
CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Poss called the regular meeting of the Lenexa Planning Commission to order at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, July 6, 2026. The meeting was held in the Community Forum at Lenexa City Hall at 17101 W. 87th Street Parkway, Lenexa, Kansas.

ROLL CALL

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT

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
Commissioner David Woolf

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT

None

STAFF PRESENT

Scott McCullough, Director of Community Development
Stephanie Sullivan, Planning Manager
Tim Collins, Engineering/Construction Services Administrator
Andrew Diekemper, Assistant Fire Chief
Spencer Throssell, Assistant City Attorney II
Dave Dalecky, Planner III
Jessica Lemanski, Planner II
Noah Vaughan, Planning Specialist II
Oliver Zigmund, Planning Intern
Gloria Lambert, Senior Administrative Assistant

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the June 1, 2026 meeting were presented for approval. Hearing no changes or corrections to the minutes of the regular meeting, Chairman Poss entertained a motion to **APPROVE** the minutes as written. Moved by Commissioner Horine, seconded by Commissioner Burson, and **APPROVED** by a majority voice vote.

CONSENT AGENDA

1. **The Rise — Consideration of a final plan for a mixed-use development on property located at 8700 Ryckert Street within the CC, Planned City Center District. PL26-07F**
2. **Lenexa Municipal Services Storage Building — Consideration of a revised final plan for an accessory structure on property located at 7700 Cottonwood Street within the R-1, Single-Family Residential District. PL26-04FR**
3. **CMC Foods and CMC Lenexa — Consideration of a final plan and final plat for manufacturing, office, and warehousing uses with deferred parking on property located at 9806 Lackman Road within the BP-2, Planned Manufacturing District.**
 - a. **Consideration of a final plan for manufacturing, office, and warehousing uses with deferred parking within the BP-2, Planned Manufacturing District. PL26-08F**
 - b. **Consideration of a final plat for a one-lot industrial subdivision within the BP-2, Planned Manufacturing District. PT26-19F**
4. **Kansas Commerce Center, Fifth Plat — Consideration of a revised final plat to adjust lot lines for warehousing and manufacturing uses on property located at 15300 W. 99th Street, 15600 W. 99th Street, and 9755 Commerce Parkway within the BP-2, Planned Manufacturing District. PT26-04FR**
5. **Wilson Accessory Structure — Consideration of a deviation from the required side yard setback to construct an accessory garage on property located at 8720 Old Trail Road within the RP-E, Planned Residential Estate District. DV26-03**

Chairman Poss entertained a motion to **APPROVE** the Consent Agenda. Moved by Commissioner Harber, seconded by Commissioner Horine, and carried by a unanimous voice vote.

REGULAR AGENDA

6. **Marmon Estates and Woodland Lakes Lot 2 — Consideration of a rezoning, preliminary plat, and final plat for a two-lot single-family residential development located near the northeast corner of 95th Street & Cherry Lane. (Public Hearing)**
 - a. **Consideration of a rezoning from the RE, Residential Estate District to the R-1, Single-Family Residential District to allow a single-family residential lot. RZ26-04**
 - b. **Consideration of a preliminary plat for a two-lot single-family residential subdivision in the R-1, Single-Family Residential District. PT26-02P**
 - c. **Consideration of a final plat for a two-lot single-family residential subdivision in the R-1, Single-Family Residential District. PT26-16F**

APPLICANT PRESENTATION

Doug Ubben, with Phelps Engineering, presented a rezoning, preliminary plat and final plat on behalf of the owner, Jim Marmon. Mr. Ubben stated that the property currently consists of three parcels. The westernmost parcel is a narrow, approximately one-acre parcel extending north from 95th Street before

