



# The City of Andover

## Agenda

Site Plan Review Committee Meeting

Tuesday, July 7, 2026

Andover City Hall - 1609 East Central Avenue

6:00 PM

---

|  | Page    |
|--|---------|
| 1. CALL TO ORDER   |         |
| 2. ROLL CALL   |         |
| 3. MINUTES   |         |
| 3.1. <a href="#">June 2, 2026 - Pdf</a>  | 2 - 10  |
| 4. COMMUNICATIONS  |         |
| 4.1. <a href="#">Committee &amp; Staff Report - Pdf</a>                          | 11 - 17 |
| 4.2. <a href="#">Potential Residential Development Report - Pdf</a>              | 18 - 19 |
| 5. AGENDA  |         |
| 5.1. <a href="#">Sign Plan: 231 S. Andover Rd. (Integrity Urgent Care) - Pdf</a> | 20 - 22 |
| 6. MEMBER ITEMS  |         |
| 7. ADJOURN   |         |



To: Site Plan Review Committee  
From: Julie Boyd  
Date: July 7, 2026  
Subject: June 2, 2026

---

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:** Review and approve the minutes of the June 2, 2026 meeting of the Andover Site Plan Review Committee.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

[Draft Site Plan Review Minutes - 06/02/26](#)



**1. CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 6:00pm by Chairperson Scott Bonebrake.

**2. ROLL CALL**

**Committee Members present:** Chairperson Scott Bonebrake, Jessica Friedrichs, Homer Henry, John Vansickle, Zach Smith

**Staff Members present:** Les Mangus, Director of Community Development; Kevin Graham, City Engineer; Julie Boyd, Planning & Zoning Administrator; Dylan Carroll, Planning Technician.

**3. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MAY 5, 2026 MEETING.**

Homer Henry made a motion to approve the minutes of the May 5, 2026 meeting as presented. Seconded by Chairperson Bonebrake. Motion passed 5-0.

**4. COMMUNICATIONS**

- A. COMMITTEE & STAFF REPORT**
- B. POTENTIAL RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT REPORT**

**5. AGENDA**

**5.1 SP-A26-0020 – REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF THE REVISED SIGN PLAN FOR DUNKIN DONUTS, GENERALLY LOCATED AT 321 S. ANDOVER RD., ANDOVER KANSAS**

Chairperson Scott Bonebrake called the first agenda item pertaining to the review and approval of the revised sign plan for Dunkin Donuts, generally located at 321 S. Andover Rd.

Julie Boyd introduced the item by stating this case involves a multi-tenant space where Dunkin’ Donuts is the tenant. Dunkin’ Donuts is seeking to replace the existing signage with updated signage reflecting their new branding standards. Their sign plans show a wall sign on the eastern elevation, facing the street, along with a sign on the south side of the building along the drive thru. She further stated that this building has a variance from 2012 that allows for a maximum wall coverage of 7.35%. Mrs. Boyd stated she was not able to determine exactly what the wall coverage would be with the new proposed signs but that it appears they will not even hit 5% wall coverage. Everything else is up to regulations.

Anders Herpolsheimer from Ron’s Sign Co. was present and spoke at the podium to address any questions from the Committee. He stated that Dunkin recently updated their branding standards and they are simply replacing the old signs with the new logo/branding standards.



John Vansickle asked if the new signage will be larger than the old. Mr. Herpolsheimer stated that he believes they are relatively similar in size to the old signs. Mr. Vansickle then asked what the façade behind the sign is made of. Mr. Herpolsheimer said he wasn't sure, but that they are planning to do a site visit on Monday.

Homer Henry asked if the owners of the building would be opposed to painting the façade before installation of the new signs. Mr. Herpolsheimer stated he wasn't sure, but he could run it back up the chain to get an answer.

Homer Henry made a motion to approve the revised sign plan for Dunkin' Donuts with the condition that the paint behind the sign matches the surrounding building so that there is not stenciling of the old sign visible. Seconded by Jessica Friedrichs. Motion passed 5-0.

**5.2 SP-A26-0006 — REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF THE REVISED SIGN PLAN FOR SCOOTER'S, GENERALLY LOCATED AT 626 S. ANDOVER RD., ANDOVER, KANSAS**

Chairperson Bonebrake called the next agenda item pertaining to the review and approval of the revised sign plan for Scooter's, generally located at 626 S. Andover Rd.

