#### PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA

MAY 5, 2025 at 7:00 PM

Community Forum at City Hall 17101 W. 87<sup>th</sup> Street Parkway Lenexa, KS 66219



#### AGENDA MAP



#### CALL TO ORDER

#### ROLL CALL

#### **APPROVE MINUTES**

#### **CONSENT AGENDA**

All matters listed within the consent agenda have been distributed to each member of the Planning Commission for review, are considered to be routine, and will be enacted by one motion with no separate discussion. If a member of the Planning Commission or audience desires separate discussion on an item, that item may be removed from the consent agenda and placed on the regular agenda.

- 1. AdventHealth Parking Garage and AdventHealth Lenexa City Center, Third Plat -Consideration of a revised final plan to expand Phase 1 of the approved parking garage and consideration of a final plat for the replat of Advent Health Lenexa City Center, Second Plat on property located approximately at the southeast corner of Renner Boulevard and 87th Street Parkway within the CC, Planned City Center District. PL25-05FR, PT25-04F
- 2. Cedar Canyon West Attached Villas Consideration of a final plat for 20 lots (duplex use) as part of the Cedar Canyon West mixed-use development located at the southwest corner of 99th Street and 100th Street within the RP-2, Planned Residential (Intermediate-Density) District. PT25-05F



#### **REGULAR AGENDA**

- 3. SRS Pool Supply Company Consideration of a special use permit for Basic Industry use to store hazardous chemicals at 14303 West 100th Street within the BP-2, Planned Manufacturing District. SU25-05 (Public Hearing)
- 4. White Oak Estates Consideration of a rezoning and final plat to allow the development of a single-family residence on property located at 79th Street and Cottonwood Street. (Public Hearing)
  - a. Consideration of a rezoning from R-1, Single-Family Residential District, to RP-1, Planned Residential (Low Density) District. RZ25-03
  - b. Consideration of a final plat for the development of a single-family residence. PT25-03F
- 5. Retail Old Town Lenexa Consideration of a preliminary plan for construction of a 5,200 square-foot mixed-use building on property located at 9213 Pflumm Road within the HBD, Planned Historic Business District. PL25-07P
- 6. Lenexa City Center North Village Townhomes Consideration of a revised preliminary plan for a multifamily development on property located at 8601 Penrose Lane within the CC, Planned City Center District. PL25-01PR
- 7. SJA Stadium Sound System Consideration of a deviation to allow St. James Academy to exceed the maximum decibel levels of noise allowed in the Unified Development Code on property located at 24505 Prairie Star Parkway within the R-1, Single-Family Residential District. DV25-02
- 8. Sunset Canyon Consideration of a rezoning and preliminary plat for a single-family residential development located near the northwest corner of the intersection of Prairie Star Parkway and Canyon Creek Boulevard. (Public Hearing)
  - a. Consideration of a rezoning from the AG, Agricultural District and CP-1, Planned Neighborhood Commercial District, to the RP-1, Planned Residential (Low-Density) District. RZ25-04
  - b. Consideration of a preliminary plat for a single-family residential development. PT25-01P

#### **STAFF REPORTS**

#### ADJOURN

#### APPENDIX

#### 9. March 31, 2025 Draft Minutes

If you have any questions about this agenda, please contact the Stephanie Sullivan, Planning Manager, at ssullivan@lenexa.com.

If you need any accommodations for the meeting, please contact the City Clerk's Office at 913-477-7550 at least 48 hours prior to the meeting. Kansas Relay Service: 800-766-3777

Assistive Listening Devices are available for use in the Community Forum by request.



May 5, 2025

## ADVENTHEALTH LCC PARKING GARAGE & ADVENTHEALTH LENEXA CITY CENTER, THIRD PLAT

Project #:	PL25-05FR PT25-04F	Location:	Northwest corner of westbound 87 <sup>th</sup> Street Parkway & Renner Boulevard
Applicant:	Chase Kohler, RIC	Project Type:	Final Plan and Final Plat
Staff Planner:	David Dalecky	Proposed Use:	Mixed-use
ts to the second		Shawnee Midland or Way Brh St Pkwy PROJECT Bive Bive Bive E 119th St	y united to the second

#### **PROJECT SUMMARY**

The applicant requests a revised final plan for a 47-space extension to the first phase of the three-story parking garage that serves *"Area 2"* of the AdventHealth Life Campus. This additional parking area will expand the ground floor of the parking garage by adding 47 parking spaces that will become enclosed later with the second phase of the parking garage. The applicant also requests a final plat that includes a replat of Lot 1, AdventHealth Lenexa City Center, Second Plat, and two new lots for recently approved buildings within this block. This project does not require a Public Hearing.

#### STAFF RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL



#### SITE INFORMATION

The AdventHealth Life Campus is a mixed-use development in City Center including a hospital, office, retail, restaurant, hotel and life activation buildings. The overall campus consists of 11 buildings on approximately 25 acres. The subject site is a part of Area 2 of the AdventHealth Life Campus.

TABLE 1: PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS					
Project No.	Туре	Name	Date Approved		
PL08-01CPR, PL08-17, and SU08-13	Concept Plan, Preliminary Plan, and Special Use Permit	City Center North Hospital	August 19, 2008		
PL16-02PR and SU16-03	Revised Preliminary Plan and Special Use Permit	City Center North Village	January 19, 2016		
PL19-06P and SU19-11	Preliminary Plan and Special Use Permit	Advent Health Life Campus	June 18, 2019		
PL21-04PR	Revised Preliminary Plan	Advent Health Life Campus	November 21,2021		
PL22-07F	Final Plan	Advent Health Life Campus	May 17, 2022		
PL24-03F	Final Plan	Advent Health Building 2A & Parking Garage	April 16, 2024		
PL24-04F	Final Plan	Advent Health Life Campus Building 2C	April 16, 2024		
PT-24-12F	Final Plat	AdventHealth Lenexa City Center, Second Plat	October 15, 2024		
PL25-02FR	Revised Final Plan	City Center North – Lot 8 – Building 2C	March 18, 2025		

LAND AREA (AC)	BUILDING AREA (SF)	CURRENT ZONING	COMP. PLAN
0.49	N/A	CC	City Center



Exhibit 1: Aerial Image of Subject Site



#### LAND USE REVIEW

This block is intended to be a mixed-use area with multiple buildings developed around a central parking structure. The buildings will include retail, restaurant, general, and office uses. These uses are allowed in the CC, Planned City Center Zoning District. Specific tenants have not yet been identified for all of the buildings. The new three-story building to be constructed at the northeasterly quadrant will be occupied by medical office uses and services.

The future land use as designated by the Comprehensive Plan is City Center, which anticipates mixed-use development tailored to an urban environment with high intensity or density, public open space, pedestrianfriendly streets and a mix of employment, shopping, entertainment, office, retail, residential, recreation, and civic uses. The planned use of the building is aligned with the designated future land use.



#### TABLE 1: COMPARISON OF SURROUNDING PROPERTIES

Vicinity	Land Use Designation	Zoning	Current Use
Subject Property	City Center	CC, Planned City Center District	Undeveloped
North	City Center	CC, Planned City Center District	Hospital (Under Construction)
South	City Center	CC, Planned City Center District	Undeveloped
East	City Center	CC, Planned City Center District	Undeveloped
West	City Center	CC, Planned City Center District	Undeveloped



#### FINAL PLAN REVIEW

This revised final plan is for construction of an additional 47 parking spaces of the planned parking garage within Area 2 of the AdventHealth Life Campus. These additional parking spaces will be located within the east side of the parking garage and will be constructed on the permanent ground level of the parking garage, which was initially part of the plans for phase two of the garage. This part of the garage will be below the adjacent grade to the east and open to the sky until the garage is completed in the future. The expanded area will have access from the drive aisles of the garage. The future phase of the garage is the remaining one-third of the structure.



Exhibit 2: Site plan reflecting the expansion of the first phase of the parking garage. Area 2 of AdventHealth LCC is outlined in red dashed line.



The parking garage is intended to serve all buildings within Area 2 on the east side of Scarborough Street and supply a certain level of parking demand for uses on the west side of Scarborough Street. The garage is being constructed in two phases with this first phase intended to serve the medical office building and two approved buildings (highlighted in red). The future phase will serve future buildings (highlighted in yellow) as reflected in Exhibit 3.



Exhibit 3: Parking garage phasing plan.

The first phase provides 355 of the total 582 spaces planned within the parking garage. The second and final phase of the parking garage is required to be constructed congruently with the construction of any additional development of the AdventHealth Life Campus and must be completed prior to occupancy of any additional



building on the east and west sides of Scarborough Street unless parking for buildings west of Scarborough Street is provided in another manner.

The parking garage is internal of the block except for the east side of the structure is adjacent to Renner Boulevard. This east facing wall is to include characteristics that appear more like a building than a parking structure. This design will be reviewed with the final plan for that phase of the garage.

The additional 47 spaces are approximately ten feet lower in elevation than Renner Boulevard, which will provide some screening of vehicles parked in this area until such time as the garage is completed. A row of evergreens and three shade trees will be installed for additional screening. This landscaping will be removed when the remaining phase of the garage is constructed.



#### Exhibit 4: Parking garage section.

#### DIMENSIONAL STANDARDS

The expanded parking area will be setback approximately 60 feet from Renner Boulevard. The setback of the future phase of the parking garage varies from 5 feet to approximately 25 feet from Renner Boulevard. The CC Zoning District has a minimum build-to line, not a minimum setback line. The parking structure is setback farther than an occupied building to allow for landscaping between the street and the structure to provide screening. The dimensions of the parking lot are consistent with parking space and drive aisle dimensions for other parking structures in City Center.

#### PUBLIC IMPROVEMENTS

No public improvements are proposed with this final plan. Access into the site will be provided with other development within the Area 2 block. Staff has noted, and the applicant has acknowledged, that several private utilities will need to serve the future buildings off of Scarborough Street, and therefore a private utility easement generally in the vicinity of the access off of Scarborough Street will need to be provided. The applicant has requested to defer providing this private easement until closer to the time of constructing the future buildings.

#### ACCESS, TRAFFIC, AND PARKING

The development pattern for this block of the AdventHealth Life Campus has two planned vehicular access points that will serve all the buildings on the block for access to the parking garage and internal surface parking areas included with the final plan approved for the Medical Office Building (MOB) and the first phase of the parking garage (PL24-03F). The vehicular circulation pattern for this expanded parking area of the garage uses the same internal drive network. The plan adds a drive aisle and parking spaces to this network.



TABLE 2: PARKING ANALYSIS				
Land Use	Parking Approved with Preliminary Plan	Required	Provided	Difference
Total Phase 1 MOB 2, Building 2B, and Building 2C (partial parking structure)		635	456	-179
All of Area 2 (complete parking structure)	800	1008	714	-294

The AdventHealth Life Campus is a compact and densely developed area. Parking is provided throughout the campus. Sites throughout City Center do not provide the required parking per the Parking Schedule of <u>Section</u> <u>4-1-D-1-C</u> of the UDC. Parking is to be shared among all sites and uses throughout City Center. The region is to be a walkable region where visitors may need to park a block or farther from their destination and walk and there exists an expectation that a visitor will park once then walk from destination to destination.

#### STORMWATER

Stormwater management meeting City Center guidelines is being addressed through a combination of the Central Green basins, along with an already existing mechanical unit that has been installed in the system just upstream of the Central Green facilities.

#### FIRE PREVENTION

The Fire Department reviewed the plans based on the current adopted fire codes and local amendments. All general planning review comments have been acknowledged or satisfied and there are no outstanding Fire Department planning review items that need to be addressed for this project to move forward. A more detailed fire code review will be conducted based on the adopted codes at the time of the building permit documentation submittal.

#### LIGHTING

Lighting is provided for this expanded area with wall mounted light fixtures. The light fixtures are a cut-off type of fixture to reduce light spill over onto the landscape areas around the parking garage.



#### LANDSCAPING

Landscaping is installed along the east and south sides of the parking garage. The landscaping is a series of evergreen shrubs and three shade trees. The remaining part of the site will be a temporary lawn space. The landscaping will be removed prior to the construction of phase 2 of the parking garage. New landscaping will be installed along the east side of the completed parking garage in a similar design and pattern the landscaping along the streets of the hospital and medical office buildings.



At Right: Exhibit 5: Landscape plan.

#### SIGNS

No signs are proposed with this final plan.



#### FINAL PLAT REVIEW

Approval of a final plat is requested for a part of "Area 2" of the AdventHealth Life Campus. The final plat includes a replat of Lot 1, AdventHealth Lenexa City Center, Second Plat (PT24-12F) and two new lots for recently approved buildings within this block. Lot 1 contains the parking garage and the two new lots will contain Buildings 2B and 2C. The final plat is consistent with Section 4-2 of the UDC. The replat does not include any new easement dedications.





#### DEVIATIONS

The applicant is not requesting any deviations from the Unified Development Code (UDC).

#### NEXT STEPS

- The Planning Commission is the approval authority on this application. The City has a practice of submitting City Center final plans to the City Council for affirmation of the Planning Commission's decision. Pending the Planning Commission's decision, the project will be tentatively scheduled for consideration by the City Council on May 20, 2025.
- The final plat must be recorded with Johnson County prior to permits being released.
- The applicant must receive permit(s) prior to commencing construction.
- The applicant should inquire about additional City requirements and development fees.

#### **RECOMMENDATION FROM PROFESSIONAL STAFF**

- ★ Staff recommends approval of the proposed final plan for AdventHealth LCC Parking Garage and the final plat for AdventHealth Lenexa City Center, Third Plat.
  - This is a final plan to expand the first phase of the parking garage for Area 2 of the AdventHealth Life Campus in the City Center.
  - The project is consistent with Lenexa's goals through **Strategic Community Investment** and **Responsible Economic Development** to create **Inviting Places**.

#### FINAL PLAN

Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of the final plan for PL25-02FR – **AdventHealth LCC – Parking Garage** at the northwest corner of westbound 87<sup>th</sup> Street Parkway & Renner Boulevard for an expansion to the parking garage.

#### FINAL PLAT

Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of the final plat for PT25-04F – **AdventHealth Lenexa City Center, Third Plat** at the at the northwest corner of westbound 87<sup>th</sup> Street Parkway & Renner Boulevard.



# Advent Health LLC - Parking Garage & AdventHealth Lenexa City Center, Third Plat Final Plan and Final Plat





# **PHASE I - PARKING PLAN** FDP APPROVED CIVIL SITE PLAN & PARKING COUNTS

PHASED TOTAL PARKING COUNTS

							_			1		
	BLDG #	BLDG Height	BUILDIN	G USE	TOTAL AREA (SF)	PARKING RATIO (STALLS / K)		Parking Required	TOTAL PROVIDED	GARAGE PROVIDED	OFF-STREET SURFACE PROVIDED	on-street Parking Provided
	2A	3	MOE	3 11	66,000	4		264				
	4D	1	RESTAL	IRANT	11,340	10		113				
Щ.				Office	12,200	4		49				
PHASE	2C	2	MIXED-USE BUILDING	Restaurant	6,000	10		60				
а.				Retail	6,200	5		31				
			PHASE I	SUBTOTAL	101,740			517	457	335	83	38
	90% Shared Parking Diversity					465	456		new	existing		
					Total Parking v	vith Alternate			500	-3	47	
								I		1		
6				Office	00.000	4						
				Onice	39,000	4		156				
<b>ASE</b>	3B 4B	2&3	MIXED-USE BUILDINGS	Restaurant	10,600	4		156 106				
PHASE		2&3										
JRE PHASE		2 & 3		Restaurant Retail	10,600	10		106				
UTURE PHASE	4B	1	BUILDINGS	Restaurant Retail BUILDING	10,600 5,000	10 4		106 20	214	200		14
FUTURE PHASES	4B	1	BUILDINGS MIXED-USE	Restaurant Retail BUILDING	10,600 5,000 10,969	10 4 5	ty	106 20 55	214	200	new	14 new
FUTURE PHASE	4B	1	BUILDINGS MIXED-USE	Restaurant Retail BUILDING	10,600 5,000 10,969 <b>65,569</b>	10 4 5	iy	106 20 55 <b>337</b>	214	200	new	

ARY		TOTAL AREA (SF)	PARKING RATIO (STALLS / K)		PARKING REQUIRED	TOTAL PROVIDED		GARAGE PROVIDED	OFF-STREET SURFACE PROVIDED	on-street Parking Provided
ΜM	DEVELOPMENT TOTALS	167,309			854			582	83	52
SU		90% Shared Pa	arking Diversi	ity	769	714		inclds the 44 alternate stalls		
		80% Shared Pa	arking Diversi	ity	683			'under' the garage		
					INCLUDES THE	14 STALL ALTERNAT	ΈI	N DEVELOPMENT		







ADVENTHEALTH LCC | DESIGN SUMMARY PACKAGE

# **PHASE II - PARKING PLAN** FDP APPROVED CIVIL SITE PLAN & PARKING COUNTS

### 1ST FLOOR





ADVENTHEALTH LCC | DESIGN SUMMARY PACKAGE

# Advent Health LCC Medical Office Building 2 & Garage at Lenexa City Center City of Lenexa, Johnson County, Kansas





nfrastructure melthic

FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLANS

HOEFER WELKER 4622 PENNSYLVANIA AVE. SUITE 1400 KANSAS CITY, MO 64112 P: 913.307.3700 www.hoeferwelker.com

BENCHMARK

1. JCBM 441 Concrete box in I-435 & 87th Street at base of a ramp to I-435 south southwest corne Elevation: 1001.85

2. BM (A) 1485 Square cut in Southwest corner signal pole base SG 4-13. Located in Southeast corner of intersection at 87th st. Parkway and Penrose Ln. Elevation: 1007.66

3. BM (B) 1088 Square cut in North Penrose Ln. Elevation: 1003.72 mer of transformer concrete base. Located 15' east of east edge o

#### FLOOD PLAIN NOTE

According to the F.E.M.A. Flood Insurance Rate Map Number 20091C0035G, revised August 3, 2009, this tract lies in OTHER AREAS, Zone "X", areas determined to be outside the 0.2% annual chance floodplain

#### SITE DESCRIPTION:

ALL OF LOTS 1 and 2 of ADVENTHEALTH LENEXA CITY CENTER, SECOND PLAT



UTILITY CONTACT INFORMATION

L	EGEND	
 Existing Section Line		Proposed Right-of-Way
 Existing Right-of-Way Line		Proposed Property Line
 Existing Lot Line		Proposed Lot Line
 Existing Easement Line		Proposed Easement
Existing Curb & Gutter		Proposed Curb & Gutter
 Existing Sidewalk	Science and the second second	Proposed Sidewalk
 Existing Storm Sewer		Proposed Storm Sewer
Existing Storm Structure		Proposed Storm Structure
 Existing Waterline	A	Proposed Fire Hydrant
 Existing Gas Main		Proposed Waterline
 Existing Sanitary Sewer		Proposed Sanitary Sewer
Existing Sanitary Manhole	•	Proposed Sanitary Manhole
 Existing Contour Major		Proposed Contour Major
 Existing Contour Minor		Proposed Contour Minor
 Existing Underground Power Line		Future Curb and Gutter

Light) 16215 West 108th Street 17101 West 87th Street Parkway Lenexa, Kansas 6219 Attn: Gary Price Lenexa, Kansas 66219 Phone: 913.477.7500 Phone: 913.681.7420 Fax: 913.894.3086 Water District #1 of Johnson County gary.price@kcpl.com 10747 Renner Boulevard Lenexa, Kansas 66219 Kansas Gas Service Phone: 913.895.5730 11401 West 89th Street Fax: 913.895.1827 Overland Park, Kansas 66214 Attn: Tony Cellitti Time Warner Cable Phone: 913 599 8991 P O Box 25567 Overland Park, Kansas 66225 Fax: 913.599.8989 tcellitti@onegas.com Attn: Steve Baxter Phone: 913.451.5858 Waterone Fax: 913.451.7652 10747 Renner Boulevard steve.baxter@twcable.con Lenexa, Kansas 66219 Attn: Jan Hardie Phone: 913.895.5775 Fax: 913.895.1827 jhardie@waterone.org

Evergy (Kansas City Power and

#### City of Lenexa Johnson County Wastewater 11811 South Sunset Drive Suite 2500 Olathe, Kansas 66061 Phone: 913.715.8500 Fax: 913.715.8501 Inspections: 913.715.8520 Surewest Communications 9701 Lackman Road Overland Park, Kansas 66219 Attn: Tom Reaves Phone: 913 322 9631 Fax: 913.541.8716 tomreaves@surewest.com



GARAGE 1 ADVENTHEALTH LCC 16855 W. 86TH STREET LENEXA, KS 66219 REVISION DATES: 1. CITY COMMENTS APR 21 2025

PROFESSIONAL SEAL **C01** ISSUE DATE: MARCH 31, 2025 HOEFER WELKER #: 124043

Title Sheet



#### GENERAL SITE AND DEMOLITION NOTES

Sterent STRADE DEMOLTION NOTES
The Constructions Covered by these Plans shall conform on a Applicable Standards and Specifications of the City State of Knasse.
Workmanning and Materials shall be Subject to the Interpretion and Applicable Standards and Specifications of the City Encoded State of Knasse.
Workmanning and Materials shall be Subject to the Interpretion and shall be held Responsible for any Decomposition of the City Conditions prior to the State of Contractor shall have Al Utilities Field Located by the Utility Congregation of the City Contractor shall welly Existing Conditions prior to Decomposition of the State of Conditions and the Spectra Contractor shall be have and the Spectra Contractor shall be held Responsible for the of Contractor shall be have and the Spectra State of Contractor shall have Al Utilities Contractor shall be have and the Spectra State of Contractor shall be and the Spectra Contractor shall be have and the Contractor shall have and the Spectra and the Spectra Contractor shall be have and the City of Lenes. Alternase and the Spectra and the Spectra Contractor shall be have and the City of Lenes. Unless Of there is the City of Lenes, Kanasa.
Al Tract. Shalls and Of Direv (be City of Lenes, Lenes Of there is the Shall Note be Permittel.
Al Full Degit Sub (cont the Shall of Direv).
Al Full Degit Sub (cont the Shall of Direv) and Construction Accordance with the City of Lenes, Lenes Of there of the City of Lenes I. Shalls are no beam of the Contractor shall be the Contractor in Accordance with the City of Lenes Accordance with the City of Lenes I. Shalls are not explore the City of Lenes I. Shalls are not beam of Contractor and Contractor shall be the Contractor Shalls are theory of City of



# HOEFER WELKER

4622 PENNSYLVANIA AVE. SUITE 1400 KANSAS CITY, MO 64112 P: 913.307.3700 www.hoeferwelker.com



# LCC ADVENTHEALTH 16855 W. 86TH STREET LENEXA, KS 66219

GARAGE

1

PROFESSIONAL SEAL

REVISION DATES: 1. CITY COMMENTS APR 21 2025

**C02** ISSUE DATE: MARCH 31, 2025 HOEFER WELKER #: 124043 Existing Conditions















#### LANDSCAPE NOTES:

- LOCATE AND FIELD VERIFY ALL EXISTING UTILITIES BEFORE COMMENCING WORK ALL TREES SHALL BE FIELD PO ITIONED AS TO AVOID CONFLICTS WITH EXIS ING AND PROPOSED UTILITIES. NOTIFY LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT OF ANY CONFLICTS OR OBSTRUCTIONS
- 3 ALL PLANT SPACING SHALL BE AS IDENTIFIED ON PLANS OR AS IDENTIFIED IN PLANT SCHEDULE
- ALL PLANT MATERIAL SHALL BE STAKED IN THE FIELD FOR APPROVAL BY LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT PRIOR TO PLANTING.
- CONTRACTOR SHALL VERIFY ALL LANDSCAPE MATERIAL QUANTITIES AND SHALL REPORT ANY DISCREPANCIES TO THE LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT PRIOR TO INSTALLATION. THE PLAN QUANTITIES SHALL SUPERSEDE SCHEDULED QUANTITIES.
- EXISTING TREES SHOWN TO REMAIN ARE TO BE SAVED AND PROTECTED AS INDICATED ON THE PLANS, ALL TREES TO BE REMOVED SHALL BE MARKED FOR APPROVAL BY THE LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT BEFORE REMOVAL.
- ALL DISTURBED AREAS OUTSIDE OF LIMITS OF WORK SHALL BE RE-VEGETATED WITH TURF TYPE TALL FESCUE SEED BLEND. REPAIR ALL DISTURBED AREAS TO ORIGINAL CONDITION AND TO OWNER'S SATISFACTION.
- ALL DISTURBED AREAS INSIDE THE LIMITS OF WORK SHALL BE SODDED WITH A TURF-TYPE TALL FESCUE GRASS SEED BLEND.
- A FULLY AUTOMATED IRRIGATION SYSTEM IS TO BE DESIGNED BY LANDSCAPE CONTRACTOR AND INSTALLED IN AREAS OF NEW PLANTINGS. IRRIGATION SYSTEM SHALL INCLUDE AUTOMATIC RAIN-SENSOR DEVICE. CONTRACTOR TO PROVIDE IRRIGATION SHOP DRAWINGS FOR APPROVAL TO LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT PRIOR TO INSTALLATION.
- 10. ANY DEVIATION TO THE APPROVED FINAL LANDSCAPE PLAN SHALL REQUIRE THE WRITTEN APPROVAL OF THE LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT PRIOR TO INSTALLATION.
- 11. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL REPORT SUBSURFACE SOIL OR DRAINAGE PROBLEMS TO THE LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT.
- 12. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL SHOW PROOF OF PROCUREMENT, SOURCES, AND VARIETIES FOR ALL SHRUBS, PERENNIALS, ORNAMENTAL GRASSES, AND ANNUALS WITHIN 21 DAYS FOLLOWING THE AWARD OF CONTRACT. TIMELY PROCUREMENT OF ALL PLANT MATERIAL IS ESSENTIAL TO THE SUCCESSFUL COMPLETION AND INITIAL ACCEPTANCE OF THE ROJECT
- 13. CONTRACTOR SHALL MAKE NO SUBSTITUTIONS WITHOUT THE APPROVAL OF THE LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT
- 14. ALL PLANTING BEDS AND NATIVE GRASS STANDS SHALL BE EDGED AS SHOWN IN PLAN. ALL TREES SHALL BE STAKED PER DETAIL.
- 16. ALL PLANT MATERIAL SHALL BE INSTALLED TO ALLOW A ONE FOOT (1') CLEARANCE BETWEEN PLANT AND ADJACENT PAVEMENT.
- 17 ALL PLANTING BEDS AND TREE DISHES SHALL BE TREATED WITH THE PRE-EMERGENT HERBICIDE TUPERSAN OR AN APPROVED EQUAL IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE MANUFACTURES INSTRUCTIONS.
- 18. CONTRACTOR SHALL WARRANTY ALL LANDSCAPE WORK AND PLANT MATERIALS FOR A PERIOD OF ONE YEAR FROM THE DATE OF ACCEPTANCE OF THE WORK OF THE OWNER
- CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR MAINTENANCE OF PLANT MATERIAL UNTIL THE COMPLETION OF THE PROJECT AND ACCEPTANCE OF THE OWNER.
- ANY PLANT MATERIAL WHICH DIES DURING THE ONE YEAR WARRANTY PERIOD SHALL BE REPLACED BY THE CONTRACTOR DURING THE NEXT NORMAL PLANTING SEASON.
- 21. ALL PLANT NAMES ON THE PLANT LIST CONFORM TO THE STANDARDIZED PLANT NAMES PREPARED BY THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON HORTICULTURAL NOMENCLATURE ROT O NAMES GENERALLY ACCEPTED IN THE NURSERY TRADE.