turning west. Lot 1 consists of approximately 19 acres, and Lot 2, within a subdivision known as Woodland Lakes, consists of approximately 9 acres, for a combined total of 28.43 acres. He further explained that the proposal would combine the three existing parcels into two lots. Proposed Lot 1 would include the existing residence and all accessory structures, including the sheds and other outbuildings, which accounts for its configuration on the final plat. The remaining property to the east would become Lot 2, a vacant lot that Mr. Marmon could sell in the future. Mr. Ubben stated that the purpose of the preliminary/final plat is to create two lots: Lot 1 containing the existing residence and accessory structures, and Lot 2 as a vacant lot. Regarding the rezoning request, Mr. Ubben explained that the western portion of the property, including the one-acre parcel, is currently zoned R-1, Single-Family Residential District, while the eastern portion is zoned RE, Residential Estate District. Because the proposed lot lines will no longer align with the existing parcel boundaries, the applicant is requesting to rezone the portion currently zoned RE to R-1 so that Lot 1 will have consistent R-1 zoning throughout.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Noah Vaughan, Planning Specialist II, presented the Staff Report for the rezoning of Woodland Lakes Lot 2 and the preliminary and final plat for Marmon Estates. He identified the subject property as three parcels located north of Prairie Star Parkway and east of Woodland Road, including a one-acre parcel that would be combined with the resulting Lot 1, pending plat approval. Mr. Vaughan explained that the western parcels are currently zoned R-1, while the eastern parcel is zoned RE and contains an existing residence. The proposed rezoning would change the eastern parcel to R-1 zoning, creating consistent zoning across all three parcels. He noted that if the plat were approved without the rezoning, both resulting lots would contain split zoning, which Staff considered undesirable. He stated that Staff evaluated the proposal using the 13 rezoning criteria and found the request to be consistent with the surrounding area. He noted that the neighborhood is characterized by large-lot residential development, including estate lots, agricultural residential properties, and nearby single-family subdivisions. Staff concluded that the proposed zoning is compatible with the existing character, surrounding zoning districts, and land uses. He also stated that denying the rezoning would provide little public benefit and would instead create split-zoned lots despite the existing infrastructure and development already being compatible with the proposed R-1 designation. Mr. Vaughan then reviewed the preliminary and final plat, explaining that both applications were being considered together because the proposal involves only minor lot line adjustments. The plat would reduce the number of lots from three to two by incorporating the one-acre parcel into Lot 1. As a result, Lot 1 would increase to approximately 19.23 acres, while Lot 2 would decrease to approximately 9.2 acres. He noted that the only dedication included with the plat is a 10-foot utility easement to the City. He also explained that the proposed diagonal side lot line required a staff-approved exception to the Unified Development Code, which generally requires side lot lines to be perpendicular to adjacent streets. Staff supported the exception because of the large-lot nature of the development and determined that no adverse impacts would result. Mr. Vaughan further stated that the applicant requested an exception to the required fencing and landscape buffer along 95th Street. Staff supported the request because mature vegetation already provides substantial screening and the proposal does not create additional residential lots or increase development density. He explained that if the rezoning is approved, Staff intends to recommend a future Comprehensive Plan amendment to redesignate the eastern parcel from Low-Density Residential to Suburban Density Residential so that the Future Land Use Map aligns with the proposed R-1 zoning. Staff recommended approval of the rezoning for Woodland Lakes Lot 2 and the preliminary and final plat for Marmon Estates, with the applications tentatively scheduled for consideration by the Governing Body on July 21, 2026.

PUBLIC HEARING

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

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

COMMISSIONER DISCUSSION

Commissioner Horine asked for clarification regarding the dashed line shown on the plat, confirming his understanding that a single property owner owns both existing lots and all of the property involved in the application. Doug Ubben confirmed that he was correct.

Chairman Poss stated that he had no additional comments on the application, noting that it was a straightforward request.

MOTION

Chairman Poss entertained a motion to recommend **APPROVAL** for **rezoning** property from RE to R-1 for **Woodland Lakes Lot 2** located at the northeast corner of 95th Street and Cherry Lane.

Moved by Commissioner Woolf, seconded by Commissioner Wagner, and carried by a unanimous voice vote.

Chairman Poss entertained a motion to recommend **APPROVAL** of the **preliminary plat** for **Marmon Estates** located at the northeast corner of 95th Street and Cherry Lane for a single-family subdivision.

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 **final plat** for **Marmon Estates** located at the northeast corner of 95th Street and Cherry Lane for a single-family subdivision.