Julie Boyd introduced the agenda item by stating that this is a revised sign plan for Scooter's located at 626 S Andover Rd. She stated that back in March, Scooter's added a wall sign on the southern elevation of the building above their drive thru. They are seeking to add another wall sign to the back of the building above the drive thru. Julie further explained that the combined area of the two signs would be approximately 31 square feet, representing about 2% of the wall area and remaining well below the maximum sign area permitted by code. The proposed sign met all applicable zoning and sign regulations.

Homer Henry sought clarification regarding the number and location of the signs, initially questioning whether multiple new signs were being added. Julie Boyd clarified that only one new sign was under consideration and that the other signs shown in the packet had been approved previously as part of the overall branding package. The Committee and staff also confirmed that the sign approved in March remained in place and that the current request was simply an addition to that approval.

Julie Boyd stated that staff have no objections to the request and noted that the sign was unlit and complied with all size and placement requirements.

Homer Henry made a motion to approve the revised sign plan for Scooters, generally located at 626 S Andover Rd. Motion seconded by Chairperson Bonebrake. Motion passed 5-0.



**5.3 SP-A26-0017 — REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF THE REVISED SIGN PLAN FOR CASEY’S, GENERALLY LOCATED AT 2036 N. ANDOVER RD., ANDOVER,**

Chairperson Bonebrake called the next agenda item pertaining to the review and approval of the revised sign plan for Casey’s, generally located at 2036 N. Andover Rd.

Julie Boyd introduced the item by stating that this is a revised sign plan for the Casey’s located at 2036 N Andover Rd. The original signage and site plan was approved in 2013 with the standard Casey’s branding at the time. Their branding has since been updated, and they are wanting to replace the old signs with the new logos. No new lighting will be added, and the new signs are actually smaller than the existing ones, so there are no concerns about wall coverage. The sign plan includes a wall sign on the business, signs on the fuel canopy and the monument sign located by the road.

Heather English from HSE Permit Solutions (sign company) joined the meeting over Microsoft Teams and addressed the Committee. She stated that there will be a new set of lighted channel letters on the front of the building and they will swap the plastic faces on the gas canopy. No structural change will be taking place and no change to the illumination will happen, just the panels will be replaced.

Chairperson Bonebrake asked if the building sign will be a new panel or will the existing façade be painted red. Heather English stated that it will be a red metal panel with the letters lit up white.

Homer Henry asked if staff needs to see a photometric plan for the signs. Julie Boyd responded that a sign like this will have a virtually negligible effect on the photometrics of a parking lot.

John Vansickle asked about monument sign and if any additional landscaping would be required. Julie Boyd stated that since the structure and layout of the sign is not changing, the landscaping requirements won’t change as well.

Homer Henry asked if the new Casey’s on Andover Road has the new or old branding. Julie Boyd stated it has the new signage as it was constructed after the branding change.

Homer Henry made a motion to approve the revised sign plan for Casey’s North, generally located at 2036 N Andover Rd. Seconded by Chairperson Bonebrake. Motion passed 5-0.

**5.4 SP-A26-0010 — REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF THE SIGN PLAN FOR 4 SEASONS RV, GENERALLY LOCATED AT 1523 W. LEDGERWOOD DR., ANDOVER, KANSAS**

Chairperson Bonebrake called the next agenda item pertaining to the review and approval of the sign plan for 4 Seasons RV, generally located at 1523 W. Ledgerwood Dr.

Julie Boyd introduced the agenda item by stating this is a wall sign for the Four Seasons RV, replacing what was the existing signage on the building. This building is set pretty far back



from the street frontage, so they get the extra wall coverage allowance built in as part of the code. While the aluminum panel is quite large, the way that the sign message area is measured means that actually they're not coming up against their maximum wall coverage. The aluminum panel is unlit, and the applicant also plan to put up some window clings on their doors.

Chairperson Bonebrake stated he was fine with the sign but wanted to know what the protocol is for the sign already being installed before approval. He stated he saw the sign already installed on his way to the meeting tonight. Julie Boyd responded that it has been up for some time, but generally when it comes to code enforcement and zoning code, we go for compliance rather than punishment. She further stated that the city could have started levying fines, but she would rather just get it approved by the SPRC.

John Vansickle asked about the front of the building and if it had been painted and Homer Henry then asked about the holes that appear to be to the right of the RV sign.

Jacob Marietta, owner of 1523 W Ledgerwood Dr, was present and spoke at the podium. He stated that the "holes" pictured are not actually holes in the façade, just where they glued the old letter on the building. He stated that he had talked with Dave Cochran, owner of Four Seasons RV & tenant at 1523 W Ledgerwood Dr. recently about getting both of the buildings painted but are struggling to find anybody to do the work. Mr. Marietta stated he believes they scrubbed and power washed the front of the building before installing the new sign. Julie Boyd stated that she was not able to see residue from the old sign when she drove by it earlier.