PLANS

FINAL DEVELOPMENT

ш

Ū

**GARA** 

1  $\mathcal{O}$ 

 $\mathcal{O}$ 

Т

ALTI

VENTHEA V. 86TH STREET A, KS 66219

ADVE 16855 W. 8 LENEXA, F

REVISION DATES: 1. CITY COMMENTS APR 21 2025

PLANTING BED WITH SPECIFIED MULCH DEPTH SPECIFIED STEEL EDGING - LAWN AREA AS SPECIFIED ARCANINGARMAN STAKE EDGING WITH METAL STAKES

Small Box

- EDGING PER SPECIFICATIONS. SET ALL EDGING 1\* ABOVE FINISH GRADE (TURF) SURFACE AS SHOWN. EDGING SHALL ABUT ALL CONCRETE CURBS AND WALKS
- PERPENDICULAR AND FLUSH WITH TOP OF CONCRETE. ALL JOINTS SHALL BE SECURELY STAKED.
- ALL JOINTS SHALL BE SECURELY STAKED. FINISH SHALL BE POWDER COAT: COLOR: GREEN. CONTRACTOR SHALL SUBMIT COLOR SAMPLE TO OWNERS REPRESENTATUPE PRIOR TO PURCHASE. CONTRACTOR SHALL LOCATE AND MARK ALL PLANT EED LOCATIONS PRIOR TO INSTALLATION OF STEEL FOR FINAL APPROVAL BY OWNER OR LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT. STEEL EDGING DETAIL - NTS
- 22. ALL PLANT MATERIALS SHALL BE SPECIMEN QUALITY STOCK & SIZE AND SHALL CONFORM TO AMERICAN STANDARD FOR NURSERY STOCK, ANSI 260.1-2014, OR MOST RECENT EDITION, FREE OF PLANT DISEASES AND PESTS, OF TYPICAL GROWTH OF THE SPECIES AND HAVING A HEALTHY, NORMAL ROOT SYSTEM.
- 23. SIZES INDICATED ON THE PLANT LIST ARE THE MINIMUM, ACCEPTABLE SIZE. IN NO CASE WILL SIZES LESS THAN THE SPECIFIED SIZES BE ACCEPTED
- 24. PLANTS SHALL NOT BE PRUNED PRIOR TO DELIVERY TO THE SITE OR AFTER INSTALLATION EXCEPT FOR THOSE BRANCHES THAT HAVE BEEN DAMAGED IN SOME WAY
- 25 PLANTS SHALL NOT HAVE NAME TAGS REMOVED PRIOR TO FINAL INSPECTION
- 26. CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR REMOVAL OF ALL WEEDS FROM THE PROJECT PRIOR TO PLANTING, CONTROL OF WEEDS DURING CONSTRUCTION AND PLACEMENT OF TUPERSAIN PRE-EMERGENT OR APPROVED EQUAL OVER THE TOP OF MULCH OF ALL LANDSCAPE BEDS.
- 27. INDEPENDENT OF NUMERIC QUANTITIES ON DRAWINGS OR IN THE PLANT SCHEDULE, INDEPENDENT OF NUMERICATION IN TEST ON DEVININGS DOWN IN FLAVIN SOFTER EAST MATERIAS AS SHOWN ON PLANS AND NO NOTATED IN THE PLANT SOFTERE EAST MATERIAS AS SHOWN ON PLANS AND NO NOTATED IN THAT SOFTEDUE FLAVIT MATERIAS SHALL COMFORM TO PLANT SCHEDULES AND SIZES SHALL BE THE MINIMUM NOTATED ON THE PLANT SCHEDULES AND SIZES SHALL BE THE MINIMUM NOTATED ON THE PLANT SCHEDULES AND SIZES SHALL BE THE MINIMUM NOTATED ADDITIONAL COST TO WHER, ALL MEASUREMENTS SHALL BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE LATEST EDITION OF AMAL STRANGABOR FOR MUSERS'S TOCK'.
- 28. PRIOR TO INSTALLATION, DEMARCATE LAYOUT OF ALL PLANTING BEDS, SEED AREAS, AND
- 29. SODDING APPLIES TO ALL AREAS DISTURBED BY CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES EVEN IF ACTIVITIES EXTEND BEYOND THE APPROXIMATED SODDING LIMITS INDICATED ON THE ACTIVITIES EXTEND BEYOND THE APPROXIMATE DISOUDURE UNIT IS INDICATED ON THE DRAWINGS, REXEMPT DISTURBED AREAS TO THE SAME CONDITION AS ORGINALLY FOUND AND TO THE OWNERY SATISFACTION. IN AREAS WHERE LAWN SD ISTURBED BEYOND THE LINTES OF CONSTRUCTION, REPLACE LAWN WITH NEW LAWN SD DISTURBED BEYOND THE UNIT OF CONSTRUCTION, REPLACE LAWN WITH NEW LAWN SD DISTURBED FOR SEED MAKES.
- 30. DOUBLE SHREDDED HARDWOOD MULCH PLANTING BEDS PER SPECIFICATIONS SHALL BE USED AS A THREE INCH (3) TOP DRESSING IN ALL PLANTING BEDS AND AROUND ALL TREES. SINGLE TREES AND SHRUBS SHALL BE MULCHED TO THE OUTSIDE EDGE OF THE SAUCER OR LANDSCAPE ISLAND. KEEP MULCH 4 INCHES FROM TREE TRUNKS AND SHRUB CROWNS
- 31. REFER TO CIVIL DRAWINGS FOR LIMITS OF EROSION CONTROL MEASURES.
- 32. LEGALLY DISPOSE OF DEBRIS ASSOCIATED WITH PLANTING OFF-SITE.
- 33 THE CITY OF LENEXA PARKS AND RECREATION DIRECTOR SHALL DECIDE WHEN STREET THE CITY OF LENEXA PARKS AND RECREATION DIRECTOR SHALL DECIDE WHEN STREET THES ARE PLANTED, WHICH WILL DERHALL VE EITH FRIST APPROPRIATE FLANTING SEASON AFTER THE DIAGEN OF CONSTRUCTION RELATED DAMAGE HAS PASSED DERRIS CAUSED OF ONG GOING CONSTRUCTION OF REATONS. REWON, OUT OF DERRIS SHALL BET THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE GENERAL CONTRACTOR. LEWONG, OF DERRIS SHALL NOT BEGIN UNTIL THE LANDSCAFE ARCHITECT AND OWNER HAVE GOING WORK SHALL NOT BEGIN UNTIL THE LANDSCAFE ARCHITECT AND OWNER HAVE GOING WORK SHALL NOT BEGIN UNTIL THE LANDSCAFE ARCHITECT AND OWNER HAVE GOING WORK SHALL NOT
- FOR SUCH. THERE SHALL BE NO DELAYS DUE TO LACK OF COORDINATION FOR THIS
- THE LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT AND OWNER SHALL APPROVE GRADES AND CONDITION OF SITE PRIOR TO SODDING/SEEDING OPERATIONS

LO'

PROFESSIONAL SEAL



May 5, 2025

# **CEDAR CANYON WEST ATTACHED VILLAS**

Project #:	PT25-05F	Location:	Southwest corner of 99 <sup>th</sup> Street and 100 <sup>th</sup> Street
Applicant:	Dan Foster, Schlagel Associates	Project Type:	Final Plat
Staff Planner:	Noah Vaughan	Proposed Use:	Duplex



#### **PROJECT SUMMARY**

The applicant seeks approval of a final plat for Cedar Canyon West Attached Villas, a proposed duplex subdivision in the Cedar Canyon West development at the southwest corner of 99<sup>th</sup> Street and 100<sup>th</sup> Street, east of Canyon Creek Boulevard. The subdivision will be a portion of Tract 3 included in the originally approved 2022 Rezoning and Concept Plan for Cedar Canyon West. A total of 20 lots (40 total dwelling units) are proposed on the 7.68-acre subject property. The site will gain access from two points off 100<sup>th</sup> Street from the east and west sides of the site onto the internal road of the subdivision, 99<sup>th</sup> Place. The plat includes a deviation for a 4-foot reduction to the rear yard setback for Lot 12, a reduction from 20 feet to 16 feet. This deviation was approved during the original preliminary plan and plat stage. The proposed final plat is consistent with the approved preliminary plat (PL24-04P), which was approved by the Governing Body on August 20, 2024, including the deviation request. This project does not require a Public Hearing.

#### STAFF RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL



#### SITE INFORMATION

This site is a 7.68-acre undeveloped tract of land located at the southwest corner of the intersection of 99<sup>th</sup> Street and 100<sup>th</sup> Street. The site is part of a regional rezoning and concept plan for 112 acres of land approved in February 2023 (RZ22-09 and PL22-04CP). This rezoning and concept plan included five zoning districts for the land bordered by Canyon Creek Boulevard on the west and future Clare Road on the east, K-10 Highway on the south and 99<sup>th</sup> Street on the north. The rezoning changed the zoning district of the subject parcel from AG (Agricultural District) to RP-2 (Intermediate-Density Planned Residential District).

Following the rezoning and concept plan, a preliminary plan and plat was submitted in 2024 for the subject property proposing the 20-lot layout with 40 dwelling units, consisting of one duplex per lot (PL24-04P). The preliminary plat contains three tracts and one approved deviation for a reduction to the rear structural setback on Lot 12 of the proposed subdivision.



Exhibit 1: Aerial Image of Subject Site





Exhibit 2: Portion of Tract 3 to be developed from PT25-05F, Outlined in Red

#### LAND USE REVIEW

The proposed use is a duplex residential subdivision. Three tracts to be owned by the Homeowners' Association will be included with this final plat: Tracts "A", "B", and "C". All tracts will be dedicated and used for open space, while Tract "B" will additionally be used for Land Use Intensity buffer and stormwater treatment. Tracts "B" and "C" will contain waterline and utility easements, and Tract "B" will additionally contain a portion of a sidewalk easement.





The Future Land Use designation for the parcel is Medium Density Residential, which matches the proposed development's intended use and existing zoning. The property has adjacent single-family residential development to the north, which is designated for Medium Density Residential and Suburban Residential development. The adjacent properties to the south, east, and west were all rezoned with the rezoning and concept plan for the overall Cedar Canyon West development for different intended uses. The properties to the west (contained within Tracts 1 & 2) were rezoned to CP-2, Planned Community Commercial District, to extend the area already zoned in this district for future commercial development in Cedar Canyon. The area to the south was rezoned to RP-4, Planned Residential (High-Density) District, and a portion of this property is being developed with multifamily at this time. The properties to the east were rezoned to RP-2, BP-2, and CP-O in order to introduce additional multifamily residential, office, and business park uses in this area of the Cedar Canyon West development.

TABLE 1: COMPARISON OF SURROUNDING PROPERTIES				
Vicinity	Land Use Designation	Zoning	Current Use	
Subject Property	Medium Density Residential	RP-2, Planned Residential (Intermediate-Density) District	Undeveloped	
North	Suburban Residential, Medium Density Residential	RP-1, Planned Residential (Low-Density) District	Single-Family Residential	
South	High Density Residential	RP-4, Planned Residential (High-Density) District	Undeveloped and multifamily under construction	
East	Medium Density Residential, Office, Warehousing	RP-2, Planned Residential (Intermediate-Density) District, BP-2, Planned Manufacturing District, CP-O, Planned General Office District	Undeveloped	
West	Community Retail	RP-3, Planned Residential (Medium-High Density) District, CP-2, Planned Community Commercial District	Undeveloped	

#### FINAL PLAT REVIEW

This is a final plat of 20 duplex lots on 7.68 acres and is a part of the Cedar Canyon West development, for which a preliminary plan/plat was approved in August 2024 (PL24-04P).

Street development includes the construction of 99<sup>th</sup> Place, which is a public street and is the internal road of the subdivision, as well as portions of 99<sup>th</sup> Street, which will serve as a connection to 100<sup>th</sup> Street. 100<sup>th</sup> Street was created in 2023 through preliminary and final plat processes to establish a connection between 99<sup>th</sup> Street and Canyon Creek Boulevard.

Stormwater management remains consistent with as it was approved in the overall approved preliminary plan. An existing off-site basin, located just to the west in adjacent Tract A, will receive and appropriately release the majority of the site, with one additional new basin on the east end of the site, in Tract B, being added to address that portion of the site that flows easterly away from the existing basin.



All lots of the proposed subdivision will contain 10' utility easements, 15' landscape easements, and 25' build lines. Lots 13-20 will additionally contain a 20' sewer easement. A 15' drainage easement is additionally dedicated within portions of Lots 18, 19, and 20. Tract B contains a 12' wide sidewalk easement in addition to utility and waterline easements that will exist on both Tracts B and C.

Staff notes that the plans depict a 30' front build line for Lots 1-4. Staff recently requested that the applicant update the plat to reflect all lots having a 25' front build line. Some plan sheets included within this packet have not been updated to reflect the 25' build line for Lots 1-4, but those plans will be updated at building permit stage.

Dedications for the right-of-way and easements on the plat are reflected in Table 2. Table 3 shows the purposes of each tract on the plat. The locations of each tract are shown in Exhibit 3 below. The plat will need a revision before recording that would indicate that tract maintenance would fall under homeowner responsibility if no HOA is established.



Exhibit 3: Subject plat with tracts outlined in red.



Table 2: Plat Dedications				
Type of Dedication	Dedicated to			
Rights-of-Way	City of Lenexa			
Utility Easement	City of Lenexa			
Drainage Easement	City of Lenexa			
Landscape Easement	City of Lenexa			
Sewer Easement	Johnson County Wastewater			
Sidewalk Easement	City of Lenexa			

Table 3: Tract Purposes					
Tract	Purpose				
A	Open Space				
В	LUI Buffer, Open Space, Stormwater Treatment				
С	Open Space				



Exhibit 4: Easements in Cedar Canyon West Attached Villas.



#### DEVIATIONS

A 4-foot deviation from the rear setback requirement for Lot 12 was approved by the Planning Commission and Governing Body during the preliminary plat process. The code requirement is 20 feet, and the deviation reduced the setback to 16 feet and is shown in Exhibit 5.

The preliminary plan (PL24-04P) designated 30' build lines for Lots 1-4 in order to meet lot width requirements; however, Staff has requested that the final plat reflect the correct 25' build line to be consistent with the minimum front yard setback requirement within the RP-2 Zoning District per <u>Section 4-1-B-7</u> of the UDC. To accomplish this, a new 1-foot deviation for lot width is requested for Lots 1-4. This deviation is shown in Exhibit 6. Information for both deviation requests is detailed in Table 4.

TABLE 4: DEVIATION REQUESTS				
Deviation Type	Lots	Code Requirement	Proposed	Deviation Request
Rear Setback	12	20 feet	16 feet	- 4 feet
Lot Width	1-4	80 feet	79 feet	- 1 foot



Exhibit 5: Setback Deviation requested for Lot 12 of the development.





Exhibit 6: Lot width deviation requested for Lots 1-4 of the development.

#### **NEXT STEPS**

- This project requires approval by the Planning Commission and acceptance of dedications by the City Council. Pending approval from the Planning Commission, the project is tentatively scheduled for consideration by the City Council on May 20, 2025.
- The final plat must be recorded with Johnson County prior to permit(s) being released.
- The applicant should inquire about additional City requirements, such as permits and development fees.



#### **RECOMMENDATION FROM PROFESSIONAL STAFF**

#### ★ Staff recommends approval of the proposed Final Plat for Cedar Canyon Attached Villas.

- This is a final plat of 20 lots and three tracts in the RP-2 Zoning District.
- The proposed use of the land is for duplex residential development.
- The project is consistent with Lenexa's goals through **Responsible Economic Development** and **Strategic Community Investment** to create **Vibrant Neighborhoods**.

#### FINAL PLAT

Staff recommends **approval** of the final plat for PT25-05F – **Cedar Canyon West Attached Villas** at the southwest corner of 99<sup>th</sup> Street and 100<sup>th</sup> Street, for a residential duplex subdivision with the lot width deviation noted in the deviations section of the Staff Report.



Data Source: City of Lenexa and Johnson County Kansas For further information, please call 913-477-7500

# Cedar Canyon West Attached Villas Final Plat





#### Cedar Canyon West Attached Villas Narrative

#### March 28, 2025

The RP-2 site is located on the southwest corner of 99<sup>th</sup> Street and 100<sup>th</sup> Street. Two full access points to 100th Street (collector) on the east and west of the site. Both access points align with other proposed roads and drive aisles. Access to 100th Street collector street that provides an alternative direct access to Canyon Creek Boulevard. The proposed project has 20 lots (40 units) and generally the same layout as the layout on the approved preliminary development plan for this parcel. The density proposed is 5.15 du/ac which is below the 8 du/ac maximum allowed by code. The lot size and setbacks meet the code requirements. A deviation to allow a reduction of the rear yard setback for lot 12 was granted with the preliminary development plan. A 15' buffer tract has been provided along the north boundary adjacent to the RP-2 neighborhood as required by the code and includes existing trees to be preserved and proposed trees to be planted with this project. Buffer tracts are also provided along both 99<sup>th</sup> Street and 100<sup>th</sup> Street that include the code required landscape.








Quarter of Section 5, Township 13 South, Range 23 East, in the City of Lenexa, Johnson : particularly described as follows: Part of the So

bet of is donabated Dee Jourse of Defaces 7, Traumés D 18 Maril, Rayer 22 East, is the City of Learne, Johnson Conn, Katana, Joang and Jonaka Sharen et al. (2014). The second set of the sec

#### LECEND.

LEGE	NI	J:
		FOUND MONUMENT AS NOTED
		FOUND 1/2" REBAR WITH KSLS 54 CAP UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED
0		SET 1/2" REBAR W/LS-54 CAP UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED
BM	-	BENCHMARK
BL or B.L.	-	BUILDING LINE
D/E	-	DRAINAGE EASEMENT
E/E	-	ELECTRICAL EASEMENT
G/E	-	GAS LINE EASEMENT
L/E	-	LANDSCAPE EASEMENT
PVC	-	POLYVINYL CHLORIDE
P/L	-	PROPERTY LINE
PUB/E	-	PUBLIC EASEMENT
RCP	-	REINFORCED CONCRETE PIPE
ROW or R/V	1-	RIGHT-OF-WAY
S/E		SANITARY SEWER FASEMENT

S/W U/E SIDEWALK UTILITY EASEMENT

CURB & GUTTER

CURB & GUTTER - EXISTING

EXISTING LOT AND PROPERTY LINES EXISTING LOT AND PROPERTY EXISTING PLAT AND R/W LINES PROPERTY LINES \_\_\_\_\_ P/I \_\_\_\_\_

#### UTILITIES: 2.

3.

4.

SANITARY SEWER MAIN

SANITARY SEWER MAIN SANITARY SEWER MAIN - EXIST. STORM SEWER STORM SEWER - EXISTING

CABLE TV - EXISTING FIBER OPTIC CABLE - EXISTING

TELEPHONE LINE - EXIST. TELEPHONE LINE - EXIST. ELECTRIC LINE - EXISTING OVERHEAD POWER LINE - EXIST. UNDERGROUND ELECTRIC - EX. GAS LINE - EXISTING

WATERLINE - EXISTING

EXISTING AREA INLET

EXISTING CURB INLET EXISTING GRATE INLET

EXISTING GRATE INLET EXISTING JUNCTION BOX EXISTING STORM MANHOLE

LIGHT - EXISTING EXISTING MANHOLE CLEANOUT EXISTING SANITARY MANHOLE

PROPOSED SANITARY MANHOLE

WATERLINE

Ö

a g

LIGHT - EXISTING

- Existing utilities have been shown to the greatest extent possible based upon information provided to the Engineer. The contractor is responsible for contracting the respective utility companies and field locating utilities prior to construction and tendingly any posterial contribution. At contracting the torogation be advected for the Engineer. The contractor of the contractor that the respective be torogation be advected for the Engineer resigneous of the contractor that be repaired at the contractor's expense. Provide study data the torogation of the engineer and the study of the engineer prior to construction, and what in UNF (Engineer any advectance). Provide study datasets and an annufactured utility structures for review by the Engineer prior to construction on the structures.

- 5.
- 6. 7.
- Provide step drawing for all precast and manufactured utility structures for review by the Engineer prior to construction of 1000 bioscience. The structure of the structure of the structure of the engine of the structure of th 8

PRAIRIE STAR PKW 95TH ST NE1/4 GHWAY SW1/4 SE1/4 103RD ST ۲ SECTION 5-13-23 LOCATION MAP SCALE 1" = 2000'

> BASIS OF BEARINGS: THE PLAT OF "CANYON CREEK FOREST" S LINE, NE 1/4, SEC 5-13-23 BEARING S87"47'43"E

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

C3.0

DATE

FINAL UTILITY PLAN



#### PLANNING COMMISSION STAFF REPORT

May 5, 2025

### SRS LENEXA

Project #:	SU25-05	Location:	14303 W. 100 <sup>th</sup> Street
Applicant:	Gayla Davis, Independence Engineering LLC	Project Type:	Special Use Permit
Staff Planner:	Jessica Lemanski	Proposed Use:	Basic Industry, Wholesale/ Warehousing, General



#### **PROJECT SUMMARY**

The applicant/owner, The Westroads Limited Partnership, is requesting approval of a Special Use Permit (SUP) for a *basic industry* use to accommodate their tenant, SRS Distribution Heritage, storing hazardous chemicals for their pool supply company. The business warehouses and wholesales pool chemicals and supplies that could potentially be corrosive and hazardous. The facility is located at 14303 W. 100<sup>th</sup> Street, at the southeast corner of Santa Fe Trail Drive and W. 100<sup>th</sup> Street. The facility is within an existing business park with a variety of office and warehousing uses. This is the first request for a Special Use Permit for this business at this location. This project requires a Public Hearing.

#### STAFF RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL FOR THREE YEARS



#### SITE INFORMATION

The subject property is located west of Santa Fe Trail Drive on W. 100<sup>th</sup> Street, about a mile northwest of the intersection of I-435 & I-35. The site has been developed as a business park since 1980 and is located in an area of Lenexa that largely consists of industrial and office uses. The site includes a multitenant building with associated parking in the front along W. 100<sup>th</sup> Street and loading docks in the rear of the building. There are two other buildings on the site that are not part of this SUP and are occupied by different tenants.



Exhibit 1: Aerial Image of Subject Site.



#### LAND USE REVIEW

The Special Use Permit is requested for 9,830 SF of space at the end of the building closest to the intersection of Santa Fe Trail Drive and W. 100<sup>th</sup> Street. A 1,017 SF portion of the tenant space will be utilized for office use, while the remaining 8,813 SF will be warehousing space for the storage and distribution of pool chemicals and miscellaneous pool construction goods, some of which are classified as hazardous materials (HAZMAT).



TABL	TABLE 1: COMPARISON OF SURROUNDING PROPERTIES						
Vicinity	Land Use Designation	Zoning	Current Use				
Subject Property	Business Park	BP-2 Planned Manufacturing District	Business Park				
North	Business Park	BP-2 Planned Manufacturing District	Warehousing and Office Complex				
South	Business Park	BP-2 Planned Manufacturing District	Commercial Printing				
East	Business Park	BP-2 Planned Manufacturing District	Electrical Equipment, Appliance, and Components Manufacturing				
West	Business Park	BP-2 Planned Manufacturing District	Self Service Gas Station				

A Special Use Permit for the storage of hazardous chemicals, which falls under the *basic industry* use classification, is required in the BP-2, Planned Manufacturing District. The need for the SUP was first noted by staff when the applicant applied for their Certificate of Occupancy, which occurred after the tenant occupied the space. Upon review of the application, Staff determined that because the chemicals to be stored at this facility are classified as hazardous, the use falls under *basic industry*. The hazardous materials being stored at this facility consist of several oxidizers, combustible liquids, and corrosive materials. A summary of the materials proposed to be stored can be found in Exhibits 2-4.



OX1: Oxidizer, Class I	CL2: Combustible Liquid, Class II
OX2: Oxidizer, Class II	CL3A: Combustible Liquid, Class IIIA
OX3: Oxidizer, Class III	CL3B: Combustible Liquid, Class IIIB
OX4: Oxidizer, Class IV	AERO1: Level 1 Aerosol
HTOX: Highly Toxic	AERO2: Level 2 Aerosol
TOX: Toxic	AERO3: Level 3 Aerosol
FL1A: Flammable Liquid, Class 1A	CORR: Corrosive
FL1B: Flammable Liquid, Class 1B	FG: Flammable Gas
FL1C: Flammable Liquid, Class 1C	CG: Compressed Gas
FS: Flammable Solid	OG: Oxidizing Gas
IRR: Irritant	CD: Combustible dust
WR1: Water Reactive, Class 1	

Exhibit 2: Hazardous Materials Classification Key. The highlighted classifications are stored at the subject property.

PRODUCT NAME	VOL. OF CONTAINER	TOTAL NO. CONTAINERS	HMIS RATING	CHEMICAL	PHYSICAL HAZARD	HEALTH HAZARD
Dry Chlor	5-50 lb	Unlimited	Health - 3 Flammability - 0 Reactivity - 1	Sodium Dichloroisocyanurate, dihydrate - 98- 100% Sodium Chloride - 0-2%	OX1	CORR
Pool Breeze Pool Care System 3' Chlorinating Tablets	5-50 lb	Unlimited	Health - 3 Flammability - 0 Reactivity - 2	Trichloro-s-Triazinetione - 90-100% Boric Acid - 0.5-1%	OX1	
Spa Bromine Tablets	2.5-50 lb	20-400	Health - 3 Flammability - 0 Reactivity - 1	Bromochloro-5,5-dimethylhydantoin 98%	OX2	CORR
Pool Breeze Pool Care System Granular 68	1-100 lb	30-3,000	Health - 3 Flammability - 1 Reactivity - 1	Calcium Hypochlorite 60-70% Calcium Chloride5-5% Calcium Hydroxide - 1.5-5% Calcium Carbonate - 1.5-5%	OX2	CORR
Pool Breeze Algicide	1-5 gal	160-800	Health - 3 Flammability - 0 Reactivity - 2	Quaternary Ammonium Compounds, Benzyl- C12-18-Alky - 49.80% Isopropyl Alcohol - 10.00% Water – 40.00	CL2	CORR
Champion Muriatic Acid	1-2.5 gal	80-200	Health - 3 Flammability - 0 Reactivity - 2	Hydrochloric Acid 30-40%	N/A	CORR

Exhibit 3: Summary of hazardous materials to be stored at the subject property.



HAZMAT Summary Interior Storage (S1)					
HAZMAT Type	Maximum Quantity in Storage		Maximum Allowable Quantity (MAQ)		
CL2	120.00	gal	240gal*		
Corr (Solid)	2888.00	lb	19500lbs**		
Corr (Liquid)	264.00	gal	1950gal**		
OX1	984.00	lb	Unlimited**		
OX2	2768.00	lb	45001bs**		
Combustible Liquid	120.00	gal	240gal*		

\* Per Table 5003.1.1(1) in the 2018 IFC

\*\* Per Table 5003.11.1 in the 2018 IFC

### Exhibit 4: Quantities of hazardous materials to be stored at the subject property versus allowable quantities pursuant to the 2018 International Fire Code.

The applicant's Occupancy Classification Letter/Commodity Letter (OCL/CL) notes that the existing fire sprinkler system is designed and installed in accordance with the National Fire Prevention Association (NFPA) to meet the requirements of Ordinary Hazard Group II and verifies that the system has sufficient coverage for the facility. Additional portable fire extinguishers are also provided on-site.

The OCL/CL also outlines the required storage, marking, and containment conditions for the hazardous materials pursuant to the International Fire Code (IFC) and NFPA. All hazardous materials must be stored on wooden pallets on the bottom level of the racks, and there will be no open containers, blending, mixing, or open use of the materials inside of the warehouse. The oxidizers to be stored at this property are required to be separated from other corrosive and liquid products by a minimum of 25 feet, and liquid products are not stored above oxidizers. In compliance with the IFC, no storage of HAZMAT is allowed to exceed a density of 200 pounds per square foot of floor area, and the storage height will not exceed 8 feet. All HAZMAT is required to be conspicuously marked with identification signs, and the containers must be approved for their intended use and not exceed 100 pounds or 10 gallons. The floors of the building are made of noncombustible construction and adhere to the IFC.

Should spills occur, they are most likely to happen during the receiving/shipping process or when transporting products in the warehouse during order assembly. In the case of a corrosive materials spill, an acid neutralizer and spill kit are used to contain and clean the spill. Oxidizers are typically a granule, so any spilled product would be kept away from moisture, swept, and contained.



#### SPECIAL USE PERMIT REVIEW

The applicant requests approval of a Special Use Permit (SUP) for a basic industry use to accommodate their tenant, SRS Distribution Heritage, storing hazardous chemicals for their pool supply company located at 14303 W. 100th Street. Staff provides the following analysis to the review criteria within <u>Section 4-1-G-5</u> of the UDC.

#### 1. The character of the neighborhood.

The proposed tenant space is located within an existing business park development at the southeast corner of Santa Fe Trail Drive and W. 100<sup>th</sup> Street, approximately a mile northeast of the intersection of I-35 & I-435. The character of the neighborhood is industrial. The site is accessed from either Santa Fe Trail Drive or W. 100<sup>th</sup> Street. These roads are two-lane asphalt surfaced roads. The majority of the buildings within this area are equipped with loading docks to accommodate warehousing and distribution uses and the loading/unloading of supplies. There are a limited number of office uses in the area. The request is consistent with the character of the area.

#### 2. The zoning and use of properties nearby.

Table 1 states the zoning and uses of the surrounding properties. This property is zoned BP-2, as are the surrounding properties.

#### 3. The suitability of the subject property for the uses to which it has been restricted.

A *basic industry* use can be allowed as a special use within the BP-2 Zoning District. The BP-2 District is the only zoning district that accommodates the *basic industry* use. The building and associated site is well equipped for the storage and distribution of materials as is intended with this use. Additionally, the building is appropriately sprinklered to accommodate the storage of the hazardous materials proposed with the *basic industry* use, and portable fire extinguishers are provided on-site to comply with the International Fire Code.