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

7. **Prairie Star Parkway Center — Consideration of a rezoning and preliminary plan/plat for a nine-lot commercial development located south of Prairie Star Parkway between Gleason Road and Dunraven Street. (Public Hearing)**
 - a. **Consideration of a rezoning from the AG, Agricultural District to the CP-2, Planned Community Commercial District to allow a new commercial development. RZ26-03**
 - b. **Consideration of a preliminary plan/plat for a nine-lot commercial development in the CP-2, Planned Community Commercial District. PL26-06P**

APPLICANT PRESENTATION

Aaron Mesmer of Block Real Estate Services, accompanied by John Mullen of Block Real Estate Services and Patrick Reuter of Klover Architects, presented the application on behalf of HWY-7, LLC. Mr. Mesmer explained that HWY-7, LLC owns the subject property located west of K-7, on the south side of Prairie Star Parkway, between Dunraven Street and Gleason Road. He noted that the property owner is a longtime local resident who has owned the property since it was annexed into the City of Lenexa in 1993. He emphasized that the owner is a long-term community member interested in the property's future development rather than a land speculator. Mr. Mesmer stated that the proposed development plan was created in collaboration with Klover Architects and consists of nine development parcels. The plan

includes restaurant sites, a bank, a gas station and convenience store, a pharmacy located across from AdventHealth, and office/commercial buildings along the southern portion of the site. He explained that the development is intended to provide a balanced mix of uses, with approximately 15 percent of the proposed building area dedicated to restaurants, 25 percent to retail, and more than 60 percent to office space.

Patrick Reuter of Klover Architects described the site's design, explaining that it was developed in response to the Comprehensive Plan, neighborhood node objectives, and feedback received during the pre-application meeting with City Staff. He stated that the site is organized around two primary pedestrian ways: a north-south spine connecting Prairie Star Parkway to the southern portion of the development, and an east-west greenway linking the various parcels. Mr. Reuter explained that the north-south corridor includes landscaped areas, sidewalks, and a decorative circular paving feature at the center of the development. He noted that seating was intentionally omitted from the central intersection because of the surrounding vehicle traffic, with the primary gathering space instead located at the southern end of the pedestrian spine. He described the east-west greenway as a 50- to 60-foot-wide landscaped corridor designed to provide a safe, convenient pedestrian connection throughout the site while minimizing conflicts between pedestrians and vehicles. The greenway includes seating areas and is intended to evolve as individual sites develop, with future amenities such as pocket parks, rain gardens, butterfly gardens, and additional gathering spaces. Mr. Reuter stated that the proposed pedestrian network fulfills the Comprehensive Plan's objective of creating walkable Neighborhood Nodes by connecting surrounding neighborhoods and the adjacent hospital to the commercial services within the development. He further described the proposed plaza at the southern end of the site, which includes a trellis, landscaping, seating areas, natural stone accents, and decorative lighting to provide a quieter gathering space removed from the site's primary vehicular circulation. He also explained that the site's stormwater detention area was consolidated to create a larger, more contiguous pond adjacent to the plaza, contributing to a park-like setting. Mr. Reuter concluded by presenting conceptual renderings illustrating the proposed plaza, greenway, trail amenities, seating areas, and other landscape features intended to establish the site's walkable character and guide future development as individual tenants are identified.

Aaron Mesmer returned to the podium and explained that, while they typically work closely with City Staff and seek a recommendation for approval, there were two key areas where their position differed from Staff's analysis: the interpretation of the Comprehensive Plan and the characterization of the project's traffic impacts. Regarding the Comprehensive Plan, Mr. Mesmer stated that the proposal was designed to balance the site's dual designations as both an Office/Employment Center and a Neighborhood Node. He noted that approximately 60 percent of the proposed development would consist of office space, fulfilling the employment objectives of the plan while also incorporating retail and restaurant uses to create a mixed-use development. He explained that the project includes pedestrian connections, landscaping, and gathering spaces that support the Comprehensive Plan's goals. He also argued that retail and restaurant uses along Prairie Star Parkway would complement the nearby AdventHealth campus by providing services for employees, visitors, and surrounding residents. He cited Blue Hawk as an example of a successful development pattern in which commercial uses are located along a major corridor while institutional uses are situated farther into the site. Mr. Mesmer further stated that the project was designed to serve as a neighborhood gathering place through enhanced pedestrian amenities, including a wide sidewalk, an internal green space corridor, and a plaza with outdoor seating intended to create a more inviting environment than a traditional streetside sidewalk. He said these features would provide a transition between the hospital campus and nearby residential neighborhoods and schools while meeting the needs of employees, residents, and visitors. Addressing traffic, Mr. Mesmer disagreed with Staff's conclusion that a more office-oriented development would generate less traffic. Drawing on his experience managing office and medical properties, he stated that office and medical uses typically require significant parking and produce concentrated peak-hour traffic as employees arrive and leave work. He noted that the project's traffic study concluded the adjacent roundabouts would continue to

