the SPRC.

Product issues are those, which affect the design of the building, landscaping, lighting, drainage, etc. These issues are more the result of the subjective review of the project by the SPRC, and application of the Appearance Criteria.

In some instances the two issues are so intertwined that they must be looked at together, but in most cases they stand fairly independently. I have tried to separate all of the stakeholder comments into the two categories in an effort to focus on the regulatory issues separate from the subjective criteria issues, some of the comments may be combined if they were repeated or closely related.

To get the update process started with the subcommittee I would like to begin with the process issues, and give some input from the staff perspective.

Process Issues

1. Preliminary or sketch review of projects for early feedback from the SPRC.

Staff would suggest that some sort of preliminary review be conducted by the SPRC or a subcommittee to address subjective criteria. Staff review of the application is already accomplished within a week to ten days.

Les Mangus said he has spoken with applicants and reviewed different regulations and there does not seem to be a one size fits all process, but in most jurisdictions there is either an application conference or a preliminary review required. The preliminary submittal is under utilized with this Committee probably because of the 30 day timeline between submittals. Making the preliminary review a staff function does not work 100 percent of the time because staff is looking at the black and white of what is required, while the Committee looks at more of the appearance of the site. A possible solution would be a subcommittee or second meeting to review the preliminary plans prior to the actual Site Plan meeting.

Don Kimble suggested having required preliminary review meetings during the third week of the month, allowing the applicant two weeks to have final plans prepared for the Site Plan meeting. Les Mangus said this would actually only allow the applicant one week to prepare final plans, they would have to be submitted a week prior to the Site Plan meeting to allow packets to be delivered one week before the meeting. Les Mangus suggested having packets delivered the Friday prior to the meeting instead of the Tuesday before the meeting. Don Kimble asked if that would create a problem with the public notice in the paper. Les Mangus said no. The Committee agreed to have packets delivered on Fridays.

Don Kimble said if applicants come to a final review without all of the information they were asked to provide at the preliminary review, or they provide it the night of the final meeting the application should be rejected. Dennis Bush said if the information requested is provided at the final meeting and is not accepted, the applicant is delayed another month and he does not want to see that happen, but if they do not submit the requested information at all they should be removed from the agenda. Les Mangus said if the Committee decides to create a preliminary meeting the conditions given to applicants will need to be very clear cut. Fred Deppner said he does not feel a week is enough turnaround time between meetings. Don Kimble agreed and suggested having 30 days between each meeting. Fred Deppner said he felt 10 to 14 days would be sufficient.

Fred Deppner asked if the applicants will be provided with a list of everything they need to bring to the preliminary meeting. Les Mangus said the preliminary meeting will be a chance for the applicant to see exactly what they need to bring for final submittal approval.

Clark Nelson asked if every application would be required to have a preliminary review. Don Kimble said he would suggest every case have a preliminary review.

The Committee discussed possible times to hold a preliminary meeting. It was decided the preliminary meeting would be done with the full committee with those not able to attend providing comments to Les Mangus prior to the meeting.

2. Cost/benefit analysis of required improvements.

Staff suggests possibly adding the estimated cost of the project to the project information to help put the cost of added improvements

in perspective.

Don Kimble said he would like to see the cost of the building and site listed separately.

Dennis Bush said he feels there needs to be some sort of standard ratio setup for how much of a projects budget should be spent on the building versus the site. Sasha Stiles said staff could track the separate cost for a specified amount of time to give the Committee an idea of the average cost of each element of the project in order to help determine what type of ratio should be used. Don Kimble said he feels not all costs provided will be truthful. Chairman Allison suggested providing members with the current landscaping Means data to make them more aware of the actual cost of a landscaping project. Fred Deppner said he feels collecting the cost data for six months to a year would provide an average that could be provided to the applicant, making the process more user friendly. Don Kimble said in his opinion to make the data more accurate the applicant will need to provide an estimated cost for the building, landscaping and site.

Don Kimble said he would rather see fewer large plantings than several small plantings because of the instant result. Clark Nelson asked if that is something the Committee can impose. Les Mangus said the criteria will have a set minimum planting size, whether the applicant decides to plant more than the required minimum will be up to them. Clark Nelson suggested making the required planting size larger.

3. Final design elements required well in advance of construction documents, and incremental review of project phases.

Staff would oppose any kind of incremental review or approval from past experience with the end result.

Don Kimble said he thinks timelines should be imposed on phases as part of a condition for approval.

4. Staff review of small projects or minor changes to approved plans. Requirements should differ for new construction vs. changes to existing facilities.