#### 4. The extent to which the proposed use will detrimentally affect nearby property.

Staff concludes that the use of the facility to store pool supplies and chemicals will not detrimentally affect nearby properties, as all life-safety protocols and measures are proposed to be met pursuant to the Occupancy Classification Letter/Commodity Letter (OCL/CL) provided by the applicant. This letter, prepared by Waxler Fire Protection Engineering, LLC, evaluates the materials being stored, their occupancy and hazardous material class, and the proper procedures and storage arrangements for those supplies. Per the Lenexa Fire Department, as long as these procedures and storage methods are followed, the facility can be classified as a Group S-1 Storage Occupancy. As long as SRS Distributions (the tenant) follows and maintains the recommendations of the provided information, the commodities, storage arrangement, and operations within this facility will be compliant with the codes and standards adopted by the City of Lenexa and remain a Group S-1 Storage Occupancy.

The Fire Department noted that if the commodities, storage arrangement, or operations were to change from what is noted in the OCL/CL letter provided, a new review would be required to ensure the occupancy classification does not change to a High-hazard Group H occupancy class, which would then prevent them from being in a building occupied by other tenants.

The Fire Department conducts annual inspections of all the commercial buildings in the city. Buildings with hazardous material are inspected by an inspector certified as a hazardous material technician. This property will be inspected annually by the Fire Department to ensure compliance with the OCL/CL.



If any concerns emerge regarding the safety or storage of these materials, or if the tenant is found to not comply with the manufacturer's recommended storage and procedures for the hazardous materials while the SUP is active, Staff may undertake a review of these concerns and consider initiating the process to revoke the SUP. The recommendation for the SUP to remain valid for 3 years allows Staff to reconsider the use if it is found to adversely impact surrounding properties.

#### 5. The length of time the subject property has remained vacant as zoned.

The site is developed as a multitenant business park with associated parking and loading areas, originally built in 1980.

# 6. The relative gain to public health, safety, and welfare due to the denial of the application as compared to the hardship imposed upon the landowner, if any, as a result of denial of the application.

Staff does not see any gain to public health, safety, and welfare from denying this application given that all safety protocols are proposed to be in place for the operation.

#### 7. Recommendation of City's permanent professional staff.

See Staff's recommendation at the end of this report.

### 8. Conformance of the requested change to the adopted or recognized Master Plan being utilized by the City.

Approval of this Special Use Permit would align with Goal 5, Strategy 5.2 of Lenexa's Comprehensive Plan: "Reinvest in established employment areas". The area is already industrial in nature, and this use seeks to diversify the tenant base within the building and provide a new service that is not present nearby.

## 9. The availability and adequacy of required utilities and services to serve the proposed use. These utilities and services include, but are not limited to, sanitary and storm sewers, water and electrical service, police and fire protection, schools, parks and recreation facilities, etc.

Utilities are available to the site. The continued operation of the facility will not generate additional need for City services.

## 10. The extent to which the proposed use would adversely affect the capacity or safety of that portion of the street network influenced by the use, or present parking problems in the vicinity of the property.

The facility is a low trip generation use. Four employees are on-site daily, and because the main use of the space is a wholesale warehouse, it is unlikely that the business will generate many retail customers that may need additional parking aside from what is already provided on-site. Because this site has been continually used for distribution, the continued operation of the facility will not adversely impact the surrounding street network. The site provides space for a variety of tenants, most of which consist of warehousing and office uses, which require parking at a rate of 1 space per 1,500 SF for warehousing and 1 space per 250 SF for office uses. The proposed use of *basic industry* for this tenant requires 1 space per 1,000 SF. The site has more than the required parking noted in the <u>Section 4-1-D-1-C</u> of the Unified Development Code.





TABLE 2: PARKING ANALYSIS					
Land Use	Parking Formula	Required Parking for tenant	Provided for entire building	Spaces provided per tenant	Difference
Basic Industry	1 space per 1,000 square feet	9			
Office	1 space per 250 square feet	4			
Total		13	127	21	+8

# 11. The environmental impacts the proposed use will generate including, but not limited to, excessive stormwater runoff, water pollution, air pollution, noise pollution, excessive nighttime lighting, or other environmental harm.

The facility is an existing development. No additional construction is proposed for this use. It is not anticipated that the site will generate any excessive stormwater runoff, water pollution, noise pollution, nighttime lighting, or other environmental harm if all protocols to manage the product are employed per manufacturer recommendations.

# 12. The extent to which the proposed development would adversely affect the capacity or water quality of the stormwater system, including without limitation, natural stream assets in the vicinity of the subject property.

No new construction is proposed with the use. No stormwater or stream protection requirements apply to this special use permit request.

## 13. The ability of the applicant to satisfy any requirements (e.g. site plan, etc.) applicable to the specific use imposed pursuant to the zoning regulations in this Chapter and other applicable ordinances.

The applicant/tenant satisfies the UDC requirements for the approval of a *Basic Industry* special use permit to allow the storage of hazardous materials.

#### DEVIATIONS

The applicant is not requesting any deviations from the Unified Development Code (UDC).

#### NEXT STEPS

- This project requires a recommendation from the Planning Commission and final approval by the City Council. Pending a recommendation from the Planning Commission, the project is tentatively scheduled for consideration by the City Council on May 20, 2025.
- The applicant should inquire about additional City requirements and development fees.
- The applicant must obtain a Certificate of Occupancy.
- The applicant must obtain a Business License.



#### **RECOMMENDATION FROM PROFESSIONAL STAFF**

#### **★** Conduct a Public Hearing.

- ★ Staff recommends approval of the proposed Special Use Permit for SRS Lenexa.
  - This is a request for a special use permit for a basic industry use storing hazardous materials within the BP-2 Planned Manufacturing Zoning District.
  - The project is consistent with Lenexa's goals through *Responsible Economic Development* to create a *Thriving Economy*.
  - Staff recommends the Special Use Permit remain valid for three years.

#### SPECIAL USE PERMIT

Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of SU25-05 – a special use permit for a *basic industry* use for **SRS Lenexa** at 14303 W. 100th Street for a period of three years.



Data Source: City of Lenexa and Johnson County Kansas For further information, please call 913-477-7500

### SRS Lenexa Special Use Permit





111 Dennis Drive Seguin, TX 78155



October 30, 2024

Kevin Sellers Fire Captain Medic 9620 Pflumm Road, Lenexa, KS 66215 Via Email: ksellers@lenexa.com

#### RE: Occupancy Classification Letter/Commodity Letter (OCL/CL) SRS Distribution 14303 W 100th St, Lenexa, KS 66215

Dear Mr. Sellers,

The purpose of this occupancy classification letter/commodity letter (OCL/CL) letter is to document our classification of the commodities and describe our evaluation of the operations, storage arrangement and fire protection/life safety systems utilized within this tenant space to be occupied by our client, SRS Distribution.

The entire footprint area of the building is approximately 59,202ft<sup>2</sup>. SRS Distribution will utilize an existing 1,017 ft<sup>2</sup> for office area and 8,813 ft<sup>2</sup> for their warehouse storage/distribution of pool chemicals and miscellaneous pool construction goods. The building is protected throughout with an approved fire sprinkler system designed and installed in accordance with NFPA 13.

#### **Applicable Codes and Standards**

The codes and referenced standards which have been adopted by the authority having jurisdiction (AHJ) and used for our evaluation are as follows:

- International Building Code (IBC), 2018 Edition with City of Lenexa Amendments
- International Fire Code (IFC), 2018 Edition with City of Lenexa Amendments
- NFPA 10, Standard for Portable Fire Extinguishers, 2018 Edition
- NFPA 13, Standard for the Installation of Sprinkler Systems, 2016 Edition
- NFPA 400, Hazardous Materials Code, 2016 Edition

#### **Description of Facility**

The existing 9,830 ft<sup>2</sup> suite is of Type IIB construction and is protected throughout with an approved automatic fire sprinkler system designed and installed in accordance with NFPA 13 as described later in this report. The building can be described as follows:

- Office and accessory use (Group B: Business Occupancy) approximately 1,017 ft<sup>2</sup>.
- Warehouse (Group S-1: Storage Occupancy) approximately 8,813 ft<sup>2</sup>.
- The ceiling height in the office and accessory areas is 10 ft.
- The building has a floor-to-ceiling height of 18 ft 6 in.

Use is for storage of Hazardous chemicals. Per Section 4-1-B-22 of the UDC, storage of hazardous materials is defined as Basic Industry. A special use permit is required for basic industry use.

#### **Miscellaneous Storage Evaluation**

The commodities stored within the facility include miscellaneous pool construction goods containing metal and plastic materials. This warehouse will also store hazardous materials, which will be discussed in a later section. Per IFC 2018, Table 3203.8, *Examples of Commodity Classification*, these metal and plastic goods are classified as Class IV Commodities and Non-Expanded Group A Plastics. A portion of the stored materials include expanded plastics, these materials are to be stored in floor piles not to exceed 5 feet as the system is not hydraulically designed to provide adequate protection for high piled storage of expanded plastics.

The storage layout will primarily use three types of shelving units: Type A, Type B, and Type C.

- Type A Single Selective Shelves will be 8 ft wide, 3 ft 6 in deep, and 16 ft tall.
- Type B Single Selective Shelves are designed to be 8 ft wide, 4 ft deep, and 12 ft tall.
- Type C Rivet Shelving Units will measure 4 ft wide, 2 ft deep, and 7 ft tall.

The storage configuration within the facility will be maintained at or below a 10-foot height to align with the design limitations of the current fire sprinkler system, which is calibrated to protect Ordinary Hazard Group II occupancies. Refer to Attachment A for the Racking Plan. This height restriction is essential to ensure the system's ability to deliver the required protection density, set at 0.20 gpm/ft<sup>2</sup> over 1,500 ft<sup>2</sup>. While the storage shelving units, including Type A (16 feet tall), Type B (12 feet tall), and Type C (7 feet tall), offer greater vertical capacity, physical barriers such as chains will be installed on the upper levels of racks to enforce the 10-foot maximum height. This controlled storage height is also critical given the presence of Class IV commodities, Non-Expanded Group A Plastics, and limited quantities of expanded plastics, as identified per IFC 2018, Table 3203.8.

Expanded plastic materials, stored in floor piles not exceeding 5 feet, will further ensure compliance, as the system is not equipped to protect high-piled storage of such items. Limiting storage heights and implementing barriers on the shelving units will support the warehouse's compliance with the requirements for Ordinary Hazard Group II and the facility's safe operational standards.

#### **Fire Sprinkler System Evaluation**

The existing fire sprinkler system is designed and installed in accordance with NFPA 13 to meet the requirements of Ordinary Hazard Group II. The system provides a water density of 0.20 gpm/ft<sup>2</sup> over a design area of 1,500 ft<sup>2</sup> (actual area calculated at 1,506 ft<sup>2</sup>), along with a 250-gpm hose stream allowance. It operates with 13 flowing sprinkler heads, each with a K-factor of 5.6, and requires a total water flow of 593.09 gpm at a base pressure of 60.397 psi. Hydraulic calculations verify that the system meets these requirements with a safety margin of +6.199 psi (9.3%), ensuring sufficient coverage for the facility. Refer to Attachment B for sprinkler drawings and detailed hydraulic calculations.

To maintain compliance with this system's design criteria, the maximum allowable storage height must be restricted to 10 feet, as dictated by the Ordinary Hazard Group II (OH2) curve, per figure 16.2.1.3.2(d). By adhering to the 10-foot height limit, the current system remains aligned with NFPA 13 requirements, avoiding the need for extensive modifications and ensuring continued protection.

#### **Portable Fire Extinguishers**

Additionally, portable fire extinguishers will be provided in accordance with IFC Table 906.3(1), for ordinary (moderate) fire hazards, with minimum-rated single extinguisher of 2-A, with a maximum distance of travel to the extinguisher of 75 ft; The basic minimum fire extinguisher rating is 2-A with a maximum distance of travel to extinguishers of 75 ft. Code compliant emergency egress signage and lighting is provided throughout the tenant space. The use of Dry Chemical,  $CO_2$ , and Halon extinguishers shall be prohibited in areas where oxidizers are stored.

#### **Hazardous Materials Evaluation**

The warehouse will store various hazardous materials, all of which can be referenced in Attachment C. Our analysis of the Hazardous Material Inventory Sheet (HMIS) shows the Chemical, its Physical and Health Hazard, as well as the quantity to be stored. The hazard classifications to be stored include Class I and Class II Oxidizers, corrosives and combustible liquids. Per IFC, Table 5003.1.1(1), we have determined the Maximum Allowable Quantities (MAQ) for each of the listed classifications for the warehouse. Per footnote n, Group S occupancies can comply with Table 5003.11.1. Given the warehouse has an existing adequate sprinkler system a 100% increase is applied to each respective quantity.

- OX1 (Class I Oxidizers) Unlimited allowance with sprinkler system
- OX2 (Class II Oxidizers) Allowable up to 4,500 lbs with sprinkler system
- Solid Corrosives Allowable up to 19,500 lbs with sprinkler system
- Liquid Corrosives Allowable up to 1,950 gallons with sprinkler system
- Combustible Liquids Class 2 Allowable up to 240 gallons with sprinkler system

All Hazardous Materials stored indoors will be below their respective MAQ.

#### Storage Requirements:

All hazardous materials indoors will be stored on wooden pallets on the bottom level of the racks. There will be no open containers, blending, mixing, or open use of these commodities inside of the warehouse. Throughout the warehouse no storage of HAZMAT will be allowed to exceed a density of 200 pounds per square foot of floor area per IFC 5003.11.1.1. The storage height of all HAZMAT materials will not exceed 8 foot in height per IFC 5003.11.1.1.2. Shelf storage will need to be of substantial construction per IFC 5003.9.9, but no seismic bracing will be required for the zone this warehouse is in. The aisle layout already adheres to IFC 5003.11.1.1.9 (see Attachment A) in that the aisles are already greater than 4 feet. Oxidizers will not be stored beneath any liquids per NFPA 400 15.2.11.1.

#### Marking:

For the storage of these materials hazard identification signs will be installed per IFC 5003.5 in which "the specific material contained shall be conspicuously affixed on stationary containers and aboveground tanks and at entrances to locations where hazardous materials are stored, handled or used, including dispensing, in quantities requiring a permit." With regards to marking per IFC 5003.5.1 all HAZMAT containers and packages will be conspicuously marked or labeled.

#### Containment:

Regarding containers, the type will be approved for its intended use and the size of any individual container will not exceed 100 pounds or 10 gallons per IFC 5003.11.1.1.5 and IFC 5003.11.1.1.6. The floors of this building are made of noncombustible construction and already adhere to IFC 5004.12.

October 30, 2024 Occupancy Classification Letter/Commodity Letter (OCL/CL) SRS Distribution 14303 W 100th St, Lenexa, KS 66215

#### **Conclusion**

Based on our analysis and recommendations of the provided information, the commodities, storage arrangement and operations within this facility will be compliant with the codes and standards adopted by the City of Lenexa. The owner has been advised that if there is a change in the storage arrangement, operations of the facility, or the types of commodities being stored, the building will need to be evaluated to ensure that all required fire protection and life safety systems are in accordance with the applicable codes and standards.

If you have any questions or concerns, please contact me by email to <u>Luis.Mendoza@waxlerfpe.com</u> or by phone at 830.946.1917.

Prepared By:

Luis Mendoza Associate Fire Protection Engineer Waxler Fire Protection Engineering, LLC

Reviewed By:



Robert J. Waxler, P.E. President Waxler Fire Protection Engineering, LLC

#### **Owner Representative Statement:**

I certify, to the best of my knowledge, that the information contained in this report is correct and complete.

Name: John Arrowood Title: Real Estate Construction Manager

ohn Arrowood

Company Name: SRS Distribution Inc

Date: 2/26/25

Signature:

## Attachment A



## **Attachment B**

October 24, 2024



John "Marty" Arrowood SRS Distribution 7440 S. Hwy 121 McKinney, TX 75070

#### RE: SPRINKLER SYSTEM ASSESSMENT SRS Distribution (AQUA-GON) 14303 WEST 100<sup>TH</sup> STREET LENEXA, KS 66215

Dear Marty,

Summit Fire Consulting (SFC) was contracted to perform an analysis of the existing fire sprinkler system for the referenced pool supply storage facility. The information was reviewed and evaluated with the intent to confirm the existing system can meet the design requirements for Ordinary Hazard Group II in NFPA 13.

Summit conducted a site visit on October 16, 2024 to document the existing conditions of the automatic sprinkler system. The installed system protecting the subject tenant space consisted of a gridded wet pipe sprinkler system with 4" near and far mains, and 1.5" branchlines. Sprinklers were installed with a maximum coverage area of less than 130 ft<sup>2</sup> per sprinkler, and the existing sprinklers were identified as high temperature, standard response uprights with 5.6 K-factors. SFC obtained a current flow test for site and the results as provided by the Lenexa water company, WaterOne are as shown below:

Flow and Pressure Informat	ion	
Information for 14303 W 100th St at ass	umed elevatio	on of 1054 ft
Fire Hydrant Information		
Flow Hydrant No:	1100200	990
Flow Hydrant Location:	14335 W	/ 100th St
Residual Hydrant No:	1100200	
Residual Hydrant Location:	14303 W	/ 100th St
Approx. Residual Hydrant Elevation:	1056	ft
Test Date:	10/17/20	024
Static Pressure:	70	psi
Residual Pressure:	60	psi
Flow:	1062	gpm
Antiginated Static Process	Danga	
Anticipated Static Pressure	Range	
Using 2019 Average for NW Crouthers		
Calculated Pressure Range for 14303 W	/ 100th State	levation 1054 ft
Max: 76 psi		
Avg: 66 psi		
Min: 47 psi		
Noto: WatorOno doosn't guarantoo tho	accuracy of th	is information due to the unlimited number
of variables that can affect this pressur		
Initial Report Date: 10/17/202	4	
	Ū	



A 12" underground pipe located on West 100<sup>th</sup> Street provides the city water supply which is tapped into by an 8" underground pipe servicing the building riser(s). The system riser for this tenant space is 4" and installed components include a Kennedy OS&Y gate valve and an Ames Series C200 OS&Y double check valve assembly backflow preventer.

Summit performed hydraulic calculations for the SRS (Aqua-gon) tenant space using the referenced flow test and documented site conditions. The calculation was performed using a proposed design criteria for Ordinary Hazard Group II which per NFPA 13 requires 0.20 gpm/ft<sup>2</sup> over 1,500 ft<sup>2</sup> with a 250 gpm hose stream allowance. See NFPA 13 (2016 Edition), Figure 11.2.3.1.1 and Table 11.2.3.1.2 shown below.



Figure 11.2.3.1.1 Density/Area Curves.

Table 11.2.3.1.2 Hose Stream Allowance and Water Supply Duration Requirements for Hydraulically Calculated Systems

	Inside Hose		Total Combined In		
Occupancy	gpm	L/min	gpm	L/min	Duration (minutes)
Light hazard	0, 50, or 100	0, 190, or 380	100	380	30
Ordinary hazard	0, 50, or 100	0, 190, or 380	250	950	60–90
Extra hazard	0, 50, or 100	0, 190, or 380	500	1900	90–120

The results of the calculations show that the existing system is capable of meeting the design requirements of Ordinary Hazard Group II. The full result report and plans have been enclosed with this letter for reference, and the summary of the calculations is shown below. The result of the calculation shows that the system achieves the required density based on the current water supply, including a 5 psi minimum safety factor In accordance with Lenexa City Code and Policies: Title 4 Unified Development Code, Section 4-8-A-15, International Building Code Section 903.3.5.4 as amended.





Hydraulic Information					
Remot	Remote Area 1				
OCCUPANCY CLASSIFICATION	Ordinary Group II				
DENSITY (gpm/ft <sup>2</sup> )	0.20 for 1500ft <sup>2</sup> (Actual 1506ft <sup>2</sup> )				
TOTAL HOSE STREAMS	250.00				
DRY CAPACITY	0.00gal				
TOTAL HEADS FLOWING	13				
K-FACTOR	5.6				
TOTAL WATER REQUIRED	593.09				
TOTAL PRESSURE REQUIRED	60.397				
BASE of RISER (gpm)	593.09				
BASE of RISER (psi)	60.397				
SAFETY MARGIN (psi)	+6.199 (9.3%)				

Please contact our office if there are any questions pertaining to this evaluation.

Prepared by: SUMMIT FIRE CONSULTING

Ali Tanvir Fire Protection Consultant

Reviewed by: SUMMIT FIRE CONSULTING

Christopher Leaver Engineering Manager





	ļ	
-		

Job	
Job Number 1	Designer
Job Name: Drawing1	Phone FAX
Address 1	State Certification/License Number
Address 2	AHJ
Address 3	Job Site/Building
nuurosa u	
System	
Density 0.20gpm/ft <sup>2</sup>	Area of Application 1500ft <sup>2</sup> (Actual 1506ft <sup>2</sup> )
Most Demanding Sprinkler Data 5.6 K-Factor 25.40 at 20.573	Hose Streams 250.00
Coverage Per Sprinkler	Number Of Sprinklers Calculated Number Of Nozzles Calculated
127ft <sup>2</sup> System Pressure Demand	13 0 System Flow Demand
60.398 Total Demand	343.09 Pressure Result
593.09 @ 60.398	+6.199 (9.3%)
Supplies	Check Point Gauges
Node         Name         Flow(gpm)         Hose Flow(gpm)         Static(psi)         Residual(psi)           1         Water Supply         1062.00         250.00         70.000         60.000	Identifier Pressure(psi) K-Factor(K) Flow(gpm)
Aquagon Hydraulic Calc 10.23.24 (CALC 2).cad	Water Supply at Node 1 (1062.00, 0.00, 70.000, 60.000)
	100 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90

Job														
Job Number						Designer								
Job Name:						State Certification/License Number								
Drawing Address 1	1					AHJ								
Address 2						Job Site/Building	1							
Address 3						Drawing Name								
							n Hydraulic Ca	c 10.23.24 (CAI	LC 2).cad					
System						Remote A	rea(s)							
	Most Demanding Sprinkler Data 5.6 K-Factor 25.40 at 20.573						Occupancy Job Suffix Ordinary Group II							
Hose Allowance At Source 250.00						Density Area of Application 0.20gpm/ft <sup>2</sup> 1500ft <sup>2</sup> (Actual 1506ft <sup>2</sup> )					)			
Additional Hose Supplies Node Flow(gpm)						Number Of Sprink	0	per Of Nozzles Calculated	Coverage Per Sprinkle	er				
						AutoPeak Results: Left: 61.0		a(s) Adjacent To Most Remo	Right: 59.58	34				
Total Hose Stream	21													
250.00														
System Flow Dem 343.09	and		Total Water Required (Including H 593.09	Hose Allowance)										
Maximum Pressur	e Unbalance In Loops													
Maximum Velocity 11.85 be	Above Ground tween nodes 12 and 7	144												
	ween nodes 1 and 2													
Volume capacity of 749.72ga			Volume capacity of Dry Pipes											
Supplies														
		Hose Flov		Residual	~	Flow	Available	Total Dema		quired	Safety Margin			
Node 1	Name Water Supply	(gpm) 250.00	(psi) 70.000	(psi) (0 60.000	· · ·	(gpm) 062.00	(psi) ( 66.596	(gpm) 593.09	1	(psi) 0.398	(psi) 6.199			
		200.00	10.000	00.000		002.00	00.000	000.00		0.000	0.100			
Contract														
Contractor	Contractor Number	er				Contact Nam	e			Contact Title				
Name of Contract	or:					Phone				Extension				
Address 1						FAX								
Address 2						E-mail								
Address 3						Web-Site								





#### Summary Of Outflowing Devices

				-		Report Description. Ordinary Group II (1
Device	9	Actual Flow (gpm)	Minimum Flow (gpm)	K-Factor (K)	Pressure (psi)	
Sprinkler	143	29.04	25.40	5.6	26.889	
Sprinkler	144	26.06	25.40	5.6	21.659	
Sprinkler	145	26.02	25.40	5.6	21.584	
Sprinkler	152	28.98	25.40	5.6	26.788	
Sprinkler	153	25.57	25.40	5.6	20.850	
Sprinkler	154	25.53	25.40	5.6	20.779	
Sprinkler	161	29.02	25.40	5.6	26.858	
Sprinkler	162	25.44	25.40	5.6	20.642	
🔿 Sprinkler	163	25.40	25.40	5.6	20.573	
Sprinkler	171	25.44	25.40	5.6	20.644	
Sprinkler	172	25.40	25.40	5.6	20.575	
Sprinkler	180	25.61	25.40	5.6	20.918	
Sprinkler	181	25.57	25.40	5.6	20.848	

➡ Most Demanding Sprinkler Data

### Node Analysis

Discharge(gpm)	Pressure(psi)	Fittings	Elevation(Foot)	Node
343.09	60.398	S	-3'-0	1
29.04	26.889	Spr(-26.889)	18'-6	143
26.06	21.659	Spr(-21.659)	18'-10	144
26.02	21.584	Spr(-21.584)	19'-1	145
28.98	26.788	Spr(-26.788)	18'-6	152
25.57	20.850	Spr(-20.850)	18'-10	153
25.53	20.779	Spr(-20.779)	19'-1	154
29.02	26.858	Spr(-26.858)	18'-6	161
25.44	20.642	Spr(-20.642)	18'-10	162
25.40	20.573	Spr(-20.573)	19'-1	163
25.44	20.644	Spr(-20.644)	18'-10	171
25.40	20.575	Spr(-20.575)	19'-1	172
25.61	20.918	Spr(-20.918)	18'-10	180
25.57	20.848	Spr(-20.848)	19'-1	181
	60.278	E(13'-2)	-3'-0	2
	30.429	T(8'-0)	17'-4½	12
	31.664	T(8'-0)	15'-6	15
	31.541	T(8'-0)	15'-9½	18
	31.408	T(8'-0)	16'-0½	20
	31.259	T(8'-0)	16'-3½	21
	31.077	T(8'-0)	16'-7	23
	30.872	T(8'-0)	16'-10	26
	30.629	T(8'-0)	17'-1½	27
	30.291	T(8'-0)	17'-8	29
	43.552	T(8'-0)	15'-6	33
	43.130	T(8'-0)	15'-9½	35
	42.752	T(8'-0)	16'-1	38
	42.439	T(8'-0)	16'-4	40
	42.170	T(8'-0)	16'-7½	42
	41.940	T(8'-0)	16'-11	43
	41.769	T(8'-0)	17'-1½	45
	41.482	T(8'-0)	17'-8	47

Hydraulic Analysis

Pipe Type	Diameter	Flow	Velocity	HWC	Repo Friction Loss	Length	Pressure
Downstream Upstream	Elevation	Discharge	K-Factor	Pt Pn	Fittings	Eq. Length Total Length	Summary
••••• Route 1 •	• • • •					Total Length	
	1.6100	1.93	0.30	120	0.000213	9'-6	<b>Pf</b> 0.002
163	19'-1	25.40	5.6	20.573	Sprinkler		Pe
172	19'-1			20.575		9'-6	Pv
_	1.6100	27.33	4.31	120	0.028788	9'-6	<b>Pf</b> 0.273
172	19'-1	25.40	5.6	20.575	Sprinkler		Pe
181	19'-1			20.848		9'-6	Pv
L	1.6100	52.90	8.34	120	0.097680	192'-11	Pf 20.01
181	19'-1	25.57	5.6	20.848	Sprinkler,		Pe 0.618
47	17'-8			41.482	E(4'-0), T(8'-0)	204'-11	Pv
М	4.2600	52.90	1.19	120	0.000855	13'-4	
47	17'-8			41.482			<b>Pe</b> 0.117
50	17'-4½			41.610		13'-4	
M	4.2600	105.85	2.38	120	0.003084	13'-4	
50	17'-4½	52.95		41.610	Flow (q) from Route 3	401.4	<b>Pe</b> 0.118
45	17'-1½			41.769		13'-4	
M	4.2600	147.92	3.33	120	0.005728	13'-3½	
45 43	17'-1½ 16'-11	42.07		41.769 41.940	Flow (q) from Route 5	13'-3½	Pe 0.095
		400.00	4.05		0.000007		
M 43	4.2600	<u>180.02</u> 32.10	4.05	<u>120</u> 41.940	0.008237	13'-4	Pf 0.110 Pe 0.120
43 42	16'-7½	52.10		42.170	Flow (q) from Route 2	13'-4	
M	4.2600	212.13	4.77	120	0.011159	13-4	
M 42	4.2600 16'-7½	32.11	4.//	42.170			Pt 0.149 Pe 0.121
40	16'-4	02.11		42.439		13'-4	-
M	4.2600	244.39	5.50	120	0.014501	13'-4	
40	16'-4	32.27	0.00	42.439	Flow (q) from Route 9		Pe 0.120
38	16'-1			42.752		13'-4	
M	4.2600	276.90	6.23	120	0.018269	13'-9	<b>Pf</b> 0.251
38	16'-1	32.51	0.20	42.752	Flow (q) from Route 7		Pe 0.127
35	15'-9½			43.130		13'-9	Pv
M	4.2600	309.76	6.97	120	0.022482	13'-6½	<b>Pf</b> 0.304
35	15'-9½	32.86		43.130	Flow (q) from Route 8		Pe 0.118
33	15'-6			43.552		13'-6½	Pv
M	4.2600	343.09	7.72	120	0.027160	34'-21/2	
33	15'-6	33.33		43.552	Flow (q) from Route 11		Pe 8.019
2	-3'-0			60.278	7E(13'-2), GV(2'-7½), BFP(-5.20	129'-0	Pv
	8.2490	0.40.00	0.00	100	3)	44.01.01/	<b>D</b> 0.400
G 2	-3'-0	343.09	2.06	<u>120</u> 60.278	0.001087	110'-0'/2	Pf 0.120 Pe
2	-3'-0			60.398	Meter Construction	110'-0½	
Į.	-0-0	250.00		00.000	Water Supply Hose Allowance At Source	110-072	r v
					Tiose Allowance At Source	_	
1		593.09					
••••• Route 2 •	••••						
L	1.6100	23.47	3.70	120	0.021721	9'-6	Pf 0.206
163	19'-1	25.40	5.6	20.573	Sprinkler		Pe
154	19'-1			20.779		9'-6	Pv
L	1.6100	49.00	7.72	120	0.084769	9'-6	Pf 0.805
154	19'-1	25.53	5.6	20.779	Sprinkler		Ре
145	19'-1			21.584		9'-6	
	1.6100	75.01	11.82	120	0.186394		Pf 8.088
145	19'-1 17' 9	26.02	5.6	21.584	Sprinkler,	16'-0 43'-4½	Pe 0.618
29	17'-8	76.51		30.291	2T(8'-0)		
M	<u>4.2600</u> 17'-8	75.01	1.69	120 30.291	0.001631		Pf 0.022 Pe 0.117
29 12	17'-8 17'-4½			30.291 30.429		13'-4	
		150.10	2.20	120	0.005901		
M 12	4.2600 17'-4½	<u>150.19</u> 75.18	3.38	30.429	0.005891 Flow (q) from Route 4		Pf 0.079 Pe 0.121
27	17'-4/2	70.10		30.629		13'-4	
M	4.2600	195.17	4.39	120	0.009565		Pf 0.127
27	4.2600 17'-1½	44.98	4.33	30.629	Flow (q) from Route 6		Pr 0.127 Pe 0.116
	16'-10	11.00		30.872		13'-4	
26					0.000755		
26 N	1 6100	32 10	5.06	120	0.038755	258'_01/	DF 11 00
26 N 26	1.6100 16'-10	32.10	5.06	120 30.872	0.038755 T(8'-0)		Pf 11.09 Pe -0.02