operate at acceptable levels of service. Mr. Mesmer also stated that locating retail and restaurant uses along Prairie Star Parkway would allow customers to access the site directly from the arterial roadway without traveling through nearby residential neighborhoods or interfering with school traffic. He summarized the neighborhood outreach process, stating that approximately 40 residents attended a neighborhood meeting on June 22, 2026 in the gymnasium at St. James Academy, along with Councilmember Charlton. He reported that no opposition was expressed during the meeting and that attendees generally supported the proposal, particularly its walkability, green space, and neighborhood-serving retail and restaurant uses. Mr. Mesmer stated that residents expressed interest in the future tenants, although no commitments have been made because the property cannot yet be marketed until the planning and zoning process is complete. He concluded by offering to answer any questions from the Planning Commission.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Jessica Lemanski, Planner II, presented the request for a rezoning and preliminary plan/plat for Prairie Star Parkway Center, located south of Prairie Star Parkway between Gleason Road and Dunraven Street. Ms. Lemanski noted that the request required a public hearing and reviewed the site's location, surrounding uses, existing zoning, and Future Land Use designation. She explained that the property has been zoned AG, Agricultural since its annexation in 1993 and is classified as Office/Employment Center on the Future Land Use Map. The applicant is requesting to rezone the property to CP-2, Planned Community Commercial District, to allow development of a nine-pad commercial center with retail, restaurants, a bank, pharmacy, convenience store with fuel sales, and five drive-thru facilities. Ms. Lemanski reviewed the rezoning criteria and stated that Staff's primary concerns involved Criteria 6 and 8, with additional discussion of Criterion 10 regarding traffic impacts. She explained that Staff believes denial of the CP-2 zoning request would better protect the public health, safety, and welfare by preserving the site's opportunity for office and employment uses consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. While the denial could limit the property owner's ability to develop commercial uses, she stated the property retains reasonable development potential under zoning districts that better align with the Future Land Use classification. Ms. Lemanski emphasized that the Office/Employment Center classification is intended to accommodate professional offices, medical services, research facilities, and other employment-generating uses. She explained that the CP-O, Planned General Office and NP-O, Planned Neighborhood Office Zoning Districts are intended to implement this classification, while CP-2 is intended for community commercial areas and would allow a broader range of commercial uses without a mechanism to preserve office or employment uses over time. She noted that Staff provided an alternative zoning option that included a limited CP-1, Planned Neighborhood Commercial area, but the applicant did not pursue that approach. Ms. Lemanski stated that the proposed CP-2 zoning does not align with the Comprehensive Plan's vision for the Prairie Star Parkway corridor, which is intended to support an employment corridor that complements the nearby AdventHealth campus and includes strategically located, neighborhood-serving commercial areas rather than larger auto-oriented commercial developments. Ms. Lemanski also discussed the site's Neighborhood Node designation, explaining that these areas are intended to encourage pedestrian-oriented gathering spaces and community interaction. She stated that while the proposed plan includes pedestrian connections and amenity areas, the overall design remains primarily automobile-oriented due to the number of drive-thrus, parking areas, and vehicle circulation patterns. She also identified pedestrian concerns related to sidewalk routes through parking areas, drive-thru lanes, and areas with potential conflicts between vehicles and pedestrians. Regarding traffic impacts, Ms. Lemanski acknowledged congestion concerns near the K-7 and Prairie Star Parkway interchange but noted that the intersection is under Kansas Department of Transportation jurisdiction. She stated that while the submitted traffic study found the roadway network could accommodate the development, Staff's concern was the difference in traffic patterns between commercial uses and the office/employment uses envisioned by the Comprehensive Plan. She noted that office uses would generally create more predictable weekday traffic patterns with fewer evening and weekend trips. Ms.

Lemanski reviewed the preliminary plan, noting that the site generally meets the technical requirements of the CP-2 Zoning District, including setbacks, landscaping, architecture, utilities, stormwater management, parking, and fire access. She explained that the applicant requested internal lot line setback deviations, which Staff supports due to the unified nature of the development and the need for shared access, utilities, and circulation. In closing, Ms. Lemanski stated that Staff recommended denial of the rezoning and preliminary plan/plat because the proposal is inconsistent with the Office/Employment Center Future Land Use classification, reduces future employment opportunities, introduces a community-scale commercial development not envisioned by the Comprehensive Plan, emphasizes automobile-oriented design over walkability, and does not advance the City's Vision 2040 goals.

