

CITY OF ANDOVER
SITE PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE
April 7, 2009
MINUTES

The Site Plan Review Committee met for a regular meeting on Tuesday, April 7, 2009 at the Andover Central Park Lodge located at 1607 E. Central, Andover, Kansas. Clark Nelson called the meeting to order at 6:03 p.m. Members present were Jason Mohler, Don Kimble, Fred Deppner 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. Chairman Doug Allison arrived at 6:19 p.m. Members absent were Chad Stearns and Stephanie Melsheimer.

Call to order

Review the minutes of the March 3, 2009 Site Plan Review Committee meeting.

Review the minutes of the March 3, 2009 Site Plan Review Committee.

Don Kimble made a motion to approve the minutes as presented. Fred Deppner seconded the motion. Motion carried 5/0.

Communications:

Communications

Review the minutes of the February 10, 2009 and the February 24, 2009 City Council meetings. The minutes were received and filed.

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

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

Review the Potential Residential Development Lot Report.

SP-2004-09- Review and approve the amended site plan of the Walnut Valley Country Store for the Prairieland Partners, Inc. sign located at 307 W. Highway 54.

SP-2004-09

From Les Mangus' Memo: The amended site plan for the pylon sign for the Walnut Valley Country Store is the result of the Prairieland Partners leasing the property for use as a farm store and a John Deere small equipment dealership. A special use

application to permit the proposed uses will be heard by the Planning Commission on April 21, 2009. The location of the Proposed sign has been selected in order to get good visibility from US-54 and fit into the existing landscape plan. The proposed sign meets the maximum surface area for the district and is in compliance with other bulk regulations.

Loren Balzer and Marc Conrady of Prairieland Partners, Inc. were present to represent the application.

Mr. Balzer explained Prairieland Partners John Deere would soon be moving into the former Walnut Valley Country Store and are proposing the installation of a 25 foot twin pole pylon sign on the southwest corner of the entrance off of south Riverview Street. The sign will have an aluminum surface painted silver metallic with a vacuum formed logo polycarbonate face and yellow embossed surface supported by acrylic urethane coated poles with a green high gloss finish. Mr. Balzer said the applicants plan to open the store on April 20th.

Jason Mohler asked if the existing Walnut Valley Country Store sign would remain. Mr. Balzer said yes, but the applicants plan to change the face.

Don Kimble made a motion to approve the amendment to SP-2004-09 as presented. Fred Deppner seconded the motion. Motion carried 5/0.

SP-2008-03- Review and approve the amended site plan of Treescapes, Inc. for two 20x20 structures located at 1202 N. Andover Road. **SP-2008-03**

From Les Mangus' Memo: The amended site plan for Treescapes is the result of the construction of a permanent shade structure not shown on the approved site plan. The owner felt that since the structure was for display no permitting or approvals were necessary, but because the structure is permanently attached to the grounds staff has determined that permits are required, which then requires SPRC approval.

David Martine of Treescapes was present to represent the application.

Mr. Martine said he is proposing the construction of two 20x20 permanent cabana structures, one of which is already built. The cabanas are wood structures with composition shingle roofs

located on the north side of the building.

Jason Mohler asked if the cabanas were for display purposes. Mr. Martine said yes.

Don Kimble made a motion to approve the amendment to SP-2008-03 as presented. Jason Mohler seconded the motion. Motion carried 5/0.

SP-2009-06- Review and approve the site plan for the Andover Lawn Equipment storage building located at 1627 N. Andover Road.

SP-2009-06

From Les Mangus' Memo: The proposed warehouse building for Andover Lawn Equipment is an expansion of the existing business across the street in order to have more lawn care equipment on site. The proposed building is similar in colors and architecture to the existing building and four others in the neighborhood. The location is proposed to be unmanned and used strictly for warehousing and assembly of lawn equipment. The plan has a couple of details that need attention, but nothing that can't be worked out before the meeting: the lighting plan falls a little short at the driveway approach, no details are given for the appearance of the wall pack lighting, and material designations are not included on the building elevations or perspectives.

Ken Huston of Andover Lawn Equipment and Randal Steiner of Randal Steiner Architect were present to represent the application.

Mr. Huston explained the proposed 50'-1.5" x 42' storage building will be located behind Glens Specialized Service Car Repair and face Market Street. The building will be constructed of tan metal panels with dark brown trim similar to the existing buildings to the north.

Jason Mohler noted there are several existing trees in the area and asked which ones would be eliminated and which would be added. Mr. Steiner explained a few trees would be eliminated for the construction of the driveway and two parking stalls, but four Canaert Junipers will be added on the northeast corner of the driveway and two Austrian Pines will be placed on the east side of the building.

Jason Mohler asked if customers would be allowed at the new facility. Ken Huston said no. The building will be accessed by staff only and not open to the public in any way.