Hydraulic Analysis

Job Number: 1

Ріре Туре	Diameter	Flow	Velocity	HWC		Friction Loss	Length		ssure
Downstream Upstream	Elevation	Discharge	K-Factor	Pt	Pn	Fittings	Eq. Length Total Length		nmary
	1.6100	1.90	0.30	120		0.000207	9'-6	Pf	0.002
162	18'-10	25.44	5.6	20.642		Sprinkler		Pe	
171	18'-10			20.644			9'-6		
<u> </u>	1.6100	27.34	4.31	120		0.028810	9'-6	1	0.274
171	18'-10	25.44	5.6	20.644		Sprinkler		Pe	
180	18'-10			20.918			9'-6		
L	1.6100	52.95	8.35	120		0.097865	193'-0½		20.06
180	18'-10	25.61	5.6	20.918		Sprinkler,			0.627
50	17'-4½			41.610		E(4'-0), T(8'-0)	205'-0½	Pv	
••••• Route 4 •	• • • •								
L	1.6100	23.54	3.71	120		0.021848	9'-6		0.208
162	18'-10	25.44	5.6	20.642		Sprinkler		Pe	
153	18'-10			20.850			9'-6	Pv	
L	1.6100	49.12	7.74	120		0.085145	9'-6		0.809
153	18'-10	25.57	5.6	20.850		Sprinkler		Pe	
144	18'-10			21.659			9'-6	Pv	
L	1.6100	75.18	11.85	120		0.187140	27'-6	Pf	8.144
144	18'-10	26.06	5.6	21.659		Sprinkler,			0.627
12	17'-4½			30.429		2T(8'-0)	43'-6	Ρv	
••••• Route 5 •	••••								
L	1.6100	13.05	2.06	120		0.007328	9'-6	Pf	0.070
152	18'-6	28.98	5.6	26.788		Sprinkler		Pe	
161	18'-6			26.858			9'-6	Pv	
L	1.6100	42.07	6.63	120		0.063929	211'-10½	Pf	14.31
161	18'-6	29.02	5.6	26.858		Sprinkler,	12'-0	Pe	0.600
45	17'-1½			41.769		E(4'-0), T(8'-0)	223'-10½	Ρv	
••••• Route 6 •	• • • •								
L	1.6100	15.94	2.51	120		0.010616	9'-6	Pf	0.101
152	18'-6	28.98	5.6	26.788		Sprinkler		Pe	
143	18'-6			26.889		·	9'-6	Pv	
BL	1.6100	44.98	7.09	120		0.072352	27'-4½	Pf	3.137
143	18'-6	29.04	5.6	26.889		Sprinkler,			0.603
27	17'-1½			30.629		2T(8'-0)	43'-4½		
••••• Route 7 •	• • • •					(())			
RN	1.6100	32.51	5.12	120		0.039680	258'-2	Pf	11.35
20	16'-01/2	98.70	0.112	31.408		T(8'-0), Flow (q) from Route 12			-0.01
38	16'-1			42.752		2T(8'-0), E(4'-0)	286'-2	Pv	
••••• Route 8 •	••••					2:(0 0); 2(: 0)			
CM	4.2600	66.19	1.49	120		0.001294	13'-9	Pf	0.018
20	16'-01/2	98.70		31.408		Flow (q) from Route 12			0.115
18	15'-9½			31.541		())	13'-9	Pv	
RN	1.6100	32.86	5.18	120		0.040488	258'-3		11.58
18	15'-9½	02.00	0.10	31.541		T(8'-0)	28'-0		11.00
35	15'-91⁄2			43.130		2T(8'-0), E(4'-0)	286'-3		
••••• Route 9 •						21(0-0), E(+-0)			
M	4.2600	163.07	3.67	120		0.006860	13'-1	Pf	0.092
26	16'-10	32.10	0.07	30.872		Flow (q) from Route 2		1	0.092
23	16'-7			31.077			13'-4	1	
M	4.2600	130.96	2.95	120		0.004572			0.061
23	16'-7	100.30	2.30	31.077		0.007072			0.001
21	16'-3½			31.259			13'-4		0.120
2 N	1.6100	20.07	5.08	120		0.039135	258'-1½		11 10
21	<u>1.6100</u> 16'-3½	32.27	5.00	31.259		T(8'-0)			-0.01
40	16'-4			42.439			286'-1½	1	-0.01
				.2.100		2T(8'-0), E(4'-0)	200-172		
••••• Route 10		20.44	E 00	100		0.028700		<b>P</b> (	14 44
N 23	<u>1.6100</u> 16'-7	32.11	5.06	<u>120</u> 31.077		0.038790 T(8' 0)	258'-5		-0.01
23 42	16'-7 <sup>1</sup> ⁄2			42.170		T(8'-0)	286'-5		-0.01
				42.170		2T(8'-0), E(4'-0)	200-5	FV	
••••• Route 11				105				_	
M	4.2600	33.33	0.75	120		0.000364	13'-7		0.005
18	15'-9½	32.86		31.541		Flow (q) from Route 8	401 7		0.118
15	15'-6			31.664			13'-7		
N	1.6100	33.33	5.25	120		0.041552	258'-1½		11.88
15	15'-6			31.664		T(8'-0)	28'-0		
33	15'-6			43.552		2T(8'-0), E(4'-0)	286'-1½	Pv	

1       16-33;       32.27       31.259       Flow (q) from Route 9       Pe 0.11/ 13'-4         0       16'-0/5       31.408       Po       0.11/ 13'-4       Pv         1       0       16'-0/5       31.408       Po       0.11/ 13'-4       Pv         1       0       16'-0/5       0.11/ Schedule 40 Steel Pipe Inside Diameter       0.457       130       140       150         1       1.16       1.33       1.51       1.16       1.33       1.51         Pipe Type Legend XO Arm-Over La Branch Line Diameter       Units Legend       Integend       ALV       Alarm Valve AngV Angle Valve       AngV Angle Valve       BUS BalV Maine         ND Drain NR Drop       Diameter       Inch       Elevation Foot       Flow       gpm       Diameter       BV       BalV BalV Valve       BFP       Backflow Preventer       BV       BV       Bushing       BalV BalV Valve       BFP       Backflow Preventer       BV       BV       Bushing       BalV BalV Valve       BFP       Backflow Preventer       BV       BV       Bushing       BalV BalV Valve       BFP       Backflow Preventer       BV       BV       C Cross Run       CV       Check Valve       Dev       Dev       C Cross Flow Turn 90'       Cpg Coupling	1       16-31/2       32.27       31.259       Flow (q) from Route 9       Pe 0.11/1         0       16'-01/2       31.408       Po       0.11/1       13'-4       Pv         1       Actual Inside Diameter       0       140       13'-4       Pv       13'-4       Pv         1       Calue Multiplier       Value Of C       100       130       140       150         1       Marco Core       0.713       1.16       1.33       1.51         Pipe Type Legend         0.0       Arm-Over       Image To Cores Main       No       1.16       1.33       1.51         Outs Legend         0.0       Arm-Over       Image To Cores Main       Presure       Image To Cores Main       No       N	pe Type Downstream Jpstream	C Analysi Diameter Elevation	Flow Discharge	Velocity K-Factor	HWC Pt	Pn	Friction Los Fittings	55	Repo	t Description: Ord Length Eq. Length Total Length	Pressure Summary
Actual Inside Diameter       4.87         Schedule 40 Steel Pipe Inside Diameter       1.47         Pipe Type Legend       Units Legend         NO       Arm-Over         AB       Branch Line         M       Cross Main         ND       Drain         R       Foed Main         R       Foed Main         Velocity       fps         Pressure       psi         Length       Foot         NO       Miliplying Factor         0.0110ger       1.01         1.01       1.02         M       Cross Main         ND       Drain         ND Crain       Food         Pressure       psi         Length       Foot         Freed Riser       Normal pressure at a point in a pipe         PN       Prissure loss due to friction between points         Pe       Pressure due to elevation difference between indicated         points       Pv         Velocity pressure at a point in a pipe         PV       Velocity pressure at a point in a pipe         PV       Velocity pressure at a point in a pipe         PV       Velocity pressure at a point in a pipe         PV	Actual Inside Diameter       \$^{4.7} = Factor       Value Of C       100       130       140       150         Multiplying Factor       0.713       1.16       1.33       1.51         Pripe Legend         O       Arro-Verer       India Legend       Allow Of C       0.713       1.16       1.30       140       150         M       Oross Main       Diameter       India Legend       Allow Of C       0.713       1.16       1.33       1.51         M       Freed Kian       Branch Line       Diameter       India Legend       Allow Allow Of C       C       Cross Run O       C       Cross Run O       C	1 1 0	16'-3½		2.22	31.259			m Route 9			<b>Pe</b> 0.114
Actual inside Diameter       = Factor       Value 01 C       100       130       140       150         Multiplying Factor       0.713       1.16       1.33       1.51         Pipe Type Legend         OO       Arm-Over       It       Branch Line       It       1.16       1.33       1.51         Mode Arm-Over       It       Branch Line       It	Addual hisba Dameter       = Factor       Value 0.0       130       140       150         Mithplying Factor       0.0       133       140       150         Mithplying Factor       0.713       1.16       1.33       151         Pipe Type Legend       Units Legend       1.16       1.33       151         Mithplying Factor       0.713       1.16       1.33       1.51         Mithplying Factor       0.713       1.16       1.34       1.51         Mithplying Factor       0.713       1.16       1.34       1.51         Mithplying Factor       0.0113ger       1.16       1.34       1.51         Mithplying Factor       Proverset       1.34       1.51       1.51         Mithplying Factor       1.51       1.51       1.51       1.51         Mithplying Factor       1.51       1.51       1.51       1.51         Mithplying Factor       1.51       1.51       1.51       1.51	uivalent Pipe Len	gths of Valves a	and Fittings (C=120	only)		C Valu	ue Multiplier				
O. Arm-Over       Diameter       Inch         L. Branch Line       Elevation       Foot         M. Cross Main       Flow       gpm         ND Drain       Discharge       gpm         ND arain       Discharge       gpm         VP Dynamic       Discharge       gpm         M. Feed Main       Pressure       psi         Length       Foot       BV         PN Outrigger       Fiction Loss       psi/Foot         RN Riser Nipple       FP       Total pressure at a point in a pipe         PS prig       T       Total pressure at a point in a pipe         PA       Pressure loss due to friction between points       Ee         Paint       Normal pressure at a point in a pipe       Pf         PA       Pressure due to elevation difference between indicated       Ee         points       Pv       Velocity pressure at a point in a pipe       FOC         Pv       Velocity pressure at a point in a pipe       FOC       FIE         Pv       Velocity pressure at a point in a pipe       FOC       FIE       45° Elbow         Ee       11½° Elbow       Ee       22½° Elbow       F         Pv       Velocity pressure at a point in a pipe       FOC       FIC	O       Am-Over         L       Branch Line         L       Branch Line         K       Cross Main         N       Drain         R       Drop         Velocity       fps         M       Freed Main         R       Freed Nier         R       Outgrame         R       Outgrame         R       Freed Riser         R       Outgrame         R       Outgrame         R       Freed Riser         R       Didentarge         R       Outgrame         P       Freid Nier         R       Outgrame         R       Outgrame         P       Total pressure at a point in a pipe         Pt       Total pressure at a point in a pipe         Pf       Pressure due to elevation difference between indicated         points       Pv         Velocity pressure at a point in a pipe         Pv       Velocity pressure at a point in a pipe         Pv       Velocity pressure at a point in a pipe         Pv       Velocity pressure at a point in a pipe         Pv       Velocity pressure at a point in a pipe         Pv       Vel	(Sch			) <b>_</b>	actor						
	HVHose ValveHydHydrantLtELong Turn ElbowmecTMechanical TeeNozNozzleP1Pump InP2Pump OutP1VPost Indicating ValveP0Pipe OutletPrVPressure Relief ValvePVPressure Relief ValvePKVPressure Reducing ValveSSupplySCVSwing Check ValveSFxSeismic FlexSprinklerStStStrainerTTee Flow Turn 90°	BL     Branch Line       CM     Cross Main       DN     Drain       DR     Drop       DY     Dynamic       Feed Main     Feed Main       FR     Feed Riser       MS     Miscellaned       DR     Outrigger       RN     Riser Nipple       SN     Swing Nipp       SP     Sprig       ST     Stand Pipe	ous e le	ElevationFoFlowgpDischargegpVelocityfpsPressurepsiLengthFoFriction LosspsiHWCHaPtTo'PnNoPfProPepo	ot m ot /Foot zen-Williams Cor tal pressure at a p rmal pressure at essure loss due to essure due to elev ints	point in a pip a point in a p o friction betw vation differe	iipe veen poin nce betwo			AngV         A           b         E           BalV         E           BFP         E           BV         E           C         Clock           CPIg         C           CV         C           DPV         E           EE         4           Ee1         1           Ee2         2           f         F           FDC         F           fEE         4           flg         F           fC         GloV           GV         C           GV         C           GV         C           GV         C           Ho         H	Angle Valve Bushing Ball Valve Backflow Prevente Butterfly Valve Cross Flow Turn 9 Coupling Cross Run Check Valve Deluge Valve Dry Pipe Valve 0° Elbow 5° Elbow 1¼° Elbow 5° Elbow 1¼° Elbow 2½° Elbow 1¼° Elbow 5° FireLock (TM) 1 5° FireLock(TM) 1 5° FireLock(TM) 1 5° FireLock(TM) 1 5° FireLock(TM) 1 50 FireLock(TM) 1	0° onnection Elbow





## **Attachment C**

OX1: Oxidizer, Class I	CL2: Combustible Liquid, Class II
OX2: Oxidizer, Class II	CL3A: Combustible Liquid, Class IIIA
OX3: Oxidizer, Class III	CL3B: Combustible Liquid, Class IIIB
OX4: Oxidizer, Class IV	AERO1: Level 1 Aerosol
HTOX: Highly Toxic	AERO2: Level 2 Aerosol
TOX: Toxic	AERO3: Level 3 Aerosol
FL1A: Flammable Liquid, Class 1A	CORR: Corrosive
FL1B: Flammable Liquid, Class 1B	FG: Flammable Gas
FL1C: Flammable Liquid, Class 1C	CG: Compressed Gas
FS: Flammable Solid	OG: Oxidizing Gas
IRR: Irritant	CD: Combustible dust
WR1: Water Reactive, Class 1	
	HAZMAT Storage Location
	S1 Warehouse

Product Name	Manufacturer	Vol of Container	Total No. Containers	HMIS rating	Chemical	CAS Number	Storage Location	Physical Hazard	Health Hazard	Total Quantity (l)	Total Quantity (gal)	Total Quantity (g)	Total Quantity (lb)
Dy Chlor	Aquabrite	5 lb 10 lb 25 lb 50 lb	Unlimited	Health - 3 Flammability - 0 Reactivity - 1	Sodium Dichloroisocyanurate, dihydrate 98-100% Sodium Chloride 0-2%	51580-86-0 7647-14-5	S1 Warehouse	OXI	CORR				120
Pool Breeze Pool Care System 3" Chlorinating Tablets	Solenis	5 lb 10 lb 25 lb 50 lb	Unlimited	Health - 3 Flammability - 0 Reactivity - 2	Trichloro-s-Triazinetione 90-100% Boric Acid 0.5-1%	87-90-1 10043-35-3	S1 Warehouse	OXI					864
Spa Bromine Tablets	Natural Chemsitry	2.5 lb 25 lb 50 lb	20-400	Health - 3 Flammability - 0 Reactivity - 1	Bromochloro-5,5-dimethylhydantoin 98%	32718-18-6	S1 Warehouse	OX2	CORR				200
Pool Breeze Pool Care System Granular 68	Solenis	1 lb 5 lb 25 lb 50 lb 100 lb	30-3000	Health - 3 Flammability - 1 Reactivity - 1	Calcium Hypochlorite 60-70% Calcium Chloride 1.5-5% Calcium Hydroxide 1.5-5% Calcium Carbonate 1.5-5%	7778-54-3 10043-52-4 1305-62-0 471-34-1	S1 Warehouse	0X2	CORR				2,568
Pool Breeze Algicide	Arch Chemicals	1 gal 5 gal	160-800	Health - 3 Flammability - 0 Reactivity - 2	Quaternary Ammonium Compounds, Benzyl-C12-18- Alky - 49.80% Isopropyl Alcohol - 10.00% Water - 40.00	68391-01-5 67-63-0 7732-18-5	S1 Warehouse	CL2	CORR		120		
Champion Muriatic Acid	CPDI	1 gal 2.5 gal	80-200	Health - 3 Flammability - 0 Reactivity - 2	Hydrochloric Acid 30-40%	7647-01-0	S1 Warehouse	n/a	CORR		144		

	HAZMAT Sun	nmary Interior	Storage (S1)
HAZMAT Type	Maximum Quanti	ty in Storage	Maximum Allowable Quantity (MAQ)
CL2	120.00	gal	240gal*
Corr (Solid)	2888.00	lb	19500lbs**
Corr (Liquid)	264.00	gal	1950gal**
OX1	984.00	lb	Unlimited**
OX2	2768.00	lb	4500lbs**
Combustible Liquid	120.00	gal	240gal*

\* Per Table 5003.1.1(1) in the 2018 IFC \*\* Per Table 5003.11.1 in the 2018 IFC



May 5, 2025

### WHITE OAK ESTATES, SECOND PLAT

Project #:	RZ25-03 and PT25-03F	Location:	NEC of 79 <sup>th</sup> Street and Cottonwood Street	
Applicant:	Matt Cox, Allenbrand-Drews	Project Type:	Rezoning and Final Plat	
Staff Planner:	James Molloy	Proposed Use:	Single-family	



#### **PROJECT SUMMARY**

The applicant requests approval to rezone the property, Parcel IF241221-4011, from the R-1, Residential Single-Family District, to the RP-1, Planned Residential (Low-Density) District, as well as Final Plat approval to modify to platted lots and to combine Parcels IF241221-4011 and IP8460001-0035 to create one new single-family lot (Lot 40) as part of White Oak Estates, Second Plat.

The applicant intends to construct a one-story, 4,100 square-foot single-family residence on the newly created lot. A public hearing is required for the rezoning request.

#### STAFF RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS ON THE PLAT


# SITE INFORMATION

The site is located near the northeast corner of 79<sup>th</sup> Street and Cottonwood Street in the White Oak Estates Subdivision. The site currently consists of two undeveloped "remnant" parcels, one unplatted, and one containing portions of Lots 35 and 36 of White Oak Estates.

<b>LAND AREA (AC)</b>	BUILDING AREA (SF)	CURRENT ZONING	<b>COMP. PLAN</b>
1.86	4,100	R-1 / RP-1	Suburban Residential
			W/BTU LER

Exhibit 1: Aerial Image of Subject Site.



Exhibit 2 and 3: Site photo, taken by Staff and Google Street View of the subject site.

BEBREFR,



# LAND USE REVIEW

The proposed rezoning and final plat request will allow the property to be replatted as one lot with the same zoning to accommodate the construction of a single-family residence on the site with access from Cottonwood Street, a local street. The platted portion of the site was originally rezoned and platted as part of White Oak Estates in 1977 as Lots 35 and 36, while the unplatted portion of the property is a "remnant" parcel that was an access easement to the rear portions of proposed Lots 35A/36A, created in 1986. This unplatted parcel provides access to the proposed single-family residence, as per Section 4-1-C-6-C, "direct access to collector streets from single-family lots is discouraged", and W. 79<sup>th</sup> Street is a designated collector street.



#### TABLE 1: COMPARISON OF SURROUNDING PROPERTIES

Vicinity	Land Use Designation	Zoning	Current Use
Subject Property	Suburban Residential R-1 / RP-1		Vacant Property
North	Suburban Residential	RP-1	Single Family Residence
South	Institutional	R-1	School
East	Suburban Residential	RP-1	Single Family Residence
West	Institutional	R-1	Church



### **REZONING REVIEW**



The applicant requests rezoning for a 0.22-acre parcel off Cottonwood Street from the R-1, Residential Single-Family District, to the RP-1, Planned Residential (Low-Density) District. Since the applicant proposes to utilize this parcel for access and construct a single-family home on the adjacent RP-1 parcel to the east (see Exhibit 3), rezoning is required to avoid having a lot with split zoning. R-1 and RP-1 are essentially identical zoning districts, except that the RP-1 requires a preliminary plan be accompanied with it and allows for deviation requests to be made. Staff provides the following analysis for the review criteria within <u>Section 4-1-G-5</u> of the UDC.

#### 1. The character of the neighborhood.

The neighborhood consists primarily of single-family subdivisions, as well as a church, elementary school, a park, and the City of Lenexa's Municipal Services service center. This rezoning is compatible with the character of the neighborhood.

#### 2. The zoning and use of properties nearby.

The subject property is located adjacent to and within the White Oak Estates subdivision. Adjacent properties are zoned either R-1 or RP-1, consisting of primarily single-family residences, with an elementary school and church located directly south and west, respectively. The surrounding land use and zoning designations are listed in Table 1 of this report.

#### 3. The suitability of the subject property for the uses to which it has been restricted.

The property as it exists is not suitable for any development, due to its relatively small size. By rezoning the property to RP-1, this property can be platted and combined with the adjacent parcel and will serve as the access point for a single-family residence.

#### 4. The extent to which the proposed use will detrimentally affect nearby property.



The proposed use is not expected to detrimentally affect nearby property. The requested change of zoning will allow two properties, which are currently undevelopable, to be developed with a single-family residence. It is Staff's opinion that the proposed use matches the character of the surrounding properties.

#### 5. The length of time the subject property has remained vacant as zoned.

The subject property has been undeveloped and used as an access easement since its creation in 1986.

6. The relative gain to public health, safety, and welfare due to the denial of the application as compared to the hardship imposed upon the landowner, if any, as a result of denial of the application.

It is Staff's opinion that denial of this rezoning would have no gain to public health, safety, or welfare.

#### 7. Recommendation of City's permanent professional staff.

See Staff's recommendation at the end of this report.

# 8. Conformance of the requested change to the adopted or recognized Master Plan being utilized by the City.

The Future Land Use (FLU) Map of the Comprehensive Plan designates the site as Suburban-Density Residential, which allows for single-family residences which resemble the character and form of a traditional single-family neighborhood. The RP-1 Zoning District is intended to accommodate low-density, single-family residential development in areas where adequate public facilities and services are available. It is Staff's opinion that the Suburban-Density Residential FLU category is well suited for the RP-1 zoning designation.

# 9. The availability and adequacy of required utilities and services to serve the proposed use. These utilities and services include, but are not limited to, sanitary and storm sewers, water and electrical service, police and fire protection, schools, parks and recreation facilities, etc.

The site is in a developed area of the City. Adequate utilities and services are provided to the subject property.

# 10. The extent to which the proposed use would adversely affect the capacity or safety of that portion of the street network influenced by the use, or present parking problems in the vicinity of the property.

It is Staff's opinion that the proposed use will not adversely impact the capacity or safety of the street network or present a parking problem within the vicinity of the property. The subject property is proposed to be platted into the adjacent parcel and will serve as the primary access into the property. This is necessary, as W. 79<sup>th</sup> Street is a collector street, which discourages additional curb cuts and access points, particularly for low-density residential.

Cottonwood Street does have peak periods of traffic backup (school or soccer, for example) and this may become an inconvenience for the eventual resident of the new single-family residence, but the new residence will generate approximately 10 additional vehicle trips per day to the street system.

The site will provide adequate parking as shown in Table 3.



TABLE 3: PARKING CALCULATIONS			
Use	Standard	Required	Provided
Single-Family Residence	2 spaces per dwelling unit	2 spaces	3 spaces
TOTAL		2	3

# 11. The environmental impacts the proposed use will generate including, but not limited to, excessive stormwater runoff, water pollution, air pollution, noise pollution, excessive nighttime lighting, or other environmental harm.

The site is currently an undeveloped lot, within a built-out, suburban residential neighborhood. Development of a residence on this parcel will inherently create an increase in run-off, as there will be impervious surface added to the lot. It is not expected that this increase in run-off will be excessive or create any additional issues with water, air, or noise pollution, or any other environmental harm.

# 12. The extent to which the proposed development would adversely affect the capacity or water quality of the stormwater system, including without limitation, natural stream assets in the vicinity of the subject property.

It is Staff's opinion that the development of a single-family residence will have a limited impact on the stormwater system.

# 13. The ability of the applicant to satisfy any requirements (e.g. site plan, etc.) applicable to the specific use imposed pursuant to the zoning regulations in this Chapter and other applicable ordinances.

The proposal to combine the subject property and adjacent property and construct a single-family residence can satisfy all zoning requirements, including requirements within the RP-1 Zoning District and subdivision standards set by Section 4-2 of the Unified Development Code.



Exhibit 4: Proposed Site Plan.



# FINAL PLAT REVIEW

The applicant proposes a final plat creating three lots on 1.86 acres and entails replatting portions of Lots 35 and 36 of the White Oak Estates subdivision, which were originally platted in 1977, and platting an unplatted parcel, which was split in 1986.



Exhibit 5: Proposed Plat Map

This replat will not dedicate any additional street right-of-way, tracts, or utility easements. All existing easements dedicated to White Oak Estates will remain as dedicated. Utility service is provided to the subject property and will not require additional utilities to be constructed, aside from those necessary to connect the subject property into existing service.

The final plat complies with the subdivision requirements of <u>Section 4-2</u> of the UDC with the exception of a requested deviation for lot width This deviation is discussed in detail within the Deviations section of this report.

### DEVIATIONS

The applicant requests a 30-foot deviation from <u>Section 4-1-B-5-F</u> of the UDC related to the minimum required lot width of 70 feet. The applicant is requesting a lot width of 40 feet for the portion of the lot adjacent to Cottonwood Street. The lot currently exists at this nonconforming width of 40 feet. The City Planning Commission has the authority to approve deviations provided the criteria from <u>Section 4-1-B-27-G-4</u> of the UDC are met.

TABLE 4: REQUESTED DEVIATION				
Lot Proposed Lot Width Required Lot Width Difference				
Lot 40	40 feet	70 feet	-30 feet	

The following table details the lot width deviation request.



<u>Section 4-1-B-27-G-4-c</u> of the UDC states that lot width deviations may be granted for up to 50% of the required minimum required lot width of the zoning designation. The required minimum lot width is 70 feet, which calculates to a maximum deviation of 35 feet. The proposed lot width is 40 feet, which requires a deviation of 30 feet.

The deviation request is necessitated by the requirement for access from Cottonwood Street. While the property primarily fronts W. 79<sup>th</sup> Street, the property may not receive access from that street, as it is a collector street and is prohibited from singular residential access. As the property is accessed from Cottonwood Street, the Cottonwood Street frontage would be considered the front yard, while W. 79<sup>th</sup> Street would be considered a side yard. The applicant has also designed the layout of the residence to face Cottonwood Street, as opposed to W. 79<sup>th</sup> Street. While short width of the lot would not be supported in most other scenarios, considering the limited site access, Staff is supportive of the lot width deviation to allow the lot width of 40 feet, which will allow the proposed lot to be developed and gain access off Cottonwood Street.