PUBLIC HEARING

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

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.

COMMISSIONER DISCUSSION

Commissioner Harber acknowledged the proposal's purpose and value but expressed concerns about its long-term compatibility with the area. He questioned comparisons to other mixed-use developments, noting that AdventHealth Prairie Star serves a different function. He stated that while there is demand for additional drive-thru businesses, he believed the Comprehensive Plan envisions activity nodes as places that encourage gathering and community interaction rather than primarily drive-thru uses. He also cautioned against approving a development that could limit the site's long-term potential, citing a similar nearby development with largely unfilled pad sites. Commissioner Harber said that he supported Staff's recommendation for denial.

Commissioner Horine stated that he understood the merits of both the proposal and Staff's concerns but questioned whether the development would function as the walkable, community gathering place described by the applicant. While he appreciated the pedestrian-oriented design and plaza concept, he expressed skepticism that patrons of drive-thru restaurants would use the plaza, suggesting the drive-thru component conflicted with the goal of creating a true gathering space.

In response, Aaron Mesmer explained that the plaza was intended primarily for pedestrians from the surrounding neighborhoods and that modern mixed-use developments often successfully integrate office, medical, and restaurant uses.

Commissioner Horine also questioned whether the proposal was consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's Office/Employment Center classification, noting that Office/Employment Centers are generally intended for professional and institutional uses rather than neighborhood gathering places. Finally, he asked Staff whether the applicant could voluntarily restrict the uses permitted under the requested CP-2 zoning through the application, rather than allowing the full range of uses otherwise permitted in the district.

Ms. Lemanski responded that the type of approach Commissioner Horine described was more consistent with a Planned Unit Development, where permitted uses can be customized rather than applying the full range of uses allowed within a standard zoning district. Commissioner Horine acknowledged that explanation but noted he had seen applicants voluntarily commit to excluding certain otherwise permitted uses as part of a rezoning application and asked whether those commitments could become part of the official record.

Scott McCullough responded that the City does not utilize conditional zoning and was not aware of that approach being used in Lenexa. While Planned Unit Developments can limit uses, he emphasized that Staff's primary concern was not the specific uses, but that the proposal introduced an auto-oriented commercial center in a location designated for office employment. He stated that the Comprehensive Plan directs auto-oriented retail uses to major interchanges and cautioned that allowing them along Prairie Star Parkway could undermine those targeted commercial areas.

Commissioner Horine then asked whether the CP-1 Zoning District would permit drive-thru restaurants. Stephanie Sullivan clarified that while CP-1 zoning allows restaurants, it does not permit drive-thru restaurants.

Commissioner Horine asked if the intent was to have no drive-thru restaurants on Prairie Star Parkway. Scott McCullough acknowledged that was what was envisioned, and he believed it was because the auto-oriented uses and zoning districts accommodating those uses are targeted for the more auto-centric interchanges. Commissioner Horine stated that, in his opinion, if there were a location for this type of development on Prairie Star Parkway, this would be it. He acknowledged that he did not necessarily like the way the plan was currently configured, but he could envision a development that included a mix of office, institutional, research, and retail uses. He added that any retail component should be located along 95th Street or Prairie Star Parkway, as that would be the most appropriate location. Commissioner Horine stated that he was not certain whether the specific uses proposed were what he would like to see on the site, but he believed some variation of the mixed-use plan could work. He referenced Staff's suggestion of approximately three acres of commercial development and noted that, if about 65% of the 17-acre site remained designated for office and similar uses, a little more than eight acres would remain available for development. He observed that this would reduce the applicant's proposed development area by roughly 60%, and he questioned whether such a reduction would be workable for the applicant. He concluded by stating that it was a difficult decision.

Commissioner Dharod asked Staff to address the potential conflict between the Comprehensive Plan's vision for office and employment uses and the concept of a Neighborhood Node, noting that he had difficulty envisioning an office area serving as a place where families would gather and socialize. Scott McCullough responded that Neighborhood Nodes can take many forms and explained that, in this location, the concept could include a campus-style office development with amenities such as trails, pocket parks, shaded seating areas, and gathering spaces for employees and trail users. He noted that these spaces would not necessarily include retail or food service but would provide opportunities for rest, recreation, and outdoor lunches.