Clark Nelson asked Les Mangus if he had any comments on the project. Les Mangus said all of his comments had been addressed by the applicants.

Don Kimble thanked the applicants for a professional presentation.

Don Kimble made a motion to approve SP-2009-06 as presented. Fred Deppner seconded the motion. Motion carried 5/0.

Review comments received from the 2009 Site Plan Criteria Review Stakeholders regarding the Site Plan Review Committee Criteria and Adopted Policies.

Review comments received from the 2009 Site Plan Criteria Review Stakeholders regarding the Site Plan Review Committee Criteria and Adopted Policies.

From Les Mangus' Memo: As a follow up to conversations with the Mayor and others over the last several months, one of my goals for 2009 is to review the Site Plan Review Committee Criteria and Adopted Policies, and suggest any changes if necessary.

To begin I would like to collect opinions from stakeholders in the process, beginning with the City Staff, Governing Body, Planning Commission, Site Plan Review Committee members and finally with face to face interviews with the applicants and design professionals if they choose.

I have begun a list below of the pros and cons of the process that I have either encountered myself, in the administration of the process, or heard from others. I would like each of you to take a few moments to reflect on the process and/or review existing SPRC Criteria and Adopted Policies, and add to the lists. If you would like a face to face conversation on the matter, one can be arranged at your convenience.

From those comments a master list will be provided for all to review, before the Site Plan Review Committee proceeds to the identification of potential solutions and preparation of an outline of proposed changes.

Drafts of the proposed changes will be divided into smaller more manageable sections for review by stakeholders as they are drawn to insure that we have addressed all of the comments before proceeding to adoption of changes.

Pros

1. Provides a method to assure the aesthetic quality and

- compatibility of new non-residential development.
- 2. Allows the designer the flexibility to interject creativity or particular store “brand identification” into each product.
- 3. Allows each design to be specific to the site and surroundings.
- 4. Allows for a preliminary or sketch review to gather input from the SPRC before investment in a final design.

Cons

- 1. Lack of prescribed standards allows for inconsistent requirements.
- 2. Does not provide minimum standards for screening, landscaping, building materials, etc.
- 3. Does not set a clear cut expectation or design harmony for each location.
- 4. Does not require a cost benefit analysis of required improvements.
- 5. Requires a comprehensive final design well ahead of construction, and is not well suited for design/build projects.
- 6. Does not provide for incremental review of phases of projects.
- 7. Consumes design schedule time from the 30 day review period to review and approval by SPRC.
- 8. Does not allow for staff review and approval of small projects, or minor changes to approved plans.

Les Mangus explained he has received comments from different committee members which now need to be refined as changes to be made to the process to create a better product.

Clark Nelson asked what the next step in the process is. Les Mangus said, in his opinion, the best thing to do would be to take a few members from the Site Plan Committee to work on new verbiage to insert into the criteria and regulations and try to put together standard/example drawings, which seems to be the way most City’s are handling both Zoning and Site Plan Regulations. Good, better, best photos or line drawings could be provided for examples of parking lot screening, building arrangement, landscaping and so on. He continued by saying he would suggest the members of the subcommittee create improvement ideas which they would then present to the entire Site Plan Review Committee followed by a presentation to the Planning Commission and lastly the City Council.

Don Kimble said the reason the criteria is being addressed is

because members of the public and past applicants had a negative experience and would like to see changes made to the process. He continued by saying he felt the con statements provide were based on poor planning by the applicant. Doug Allison agreed. Don Kimble stated cost and determining whether or not a project was minor would be difficult to define.

Don Kimble explained he travels around the country going through different site plan processes and only complete packages are allowed, nothing is submitted at the last minute. He continued by saying one of his biggest peeves is local applicants trying to handle their own civil engineering, which should not happen.

Fred Deppner said he feels the more subjectivity that can be done away with and the more that can be put in black and white, the less complaints the Committee will receive. Applicants need to be given a concrete idea of what to expect when presenting so they are not faced with delays. Don Kimble said he feels any delays would be the fault of poor planning on behalf of the applicant. Fred Deppner said he disagreed, if the process is subjective the applicants do not know what to expect.

Dennis Bush said he feels there should be some fiscal thresholds and the Committee should not look at any projects costing less than \$10,000. He continued by saying if there is a remodel done to an existing building that is less than \$100,000 to \$150,000 there should be a set percentage of dollars set aside for landscaping. The idea that the Committee could impose a \$30,000 landscape requirement on a remodel job less than \$100,000 is totally out of line in his opinion. Don Kimble said the problem with this scenario is how to determine if applicants are being truthful. Dennis Bush said there needs to be a reasonable cost established with bringing projects to Andover. The Committee saying it is not concerned with cost is where hard feelings begin.