Exhibit 6: Yard Designations

# NEXT STEPS

- The Planning Commission is the final authority for the final plat pending rezoning approval. The rezoning request requires a recommendation from the Planning Commission and final approval by the City Council. Pending a recommendation from the Planning Commission, the project is tentatively scheduled for consideration from the City Council on May 20, 2025.
- Prior to submitting the final plat, the applicant must make requested revisions to the plat document.
- A landscape plan, including a code-compliant fence detail and plant schedule, shall be provided to and approved by City staff, prior to the plat being recorded.
- The final plat must be recorded with Johnson County prior to permit(s) being released.
- The applicant must receive permit(s) prior to commencing construction.
- The applicant should inquire about additional City requirements and development fees.



## **RECOMMENDATION FROM PROFESSIONAL STAFF**

#### **★** Conduct a Public Hearing.

- ★ Staff recommends approval of the proposed rezoning and final plat for White Oak Estates, Second Plat.
  - The project is consistent with Lenexa's goals through *Responsible Economic Development* and to create *Vibrant Neighborhoods*.

#### REZONING

Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of rezoning property from R-1 to RP-1 for RZ25-03 near the northeast corner of W. 79<sup>th</sup> Street & Cottonwood Street.

#### FINAL PLAT

Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of the final plat for PT25-03F – **White Oak Estates, Second Plat,** near the northeast corner of 79<sup>th</sup> Street & Cottonwood Street, to accommodate the construction of one single-family residence with the following condition:

1. A landscape plan, including a code-compliant fence detail and plant schedule, shall be provided to and approved by City Staff, prior to the plat being recorded.



Data Source: City of Lenexa and Johnson County Kansas For further information, please call 913-477-7500

White Oak Estates Second Plat Rezoning and Final Plat













### PLANNING COMMISSION STAFF REPORT

May 5, 2025

# **RETAIL LENEXA OLD TOWN**

Project #:	PL25-07P	Location:	9213 Pflumm Road
Applicant:	Tom Nolte, Nolte Architecture	Project Type:	Preliminary Plan
Staff Planner:	Jessica Lemanski	Proposed Use:	Retail and other uses
Color Nies Sci	75th St. () y unit of the state of the stat	SAMANA DE LE MORT	Site St reading to the st read

# **PROJECT SUMMARY**

The applicant requests approval of a preliminary plan for a new, 5,200 square-foot building in the HBD, Planned Historic Business District, located at 9213 Pflumm Road to accommodate retail and other uses allowed in the district. The site is currently undeveloped, but three structures (a house, garage, and shed) existed on the property until they were demolished in 2018. The building is proposed to be situated at the midblock of Pflumm Road between W. 92<sup>nd</sup> Street and Santa Fe Trail Drive. The HBD District, which covers the City's historic commercial core, aims to preserve the historical significance and unique qualities of the area while encouraging economic vitality and compatible development.

#### STAFF RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL



# SITE INFORMATION

The site is at the midblock of Pflumm Road between W. 92<sup>nd</sup> Street and Santa Fe Trail Drive. The site is currently an empty grassed lot with a sidewalk featuring historic brick pavers along Pflumm Road. The property fronts the northwest section of the public alley that provides access to the City-owned parking lot from Pflumm Road, as well as to the back entrances of the retail and restaurant buildings that front along Santa Fe Trail Drive.

LAND AREA (AC) 0.25	BUILDING AREA (SF) 5,200	CURRENT ZONING HBD	COMP. PLAN Mixed Use
0.25		HBD	Wixed Use
	// // / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / /	1 14 / 1	

Exhibit 1: Aerial image of subject site.



# LAND USE REVIEW

The subject property is situated on Lot 14 and 15, Block 4 of the Lenexa City Plat, recorded in 1869. The site is zoned HBD, Planned Historic Business District. The property is situated behind several retail and restaurant businesses that front Santa Fe Trail Drive within Historic Old Town Lenexa. A City-owned parking lot sits east of the site and is accessed by the public alley from either W. 92<sup>nd</sup> Street or Pflumm Road.

The applicant is proposing a multi-tenant retail and mixed-use building. The middle tenant space is proposed to be a custom tailor shop, with no other tenants currently proposed by the applicant. Retail is a permitted use within the HBD District.



TABLE 1: COMPARISON OF SURROUNDING PROPERTIES			
Vicinity	Land Use Designation	Zoning	Current Use
Subject Property	Mixed Use	Historic Business District	Undeveloped
North	Mixed Use	Historic Business District	Banking Services
South	Mixed Use	Historic Business District	Restaurant, General
East	Mixed Use	Historic Business District	Church or Place of Worship
West	Mixed Use	Historic Business District	Public Parking



## PRELIMINARY PLAN REVIEW

The 0.25-acre site is located at the midblock of Pflumm Road between W. 92<sup>nd</sup> Street and Santa Fe Trail Drive. The site is currently undeveloped and sits adjacent to a City-owned parking lot, a bank, a public alleyway that provides access to the parking lot, and the rear of the retail buildings that front along Santa Fe Trail Drive. The rear of the Holy Trinity Early Education Center is across Pflumm Road.

The preliminary plan proposes a one-story, three-tenant-space building fronting Pflumm Road, with associated parallel parking spots on the south side of the building along the public alley, and sidewalks along the east and south sides of the building.

The north side of the site is planned to be landscaped. An insulated overhead docking door is situated on the east side of the building to accommodate deliveries and shipments for tenants. The dumpster enclosure is also placed on the east side of the building next to the overhead door and adjacent to the public alleyway.



Exhibit 2: Site Plan.

The building occupies the majority of the site, while still complying with required setbacks under the HBD standards. The brick sidewalk along Pflumm Road will remain and concrete will be added to expand the pedestrian walkway leading up to the main entrance of the building. A concrete sidewalk will also be added to the south side of the building with bulb outs on the corners where the public alley intersects with Pflumm Road and the driveway along the east side of the building.



#### DIMENSIONAL STANDARDS

TABLE 2: DIMENSIONAL STANDARDS				
Feature Requirement Proposed				
Minimum District Size	n/a	10,730 SF (0.25 ac)		
Maximum District Size	n/a			
Minimum Setback from Streets	10'	East (Pflumm Road): 10'		
Minimum Setbacks, Other	10'	North: 10' South: 22.35' West: 11.1'		
Maximum Height	45'	19'4" (top of parapet)		
Minimum Open Space	n/a	2,578 SF (24%)		

The front façade of the building is set back at least 22 feet from Pflumm Road, and 10 feet from the property line on the north and east sides of the lot, which is in compliance with the setbacks for the Historic Business District. The south side of the building is proposed to be constructed at least 22 feet from the opposite curb of the public alley drive aisle. A 16-foot public-access easement exists within the drive aisle to allow the movement of vehicles through the alley. The curb along the south side of the building bulbs out on either side of the property line and allows for 3 parallel parking spaces along the alley, including one accessible space.

The parking spaces for the neighboring property to the north currently encroach into the northern area of the subject property. The applicant intends to replat the property to adjust the lot line and eliminate the encroachment. The subject property is currently platted as Lot 14 and 15, Block 4 of the Lenexa City Plat. The plat was recorded in 1869. The applicant submitted a final plat for the property, which is currently scheduled for consideration at the June 2, 2025 Planning Commission meeting, to remove the lot line between Lots 14 and 15 and create one lot so that the building does not cross the platted lot line. Additionally, the lot line on the north side of the property, between Lot 15 and Lot 16, will be adjusted to eliminate the encroachment of the neighboring property's parking spaces onto the subject property. There is a 5' permanent drainage easement on the east corner of the southern lot line and a permanent parking, access, and utility easement along the southern lot line. The final plat will need to comply with UDC Section 4-2 and must be approved prior to or with Final Plan approval. The development will still need to comply with setbacks pursuant to the adjusted north lot line or a deviation will need to be sought at the time of final plan consideration.

#### **PUBLIC IMPROVEMENTS**

The sidewalk along Pflumm Road is planned to be widened to allow for a pedestrian oriented configuration. Additionally, the driveway entrance and concrete curb and gutter that currently exist along Pflumm Road that provided access for the former house are planned to be removed and the sidewalk will be replaced with brick pavers to match the adjacent sidewalks. All utilities serving structures immediately surrounding the demolition boundary shall remain in service throughout the project. Although the public alley will be widened as it enters from Pflumm Road, no new streets are proposed with the construction of the building.



#### ACCESS TRAFFIC, AND PARKING

Per UDC Section 4-1-D-C, a retail use would normally be required to provide 1 space per 250 square feet; however, per UDC Section 4-1-D-E, development within the HBD District is exempt from strict compliance with the parking space requirements listed in Section 4-1-D-C. In lieu of strict compliance with the parking requirements, the site was analyzed by Staff and, based on the limited use of the building and public parking provided adjacent to the site, Staff determined that the development is able to be parked by the City public parking lot and the three spaces on the south side of the property.

The changes to the site include the addition of 3 parallel parking spaces along the public alley that provides access to the City-owned public parking lot. These spaces will provide convenient access to the building for users. The City-owned parking lot provides approximately 50 parking spaces, with an additional 86 regular spaces and 4 handicapped accessible spaces at the front of the buildings along Santa Fe Trail Drive.

	TABLE 3: PARKING ANALYSIS				
Use	Requirement	Required	Provided		
Retail	1 space per 250 square feet (HBD exempt from strict compliance)	To be determined by Staff	3 plus public spaces in City lot		
	TOTAL		3 plus public spaces in City lot		

#### STORMWATER

Stormwater management will be handled on-site, with underground treatment and detention being provided along the north property line in a 48-inch HDPE pipe.

#### FIRE PREVENTION

The Fire Department reviewed the plans based on the current adopted fire codes and local amendments. All general planning review comments have been acknowledged or satisfied and there are no outstanding Fire Department planning review items that need to be addressed for this project to move forward. A more detailed fire code review will be conducted based on the adopted codes at the time of the building permit documentation submittal.

#### LIGHTING

Details regarding site lighting are not required with a preliminary plan. It is expected for the building to include light fixtures and potentially some pedestrian scale lighting along the walkways. A photometric plan and details of exterior lighting will be provided with the final plan.



#### LANDSCAPING

The site will have new landscape materials planted. There are no existing trees or landscaping on the site. The new landscaping will be installed primarily on the north- and southeast corners of the building, with additional plantings on the southwest corner.

A detailed landscape plan that identifies the plant type and size will be provided with the final plan submittal.



Exhibit 3: Preliminary landscape plan.

#### ARCHITECTURE

The new building features a brick and wood front façade with four doors for tenant spaces and windows. The doorways will be painted wood with bronze colored metal awnings to emphasize the main entrance. The sides of the building carry the brick detailing throughout the bottom of the structure but primarily consist of stucco walls with a side entrance door and window on each side. Brick pillars along the sides of the building serve to break up the longer walls where there are less architectural features. An overhead insulated door, painted to match the wood on the front façade is located at the rear of the building on the east side. Roof-mounted mechanical equipment will be screened by the parapet of the building. The dumpster is proposed to be on the southeast side of the building to minimize any obstructions with the parking lot drive aisle adjacent to the east property line.



#### RETAIL LENEXA OLD TOWN – PL25-07P Planning Commission Staff Report May 5, 2025



Exhibit 4: West façade facing Pflumm Road.





Exhibit 5: East façade facing City-owned parking lot.



Exhibit 6: South side elevation.



Exhibit 7: North side elevation.



# **REVIEW PROCESS**

- This project requires a recommendation from the Planning Commission and final approval by the City Council. Pending a recommendation from the Planning Commission, the project is tentatively scheduled for consideration by the City Council on May 20, 2025.
- The applicant must submit a final plan and a final plat application prior to applying for permit(s).
- The plat must be recorded with Johnson County prior to permit(s) being released.
- The applicant must receive permit(s) prior to commencing construction.
- The applicant must obtain a Certificate of Occupancy before opening for business.
- The applicant must obtain a Business License prior to opening for business.
- The applicant should inquire about additional City requirements, such as permits and development fees.

# **RECOMMENDATION FROM PROFESSIONAL STAFF**

#### ★ Staff recommends approval of the proposed Preliminary Plan for Retail Lenexa Old Town.

- The preliminary plan will allow the development of a mixed-use building in the Historic Business District.
- The project is consistent with Lenexa's goals through *Strategic Community Investment and Superior Quality Services* to create *Healthy People and Vibrant Neighborhoods*.

#### PRELIMINARY PLAN

Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of the preliminary plan for PL25-07P – **Retail Lenexa Old Town** located at 9213 Pflumm Road for a mixed-use development.



Data Source: City of Lenexa and Johnson County Kansas For further information, please call 913-477-7500

# Retail Old Town Lenexa Preliminary Plan































May 5, 2025

# LENEXA CITY CENTER NORTH VILLAGE TOWNHOMES

Project #:	PL25-01PR	Location:	NEC of Winchester Street and Penrose Lane
Applicant:	Tim Breece, Lenexa City Center Holdings, LLC	Project Type:	Revised Preliminary Plan
Staff Planner:	Dave Dalecky	Proposed Use:	Multifamily



### **PROJECT SUMMARY**

The applicant requests approval of a revised preliminary plan for a multifamily development in City Center. The development includes 61 townhomes distributed among ten buildings. The site is located at the northeast corner of Winchester Street and Penrose Lane in City Center.

### STAFF RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL



## SITE INFORMATION

The site is at the northeast corner of Winchester Street and Penrose Lane in City Center. The proposed development includes 61 townhomes distributed among ten buildings. Preliminary and final plans for townhomes were previously approved for this site (PL06-20P, PL06-34F, PL15-34FR, and PL20-08P). A special use permit and final plan were approved for this site in 2017 (SU17-04 and PL17-01FR) for a development consisting of 31 single-family homes. Per <u>Section 4-1-B-28-D</u> of the Unified Development Code (UDC), a special use permit is required for single-family development in City Center.

This site is currently platted in two lots and one tract as part of Lenexa City Center – North Village First Plat (PT06-19F). The proposed plan accounts for the lot boundaries and easements on the recorded plat.



Exhibit 1: Aerial image of subject site.


# LAND USE REVIEW

The site is zoned CC, Planned City Center District. The site is at the northeast corner of Winchester Street and Penrose Lane, in the region of City Center known as North Village. This area of the North Village has been approved for a townhome development from the earliest approved plans for the region. Per <u>Section 4-1-B-28-C</u> of the UDC, multifamily is an allowed use in the CC Zoning District.



## TABLE 1: COMPARISON OF SURROUNDING PROPERTIES

Vicinity	Land Use Designation	Zoning	Current Use
Subject Property	City Center	CC, Planned City Center District	Undeveloped land
North	Cite Center	CC, Planned City Center District	City park and Single- family residential
South	City Center	CC, Planned City Center District	Mixed-Use
East	City Center	CC, Planned City Center District	City park
West	City Center	CC, Planned City Center District	Multifamily residential



## PRELIMINARY PLAN REVIEW

The 4.42-acre site is "L" shaped and located at the northeast corner of Winchester Street and Penrose Lane. The development contains 61 townhomes among ten buildings yielding 13.8 dwelling units per acre. The buildings range from three to nine-unit buildings. The front facades of the townhomes will face out to the adjacent streets and to the City-owned park spaces of the Central Green. The grade of the site is sloped, descending from the streetside to Central Green Park. The buildings are two-three-story split elevation buildings; two stories on the up-slope side and three stories on the down slope side. The buildings are two stories facing the street and three stories facing out to Central Green Park. The buildings that face the street are called Cityside and the buildings that face Central Green Park are called Parkside.

An internal drive will provide access to the garages. Each townhome will have a two-stall garage. On-street parking is provided on Winchester Street and Penrose Lane around the site. Each unit has a two-stall garage and driveway space where two vehicles can be parked. Three surface-grade parking spaces are provided along the internal drive.

A tract of land is incorporated with this development across the public street. This space contains an amenity feature for the development that includes a pool, a clubhouse with an exercise room and restrooms, and a dog park. This tract has been shown as a part of the townhome development in each of the previously approved plans. The amenity tract has sidewalk access from all sides. This tract has parallel parking along the two long sides of the tract.



Exhibit 2: Site Plan.



The units will each have entrances directly out to the street or to Central Green Park. A door to each unit will also be provided along the internal drive for direct access to the driveway. The individual building entrances and the interconnections of sidewalks throughout the development are an important element for the project to encourage pedestrian circulation around City Center.

### DIMENSIONAL STANDARDS

City Center is a unique region where projects are designed to create an urban environment where buildings are placed close to the street. Per <u>Section 4-1-B-28-F-3</u> of the UDC, the setback range for residential streets is 5 to 20 feet. The Cityside townhome buildings are setback 6 feet from the adjacent street right-of-way along the front side of the buildings. The side yard setbacks range from 6 to 15 feet from the right-of-way. The buildings will have front entry stoops to the front door. The stoops range from 2 to 7 feet tall, or 4 to 13 steps. The stoops may encroach into the setback, provided the design defines the public and private spaces of the development.

The amenity feature, which is within a tract between Penrose Lane and Winchester Street, has a reduced setback for the cabana building along the south side. The setback is reduced to 1 foot. Staff does not object to this setback because the structure will be several feet from through lanes of Winchester Street. The street right-of-way includes parallel parking, a sidewalk, and space for landscaping between the features of the amenity tract. site. A deviation is not required for an encroachment into the setback for City Center, provided the encroachments are approved as part of a development plan or development agreement. This encroachment is the same that was approved with the previous preliminary plan in 2020.



Exhibit 3: Cabana setback reduction.

The building height range for residential development in City Center is 20 to 100 feet. The buildings are twothree-level structures that range in height from 20 to 37.5 feet in height.



#### PUBLIC IMPROVEMENTS

New sidewalks will be constructed along the public streets adjacent to the Cityside buildings and along the amenity feature tract. The existing sidewalks are not along the curb where parallel parking is provided. The new sidewalks will allow entering and exiting a parked vehicle without stepping through landscaping or on mulched ground. The design of the sidewalks will be reviewed in greater detail with the final plan. A decorative scoring pattern that emulates the modular pavement of the Pedestrian Amenity Zones may be provided for the new sections of sidewalks. Two access drives exist, one on Cardinal Street and one on Elmridge Street, but are only curbed. The construction of the two drive entrances must be completed to City standards with this project. No additional public improvements are provided with this development.

#### ACCESS, TRAFFIC, AND PARKING

The site has one private drive between the Cityside and Parkside rows of buildings. This drive provides access to the driveway and garage of each unit. This access drive is generally 20 feet wide with two sections that widen out to 27 feet, which allows larger vehicles, such as trash and delivery trucks, to pass each other.

Sidewalks are provided along the public streets and a paved trail is in Central Green Park along the easterly side of the site. A sidewalk is proposed on-site from Penrose Lane, between buildings, then to Central Green Park. New sidewalks will be installed along the public streets with parallel parking. The existing sidewalks have a strip of landscaping between the curb and the sidewalk which does not provide a space for a person to enter or exit a vehicle that is parked. New sidewalks will be constructed adjacent to the curb of the public street.

The site plan provides 247 parking spaces. A two-space garage is provided for each unit, and two spaces are provided in the driveway of each unit. Three spaces are provided in a parking area along the access drive. Parallel parking is provided along the public street. These spaces are not designated for a specific use and are available for any resident or visitor to City Center. 31 parallel parking spaces are provided along the streets adjacent to the Cityside buildings. <u>Section 4-1-D-1</u> of the UDC requires 122 parking spaces per the ratio requirements for multifamily uses. The requirement for additional visitor parking is not applicable to this development because parking spaces are not located in a common area.

TABLE 2: PARKING ANALYSIS			
Use	Requirement	Required	Provided
Multifamily	1 space per efficiency unit, 1.5 spaces per 1-bedroom unit, 1.75 spaces per 2-bedroom unit, 2 spaces per 3+- bedroom units and 0.25 spaces per unit for visitor parking if parking spaces are located in common parking area	122	247

#### STORMWATER

Stormwater for City Center North was designed, approved, and constructed in 2007. Stormwater infrastructure to handle this project has already been constructed and the project will only need to tie into the system. This system includes the Central Green basins, which provide most of City Center with the necessary 1-year and 10-year detention that was required, as well as an existing hydrodynamic separator that is installed on the storm line running through this project (it is located within the center alley way of this project).



#### FIRE PREVENTION

The Fire Department has reviewed the documents based on the current adopted fire codes and local amendments. All general planning review comments have been acknowledged.

#### LIGHTING

New lighting will be installed along the access drive between the buildings. This will be the area lighting for the space between the buildings. The townhomes will also have building mounted light fixtures at the entrances and the deck spaces. Streetlights are installed along the public streets.

A photometric plan is provided with the preliminary plan. Lighting and photometric details are required with a final plan submittal. The lighting information will be reviewed in greater detail with a final plan.

#### LANDSCAPING

The preliminary plan shows landscaping throughout the site consistent with the UDC requirements. Trees and foundation landscaping are provided along the townhome buildings. Trees are installed between driveways on either side of the access drive. The landscaping will continue around the ends of the buildings. Foundation plantings are installed along the Parkside buildings that face Central Green Park. This side of the buildings have patio and raised decks which will not provide space for trees to mature. Trees, shrubs, and ornamental landscaping are installed in Central Green Park which enhance the landscaping adjacent to the site.



Exhibit 4: Landscape plan.



### ARCHITECTURE

The buildings use an eclectic design combining traditional and contemporary characteristics. The buildings will have offset façade planes with frequent material changes of smooth block, brick, lap siding and cementitious wall board. The buildings use varying window patterns, some being floor to ceiling windows and some using distinctive mullion patterns. The design of the entry doors of the Cityside units will vary among the units within the same buildings. An entry door may have a sidelight window or a clerestory window or may not have either. The Cityside buildings will have entry stoops to the front door of the townhomes. The stoops will use masonry columns and metal rails to create an old-world character for the townhome entrances. Raised patios are provided for the buildings, the Cityside buildings will have a cantilever patio facing the interior access drive and the Parkside buildings will have a post supported patio facing Central Green Park. The post supported patios use an angled metal frame support design to add an additional contemporary detail to the building design.



Exhibit 5: Cityside building elevation.



Exhibit 6: Parkside building elevation.

The entry doors of the Parkside units will have a more consistent appearance. The space for the entry doors is limited due to the garage doors being on the same level as the entrances. The townhome buildings will use different garage door designs to create variation among the units and buildings. The different style of the garage doors will create a more aesthetically pleasing view of the internal drive than if all the doors are the same.

The roof forms will vary among the buildings alternating between flat and pitched roof elements. The roof line will articulate between adjacent units, creating a dramatic street presence for the series of townhome buildings.

The buildings are well designed and include a reasonable level of detail for the preliminary plan. A more extensive review of the buildings will be done with a final plan submittal.



#### SIGNS

A monument sign is proposed with the development. The sign is located at the northwesterly part of the site. The sign is within a lawn area between the end of a building and Cardinal Street right-of-way. The sign is a contemporary styled sign that is a formed concrete monument with stone accents and cut letters installed on the sign face.

The Lenexa City Center Neighborhood Design Standards & Guidelines state that signs are to be oriented to pedestrians rather than passing vehicles. Monument signs are less common in City Center than wall signs. Monument signs are often vehicle oriented and can cause visibility concerns for compact development such as City Center. The proposed sign is in a location that will not obstruct drivers' sight distance at the southeast corner of the intersection of the private drive entrance and Cardinal Street. Other projects in City Center have monument signs that are well designed and coordinated with the surrounding site features. This sign is appropriately sized and is in an acceptable location. Additional landscaping will be required around the base of the sign. A separate sign permit is required for all signs.

## DEVIATIONS

The applicant is not requesting any deviations.

# **REVIEW PROCESS**

- This project requires a recommendation from the Planning Commission and final approval by the City Council. Pending a recommendation from the Planning Commission, the project is tentatively scheduled for consideration by the City Council on May 20, 2025.
- The applicant must gain approval of a final plan application prior to applying for permit(s).
- The applicant must receive permit(s) prior to commencing construction.
- The applicant must obtain a Certificate of Occupancy before opening for business.
- The applicant must obtain a Business License prior to opening for business.
- The applicant should inquire about additional City requirements, such as permits and development fees.

# **RECOMMENDATION FROM PROFESSIONAL STAFF**

- ★ Staff recommends approval of the proposed Revised Preliminary Plan for Lenexa City Center North Village Townhomes.
  - The revised preliminary plan will allow the development of a multifamily project in City Center.
  - The project is consistent with Lenexa's goals through *Responsible Economic Development* to create *Inviting Places*.

#### PRELIMINARY PLAN

Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of the revised preliminary plan for PL25-01PR – **Lenexa City Center North Village Townhomes** at the northeast corner of Winchester Street and Penrose Lane, for a multifamily development.



Lenexa City Center North Village Townhomes Revised Preliminary Plan





PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLANS LENEXA CITY CENTER -NORTH VILLAGE TOWNHOMES IN THE CITY OF LENEXA, JOHNSON COUNTY, KANSAS



PREPARED & SUBMITTED BY: PHELPS ENGINEERING, INC. 1270 N. WINCHESTER OLATHE, KS 66061 913–393–1155 OFFICE 913–393–1166 FAX CONTACT: JUDD CLAUSSEN, P.E.

- 11 4

TOWNHOMES

R SHEET NORTH VILLAGE T KA, KANSAS ELOPMENT PLANS

CENTER

CITY

LENEXA

FINAL

NOSS OF

SHEET C000

COVER LENEXA, DEVEL

OWNER/DEVELOPER: UNINER/DEVELOPER: LENEXA CENTER HOLDINGS, LLC 17 RESEARCH PARK DRIVE, SUITE 100 ST. CHARLES, MO 636-439-2800 CONTACT: TIM BREECE



I CERTIFY TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE & ABILITY THAT ALL LAND DISTURBANCE ACTIVITY, CONSTRUCTION & DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATED WITH THIS PROJECT WILL BE DONE PURSUANT TO THIS PLAN.



Know what's below. Call before you dig.

# SET <sup>\*</sup>C<sup>\*</sup> QUT IN NORTHEAST CORNER OF CONCRETE LIGHT POLE BASE SOUTH SIDE OF PENROSE LANE WEST OF THE PARKING LOT ENTRANCE. ELEVATION = 982.67

FOUND "-I" CUIT ON SOUTH SIDE CARDINAL STREET AT PARKING CORNER WEST OF PARKING LOT ENTRANCE FROM ORIGINAL LEVEL LOOP MAY 19, 2008 ELEVATION = 588.64

VERTICAL DATUM = NAVD88 BASED JOHNSON COUNTY PUBLIC WORKS BENCHMARK #440 (NOW DESTROYED) PEI ORIGINAL LEVEL LOOP RUN ON MAY 19, 2008

LEGAL DESCRIPTION: LOTS 4 AND 5 AND TRACT D, LENEXA CITY CENTER - NORTH VILLAGE, FIRST PLAT, A SUBDIVISION IN THE CITY OF LENEXA, JOHNSON CONTINY, KANASA.

ZONE X, DEFINED AS AREAS DETERMINED TO BE OUTSIDE THE 0.2% ANNUAL CHANCE FLOODPLAIN, AS IRANCE RATE MAP PREPARED BY THE FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY FOR THE CITY OF DIREA JUNISMON COUNTY KANASS MAP NO 2000/CONSE AND DATED MURIST 3. 2009

NET AREA = ±3.4202 ACRES

FLOOD NOTE:

INS PROPERTY LIES WITHIN SHOWN ON THE FLOOD INSU LENEXA, COMMUNITY IN BENCHMARKS: OWNER/DEVELOPER/OPERATOR/CONTRACTOR

DATE

400

SCALE: "=200"





















All wall mounted equipment will be painted a blending or coordinating color will wall finish



LENEXA,

KANSAS

3-27-2025 25-3090



ΡΫ́R

All wall mounted equipment will be painted a blending or coordinating color will wall finish











painted a blending or coordinating color will wall finish





LENEXA CITY CENTER \_ NORTH VILLAGE TOWNHOMES New Townhomes Complex Kansas

onesGillamRenz



Q

()



٨



# LENEXA NORTH VILLAGE TOWNHOMES

WOOD ACCENT

METAL KYNAR - EXTRA DARK BRONZE



SIDING COLOR 1

KYNAR - EXTRA DARK BRONZE WINDOWS, AWNINGS, RAILINGS, ROOF FASCIA



**BRICK BLEND - FACEBRICK** 



SPLIT FACE STONE

HONED - SMOOTH CUT

SAMPLE EXTERIOR FINISHES





LENEXA CITY CENTER \_ NORTH VILLAGE TOWNHOMES

LENEXA,

EVISION:

ДАТЕ: 3-27-2025 ООВ: 25-3090 SHEET NO.: АСС2.2

Рал Preliminary









May 5, 2025

# ST. JAMES ACADEMY STADIUM SOUND SYSTEM

Project #:	DV25-02	Location:	24505 Prairie Star Parkway
Applicant:	Dan Foster, Schlagel Associates	Project Type:	Deviation
Staff Planner:	James Molloy	Proposed Use:	High School Stadium PA System



# **PROJECT SUMMARY**

The applicant requests approval of a deviation to allow for St. James Academy (SJA) to exceed the noise level permitted by the Unified Development Code (UDC). St. James Academy is a private high school, located at the southeast corner of Prairie Star Parkway and Clare Road, and includes an outdoor athletic stadium. The school hosts sporting events, school assemblies and other events customarily associated with high schools, such as band practices and graduations, at the stadium. A deviation from the noise regulations will allow St. James Academy to utilize their property and public address system for events without having to secure a special event permit for each event.