Aaron Mesmer stated that he believed there was an inherent conflict between the concepts of an Office/Employment Center and a neighborhood gathering place. He explained that office developments primarily serve employees, while neighborhood gathering places are typically supported by commercial uses such as restaurants or dessert shops. He stated that the applicant's proposal attempted to balance both objectives while remaining economically viable and noted that the CP-1 Zoning District would not accommodate some of the uses the applicant believed were necessary to achieve that vision.

Commissioner Burson shared his remembrance from serving on the Comprehensive Plan planning process. He explained that, for this area, the intended vision for a Neighborhood Node resembled a campus-style office environment similar to Corporate Woods, featuring trails, green space, pocket parks, water features, and outdoor gathering areas for employees and visitors. He stated that the term "Neighborhood Node" was intentionally broad because it could have different meanings throughout the city, but in this location, it was envisioned as an Office/Employment Center with integrated open space rather than a retail-oriented gathering place.

Commissioner Dharod stated that the discussion helped clarify the intent of the Comprehensive Plan. He acknowledged that the Comprehensive Plan serves as a policy guide rather than law but noted that the plan for this particular site was adopted only two years earlier and therefore remained relatively recent. He expressed hesitation to deviate from a plan that had been thoughtfully developed through a comprehensive planning process, particularly given the continued need for office and employment uses in the area and the presence of similar developments nearby. He concluded that, because the plan was still relatively new, he believed the Commission should remain consistent with its vision for the property.

Commissioner Wagner stated that she was also conflicted. She believed the proposed development could be a successful addition and provide value to the community but expressed concern about the extent to which it deviated from the recently adopted Comprehensive Plan. She indicated that her primary concern was the potential traffic impacts associated with the proposal, particularly given the number of proposed drive-thru uses, which she felt was excessive and consistent with concerns raised by other Commissioners.

Commissioner Katterhenry stated that Prairie Star Parkway serves as one of Lenexa's signature corridors, particularly west of Pflumm Road, where the character is primarily residential and office rather than retail. He observed that the existing retail nodes along the corridor are oriented more toward adjacent streets than Prairie Star Parkway itself. Based on the corridor's established character, he stated that he agreed with the Comprehensive Plan's vision for the site and believed its recommended land use was appropriate.

Commissioner Woolf stated that, in his view, the proposal appeared to be a retail development being fit into an office and employment area rather than an office development with supporting retail uses. He indicated that he would be more supportive of the latter approach. He suggested that limited retail, such as a drive-thru pharmacy on the east side of the site and a single drive-thru restaurant near the northeast corner, could be appropriate if the remainder of the development was primarily office space with integrated gathering areas and green space. He concluded that he could support a zoning change allowing some retail uses, but believed the current proposal placed too much emphasis on retail and not enough on office and employment uses.

Commissioner Jamison stated that he liked the overall concept of the proposal but believed the plan included too much development for the site. Drawing on his familiarity with the area, he expressed concern about the traffic impacts, particularly with multiple drive-thru restaurants and increased activity during school dismissal times. He suggested that a scaled-back version of the proposal might better fit the site while still providing restaurants and other amenities west of the existing commercial areas. Although he recognized the Comprehensive Plan's vision for the property, he believed there may be an opportunity for compromise by reducing the intensity of the retail component. He also asked the applicant whether Staff's earlier suggestion to limit the commercial portion of the site to approximately three acres had been considered or whether that proposal had effectively been rejected.

Chairman Poss reminded the Commission that its role was not to redesign or suggest specific changes to an applicant's proposal, but rather to evaluate the plan as submitted. While acknowledging that the proposal could potentially be modified, he emphasized that it was not the Commission's responsibility to direct how the applicant should revise the development plan.

Responding to Commissioner Jamison's question, Aaron Mesmer responded that the applicant had considered Staff's proposal and made revisions to the plan by adding an interior plaza with seating and a trellis, expanding the green space, and incorporating additional pedestrian-oriented features to better align with the Comprehensive Plan's vision. However, he explained that the CP-1 Zoning District limited

the range of commercial uses that could be developed and that restricting the commercial area to approximately three acres would not provide sufficient development to make the project economically viable. He noted that such a limitation would largely accommodate only uses such as a gas station and pharmacy. As a result, while the applicant revised the plan, they did not pursue a split-zoning or Planned Unit Development approach.