Les Mangus said when he and Don Kimble met to discuss these issues they toured sites in Wichita that Mr. Kimble felt were great projects because of the City of Wichita's great landscaping ordinance. Some of the sites are done nicely others were not. He continued by saying after reviewing Wichita's ordinance it was obvious which of those sites are covering the minimum and which were going above the required minimum.

Dennis Bush said he feels trying to regulate developers who are covering the minimum required landscaping will only anger those looking to come to the area. He continued by saying he feels

landscaping should only be a small part of the process. Don Kimble disagreed saying he feels landscaping is the most important part of the process with the building's appearance being less imperative.

Dennis Bush said he thinks there should be a dollar investment threshold stating projects working under a certain dollar amount follow a set of prescribed standards. Projects over that set amount would be treated as new projects and required to go through the entire site plan process. He continued by saying he liked the idea of providing pictures or line drawings as examples of what is expected.

Fred Deppner said if the goal of this discussion is to make the process more predictable for developers before coming to the Committee a dollar amount has to be set. The opposite end would be total subjectivity which generated this discussion. Don Kimble said the problem with that situation is the applicant could spend the proper amount of money but still not adequately landscape the site.

Sasha Stiles said it must be a reality that there is a perception that this is a difficult process to go through, but she believes the Committee has brought hard to quantify value to this community. There has to be a happy medium and a way to make the process more user friendly to further benefit the community. The City is getting to a population level where more commercial businesses will start to look at Andover as a potential place to develop. This Committee needs to continue for that reason.

Dennis Bush said he would like to see the streetscape guidelines done for Central extended to other areas in the City. Les Mangus said a contract for a design concept study for Highway 54 will be reviewed by the City Council at its April 14, 2009 meeting. Other major streets in the City also have the guidelines. Les Mangus said the Committee may come across developers who do not want to follow the streetscape guidelines because it does not fit plans for a site. Dennis Bush agreed but said the developer will know what is expected of the area before they begin investing any money on the site.

Les Mangus said it is difficult to find a balance in the criteria between a small remodel project and a new \$12 million Dillon's store. He continued by saying he has the most problems with the contractors who absolutely refuse to hire professionals.

Jason Mohler said he has taken several projects through the Edmond Oklahoma Site Plan Review process which is a painful process handled by the Planning Commission and City Council, not a group of peers. From this experience he has learned it is not that it cost so much in civil, landscape and architectural design, it is that you move further through the process timeline wise. The money was spent upfront rather than when the final construction documents were put together. Jason Mohler said he is not opposed to looking at prescriptive standards, but, on the other hand, every site is different creating the need for some subjectivity.

Chairman Allison said he feels the Committee needs to do a better job of defining the concepts it is looking for, but not necessarily how they are handled. He suggested basing remodel requirements on square footage instead of cost to help eliminate any major dishonesty on the part of the applicant. Don Kimble said he feels this would still allow sites to be landscaped improperly.

Dennis Bush said he does not want to see prescriptive standards set for new developments, but he does not like the obstacles he feels this Committee has put in the way of developers trying to come to the City. He continued by saying he feels there should be some reasonableness brought to the dollar amount invested. Jason Mohler said he agrees that there is a difference between a remodel project and new construction.

Jason Mohler suggested using the checklist provided in the Site Plan Review Criteria while reviewing each case. Don Kimble said his opinion is the checklist is too vague and subjective.

Don Kimble said he feels he is a little naive on the subject of Wichita builders not wanting to come to the City. When looking up and down Andover Road he does not see any business not there. He feels it is small local developers who are unhappy with the process. Dennis Bush said there is a general fear among Wichita developers about what they will have to go through to get a project through the Site Plan Committee. Don Kimble said he disagreed and used the new Spangles as an example saying all the developer would have to do is pick up the building and move it to Andover. There is not one thing different from the south Rock Road Spangles than the one they plan to put in Andover. Jason Mohler disagreed, saying as the agent for Spangles he knows significantly more landscaping was used along the Andover Road frontage for the Andover Spangles site.

Dennis Bush asked what the theory behind putting trees in the

landscape strips, especially near signs, is. Les Mangus said placing trees in the small area is completely against the principal. Trees are supposed to shade parking and create visual relief from the building structure. Les Mangus said many cities are starting to use a formula for shade trees. Don Kimble noted most of those plans are calling for a landscape island for every ten parking stalls.

Chairman Allison noted it is not often a professionally designed project does not make it through the process.

Clark Nelson said the Committee needs to appoint a few members to discuss and negotiate potential results to be reviewed by the Site Plan Review Committee.

Chairman Allison, Don Kimble, Fred Deppner and Dennis Bush were named as members of the subcommittee.

Member Items: There were no member items.

Member Items

*Fred Deppner made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 7:05 p.m.
Clark Nelson seconded the motion. Motion carried 6/0.*

Adjourn

Respectfully Submitted by

Kandace Hunt
Administrative Secretary

Approved this 5th day of May 2009 by the Site Plan Review Committee, City of Andover.