### STAFF RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL WITH A CONDITION



## SITE INFORMATION

The overall site for the high school is approximately 42 acres, with the stadium occupying approximately 13 acres of the site. The school was originally constructed in 2004, with various additions to the site made since then, including more recently the addition of the stadium and additional parking. The field has existed since 2020 and the sound system was added in 2022 and has occasionally exceeded the decibel levels of the code via the special event permit process, a process that can be restrictive and burdensome for a high school to manage. The deviation request relates primarily to the public address system located at the stadium as noted in Exhibit 1 below, but includes other noise-producing activities such as the playing of band instruments, crowd noise and noises typically associated with a high school.

LAND AREA (AC)	BUILDING AREA (SF)	CURRENT ZONING	COMP. PLAN
13.3 Acres	N/A	R-1	Institutional

Exhibit 1: Aerial image of subject site.



# LAND USE REVIEW

The site is zoned R-1, Residential Single-Family District, and is classified as institutional by the Comprehensive Plan's Future Land Use Map. The subject property is surrounded on three sides by various residential uses, with future commercial development envisioned to the north.



TABLE 1: COMPARISON OF SURROUNDING PROPERTIES			
Vicinity	Land Use Designation	Zoning	Current Use
Subject Property	Institutional	R-1 Residential Single-Family	High School (St. James Academy)
North	Neighborhood Retail	CP-1 Planned Neighborhood Commercial District	Vacant Property
South	Suburban Residential	RP-1 Planned Residential Single- Family District	Single-Family Subdivision
East	Medium-Density Residential	RP-2 Planned Intermediate- Density District	Single-Family Subdivision
West	Medium-Density Residential	RP-2 Planned Intermediate- Density District	Vacant Property and Subdivision





Exhibit 2: Location of SJA Public Address Sound System (circled in red).

# DEVIATIONS

The requested deviation is for an exception to the Lenexa Noise Regulations as noted within Table 2. The deviation is allowed per Section 4-1-C-4-E-7-c, which provides an exemption for, "sound that a person is making or causing to be made when said person has received and maintains a valid license or permit that specifically allows the sound from any department, board, or commission of the City authorized to issue a license or permit." The Planning Commission recently granted a similar deviation to the KC Bier project (PL24-09FR) located near the southeast corner of Prairie Star Parkway and Ridgeview Road.

TABLE 2: NOISE DEVIATIONS			
Deviation	Allowed	Proposed	Maximum Difference
Noise (Section 4-1-C-4-E-2 of the UDC)	70 dB(A) (7 AM to 7 PM) 55 dB(A) (7 PM to 7 AM)	Up to 92 dB	22 dB (7 AM to 7 PM) 37 dB (7 PM to 7 AM)





Exhibit 3: Site Sound Map at Maximum Volume. SJA property outlined in red, residential outlined in yellow

Though the property is zoned R-1, Staff uses the criteria stated in <u>Section 4-1-B-27-G-4-f</u> for planned districts to analyze this deviation request. The five criteria to consider are:

# 1. That the deviation requested arises from a condition that is unique to the subject property, is not ordinarily found in the same zoning district and has not been created by the action of the landowner or applicant.

The subject property is a unique site compared to most institutional uses within a typical residential neighborhood in Lenexa, as it is the only high school within the City. St. James Academy is one of two schools (the other being Mill Creek Middle School) with a full athletic facility and is the only facility with a "complete" stadium facility setup, with hosted events such as sports games, as would be expected with a high school, either public or private. High schools have high levels of outdoor activities and St. James is not unique as a high school in having such activities. No high school could operate under the City's noise regulations without some relief afforded to it. Up until now the school has processed special event permits to exceed the maximum noise levels for school-related events, which has proven restrictive and difficult to navigate as events are required to be determined too far in advance for the permit approval.

Staff clarifies, through a proposed condition of approval, that this deviation should only be granted for typical school-related activities. Should a use, such as a school carnival or concert, be proposed by the school, then a special event permit will need to be processed and the noise analyzed with such a request.

# 2. That the granting of the deviation will not adversely affect the rights of adjacent landowners or residents.


The deviation request has the potential to affect the adjacent residences, particularly those to the south of the stadium, which are roughly 225 feet away from the public address system. According to the sound study submitted by the applicant, residences to the south may experience sound at a volume of between 51-66 dB at low volume and 66-84 dB at the maximum volume. Residences to the west are 770 feet away from the sound system. Per the sound study, it is estimated that those residences may experience noise anywhere between 60-69 dB at low volume and 69-78 dB at maximum volume.

It is expected that this public address system would only be used for sporting events and large events, such as graduation, which are not a daily or year-round occurrence. Additionally, the system will not be used at its maximum volume and will be mostly used at low volume according to the applicant. This should reduce the impact on nearby residents. Physical buffers and distance, such as the stadium's grandstands and Clare Road itself, will help mitigate impacts of noise generated at the school for residents to the west.



Exhibit 4: Distance to Existing Residential Properties.

# 3. That the strict application of the requirements of this Chapter would constitute an unnecessary hardship upon the landowner represented in the application.

Strict application of the noise ordinance would limit the high school to emit no more than 70 dB(A) between 7 AM and 7 PM, and no more than 55 dB(A) between 7 PM and 7AM. These limits would significantly impact the ability of the high school to adequately host events on-site, particularly after-school events, such as sporting events and other school activities, which may be considered an unnecessary hardship for the school.

The aerial image in Exhibit 5 reflects that the school was constructed circa 2004 as the area was being built out with residential uses. Homeowners moving into the area should have been aware that a high school was being constructed. High schools generate certain impacts to carry out their mission of education and those moving to an area around the school should have an expectation of living with such impacts such as periodic noise events.





Exhibit 5: St. James Academy Stadium Site in 2004.

### 4. That the deviation requested will not adversely affect the public health, safety or general welfare.

Exceeding the noise regulations will impact neighboring residents during the time the sound system is activated or other noisy activities occur; however, the impact should be no more than should be customarily expected for a high school. In Staff's opinion, the higher levels of sound are reasonable for the use of a high school. Staff is supportive of the request for the deviation provided that the listed circumstances are accounted for, such as utilizing a lower sound system volume and limiting how late in the evening the system is used.

### 5. That the deviation will not conflict with the purpose and intent of this Code.

The intent of the code is to establish a reasonable standard by which residents and landowners may expect certain noise levels to be produced from a site and for that noise not to create distress or undue aggravation. Staff concludes that the noise expected to be generated from the St. James Academy stadium PA is not unreasonable and should be expected for the high school site.



### SOUND SYSTEM USE

The applicant provided a narrative regarding use of the stadium and sound system. A summary of the uses and frequency is provided in Table 3.

TABLE 3: SUMMARY OF EVENTS						
Event Type	Day(s) of the Week	Events/Games Per Year	Time(s)	Time of Year		
Varsity Football	Fri	4-7 Games	4 PM – 10 PM	Fall		
Junior Varsity Football	Mon	3-5 Games	4:30 PM – 9 PM	Fall		
Boys Soccer	Tues, Thurs, Sat	5-8 Games	4:30 PM – 9 PM (Weekday) 11 AM – 2 PM (Sat)	Fall		
Girls Soccer	Tues, Thurs, Sat	5-8 Games	4:30 PM – 9 PM (Weekday) 11 AM – 2 PM (Sat)	Spring		
Student Body Events	Varied	10-15 Events	8:30 AM – 3:30 PM (During School Days)	Year-Round		

The stadium and sound system are expected to be used up to three times per week, depending on the time of year and sports that are in season. Most of these events would be occurring in the evening during the school week; however, a few events would occur during the weekend. It is anticipated that most sporting events would be completed by 9 PM, however, there is the potential for fall football games to exceed 9 PM. This is not expected to be a regular occurrence.

### SOUND STUDY RESULTS

The City's noise regulations state the maximum volume is to be measured at the property line.

A sound study was prepared by the applicant and measures the noise levels at various distances from the site to determine a "baseline" for noise levels in the area. This study is an approximation of the noise that is generated by this sound system, including scenarios of volumes at "low", "medium", and "maximum" for the sound system. According to the applicant, the maximum volume of the sound system overall is 97dB. According to this study, it was determined that residences to the south may experience sound at a level of between 51-66 dB at low volume and 66-84 dB at the maximum volume, while the property line to the west may experience sound levels between 69 dB and 90 db. Depending on the time of day and setting the system is set to, these decibel levels would exceed the maximum allowable at the property line. The applicant stated that they do not intend to use the public address system at maximum volume.

To provide additional context for how loud the public address system may be, Exhibit 6 demonstrates the decibel (dB) level of everyday sources of noise.





### NEXT STEPS

• The Planning Commission is the final authority on this application.

## **RECOMMENDATION FROM PROFESSIONAL STAFF**

- ★ Staff recommends approval of the proposed deviation for St. James Academy Stadium Sound System.
  - The deviation request will allow for St. James Academy to exceed noise levels permitted by City code in order to conduct activities typical of a high school.
  - The project is consistent with Lenexa's goals through *Strategic Community Investment* to create *Inviting Places*.

### DEVIATION

Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of the deviation for **DV25-02 – St. James Academy Sound System** at 24505 Prairie Star Parkway with the following condition:

1. The exemption provided by the granting of this deviation shall be strictly applied to sanctioned events that are primarily organized, managed, and controlled by the school's administration, faculty, or student leadership as part of its core educational, athletic, or extracurricular programs. Any other events must comply with the noise regulations or obtain a special event permit.



Data Source: City of Lenexa and Johnson County Kansas For further information, please call 913-477-7500

## St. James Academy Sound System Deviation Request



0

100

200





## multistudio

# Memo

### St. James Stadium Sound System Deviation Request

### **Overall Narrative**

St. James Academy is submitting this deviation request with the goal of eliminating the need to apply for an annual special event permit for events being held at their stadium. Special Event Permits have been applied for and approved since the construction of the stadium.

The school anticipates to continue to host sporting events and graduation as documented in the previous special event permit documentation. They will add Friday night varsity home games. Sound amplification during these events will be similar to current use and may include pregame music, prayer, national anthem and game announcements (i.e. goal announcement in soccer). This sound system use case type and volume is similar to what has been approved in the event permit applications. With exception of Friday night football, all events are anticipated to be complete by 9:00 p.m. Football events may run past 9:00 p.m. in event of overtime play. The increased grandstand capacity will allow the school to use the facility for school assemblies (assumed to be 10-15 events per year), but these events will occur during school hours.

There is an existing sound system that is currently installed and has been in use since the installation of the scoreboard in 2022. The system has a maximum capacity of 97 dBA +/- 3 db. max SPL. The PA system is set not to exceed 30% of this maximum SPL. The provided sound heat maps should be analyzed with this additional reduction in mind. See the heat map on drawing A10/A101, illustrating the anticipated usage levels. Drawing A10/A101 reflects the anticipated use level.

The sound heat maps previously submitted have been updated to include an overlay of the landscape plan, which demonstrates a significant landscape buffer at property lines. The sound heat map does not include the impact that the landscape and berm will have on sound dampening and distribution. It is anticipated that the height of the berm and the density of the landscape will contribute to further reduction in the sound transfer.

It should also be noted that Clare Rd. is planned as a four-lane arterial road, producing its own sound disturbance impacting neighbors to the west. Traffic on this road is not subject to the ordinance and is not limited by time of day.

The information presented in these responses represents the current operational approach that has successfully been in place for the past 3 years. The following pages include responses to the city's questions, updated drawings and graphics and technical data for the installed sound system.

# Summary of Comments on Combined docs SJA Stadium Sound System830534.pdf

## Page: 6

	-	
	Author: CDJAMESM	Subject: Text Box Date: 4/14/2025 11:12:37 AM
		which answers the questions that staff has regarding use of the stadium. a of this response for an overall narrative.
	Author: CDJAMESM	Subject: Text Box Date: 4/14/2025 11:13:56 AM
	RESPONSE: See attached A	b(a) markings, showing the precise location of the sound system. S101, annotated to show location. Sound system was installed with the permitted scoreboard in 2022.
$\equiv$	Author: CDJAMESM	Subject: Text Box Date: 4/14/2025 11:13:08 AM
	impacts.	nonstrated more clearly? This would assist staff in providing the most accurate representation of potential noise awing, A101, showing full landscape plan with heat map overlays. Indication of property lines has been
	enhanced in red.	
	Author: CDJAMESM	Subject: Text Box Date: 4/14/2025 11:13:02 AM
	RESPONSE: Documentation installed. See attached appli	a is for the existing sound system permitted with the scoreboard in 2022. No new system is being a cation guide for Daktronics Sport Sound 1500. Performance is 97 dBA +/-3 db max SPL. Refer to ted volume usage. This is the sound system that has been in place since the addition of the
	Author: CDJAMESM	Subject: Text Box Date: 4/14/2025 11:13:00 AM
	RESPONSE: Refer to list of e for these event types since th host events of the same type assemblies, including gradua	nts per year would require use of the PA system? What days would those typically occur on? vents and dates/times submitted under the current Special Event Permit. These permits have been approved the installation of the scoreboard in 2022. With renovation of the stadium, the school intends to continue to and with similar use of the sound system. Anticipated use is for school sporting events (est. 3 per week) and tion. The school anticipates 10-15 assemblies during the school year, occurring during school hours. the during the week, with some Saturday events.
	Author: CDJAMESM	Subject: Text Box Date: 4/14/2025 11:12:58 AM
	RESPONSE: The school doe system at "low volume" as i Smaller events may require	em be set to operate at "maximum volume"? ss not anticipate operating the system at "maximum volume" and anticipates continuing to operate the dentified on sheet A101. Currently, the PA system is set at a level not to exceed 30% of maximum volume. less than a 30% volume level and will be adjusted accordingly. Events with larger attendance, like Friday require more volume, but again would not exceed 30% of maximum volume. These levels are consistent
	Author: CDJAMESM	Subiect: Text Box Date: 4/14/2025 11:12:55 AM
	<b>RESPONSE:</b> Landscaping a	here be any other noise dampening features installed on site? long Clare Rd. is planted upon an 8' berm. The expanded grandstand and press box added during the provides additional buffer. These are reflected in the updated sheet A101.
		tilized for these graphics, as landscaping can assist in noise dampening. at map graphics, with landscape plan on sheet A101.
	Author: CDJAMESM	Subject: Text Box Date: 4/14/2025 11:12:51 AM
	<b>RESPONSE:</b> Home football	bise exist during events, such as a marching band? varsity events would likely have a pep band during the game. A couple times a year, a marching band may ractices occur immediately before football games (about 5 p.m.) and are concluded before game start. Football is has band participation.
	Author: CDJAMESM	Subject: Text Box Date: 4/14/2025 11:12:51 AM

What time do events typically end on site?

RESPONSE: With exception of Friday night football, all events are anticipated to be complete by 9:00 p.m. Football events may run past 9:00 p.m. in the event of an overtime.



# SPORTSOUND 1500HD APPLICATION GUIDE

## **TYPICAL TRACK**

- SPL Coverage for a Sportsound<sup>®</sup> 1500HD in a typical football/soccer stadium with a track
- Performance: 97 dBA +/- 3 dB Max SPL
- Frequency Shown: 500-4000 Hz Average



Please contact Daktronics with any questions about adding a Sportsound 1500HD to your venue.



### WWW.DAKTRONICS.COM E-MAIL: SALES@DAKTRONICS.COM





### PLANNING COMMISSION STAFF REPORT

May 5, 2025

## SUNSET CANYON

Project #:	RZ25-04 & PL25-01P	Location:	Near the northwest corner of the intersection of Prairie Star Parkway and Canyon Creek Boulevard
Applicant:	Dan Foster, Schlagel Associates	Project Type:	Rezoning & Preliminary Plat
Staff Planner:	Dave Dalecky	Proposed Use:	Single-Family Residential



### **PROJECT SUMMARY**

The applicant requests approval to rezone property near the intersection of Prairie Star Parkway and Canyon Creek Boulevard from the AG, Agricultural District and CP-1, Planned Neighborhood Commercial District, to the RP-1, Planned Residential (Low-Density) District, to allow a single-family residential subdivision. The companion preliminary plat contains 175 lots and 8 tracts in clusters around sections of stream corridor. Public streets will be constructed to access clusters of lots of the subdivision. The applicant requests a deviation from the Unified Development Code (UDC) for the lot widths of some of the lots of the subdivision. The City and developer intend to engage in an exchange of certain lands of the adjacent properties resulting in an equitable exchange of land area for a future City park site and for development of certain land for lots within the subdivision. Consideration of the exchange of land will occur concurrently with consideration of the rezoning request. A Public Hearing is required for the rezoning request.

### STAFF RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL



### SITE INFORMATION

This site contains 81.37 acres of privately-owned and city-owned property located near the northwest corner of Prairie Star Parkway and Canyon Creek Boulevard. The site is adjacent to land now owned by the City and is intended to be a future City park. The City and the applicant are coordinating an exchange of property which will result in a balanced transfer of land area. The exchange will change the general shape of the land owned by the City and the developer but the areas owned by each will be very nearly the same after the exchange.

The purpose of the exchange of land is to convey land more suitable for development to the developer and for the City to receive sensitive lands, which contain wooded areas, sloped terrain, stream corridors, and a water feature more suitable for a park. The City Council provided initial support for such an exchange on July 16, 2024, by authorizing staff to publish notice of the proposed trade of certain parkland. The exchange of land is reflected in Exhibit 1 below where the City receives the areas in green and the developer receives the areas in blue.



AREA:	
TRACT A	= 18.06 ACRES
TRACT A-1	= 9.72 ACRES
TRACT B	= 3.34 ACRES
TRACT B-1	= 12.80 ACRES

Exhibit 1: Land exchange.





LAND AREA (AC)	LOTS	CURRENT ZONING	COMP. PLAN
81.37	175	AG, CP-1	Suburban Density, Neighborhood Commercial, and Park/Open Space



Exhibit 2: Aerial Image of Subject Site.



## SITE HISTORY

The property was annexed into the incorporated limits of Lenexa in 1999 and was zoned AG. The property to the east, of which a portion will be incorporated into this subdivision, was rezoned to CP-1 in 2001 (RZ01-07). The rezoning included a concept plan (PL01-01CP) for retail uses. The site remains undeveloped.

## LAND USE REVIEW

The proposed development is for a single-family use. This site has been designated as Suburban Residential, Neighborhood Commercial, and Park/Open Space uses on the Future Land Use Map of the Comprehensive Plan for several years. The recent update to the Comprehensive Plan did not change the designated uses. That part of the site designated as Neighborhood Commercial extends across the property line and is a larger area than what is zoned CP-1. The part of the proposed subdivision shown as Neighborhood Commercial is also owned separately than the portion zoned CP-1, which is a significant obstacle to require that part of the site to develop as a different use than what is proposed unless property is sold from one owner to another. The area to remain zoned CP-1 is 5.3 acres in area and is of sufficient size to develop as a small neighborhood commercial development to provide services to the neighboring community.

The land exchange will result in a near equal trade of land area designated as Suburban Density and Public/Open Space. A substantial amount of area that can be effectively made into active and passive recreational areas will be retained under City ownership for a future park.





TABLE	1: COMPARISON	OF SURROUNDING PROPE	RTIES	
Vicinity	Land Use Designation	Zoning	Current Use	
Subject Property	Suburban-Density Residential, Neighborhood Commercial, and Park/Open Space	AG, Agricultural District and CP-1, Planned Neighborhood Commercial District	Undeveloped land	
North	Low-Density Residential and Suburban-Density Residential	RE, Residential Estate District and AG, Agricultural District	Estate Lot Single- Family Residential	
South	Suburban-Density Residential, Medium- Density Residential, Park/Open Space	AG, Agricultural District, RP-1, Planned Residential Single- Family (Low-Density) District, and RP-3, Residential Planned (Medium High-Density) District	Single-Family Residential, Multifamily Residential, and Undeveloped land	
East	Suburban Density Residential, Park/Open Space, and Neighborhood Commercial	RP-1, Planned Single-Family (Low-Density) Residential District, and CP-1, Planned Neighborhood Commercial District	Single-Family Residential and Undeveloped land	
West	Low-Density Residential, Suburban-Density Residential, Park/Open Space	AG, Agricultural District	Agricultural and Undeveloped land	



### **REZONING REVIEW**

The applicant proposes to rezone the subject site from the AG (Agricultural) and CP-1, Planned Neighborhood Commercial Districts to the RP-1, Planned Residential Single-Family (Low-Density) District. The land retained or received by the City will remain AG.



Staff provides the following analysis for the review criteria within <u>Section 4-1-G-5</u> of the Unified Development Code (UDC).

### 1. The character of the neighborhood.

The neighborhood is a developing region of the City at the fringe between suburban development and rural development. The site is near the current terminus of Prairie Star Parkway, an arterial street intended to continue in the future to an intersection with K-10 Highway to the southwest. Additional development is anticipated along the Prairie Star Parkway corridor and to the north. The property on the south side of Prairie Star Parkway is developed with multifamily and single-family uses. The proposed single-family subdivision is in keeping with the character of the area.

### 2. The zoning and use of properties nearby.

The zoning and uses of the adjacent properties are predominantly AG and agricultural uses or undeveloped land. The RP-1 Zoning District is the second most predominant zoning in the vicinity of this site. Some neighboring properties are currently estate sized residential lots (one acre or greater in area). An adjacent tract is zoned CP-1 anticipated for a neighborhood scale retail development. The zoning and land use of adjacent properties is noted in Table 1.



### 3. The suitability of the subject property for the uses to which it has been restricted.

The property is currently restricted to low-density single-family and agricultural uses based on its current zoning. Agricultural uses are not suitable for this site. The site has significantly sloped terrain and several ridge lines and converging stream channels. The terrain limits the location for any type of use or development to the areas of higher elevation.

### 4. The extent to which the proposed use will detrimentally affect nearby property.

The proposed uses will not detrimentally affect nearby properties as appropriate street and other infrastructure will be provided for the development. It is Staff's opinion the proposed uses are compatible with the existing and planned uses in the vicinity.

### 5. The length of time the subject property has remained vacant as zoned.

The property is undeveloped land and was zoned AG since being annexed into the City in 1999. A part of the site was rezoned to CP-1 in 2001 for a neighborhood commercial center. The part of the site zoned CP-1 has remained undeveloped.

# 6. The relative gain to public health, safety, and welfare due to the denial of the application as compared to the hardship imposed upon the landowner, if any, as a result of denial of the application.

It is Staff's opinion that denial of this rezoning would have no gain to public health, safety, or welfare since the proposed development's density and uses are compatible with surrounding development and appropriate infrastructure is or will be available to serve the site. Denial of the application would restrict the property to the existing zoning of AG which is not as appropriate in this location. The portion zoned CP-1 would remain zoned as such.

### 7. Recommendation of City's permanent professional staff.

See Staff's recommendation and the end of this report.

# 8. Conformance of the requested change to the adopted or recognized Master Plan being utilized by the City.

The City completed a major Comprehensive Plan update in July of 2024. The Future Land Use (FLU) Map designation for the site did not change from the previously adopted Comprehensive Plan. The designations are Suburban Density Residential, Park/Open Space and Neighborhood Commercial. Staff concludes that the land exchange will result in a balance of uses consistent with the current designations of the FLU. The following table shows the land use areas reflected on the FLU and the proposed land use areas for the subject site.



TABLE 3: LAND EXCHANGE AREA COMPARISON						
OwnerCurrent Area (Acres)Proposed Area (Acres)Differe (Acres)						
City (Park/Open Space)	58.31	69.95	+11.64			
Developer (Suburban Density and Neighborhood Commercial)	96.70	85.06	-11.64			

# 9. The availability and adequacy of required utilities and services to serve the proposed use. These utilities and services include, but are not limited to, sanitary and storm sewers, water and electrical service, police and fire protection, schools, parks and recreation facilities, etc.

Several properties remain undeveloped in the vicinity of this site. The region is developing with various uses along Prairie Star Parkway. Adequate utilities and services are or will be available to the subject property. The site is subject to the City's stormwater management requirements which are applicable to all development in the City. The site is within the Olathe School District.

# 10. The extent to which the proposed use would adversely affect the capacity or safety of that portion of the street network influenced by the use, or present parking problems in the vicinity of the property.

The proposed subdivision will be served by several streets, most of which are currently inadequate to serve the development; however, improvements will be made to adequately serve the development as described in the plat review section of this report. Upon the improvements being made, the subdivision will not adversely affect the capacity or safety of the street network. In fact, the improvements required to serve the proposed subdivision will enhance the network for current users.

# 11. The environmental impacts the proposed use will generate including, but not limited to, excessive stormwater runoff, water pollution, air pollution, noise pollution, excessive nighttime lighting, or other environmental harm.

The proposed rezoning is not anticipated to generate any environmental impacts exceeding the requirements of the UDC.

# 12. The extent to which the proposed development would adversely affect the capacity or water quality of the stormwater system, including without limitation, natural stream assets in the vicinity of the subject property.

The site is subject to the UDC requirements for stormwater management and is required to meet the same standards as any new development.

# 13. The ability of the applicant to satisfy any requirements (e.g. site plan, etc.) applicable to the specific use imposed pursuant to the zoning regulations in this Chapter and other applicable ordinances.

The applicant requests deviations for the subdivision. The request is for reductions of the minimum 70foot lot width requirement, the minimum 30-foot front yard setback requirement, the minimum 8,000 SF lot area requirement. The lot width reduction request is for 60 lots of the 175-lot subdivision. The setback



and area reduction request applies to a select group of lots. A deviation is also requested for two encroachments into the 50-foot setback along Prairie Star Parkway.

A deviation request may be considered using the criteria listed in <u>Section 4-1-B-27-G-4</u> of the UDC. The deviation requests are described later in the Staff Report.

### PRELIMINARY PLAT REVIEW

The subject site is located near the northwest corner of the intersection of Prairie Star Parkway and Canyon Creek Boulevard. The subdivision contains 175 lots and 8 tracts. The site has significant terrain variation creating "fingers" of developable areas along ridge lines with a series of "draws" that contain stream corridors. Clusters of lots line streets along ridge lines through the site. The subdivision is configured into three main clusters of lots. Each cluster will have streets intersecting the surrounding street network due to the limitations of connecting streets across the stream corridors through the site.



Exhibit 3: Preliminary Plat (site plan).

New streets will access the clusters of lots from Prairie Star Parkway on the south, Canyon Creek Boulevard on the east, and 91<sup>st</sup> Street on the north. Several streets will be cul-de-sac streets due to the limitation of crossing the significantly sloped terrain.



The resulting layout of the subdivision is for several lots to back to a draw through the site. The lots that do back to a draw will abut a tract that is to be owned and maintained by Homeowners Association (HOA). Eleven lots will back directly to the City owned property.

An amenity tract is provided at the southeast cluster of lots at the intersection of a 92<sup>nd</sup> Terrace and Canyon Creek Boulevard, across from the street into Arbor Lake South subdivision. The amenity tract is shown to include a pool, clubhouse building, playground, sport court and a 15-space parking area. The details of the amenity tract will be reviewed with a final plan submittal. A subdivision amenity final plan may be provided with a final plat for the phase of the subdivision that contains the amenity tract.

The subdivision includes several locations where sidewalks are provided from the local streets between lots then to the future park property. These sidewalks will connect to future trails. The timing of the completion of the public trails is not known. The expectation is for the sidewalks to be constructed with the public improvements for that phase of the subdivision. The sidewalks are dedicated to the City as a sidewalk easement within a tract owned and maintained by the HOA.

The City's Master Parks and Trails plan shows trails through the future City park and through the privately owned property to the intersection of 91<sup>st</sup> Street and Canyon Creek Boulevard. The trail locations are conceptual and will require further consideration for placement and design. The developer has committed to cooperating with the City for dedication of any required easements to connect a park trail through the HOA owned tracts along the stream corridors for installation of a public park trail.

### DIMENSIONAL STANDARDS

The subdivision is generally in compliance with the subdivision requirements of <u>Section 4-2-C</u> of the UDC. The applicant is requesting deviations to reduce the lot width, front yard setback, and lot area for 60 lots. These lots reflect the "smaller" of the two housing types that are proposed by the developer. The smaller lots have a dwelling classification of E, and the larger housing type has a dwelling size of D. Dwelling size is the minimum floor area of the home.