Commissioner Burson stated that, in his view, the preliminary plan and rezoning request must be evaluated separately because zoning establishes long-term allowable uses for a property, while development plans can change over time. He noted that, during his more than decade of service on the Commission, he had not seen a development plan remain exactly as originally proposed. He emphasized that the applicant stated that they did not currently have tenants secured and therefore could not guarantee what specific uses would ultimately occupy the buildings, meaning the Commission must consider the potential uses allowed under the requested zoning district. Commissioner Burson stated that he did not believe rezoning the property to CP-2 was appropriate for this location. He referenced the recently adopted Comprehensive Plan and the significant staff, consultant, and public input involved in its development, noting that no one had previously identified this parcel as an area that should deviate from the planned Future Land Use classification. He stated that the Comprehensive Plan included thoughtful reasons for the current classification and that he saw no justification for changing it only two years after adoption. Commissioner Burson acknowledged the applicant's response to Commissioner Jamison's question regarding why a partial CP-1 rezoning was not proposed while preserving office uses on the remainder of the site. He stated that the applicant indicated that approach was not consistent with their development goals. Referencing Chairman Poss's earlier comments, he reiterated that the Commission's role was not to redesign the proposal. Based on the plan and rezoning request before the Commission, he stated that he could not support either and believed the proposal was not aligned with the Comprehensive Plan or Staff's analysis. He commended Staff's review and stated that he found no errors in the report. Commissioner Burson concluded by stating that he would recommend denial.

Chairman Poss stated that many of his concerns had already been addressed by other Commissioners but wanted to highlight several key points. He explained that his initial review of the proposal indicated that it was primarily an auto-oriented plan and, while not intended as a criticism, appeared to be centered around a gas station with other uses arranged around it. He noted that the applicant's vision images presented during the meeting were difficult to reconcile with the actual plan submitted for consideration. Chairman Poss referenced Prairie Star Parkway's intended character as outlined in the Comprehensive Plan, noting that the corridor was designed as a scenic, meandering boulevard that buffers traffic from pedestrian and neighborhood amenities. He stated that more intense, auto-oriented commercial uses were intended to be concentrated near the K-7 and K-10 interchanges rather than along the frontage of Prairie Star Parkway. He pointed out that existing higher-intensity commercial developments are located closer to major intersections, such as Renner Boulevard, Ridgeview Road, and the K-7 interchange, while areas farther west transition to residential, golf course, and lower-intensity uses. Chairman Poss stated that the proposed CP-2 zoning was not appropriate for this location because it extended too far from the K-7 and Prairie Star Parkway interchange. He agreed with the Comprehensive Plan's vision for the property and stated that he saw no reason to deviate from that guidance. He also addressed the applicant's comparison to the 115th Street and Nall Avenue area, stating that the locations were not comparable due to differences in surrounding development patterns, including existing commercial uses, apartments, and overall intensity of development. Regarding the Golden Criteria, Chairman Poss stated that he agreed with Staff's analysis, particularly the findings related to the land use pattern and compatibility of the proposed development. He noted that the applicant's request would introduce a commercial retail and restaurant development pattern that was more intense than the Office/Employment Center classification identified for the property. While acknowledging that the proposed uses could be appropriate in other locations, he stated that the proposal represented a substantial departure from the development pattern envisioned for this site. Chairman Poss concluded that, in his opinion, the proposed

plan and rezoning request did not align with the Comprehensive Plan and opened the discussion for any additional Commissioner comments or a potential vote.

MOTION

Chairman Poss entertained a motion to recommend **DENIAL** of rezoning property from AG to CP-2 for RZ26-03 – **Prairie Star Parkway Center** located south of Prairie Star Parkway between Gleason Road and Dunraven Street, for a retail and restaurant development.

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

Chairman Poss entertained a motion to recommend **DENIAL** of the preliminary plan/plat for PL26-06P – **Prairie Star Parkway Center** located south of Prairie Star Parkway between Gleason Road and Dunraven Street, for a retail and restaurant development.

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

STAFF REPORT

Stephanie Sullivan announced that she would be sending an email to Commissioners shortly to request availability for a half-day Planning Commission retreat that would include training exercises. She noted that a similar retreat had been held approximately two years earlier and explained that this session would likely begin at noon and continue through the remainder of the day. She asked Commissioners to respond to the availability request once they received the email.

ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Poss ended the regular meeting of the Lenexa Planning Commission at 8:33 p.m. on Monday, July 6, 2026.