Parking, signage and minor building revisions could be addressed with a prescriptive standard. The SPRC ordinance would have to be amended to establish thresholds and staff level of responsibilities.

Les Mangus said he has found a prescriptive standard where the

size of the landscape bed is determined by the surface area of the sign by a three to one ratio. If a sign is 100 square feet, 300 square foot of landscaping would be required with a certain square foot value assigned to plantings. Don Kimble said he would recommend approving a similar standard. Dennis Bush asked if adopting such standard would require a change in the sign ordinance. Les Mangus said the ordinance might require a change because it states all signs come to the Committee for review, but the Committee could adopt a policy with this matrix and assign the responsibility to staff.

Les Mangus said he also found a similar formula for parking lots. The average seems to be for every ten stalls there would be a landscaping island equivalent to the size of a parking stall. This would accomplish the idea of spreading the landscaping throughout the site instead of leaving it all along the edges. Jason Mohler said requiring a landscape island for every ten parking stalls is an evolving concept that could fail in the future and may not work for each site. Dennis Bush suggested if an applicant does not agree with the prescriptive standards they could appeal to the Committee.

5. Incomplete or late submittals.

From the staff perspective the time schedule is very demanding. If the application is submitted timely, and staff is able to review and return comments within 10 working days, the applicant is left with basically one week to turn revisions around in order to get the packets out the SPRC members a week ahead of the meeting. Perhaps the packets could be delivered to the members the Friday before the meeting in an effort to give the applicant more time to complete necessary revisions.

Incomplete submittals will be accepted at the preliminary meeting review but not at the final meeting. If an applicant skips the preliminary meeting and submits an incomplete final application it should be rejected.

6. Signed and sealed submittals.

This requirement is self explanatory, and would stop some of the incomplete submittals, but put more pressure on the designer to provide more information. Lighting for example is rarely submitted by a licensed electrical engineer and structural engineer for the pole bases.

Dennis Bush said he thinks there should be a threshold on what projects are required to have signed and sealed plans, but he does

not know what that threshold is. Les Mangus said in order for construction plans to be approved by the building official they must be signed and sealed, so it is more a matter of determining at what level it is required. Jason Mohler noted that most plans submitted to the Committee are not final plans so engineers will not stamp them. Don Kimble said he is not concerned about what level the signed and sealed copies are provided as long as the City receives them.

The Committee decided to require signed and sealed plans with the final submittal.

7. Standard formats for information transmittals.

This issue should be easily addressed by providing the applicant with forms for information such as code data, parking and landscape schedules.

8. Photos and/or illustrations included in guidelines and standards, and condense the criteria document to make it easier to read and understand.

Photos or illustrations of good practices or design theory could be provided in a guideline type of document.

Les Mangus said even zoning regulations are beginning to use more illustrations and less text, some use pictures other use drawings. Don Kimble said anything that makes the criteria graphically easier to explain should be included.

Les Mangus said he does not think the guidelines could be condensed, but a separate handout showing examples of what will and will not work could be provided to applicants. Seeing the level of detail required in advance could be helpful to the applicant.

9. Colored site plan and building material samples for SPRC packet.

Requirements for colored plans could be added to the required documentation. Material samples for each member might get a little cumbersome for delivery and expensive for the applicant.

Don Kimble noted that he does not want a material board included in each packet, he would just like pictures of the material being used included.

Don Kimble said he thinks colored copies need to be provided to illustrate at a glance building, parking and landscape coverage. Dennis Bush said he does not think plans need to be colored to get

the concept across, cost thresholds should be considered. Jason Mohler suggested informing applicants during the preliminary review whether or not color plans would need to be included with the final submittal. Dennis Bush said he thinks there should be a threshold set for which projects require colored copies.

10. More frequent meetings.

Perhaps a subcommittee similar to the Subdivision Committee could be appointed to give preliminary comments to the applicant.

The Committee decided to require a preliminary meeting for all applicants.

11. Landscape architect on SPRC.

The ordinance suggests that the members have a background in related fields. The problem the Mayor often encounters is finding people to fill the vacant positions.

12. Provide aerial photos of the site and surrounding area.

Staff will provide aerial photos of the subject property and surrounding area.

13. Utilize the Site Plan Review Checklist form for every case review.

Staff can modify the form and provide a copy for each case to be used in a checklist fashion.

Chairman Allison adjourned the meeting at 8:40 pm.

Adjourn

Respectfully Submitted by

Kandace Hunt
Administrative Secretary

Approved this 2nd day of June 2009 by the Site Plan Review Committee, City of Andover.