### **PUBLIC IMPROVEMENTS**

A combination of new arterial (Canyon Creek Boulevard), collector (91<sup>st</sup> Street), and local streets will be required and constructed with this project. Exhibit reflects the streets needed to be constructed or improved in order to serve the project.





Exhibit 4: Surrounding street improvements.

Portions of these perimeter streets may be constructed or improved in phases. Per a previous development agreement, Canyon Creek Boulevard is the responsibility of the City to construct. The remainder of the streets will need to be constructed by the developer as the project progresses. The applicant and City are actively working on a new development agreement that will address the phasing and responsibilities of constructing the perimeter street network necessary to serve the development and/or each phase of the development.

The applicant provided a phasing plan (Exhibit 5) and the City will coordinate with the applicant on timing and phasing of the street infrastructure as final plats are submitted per the approved development agreement.





Exhibit 5: Subdivision phasing plan.

The preliminary plat boundary shall include the right-of-way for the abutting Canyon Creek Boulevard and 91<sup>st</sup> Street to the centerline of the streets. Any future final plat submittal for any phase of the subdivision that abuts these streets shall include the right-of-way to the centerline of these streets.

### STORMWATER

The applicant has submitted a preliminary stormwater management study indicating the intent to meet the City's stormwater standards and requirements. This includes extended wet detention, extended dry detention, mechanical structures (hydrodynamic separators), as well as general preservation practices.



### FIRE PREVENTION

The Fire Department reviewed the plans based on the current adopted fire codes and local amendments. All general planning review comments have been acknowledged or satisfied and there are no outstanding Fire Department planning review items that need to be addressed for this project to move forward. A more detailed fire code review will be conducted based on the adopted codes at the time of the building permit documentation submittal.

### LIGHTING

Streetlights will be installed along all public streets in accordance with the City Public Improvement requirements. Lights may be installed at the subdivision amenity tract. Site and exterior lighting on private development is subject to Section 4-1-C-4-I of the UDC.

### LANDSCAPING

Single-family subdivisions require a fence and landscape buffer along collector and arterial streets. The buffer is typically provided in a tract between lots and the street right-of-way. The tract is identified on the plat as a tract to be maintained by the HOA. Section 4-2-E-4 of the UDC states the minimum landscape requirements for the buffer. The UDC provides for an exception to be granted by the Planning Commission, if for good cause, a fence is not required. The applicant is requesting the exception for the sections of the subdivision where a tract that contains stream corridor to not contain a fence. Similar exceptions have been granted for subdivisions where areas that are to remain in their current condition, including the naturally occurring vegetation in these areas. Staff support this request for an exception to the buffer requirement for the areas where the large tracts with stream corridor abut Canyon Creek Boulevard and 91<sup>st</sup> Street.



Exhibit 6: Request for fence and landscape buffer locations.



### ARCHITECTURE

Single-family residential development is subject to <u>Section 4-1-C-5-C</u> of the UDC. These regulations do not specify building design standards to the same extent as other types of development. The review of the design of a single-family residential dwelling occurs during the building permit review of the structure.

### DEVIATIONS

The applicant requests deviations from <u>Sections 4-1-B-6-F</u> of the UDC related to the minimum lot width, front yard setback and lot area for single-family lots. The applicant is requesting that 60 of the 175 lots be allowed reduced dimensions for a villa-style house product for this subdivision. The applicant is also requesting an encroachment into the parkway setback along Prairie Star Parkway. The request is for an encroachment in two locations. The encroachments are for a local street cul-de-sac bulb to encroach 7 feet and the rear yard of a lot to encroach 11 feet into the 50-foot setback. The Planning Commission has the authority to approve deviations provided the criteria from <u>Section 4-1-B-27-G-4</u> of the UDC are met.

TABLE 4: REQUESTED DEVIATIONS						
Deviation	UDC Requirement	Proposed	Difference			
Lot width (60 lots)	70 feet	54 feet	16 feet			
Front yard setback (30 lots)	30 feet	25 feet	5 feet			
Lot area (28 lots)	8,000 SF	7915 – 6912 SF (varies)	95 – 1,088 SF			
Parkway setback	50 feet	39 feet	11 feet			

The following table lists the building height deviation request for each of the seven buildings:

Staff supports the deviations requests as proposed. The deviations for smaller lot dimensions allow for a reasonable clustering of smaller lots on a difficult site to develop. The area of undevelopable land for this site due to difficult terrain and stream corridor limits the number of lots that can be developed under UDC standards. The applicant commits to providing 7-foot side yard setbacks for all lots, which will eliminate the challenges of constructing homes closer together than the minimum side yard setback allows.

The deviation request to encroach into the 50-foot parkway setback along Prairie Star Parkway is minimal and will not result in any noticeable reduction of area that is to be landscaped.





Exhibit 7: Deviation plan.

### **REVIEW PROCESS**

- This project requires a recommendation from the Planning Commission and approval by the City Council. Pending a recommendation from the Planning Commission, the project is tentatively scheduled for consideration by the City Council on May 20, 2025.
- The applicant must submit a final plat application prior to applying for permit(s).
- The final plat must be recorded with Johnson County prior to permit(s) being released.
- The applicant must receive permit(s) prior to commencing construction.
- The applicant should inquire about additional City requirements, such as permits and development fees.



### **RECOMMENDATION FROM PROFESSIONAL STAFF**

### **★** Conduct a Public Hearing for the rezoning request.

### **★** Staff recommends approval of the preliminary plat for Sunset Canyon.

• The project is consistent with Lenexa's goals through **Responsible Economic Development** to create **Vibrant Neighborhoods** and a **Thriving Economy**.

### REZONING

Staff recommends **approval** for rezoning property from AG and CP-1 to RP-1 for **Sunset Canyon** located near the northwest corner of the intersection of Prairie Star Parkway and Canyon Creek Boulevard.

### PRELIMINARY PLAT

Staff recommends **approval** of the preliminary plat for **Sunset Canyon** located near the northwest corner of the intersection of Prairie Star Parkway and Canyon Creek Boulevard for a single-family subdivision with deviations as noted in the Staff Report.



Sunset Canyon Rezoning and Preliminary Plat





#### LEGEND:

HDPE L/E

MSFE

PVC

S/E

S/M

TE

WSE W/F

\_\_\_\_

P/L PUB/E RCP ROW or R/W

ACCESS EASEMENT A/E BACK OF CURB B/F BACK TO BACK BM BL or B.L. BENCHMARK BUILDING LINE CO TJB CLEANOUT TELEPHONE JUNCTION BOX C&G CURB AND GUTTER D/E E/E EL FL G/E DRAINAGE EASEMEN ELECTRICAL EASEMENT ELEVATION

FLOW LINE

GAS LINE EASEMENT

POLYVINYL CHLORIDE PROPERTY LINE

SERVICELINE

SIDEWALK TOP ELEVATION UTILITY EASEMENT WATER SURFACE ELEVATION

CURB & GUTTER

P/L PROPERTY LINES

HIGH-DENSITY POLYETHYLENE LANDSCAPE EASEMENT

MINIMUM SERVICEABLE FLOOR ELEVATION

PROPERTY LINE PUBLIC EASEMENT REINFORCED CONCRETE PIPE RIGHT-OF-WAY

SANITARY SEWER EASEMENT

WATERLINE EASEMENT

ASPHALT PAVEMENT - EXISTING

ASPHALT PAVEMENT - PROPOSED

CONCRETE PAVEMENT - EXISTING

ASPHALT PAVEMENT - EXISTING

CONCRETE SIDEWALK - EXISTING

CONCRETE SIDEWALK - PROPOSED

CURB & GUTTER - EXISTING

EXISTING PLAT LINES

SANITARY SEWER MAIN SANITARY SEWER MAIN STORM SEWER

CABLE TV - EXISTING

GAS LINE - EXISTING

EXISTING MANHOLE CLEANOUT

EXISTING CURB INLET EXISTING CURB INLET EXISTING GRATE INLET EXISTING JUNCTION BOX EXISTING STORM MANHOLE

LIGHT - EXISTING

WATERLINE - EXISTING

STORM SEWER - EXISTING

FIRER OPTIC CARLE - EXISTING FIBER OP TIC CABLE - EXISTING TELEPHONE LINE - EXIST. ELECTRIC LINE - EXISTING OVERHEAD POWER LINE - EXIST. UNDERGROUND ELECTRIC - EX.

EXISTING SANITARY MANHOLE

PROPOSED SANITARY MANHOLE EXISTING AREA INLET

TREELINE EXISTING LOT AND R/W LINES

WER MAIN - EXIST.



LOCATION MAP

### City of Lenexa, Kansas

Jim Walbert, Community Developmen 913-477-7733 ate Frosion Inspection Dale Clark, Erosion Control Inspector 913-238-0905

### UTILITY CONTACTS:

Johnson County Wastewater 11811 S. Sunset Dr., St Olathe, KS 66061-7061 913-715-8500 913-715-8501 fax Inspections: 913-715-8520

Kansas One Call . ww.kaneaeonacall.com

Evergy Jimmy Godbout Phone: 913-667-5119 Email: Jimmy.Godbout@evergy.con

### Charter Spectrum

Greg Thomas 8221 West 119th Street Overland Park, KS 66212 Phone: 913-643-1950 Email: greg.thomas@twcab

Google Fiber

Greg Link 908 Broadway Blvd. 6th Floor Kansas City, MO 64105 Phone: 816-605-6936 Email: greglink@google.com

### AT&T - Residential New Business

9444 Nall Avenue Overland Park, KS 66207 Phone: 913-383-4929 Email: ca4089@att.com

WaterOne Lenexa, KS 66219-9624 Phone: 913-895-5773 Email: kjohnson@wateron

Developer Services Developer Services: Phone: 913-895-5700 Fax: 913-895-5607 Craig Mills Phone: 913-895-5638 Email: cmills@waterone.c www.waterone.org/develo

Atmos Energy Tony Benedict - Reside 25090 W. 110th Ter. Olathe, KS 66061 Phone: 913-254-6344 Email: tony.denedict@atmosenergy.com

### PRELIMINARY PLAT FOR SUNSET CANYON



#### heet List Table COVER SHEE C0.0 NW CORNER PP NE CORNER PP SE CORNER PP DEVIATION PLAT C2.0 C2.1 TRAIL CONNECTION PLAN OVERALL LANDSCAPE PLAN L1.0 NW CORNER LP NE CORNER LP SE CORNER LP

PREPARED AND SUBMITTED BY:

SCHLAGEL & ASSOCIATES, P.A.

APPROVED FOR ONE YEAR FROM THIS DATE

APPROVED BY

CITY ENGINEER

DAWN MONTGOMERY

LENEXA KS 66227

DEVELOPER:

p (913)912-9000 TRAVIS@GRATADEV.CON

GRATA DEVELOPMENT.LLC

6300 W. 143RD ST., SUITE 200 OVERLAND PARK, KS 66223

100 CEDAR NILES RE

OWNER:

#### GENERAL NOTES:

- 1.
- 4
- 5.
- to contractor. Contractor. Contractor. Contractor. Explored to compare the safety of the project and the safety of the public and shall adhere to all federal, state and local safety regulations. Contractor is responsible for coordinating occurruncion activities with other constractors concurrently working onsite. Contractor shall coordinate all subcontractor activities, and shall be the sole contract for the owner.
- 6.
- Lominators small accounting all subcontrated activities, and shall be the size contact for the owner. Contractor shall subcound all regulated permits insurance equivalences that downing prior to construction. Insurance Water for use on site must be purchased from the local water utility having jurisdiction, and shall be purchased per their requirements. 8
- 9.
- requirements. All traffic control required in conjunction with the proposed construction shal be in conformance with the Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) and shall be a subsidiary obligation of the contract. Contractor is responsible for the contraction of all mattering testing required for the virok. This includes scheduling of tests, coordinating and providing access to sample locations, and satisfying all test result reporting requirements. 10.

#### EARTHWORK:

- Lis recommended that a Geotechnical Engineer observe and document all earthwork activities. Contours have been shown at 1-loot of 2-bot intervals, as indicated. Grading shall consist of completing the earthwork required to bring here physical ground endersion of the assisting tas to the finished particle uses and the share and the share of the same share the sam
- undhout
- Unless otherwise noted, all earthwork is considered Unclassified. No additional compensation will be provided for rock or 6
- Unless otherwise noted, all estimations's is considered Unclassified. No additional compensation will be provided for rock or whate excavation, unless specificity stread otherwise. Prior to estimate and the stream of the str
- 10.
- 12
- Hill meterates shall be per Geolectrinical Kepot and stata not include organic matter, devisio troppot. All tills placed on signes greater fram 6:1 shall be benchrist. The Contractor shall be responsible for redistributing the topsoil over proposed turf and landscaped areas to a minimum deph of Grinches below final grade. All areas shall be graded for positive drainage. Unless noted otherwise the following grades shall apply: 1. Tarl Areas 25% Minimum, 41:1V Maximum. 13.
- 14.
- Paved Areas 1.2% Minimum, 5% Maximum
- Paved Areas 12% Minimum, 5% Maximum A.D.A. parking statis shaft not be slogged geteet rhen 2% in any direction and constructed per A.D.A. requirements. All disturbed areas shaft be fertilized, seeded and multihed immediately after earthwork activities have casead. Seeding shall be per the Ericsion and Sediment Control Plan androt Landscape Plan. In this specified seeding shall be per XMW Section 2400, latest edition. Unless otherwise noted, seeding shall be subsidiary to the contract price for earthwork and oracing architest.

#### UTILITIES

- 1. Existing utilities have been shown to the greatest extent possible based upon information provided to the Engineer. The Example solutions now been screen in one by example solution pause a pain information phones to the trapheter, in a bioinformation of the solution of the solution of the solution of the solution of the trapheter is and isolarity any spreaded and contract. All contracts shall immediately be toward to the station of the trapheter. The contractor shall be responsible for coordinating any required utility relocations. Utilities damaged through the engigence of the contracts of that pre-spreaded at the contractor's expense. Contractor shall welfy flow-items and structure tops pains to construction of a ball notify Engineer of any discrepancies. Proved shall durings to all process at the annufacture of display and uturations for texter by the Engineer prior to construction of
- 3
- the structures. Utility Separation Waterlines shall have a minimum of 10 feet horizontal and 2 feet vertical separation from all sanitary sever lines, manholes, and sanitary sever service laterals, as measured from edge to edge. If minimum separations can be appresent to the operation of the op
- 6
- 7.
- Using Segmentation, Valentined State Takes & minimum of 10 bits introductional and 2 bits which assigns that the segmentation them all assigns on the doublest-concrete encomment of the semitary intre shall be required 10 bits in the acid fraction of the conflict. Payment for terror/hing, baseling pipe embedinent, flowable fit, baselit materials, clean up, seeing, socking and any terror be to be inter-concrete encomment of the semitary intre shall be required 10 bits in the acid fraction of the embeddinent. The semitary inter shall be required 10 bits in the semitary inter shall be required 10 bits in the semitary inter shall be required 10 bits in the semitary inter shall be required 10 bits in the semitary inter shall be required 10 bits in the semitary inter shall be required 10 bits in the semitary inter shall be required 10 bits in the semitary inter shall be required 10 bits in the semitary inter shall be required 10 bits in the semitary inter shall be required 10 bits in the semitary inter shall be required 10 bits interval bits interval bits in the semitary interval bits interval bit

PREPARED BY CHLAGEL & ASSOCIATES, F

DATE

Π

9

A

Т

CO

STREET AS SUNSET CANYON PRELIMINARY PLAT ROAD AND 91ST LENEXA, KANSA

MIZE

COVER SHEET

C0.0





<u>75' x 13</u>	75' x 130' LOTS					90' x 130' LOTS	
LOT #	AREA (SF)		LOT #	AREA (SF)		LOT #	AREA (SF)
1	12,136.90		23	10,444.17	1	1	13,092.44
2	12,126.96		24	9,564.10		2	16,531.49
3	11,250.00		25	10,922.48		3	14,199.23
4	12,154.81		26	12,119.25		4	15,144.61
5	10,376.05		27	18,381.79		5	27,014.23
6	9,750.00		28	15,061.67		6	26,203.54
7	9,750.00		29	21,350.90		7	16,113.18
8	10,050.93		30	15,717.52		8	14,284.50
9	11,466.29		31	16,607.80	1	9	14,610.99
10	12,550.28		32	13,245.02			
11	12,425.52		33	12,718.98	]	LOT #	AREA (SF)
12	11,202.64		34	10,345.16		TRACT:	A 20,460.39
13	10,871.48		35	10,654.98		TRACT:	B 87,471.14
14	10,931.75		36	10,522.84		TRACT: (	C 55,954.23
17	15,366.69		37	13,435.06		TRACT: I	D 71,321.60
18	15,390.39		38	13,223.53		TRACT: I	E 8,182.54
19	9,956.16		39	12,053.85	'		
20	9,957.67		40	10,700.66	]		
21	13,630.49		41	12,336.09	]		
22	13,677.72				-		

TRACT NOTES: 1. TRACT A RE TO BE OWNED BY THE HOMES ASSOCIATION AND IS USED FOR OPEN SPACE AND STORMWATER BMPS.



CHLAGEL & ASSOCIATES, P.

MIZE ROAD AND 91ST STREET LENEXA, KANSAS

SUNSET CANYON PRELIMINARY PLAT

NW CORNER F

<sup>SHEET</sup> C1.1

0 60 120 SCALE: 1\* = 60'





SUNSET CANYON PRELIMINARY PLAT MIZE ROAD AND 91ST STREET LENEXA, KANSAS

SCHLAGEL

PREPARED BY

CHLAGEL & ASSOCIATES, P.

NE CORNER PR

<sup>SHEET</sup> C1.2

200

0 60 120 SCALE: 1" = 60'




















# CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Poss called the regular meeting of the Lenexa Planning Commission to order at 7:40 pm on Monday, March 31, 2025. The meeting was held in the Community Forum at Lenexa City Hall at 17101 W. 87<sup>th</sup> Street Parkway, Lenexa, Kansas.

## ROLL CALL

## COMMISSIONERS PRESENT

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT Commissioner David Woolf

Chairman Chris Poss Vice-Chairman Mike Burson Commissioner Sunny Dharod Commissioner Ben Harber Commissioner Don Horine Commissioner Jermaine Jamison Commissioner Curt Katterhenry Commissioner Cara Wagner

### STAFF PRESENT

Scott McCullough, Community Development Director Tim Collins, Engineering and Construction Services Administrator Andrew Diekemper, Assistant Chief – Fire Prevention Steven Shrout, Assistant City Attorney II Dave Dalecky, Planner II James Molloy, Planner II Jessica Lemanski, Planner II Noah Vaughan, Planning Specialist Gloria Lambert, Senior Administrative Assistant

# APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the March 3, 2025, meeting were presented for approval. Chairman Poss entertained a motion to **APPROVE** the minutes. Moved by Commissioner Horine, seconded by Commissioner Burson and **APPROVED** by a unanimous voice vote.

# CONSENT AGENDA

- 1. FLITE Country Hills Consideration of a final plan for a drive-thru ATM in the parking lot of Country Hills Shopping Center located at 15117 West 87th Street Parkway within the CP-1, Planned Neighborhood Commercial District. PL25-07F
- 2. Redevelopment Project Plan 3I for the City Center TIF District (Advent Health Medical Office Building 2 & Parking Garage Project) – Consider making a finding that the project plan is consistent with City's Comprehensive Plan



#### 3. Redevelopment Project Plan 3J for the City Center TIF District (Village at City Center North – Mixed-Use Retail & Commercial Project) – Consider making a finding that the project plan is consistent with City's Comprehensive Plan

Chairman Poss entertained a motion to **APPROVE** Consent Agenda Items 1-3. Moved by Commissioner Harber seconded by Commissioner Horine and carried by a unanimous voice vote.

## **REGULAR AGENDA**

- 4. Lakeview Building Renovation Consideration of a rezoning and preliminary plan to allow Wholesale and Warehousing, General and Office uses on property located at 11217 Lakeview Avenue. (Public Hearing)
  - a. Consideration of a rezoning from CP-O, Planned General Office District to BP-2, Planned Manufacturing District. RZ25-02
  - b. Consideration of a preliminary plan to allow Wholesale and Warehousing, General and Office uses. PL25-04P

#### APPLICANT PRESENTATION

Mark Morris, with Mechanical Sales Midwest, shared that the company currently operates at 11301 Strang Line Road in Lenexa. Mr. Morris stated that having been in the market for the past 12 years, the business has experienced considerable success. Currently leasing their facility, they are now exploring the opportunity to purchase a building on Lakeview Avenue to relocate and operate from that location.

#### STAFF PRESENTATION

David Dalecky presented the Staff Report. Mr. Dalecky stated that the request was to rezone the property located at 11217 Lakeview Avenue in the South Lake Business Park from CPO (Planned Office District) to BP-2 (Planned Manufacturing District), which is one of the two business park districts. He displayed the site location onscreen explaining it was centrally located within the South Lake Business Park, bordered by College Boulevard to the north, I-35 to the east, Renner Boulevard to the west, and extending around 113th to 116th Streets to the south. He displayed the Zoning and Future Land Use map stating that it was consistent with the area's Future Land Use, despite the anomaly of the current CPO zoning. The site was rezoned from Business Park District to CPO in 2004, and a minimally invasive surgical hospital occupied the building with a special use permit under the CPO zoning. The property had always been designated for business park use, so the proposed rezoning aligns with the Future Land Use. He presented the 13 criteria onscreen which are standard considerations in the City's Unified Development Code (UDC) for rezoning and special use permits. The four-acre lot with the existing onestory building is about 36,000 square feet. The applicant's proposed use would require 134 parking spaces, and the site currently has 144 spaces, which is more than sufficient. He displayed the site plan on the screen showing the parking area and several access points, two on Lakeview Boulevard, one on 113th Street, and an access easement connecting to adjacent buildings. The applicant plans to modify the building, adding two new docks at the rear (east side) of the building. Additionally, there is potential for modifications to the site's entry points to accommodate the turning radius of semi-trucks. Any modifications required for the changes will be included in a final plan submission for further review. The parking lot may require milling and overlay, along with the necessary re-striping of parking spaces. Landscaping on the property is also in poor condition in some areas, with missing or dying plants. Any deficient landscaping will be replaced to bring the property into compliance with the approved plan. A new landscape plan will be submitted with the final plan for review. Staff recommends approval of the rezoning, and the preliminary plan as presented in the staff report. This item is scheduled to go before the city council on April 15th.



## PUBLIC HEARING

Chairman Poss **OPENED** the Public Hearing and asked if anyone wished to speak on this item. No one from the audience came forward.

Chairman Poss entertained a motion to **CLOSE** the Public Hearing. Moved by Commissioner Horine, seconded by Commissioner Wagner, and carried by a unanimous voice vote.

#### COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Commissioner Burson commented that the surrounding parcels were all zoned BP-2, therefore, rezoning the property to match the rest of the business park made perfect sense and he supported Staff's report.

Chairman Poss asked Staff if they knew why the site in question was rezoned as CPO. Scott McCullough replied that there appeared to be a nuance in what was being done with the hospital, or possibly some ancillary uses, which led to the need for rezoning. Mr. McCullough added that the code might have changed after the fact, which could have driven the rezoning decision. On the surface, it seemed that rezoning wasn't necessary, but the code ultimately required it in order to accommodate the hospital's use. He also clarified that the hospital use might have been allowed by right in the BP-2 zoning district at the time, but without an exhaustive review of the code from 2003 or 2023, it was unclear.

Chairman Poss agreed with Commissioner Burson that it clearly made sense to rezone the site back to its original zoning district of BP-2 and also, as mentioned in the Staff Report, the preliminary plan was a good opportunity to address some of the deferred maintenance on the property that has been happening over the years.

#### MOTION

Chairman Poss entertained a motion to recommend **APPROVAL** of rezoning the property from CP-O, Planned General Office District, to the BP-2, Planned Manufacturing District, for **11217 Lakeview Avenue** located at 11217 Lakeview Avenue.

Moved by Commissioner Jamison, seconded by Commissioner Katterhenry, and carried by a unanimous voice vote.

Chairman Poss entertained a motion to recommend **APPROVAL** of the preliminary plan for **11217 Lakeview Avenue** located at 11217 Lakeview Avenue, for Wholesale and Warehousing, General and Office uses, with no conditions.

Moved by Commissioner Katterhenry, seconded by Commissioner Horine, and carried by a unanimous voice vote.

- 5. Vantage at Lenexa Consideration of a rezoning and preliminary plan for a multifamily residential development on property located approximately at the northwest corner of Prairie Star Parkway and Monticello Road. (Public Hearing)
  - a. Consideration of a rezoning from AG, Agricultural, R-1, Single-Family Residential and RP-3, Planned Residential (Medium-High Density) Districts to RP-4, Planned Residential (High Density) District. RZ25-01



#### b. Consideration of a preliminary plan for a multifamily residential development. PL25-03P

### APPLICANT PRESENTATION

Brett Mozzetti, Continental Properties, provided an overview of Continental Properties, a privately held developer, owner, and operator of multifamily communities. The company has developed over 125 communities, totaling more than 45,000 units across approximately 19 or 20 states. Mr. Mozzetti explained that what sets Continental Properties apart from other developers is that they manage all aspects of the development process, including design, construction, market research, acquisitions, and customer experience. They stated that they do not develop to sell, they develop to become a part of the fabric of the community. He noted that this project would be Continental Properties' first proposal in Kansas and the Kansas City metro area. Regarding the project site, he explained that it is located at the northwest corner of Monticello Road and Prairie Star Parkway, just east of K-7 and north of K-10. The property currently exists as a single parcel with three single-family residences, all owned by one group and currently used as rental property. He said the site is vegetated and is located just to the east of the Coon Creek Trail near the Black Hoof Park Trailhead. Approximately 60% of the site is already zoned RP-3, which permits multifamily use, while a small portion is zoned R-1, Single-Family Residential District. The remaining area is zoned Agricultural. The request is to rezone the entire property to the RP-4, Planned Residential (High Density) District, which allows up to 16 dwelling units per acre and would classify the development as high-density residential. He stated that their request aligns with the 2040 Comprehensive Plan, which designates the parcel for future high-density residential development and as part of a 2040 neighborhood node, which encourages a mix of housing types. Mr. Mozzetti discussed the outreach efforts to neighboring homeowners' associations (HOAs), adjacent to the neighborhood, including Silverleaf, Brampton West, and The Enclave at Prairie Star. He noted that efforts to meet with Manchester Park were unsuccessful because he never heard back. They did host meetings and invited HOA Board Members and Presidents of Silverleaf, Brampton West, and The Enclave at Prairie Star. At the meeting, concerns were raised about preserving vegetation and ensuring adequate setbacks from existing homes and the Coon Creek Trail. Regarding the site conditions, he explained that the property has a 70-foot grade change and the presence of easements along the eastern boundary, as well as bedrock that will require creative site planning and grading strategies. The proposed plan includes nine three-story buildings with a total of 297 units, which equates to 14.43 units per acre, below the maximum allowed by the RP-4, Planned Residential (High Density) District. The development will provide 61.2% open space, exceeding the municipal code requirements. Access to the development will be provided by two points: a right-in, right-out access from Prairie Star Parkway, with a dedicated right-turn lane, and a full access point at the future 95th Street. The developer plans to dedicate right-of-way and construct a portion of the public roadway to facilitate this access. He highlighted the proposed architectural and design features, including highquality materials like fiber cement board siding and masonry, townhome-style buildings, attached garages, and amenities such as a clubhouse, pool, pet playground, pickleball court, and pedestrian connections to the Coon Creek Trail. He also mentioned that the units would range from one to three bedrooms, with modern in-unit features such as granite countertops, stainless steel appliances, and walk-in closets. The project aims to meet the growing demand for housing in Johnson County, driven by recent economic development in the area, including Panasonic and the Century Commerce Center. He emphasized the proposal's compliance with the comprehensive plan, its compatibility with the existing community, and its commitment to minimizing environmental impact through fewer, taller buildings, as well as the provision of public right-of-way and infrastructure improvements. In conclusion, Mr. Mozzetti stated that Continental Properties is dedicated to owning and operating the community long-term, becoming a good neighbor, and contributing to the continued growth and development of Lenexa.

## STAFF PRESENTATION

Dave Dalecky presented the Staff Report for the rezoning and preliminary plan request for the Vantage at Lenexa development. This development is located at the northwest corner of Prairie Star Parkway and Monticello Road, on predominantly undeveloped land, with three rental homes currently on the site. The applicant now owns the



entire property, which is divided into three zoning districts. One of these districts, RP-3, Planned Residential (Medium-High) Density, was part of a larger zoning project from 2006 called Bristol Ridge, which has since been absorbed into the Watercrest and Watercrest South developments. The section zoned AG, Agricultural, was originally preserved for mixed use, but this designation was never formalized. The site is designated for highdensity residential use on the city's Future Land Use Map, making the development appropriate for the area. The proposed development covers 20.59 acres and includes 297 units across nine buildings, resulting in a density of 14.4 units per acre, which is below the maximum allowed in the RP-4, Planned Residential (High Density) Zoning District. The Staff Report analyzes all 13 criteria for rezoning, but two specific factors were highlighted: the development's conformance to the Comprehensive Plan and its traffic impacts. The City's Future Land Use Map shows the area around the K-7 and Prairie Star Parkway intersection as intended for more intense development, with less intensive development further out, which fits the proposed development. Regarding traffic, the primary access points are from the future 95th Street, which connects to Monticello Road, and Prairie Star Parkway. These access points meet the City's traffic and fire department requirements. The site has significant grade changes, with a high point at the southeastern corner and a descending slope to the northwest, near city-owned parkland and the Coon Creek Trail. Retaining walls will be used to address the grade changes, and the buildings on the southern side will sit 10 to 18 feet lower than Monticello Street grade. The landscape plan meets the city's requirements for buffer zones along the north and east property lines, with an emphasis on tree preservation on the west side. A stormwater treatment basin will be located at the northwest corner of the site. Pedestrian connectivity is also a key feature, with sidewalks both within the site and connecting to the nearby Coon Creek Trail. The site's preliminary plan includes a plat, and the applicant has identified the need to vacate part of an old county road that exists on the property. The building elevations show a mix of traditional materials, with options for stacked stone or cementitious panels for the base of the buildings. The applicant has requested a three-foot deviation from the maximum 35-foot height limit in RP-4 zoning, which is common in multifamily developments due to modern construction techniques. Staff support the height deviation request, as the design aligns with typical multifamily construction. He stated that staff recommends approval of the rezoning from the three existing zoning districts to RP-4 and approval of the associated preliminary plan. The City Council is scheduled to consider the request at its meeting on April 15th.

## PUBLIC HEARING

Chairman Poss **OPENED** the Public Hearing and asked if anyone wished to speak on this item.

Vickie Townsley, a resident and HOA secretary of a senior housing development in The Enclaves on Chelsea Street in Lenexa, voiced several concerns that she and the HOA had that were discussed during a meeting in February. She highlighted the removal of trees and the loss of the sound barrier along K-7, which will affect the community. She also expressed worry about increased traffic in the roundabout, particularly with many students traveling to nearby schools like St. James Academy and Manchester Elementary, creating potential safety risks. She shared that a resident in Brampton West had reported a school bus being hit in the roundabout earlier this year and fears that additional lanes into the new development could make the situation worse. Another concern she raised was the potential damage to foundations caused by blasting rock during construction. A nearby neighbor had experienced damage during previous building projects, and other homes in the area had similar issues. Noise from traffic and the pickleball courts was also mentioned as a concern, as many senior residents enjoy quiet evenings on their patios. She also expressed worry over the impact on Coon Creek Trail, a popular walking area for seniors, and the surrounding wildlife. Considering these issues, she requested that the zoning remain unchanged and that the proposed apartment complex be relocated to a different urban area.

Corey Forte, a resident, noted the stark contrast between the single-family homes in the Brampton West subdivision where he lives and the proposed RP-4 zoning, which he felt was an inappropriate fit for the area, especially considering the site's terrain and environmentally sensitive areas. Mr. Forte stated that he was a civil engineer and argued that the steep grade change and the number of proposed structures on the site were not ideal, and he questioned the planning decision that allowed for such a development in this location. He also expressed concern about the impact on the nearby public park or nature trail, emphasizing that it would be better to have a lower-density development in the area. While he acknowledged that the proposed zoning matched



what had been established by Lenexa, he felt the location itself was a poor choice. He questioned the planning process that designated the land as RP-4 in the first place and expressed interest in digging deeper into that issue. He was particularly concerned about the blasting required for construction, which he believed would cause significant structural and grading challenges, especially given the shallow bedrock on the site. He also noted the environmental impact of clearing the remaining trees in the area, as many trees had already been lost due to nearby developments. He requested that a buffer, similar to the one found in the nearby Silver Leaf community, be added to help mitigate the contrast between the single-family residential area and the proposed high-density development. Lastly, Mr. Forte pointed out the discrepancy between the minor concern over a five-foot fence setback on the earlier Board of Zoning Appeals agenda and the much larger issue of a nearly 40-foot building being constructed next to single-family homes, which would block views of wildlife and trees. He objected to the development and urged further consideration of alternative uses for the land.

Chad Bowman, a resident located just south of Mr. Forte, echoed the traffic-related issues raised earlier, mentioning that his two children attend Manchester Park Elementary, which is already overcapacity with 618 students. Mr. Bowman questioned whether the community is prepared for an additional 10% enrollment increase, considering the difficulties the school faces in finding substitutes and full-time teachers. He also shared a personal experience, noting that his children were nearly on the bus involved in a recent accident. He criticized the speed and lack of proper signage around the roundabout, which he described as a dangerous blind curve, particularly for traffic coming from the east. He voiced his concerns about the impact of the development on the neighborhood's aesthetics. Living in a single-family home with a view of trees to the west, he expressed disappointment that the development was moving forward so guickly, which, had he known, might have influenced his decision to move to the area. He argued that the proposed development is the wrong approach for attracting young families to Lenexa, a city he deeply appreciates for its park system and trails. Chad was especially concerned about the proposed changes to Coon Creek Trail, where 30-foot retention walls would be built, obstructing the natural landscape and views for residents. He felt this would diminish the quality of life in the area and detract from what Lenexa offers to its residents. Additionally, he raised concerns about the traffic speed on Monticello, describing it as a "racetrack" between Prairie Star Parkway and 95th Street. He feared that adding more traffic, especially with the proposed hill, could lead to safety issues. Based on his nearly 10 years of living in the area, he requested a reconsideration of the zoning, emphasizing that the development does not seem suitable for the location.

Colleen Connor, a resident of Manchester Park, spoke on behalf of herself and other community members who could not attend the meeting. Ms. Connor urged the Planning Commission to vote against the rezoning proposal for several reasons. She and her husband moved to the area in 2009, having done their due diligence, knowing that the area would develop over time. They were aware that the region was designated for future growth, but never expected a three-story, nine-building apartment complex to be built in such a highly residential area, especially near an elementary school. She felt that this development does not align with the existing neighborhood and would disrupt the transition from single-family homes to commercial areas. She referenced the previous development proposals for the nearby Watercrest area, which included townhomes that were better suited to the neighborhood with a density of eight units per acre. She disagreed with the Staff Report that claimed the 300-unit apartment complex would fit well with the surrounding areas. She acknowledged that services like water and sewer would likely be adequate but questioned the adequacy of the local schools to support the development, particularly since Manchester Park Elementary is already the largest school in the Olathe School District and has limited capacity. Another concern she raised was the impact on the local trail system, which is highly valued by the community. Lenexa's parks and trails are a major reason why people choose to live there, and she pointed out that the proposed buildings would be towering over the trail, creating an unpleasant and overwhelming environment for those who use it regularly. She suggested that the Planning Commission consider lowering the building heights and increasing the tree buffer between the development and the trail to preserve the natural space and make for a smoother transition from the residential area to the commercial zone. She concluded by expressing her belief that while Lenexa does need development, apartment complexes should be located in more appropriate areas such as along major highways, not in residential neighborhoods. She strongly urged the commission to vote no on the rezoning.



Steve Flones, a resident of Manchester Park since 2001, shared his long-standing affection for Lenexa, referencing his memories from the 70s and 80s, and highlighted the special nature of the community. Mr. Flones mentioned that the community outreach had failed to reach Manchester Park Elementary, as he spoke with the school's principal, who was unaware of the project. He expressed concern about the impact the development would have on an already overburdened elementary school, especially given that the Olathe School District has sold all its property in Lenexa and is focused on properties it owns elsewhere. He agreed with others who noted the stark contrast between the proposed apartment complex and the surrounding residential areas. He felt the apartments would disrupt the character of the neighborhood and should be replaced with a development more in line with the single-family homes in the area, suggesting that a buffer should be created to reduce the contrast. Additionally, he raised concerns about the company behind the development, citing a quick online search that revealed over 40 one-star reviews, raising doubts about their property management. He emphasized that while he is not opposed to apartments, he believes this development is not suitable for the area. He concluded by urging the commission to vote no on the rezoning.

Jeannette Duwe, a resident, expressed her shock at not having received any outreach or communication from the developers, especially considering her property directly backs up to Monticello Road, near the roundabout. Ms. Duwe was disturbed that the company claimed to want to be part of the community but did not make an effort to contact her or address her concerns. She spoke concerning the ongoing traffic issues in the area, particularly the noise from vehicles speeding through the roundabout and modified cars on Prairie Star Parkway. She also feared that the addition of 300 new dwellings would significantly worsen these traffic problems and lead to even more road trips and congestion. She emphasized the mismatch between the proposed development and the existing community, stating that something like the nearby townhomes in Sun Ridge Canyon would be a much better fit for the area. She expressed concern that high-density, multifamily developments could bring increased noise, a transient population, and potential crime, all of which could negatively affect the safety and community feel of the area, especially near the trail system. As a mother, she placed great value on Lenexa's safety, which she feared could be compromised by the development. She concluded by urging the commission to vote against the rezoning, stressing that Lenexa's special character could be lost if the area became overdeveloped.

Alissa Smith, who resides in the Silver Leaf community, shared her concerns about the proposed development. Ms. Smith commented on the ongoing traffic issues, particularly around the roundabout, and mentioned that as a runner, she has almost been hit multiple times while crossing there. She noted that with the proposed development, people coming from the east would have to navigate the roundabout to enter the community, as there would be no direct access from the east side. She also raised concerns about the impact on the 2040 Comprehensive Plan, referencing recent developments like Copper Creek on Woodsonia Drive that have already increased density in the area. She suggested that the continued rezoning of these areas might require a reevaluation of the plan as a whole, rather than just focusing on individual rezoning requests. She also echoed the concerns of others at the meeting and urged the Commission to vote no on the rezoning proposal.

Abby Doyle, emphasized the significant negative impact the proposed project would have on the lake and surrounding trails, particularly the loss of native trees and wildlife, which would reduce the area's beauty. Ms. Doyle mentioned how the park is a valuable resource not only for the adjacent neighborhoods but also for residents across Lenexa and even Kansas City, noting that the development could change the visitor experience and potentially reduce usage over time. She urged the decision-makers to vote against the proposed rezoning to preserve the natural charm of the area.

Robert Graham Jr., who lives directly across from the proposed apartment complex on Monticello Road, expressed his concerns about the significant changes the development would bring to the area. Having lived in the neighborhood since the early 1970s, he has witnessed extensive changes in Lenexa and is worried about the additional strain a large apartment complex would place on local traffic. He described the current traffic situation as problematic, with speeding and frequent accidents, particularly around a nearby roundabout. He also voiced concerns about the potential need for blasting to prepare the site, citing past experiences with construction near his property, where blasting caused severe foundation damage to a house he had lived in. While he



acknowledged the apartment complex looked nice, he felt it was not a suitable fit for the area and would disrupt the neighborhood. As a result, he opposed the proposed development.

Mike Feller, a resident of Lenexa since 1997, shared his concerns about the rapid growth of apartment developments in the city. Mr. Feller commented that 28 years ago, over three-quarters of Lenexa's housing was single-family homes, but with the increasing number of apartment developments, he believed that the proportion of single-family homes would soon drop below half for the first time in the city's history. He expressed frustration with what he perceived as the city prioritizing commercial developers' interests over those of taxpaying citizens. He pointed out that developers had received significant tax incentives, including over \$750 million for various projects, while single-family housing developers received no such benefits. He also raised concerns about the impact of new apartment units on local services like schools, police, and fire, noting that apartment complexes do not pay local property taxes, placing the financial burden on homeowners. He then questioned whether the proposed development was in a Tax Increment Financing (TIF) district and whether the developer would be receiving any tax incentives. He mentioned that several months ago, two members of the City Council and staff met with a large group, including the director of the Kansas City Metro Home Builders Association, to discuss affordable housing concerns in our area. He went on further to state that while affordable housing problems are not unique to Lenexa, it is, we found out, worse here than in neighboring cities, and it's because there's some underlying policies, actions, and inactions by the city and county that are significantly contributing to the problem, one of which is zoning. He then accused the development of violating the city's zoning policies, as the proposed development did not seem to meet the typical criteria for apartment complexes in the area. Lastly, he raised concerns about the developer's registration status with the Kansas Secretary of State, asking for clarification before any votes on the development were held. Chairman Poss responded that status of the applicant's business license had no bearing on the land use decision that was being discussed.

Brooklyn Gaupp expressed concerns about the proposed development due to its proximity to her home. She said that many families in her neighborhood have children who play outside, and she worried that increased traffic from the development would create safety risks for her and the other kids. She also agreed with previous concerns that were raised about the strain on local schools, noting that there is already not enough capacity for more residents in the area.

Steve Wirtz, a resident of Overland Park, shared concerns about how decisions made in surrounding communities, including Lenexa, Shawnee, Olathe, and Gardner, were negatively impacting his property values and quality of life. Mr. Wirtz mentioned that property taxes in Johnson County have been rising three times the rate of inflation in recent years, which is becoming a growing concern for his family. As the CFO of his household, he worried about the financial burden of these increases, especially since they are looking to potentially pass their home down to one of their children. He also expressed frustration that apartment complexes, which don't pay into the local property tax base, are contributing to these issues. He felt that the surrounding areas, including Overland Park, were experiencing similar problems. He urged the city to consider whether residents in new developments, particularly renters, would be contributing to the community's services, such as schools and public services, before proceeding with such projects.

Gaylene Van Horn, a resident, expressed significant concerns about the proposed apartment development. Ms. Van Horn questioned the affordability of the project, particularly for individuals or seniors living on limited incomes, such as those relying on social security or pensions, given the high-income threshold of \$168,000 for some of the units. She inquired about the proposed rental costs for various apartment sizes and whether they would truly serve those in need of affordable housing. She also pointed out the severe lack of affordable single-family homes in Lenexa, referencing a Johnson County report that showed only one home under \$150,000 available in the area. She argued that this site could be better used for small to mid-size single-family homes, which she believes are desperately needed. She noted that many people, including seniors and young adults, prefer to buy homes rather than live in apartments and are therefore moving to other areas like Gardner, Platte City, and Spring Hill, where smaller, more affordable homes are being built. She expressed skepticism about the claim that the proposed apartments would blend seamlessly into the existing residential area, pointing out that the character of the neighborhood would not be positively impacted by the development. She also questioned



the need for additional apartment units in Lenexa, citing the large number of existing, under-construction, and planned apartments in the city. She asked for clarification on how this new development would truly provide housing that doesn't already exist and how it would support the local workforce. Further, Ms. Van Horn raised concerns about the potential financial impact on the community, asking whether the developer would be responsible for contributing to the funding of necessary infrastructure, including first responders, schools, and other services. She also requested details on the expected property taxes for the development and whether any tax incentives or abatements were being offered to the developer. In conclusion, she strongly opposed the proposed apartment complex.

Daniel J. Browne, a resident, expressed his strong opposition to the proposed apartment development. Mr. Browne acknowledged that high-density housing typically leads to increased traffic but emphasized that this development would dramatically escalate traffic in a short period. He sought clarification on the differences between various zoning designations, noting that RP-4 allows for 16 dwelling units per acre, which would represent a significant change in the area compared to existing zoning. He pointed out that the surrounding neighborhoods are predominantly R-1, except for the Sunridge Canyon area, and he believed that placing an RP-4 development directly across from R-1 zoning would drastically alter the character of the neighborhood. He suggested that a more transitional type of housing would be more appropriate for the area. While he recognized the need for different housing densities, he argued that such a dramatic shift in zoning could be harmful to the character of the neighborhood. As the president of the Manchester Park Homeowners Association for over two years, he also mentioned that he had not been contacted by Mr. Mozzetti regarding the development, and he only became aware of the meeting after noticing a sign along Prairie Star Parkway. He strongly opposed the rezoning and urged the commissioners to reconsider and not approve the proposal.

Chairman Poss entertained a motion to **CLOSE** the public hearing. Moved by Commissioner Horine, seconded by Commissioner Burson, and carried by a unanimous voice vote.

### COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Chairman Poss asked Tim Collins, the Engineering and Construction Services Administrator, if he could address the traffic issues raised by the residents during the hearing. Mr. Collins responded that Steve Schooley, the Traffic Manager, was involved in the review and had not identified any issues. He added that the arterial roadways that are currently constructed are capable of handling the increased traffic. Chairman Poss expressed sympathy for the residents' concerns about safety, especially near roundabouts, but acknowledged that people sometimes drive recklessly. However, he noted that on the western side of Prairie Star Parkway, increased traffic appeared to have made drivers more cautious, which seemed to have slowed down speeding. Mr. Collins agreed that this seemed to be the case, although he could not confirm it as an engineer. He further commented that it appeared to be more of an enforcement issue that needed to be addressed.

Chairman Poss asked Mr. Mozzetti to address the issue raised by residents that concerned blasting and rock removal. Mr. Mozzetti explained that a geotechnical report had been conducted, which involved taking over 65 borings across the entire site. He noted that the shallowest bedrock was found in the northwest corner, near the Cliffs of Watercrest, and less shallow rock around Monticello Road in the southeast corner. They expect the northwest quadrant of the site to be the fill condition, where no blasting was expected and they would be adding dirt to that section to support the infrastructure. In contrast, the southeast corner had deeper bedrock, ranging from 4 to 24 feet below the current grade. They would not know for certain whether rock could be scraped away or blasting would be necessary until construction begins. He stated that some minor blasting might occur during site preparation to reach the required elevations, especially for utility trenching. He also confirmed that the geotechnical report indicated the presence of both shale and limestone bedrock, with varying depth and location.

Chairman Poss asked staff for further information. Butch Diekemper, Fire Marshal for the Lenexa Fire Department, explained that blasting in Lenexa is highly regulated, with the city issuing between three to five blasting permits per year. Due to the area's rock shelf, many permits are issued for developments like the one being discussed. The city's restrictions on seismic movement during blasting are much stricter than industry



standards, being 100 times higher than what is typically allowed. These regulations were set by the governing body years ago and have remained unchanged. Additionally, the city requires that homes within certain distances (500 to 1,000 feet) of blasting sites undergo surveys, though homeowners have the option to opt out. He also noted that the city has not been made aware of any complaints regarding blasting, and while the city does not intervene in litigation between homeowners and blasters over issues like cracked basements, the survey provisions are in place to protect homeowners if they choose to take advantage of them. He explained that, according to current city regulations, blasting in Lenexa is permitted from 8:00 AM to 4:00 PM. After 4:00 PM, blasting is not allowed. While the city is reviewing some of the related codes, Mr. Diekemper did not anticipate any changes to this policy at this time.

Chairman Poss asked, though he noted it was not relevant to the application, whether the site in question lies within a TIF (Tax Increment Financing) District. Scott McCullough replied that any request for tax incentives goes to the Governing Body, not the Planning Commission therefore, the narrower focus is on land use criteria of the code tonight. Mr. McCullough added that the city has provided incentives to a few apartment complexes that have been in areas where the city wants to incentivize the development and activities. He went on to say that outside of places like City Center where TIF Districts occur, apartment developments do not generally receive tax incentives. There have been a few that have received incentives, but generally, even they will pay taxes. It has not been in the form of complete tax abatement and apartment complexes absolutely pay property taxes.

Chairman Poss addressed the comments raised concerning the possible crowding of schools and said that although he is sympathetic, that issue is not under the Commission's purview. School Districts have access to all the Planning Commission's information that is made public, including future land use, and how the city will plan for the area to develop. The districts may review the information whenever they deem necessary for the students in their district.

Chairman Poss asked Scott McCullough if the Future Land Use for the site is question had changed with the recent Comprehensive Plan update. Mr. McCullough began by reminding everyone that the city went through a yearlong process that ended last summer with the Comprehensive Plan that involved widespread public notice. As he looked at the information, he stated that on digital page 27 of the Comprehensive Plan the areas of change map denotes that this was a parcel that did not change its land use classification. It was high density at the time the plan was being revised and it carried forward with the new plan.

Commissioner Horine asked if this area did not change during the last plan, when the previous Comprehensive Plan was adopted. Mr. McCullough replied that it was adopted in 2016. Commissioner Horine asked if the Comprehensive Plan is reviewed approximately every 10 years. Mr. McCullough was not sure if that was the practice but that 2016 was the last major review, so it would have been classified for high density in 2016.

Commissioner Horine asked why the entrance to the development from Prairie Star Parkway is a right in, right out only. He said that when the bridge was built an extra lane was provided on the eastbound bridge specifically to accommodate a left turn lane. Tim Collins replied that as they were going through the review process with the development team, a full access entrance was proposed but the entrance would have been closer to the bridges on Prairie Star Parkway. However, the development team determined that this location was not ideal for them. Their analysis of the site's grades, bedrock conditions, and the placement of their buildings made it difficult to make a full access entrance work in that area. As a result, they opted to proceed with the "right in, right out" access point in the location they preferred. Commissioner Horine responded that their option to provide a left turn lane from eastbound Prairie Star Parkway from K-7 would have aided traffic flow. He then addressed the applicant's deviation request saying that it has been considered multiple times and discussed extensively, and he has no objections to their request. He went on further to state that the development proposal aligns with what was envisioned in the Comprehensive Plan. The developers are adhering to the goals set out in the plan and are doing a good job of ensuring the project stays within the intended parameters. While it's acknowledged that trees will be lost and wildlife will be displaced, this is a natural consequence of development as it moves east, west, north, and south. This pattern of impact has been a part of development for as long as anyone can



remember. Therefore, he is in favor of the proposed plan and believes the deviation is reasonable given the circumstances.

Commissioner Harber shared that he is a 54-year resident of Lenexa where his neighborhoods were Whispering Hills, Hirning Woods, Hidden Valley and Mill Creek Farms. He recalled that their neighbors once opposed significant changes, including the widening of 87<sup>th</sup> Street, the expansion of Woodland into Olathe, and even the construction of K-10. While these developments were initially viewed as detrimental, over time they became part of the area's growth and were eventually seen as positive. Commissioner Harber pointed out that the Comprehensive Plan was intentionally designed to accommodate density in specific areas, and the plan's execution is consistent with that vision, also supporting the project.

Commissioner Dharod asked if the rezoning of the property were approved, would there still be aspects of the development that would require additional approvals at various checkpoints throughout the development phase. He also inquired if the approval would bind the city to the entire development plan that was presented or if certain aspects of the plan could still be subject to review and approval during the development process. Scott McCullough responded that this is the first step in the entitlement process, but if the preliminary plan is submitted and approved, the final plan will need to basically reflect the preliminary plan to a high degree. If it were to change to any significant degree, they may need to resubmit a new preliminary plan. Once the preliminary plan is approved at the City Council stage, that provides the entitlement for the applicant to move to the next step, which is the final plan and final plat. They could then proceed with the building permits and site development permits, then all the technical work that goes into the development of the property will begin.

Commissioner Dharod asked if the Board was just focusing on the rezoning aspect of the application. Mr. McCullough replied that the Board is recommending both the rezoning and preliminary plan/preliminary plat to the City Council with the Board's action today.

Commissioner Dharod agreed with earlier comments that rezoning to RP-4, Planned Residential (High-Density) District, aligns with many of the goals and visions established for the future of Lenexa. Hopefully, all the concerns will be further considered and addressed as the development moves forward. Based on this, he is in favor of approving the rezoning.

Commissioner Wagner stated that the discussion is not about changing the Comprehensive Plan, and that the proposal aligns with the intended use for this general space. However, she expressed a desire to see more details regarding the buffering, particularly on the north side of the property, where it abuts residential backyards. She would like to know the plan for maintaining some of the existing vegetation or what measures can be taken to improve the buffering and help ease the transition into that space. Regarding the height, Commissioner Wagner noted that the proposed development generally falls within the guidelines of other RP-4 areas and makes sense overall. However, she pointed out that the section cut showing Building 7's height in relation to the retaining wall and property line appears quite drastic. She questioned whether this steep retaining wall, especially with such a tall building, has been seen in other developments. Commissioner Wagner emphasized the need to consider whether this design makes the most sense given the planned elevation and overall build-out height.

Commissioner Burson commented that when it comes to public comments on development, particularly in western Lenexa, there is often opposition due to concerns about cutting down trees and disturbing wildlife. He pointed out that many areas now developed were once home to trees, turkeys, and deer, and that every parcel in the city is owned by someone who has the right to use it for its intended purpose, just like the residents who live nearby. He emphasized that the focus should not be on emotional reactions to development but rather on the Comprehensive Plan, in which he had been involved for several years. Commissioner Burson explained that the Comprehensive Plan was shaped by input from both developers and residents, ensuring that it was a balanced approach to the future of Lenexa. He shared that there had been complaints about tall buildings near trails and other developments. He referenced the Watercrest development on Renner Boulevard between 87<sup>th</sup> and 79<sup>th</sup> Street, which was initially met with concerns about density and height deviations. After seeing the completed project, it now fits seamlessly into the neighborhood.



Commissioner Jamison expressed some concerns after reviewing the report multiple times. His first concern was regarding the access points for the development. He clarified that there would be no access from Monticello and asked if the access would be off 95th Street, similar to driving down Lone Elm, taking a left onto 95th, and then using the roundabout. He questioned whether this aspect of the development had been sufficiently discussed, as he felt it might add a significant element to the project that hadn't been fully considered by the developer. Regarding the building height, Commissioner Jamison mentioned that Mr. Mozzetti had mentioned nine buildings at 38 feet in height, and he asked what the impact would be on the number of buildings if the height were reduced to 35 feet. He was curious whether a reduction in building height would affect visibility and whether the developer had considered this aspect. Mr. Mozzetti responded that the proposal includes only two access points: a right-in, right-out access from Prairie Star Parkway, and a secondary access point from 95th Street, which would be extended west from the existing roundabout on Monticello. He explained that due to the elevation changes on the site, full access from Prairie Star Parkway would be problematic and infeasible, so the proposed access points were a more suitable option. As for the building height, he explained that reducing the height to 35 feet would substantially reduce the unit count, as it would be difficult to achieve three-story buildings at that height with modern construction methods.

Commissioner Jamison also reflected on the growth of Lenexa over the past 23 years, acknowledging that with change comes opportunity. He shared that while he wasn't entirely on board with the project due to some lingering questions, he recognized the importance of continued development in making the city a place for families and individuals to raise their families and build careers. He expressed confidence in the city's staff and their ability to make the right decisions for the community but emphasized the importance of considering all the citizens' concerns during the process. He expressed support for the rezoning but asked that the feedback from the citizens be understood and considered moving forward.

Commissioner Katterhenry mentioned that when the new Advent hospital was being developed, there were concerns about its impact, but the presence of trees along the trail has helped minimize the visual effect. He said that the hospital is not very visible from the trail, and the houses in the neighborhood are located on the other side. Surprisingly, the hospital's presence has not been as disruptive as initially anticipated. He also pointed out that across Renner Boulevard from the neighborhood is the Watercrest development, which consists of five or six-story apartment complexes. Despite initial concerns, the impact of these buildings has not been significant to that neighborhood either. Regarding the rezoning proposal, he could not oppose the Comprehensive Plan, as it has been in place and allocated for this type of development. He commented that he was not entirely in favor of the apartment density in Lenexa, the need for higher-density housing near highways, rather than single-family homes, has driven the decisions. He mentioned his support for transitional elements wherever possible but felt that in this case, the three-story buildings are not far off from the two-story homes across the street. He said he did not see a strong reason to oppose the proposal in this regard.

Chairman Poss shared that during his analysis of the project, the first thing he reviewed was the Future Land Use Map. He stated that the area is designated for High-density development, which aligns with the nature of the proposed project. As he went through the golden criteria, he found nothing that would change his opinion in favor of the project. He pointed out that the applicant's proposal fits the vision for the area. He said there were no requests for setback deviations, and in fact, the applicant had increased the distance between the single-family homes and the proposed development to create more separation. He also mentioned that the green space in the project met the requirements, with only a 1% difference from the minimum required, still exceeding the standards for an RP-4 development. Chairman Poss stated that based on his review of the golden criteria and the alignment of the project with the future land use map and comprehensive plan, he saw no reason to deny the application. The project was exactly what had been envisioned for the area's development.

#### MOTION

Chairman Poss entertained a motion to recommend **APPROVAL** to rezone property from AG, Agricultural, R-1, Single-Family Residential, and the RP-3, Planned Residential Medium High-Density districts to the RP-4,



Planned Residential High-Density District for **Vantage at Lenexa** located at the northwest corner of Prairie Star Parkway and Monticello Road.

Moved by Commissioner Jamison, seconded by Commissioner Burson, and carried by a unanimous voice vote.

Chairman Poss entertained a motion to recommend **APPROVAL** of the preliminary plan/plat for **Vantage at Lenexa** located at the northwest corner of Prairie Star Parkway and Monticello Road for a multifamily development with the following deviation:

1. A deviation from Section 4-1-B-9-F of the UDC to allow the apartment buildings to exceed the 35-foot building height as noted within the Staff Report.

Moved by Commissioner Horine, seconded by Commissioner Burson, and carried by a unanimous voice vote

## **STAFF REPORT**

No announcements from Staff.

## ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Poss ended the regular meeting of the Lenexa Planning Commission at 9:42 p.m. on Monday, March 31, 2025.