Homer Henry made a motion to approve the sign plan for Four Seasons RV generally located at 1523 W Ledgerwood Dr., with the conditions that the holes & glue are removed or at least painted over the match the rest of the façade on the front of the building. Seconded by Zach Smith. Motion passed 5-0.

**5.5 SP-A26-0015 — REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF THE SITE PLAN FOR PRINT ME A SIGN, GENERALLY LOCATED AT 225 W. CENTRAL AVE., ANDOVER, KANSAS KANSAS**

Chairperson Bonebrake called the next agenda item pertaining to the review and approval of the site plan for Print Me A Sign, generally located at 225 W. Central Ave.

Julie Boyd introduced the agenda item by stating that this case involves two parts, a sign and a proposed fence. The applicant has installed a new wall sign on the front of the building that has the Print Me A Sign logo on it. It is the only sign, so there are no concerns about wall coverage on that side. It will be illuminated and made of acrylic. In addition to the sign, the applicant is proposing a fence around the existing canopy of the bank, that used to be the drive thru area to close it off from the outside. The applicant has told city staff that the area would be used for storage of materials and equipment. Use of this area as outdoor storage would require a conditional use permit, but that doesn't preclude the approval of the site plan.



Homer Henry asked for clarification on where the fence would be located. Julie Boyd stated that it would be located underneath the canopy of the drive thru and not around the entire property.

Jacob Marietta, owner of 225 W. Central Ave, was present and spoke at the podium to address any questions from the Committee. Mr. Marietta explained that the proposed project is to enclose this area with fencing and gates and install printed mesh screening designed to match the building's brick exterior. The enclosed space would be used to store a forklift, lumber, pallets, and materials used for crate construction. He further stated that the primary motivation for the enclosure is to improve security and reduce unauthorized access. He noted ongoing issues with local youths entering the property, damaging windows, and taking pallets to build bicycle ramps. Enclosing the area would help keep stored materials out of sight and less accessible. He also noted that the roof clearance under the structure is approximately seven feet and expressed a preference for extending the fencing to the underside of the roof rather than installing a standard six-foot fence. The goal is to create a more secure enclosure that discourages people from climbing over and entering the space. Although there is nothing particularly valuable stored there, the enclosure would help prevent trespassing, vandalism, and other property disturbances while maintaining an attractive appearance that complements the building.

Julie Boyd advised that because the property is zoned B-3, fences up to eight feet in height are permitted, provided they are not located within the front yard. She noted that the proposed fence location is not within the front yard and would be permitted under the zoning regulations.

Homer Henry expressed concern about the visual impact of the proposed chain-link fence, noting that while it would not be located in the front yard, it would still be visible from Central Avenue. Julie Boyd acknowledged that chain-link fencing is not commonly used in prominent locations along Andover Road but noted that the zoning regulations do not prohibit it. She explained that while similar fencing exists at some local businesses, it is generally located in less visible areas.

Homer Henry asked about using a wood fence instead of the chain link. Mr. Marietta said they had explored that option but could not find wood planks tall enough.

Chairperson Bonebrake asked if they are planning to have the barbed wire on top. Mr. Marietta stated they are not planning on installing any barbed wire and that it is just shown on the plans. Les Mangus stated that barbed wire on fences is not allowed within city limits.

Les Mangus stated that staff's only concern is that we don't know what this screening material will look like in practice. There was discussion amongst Committee members and staff about the best way to word the motion to ensure that the screening material is maintained for the years to come.

Homer Henry made a motion to approve the site plan for Print Me a Sign with the conditions that the screening around the fence be maintained by the owner/landlord. Seconded by Chairperson Bonebrake. Motion passed 5-0.



Jacob Marietta stated that there will actually be two signs on the property and asked if he would need to go back through the process to get the other sign approved as well.

There was discussion amongst the Committee and staff about the best way forward and whether the second sign would need to go back before the Site Plan Review Committee if it is identical to the sign that was just approved.

Homer Henry made a motion to rescind the first motion. Seconded by Chairperson Bonebrake. Motion passed 5-0.

Homer Henry made a motion to approve the site plan for Print Me a Sign, generally located at 225 W Central Ave with the amendment of adding the same sign provided in this plan to the east entrance, also approving the fencing with the condition that the screening by maintained by the owner/landlord. Seconded by Scott Bonebrake. Motion passed 5-0.

Homer Henry thanked Jacob Marietta for attending the meeting and answering all of the Committee's questions.

**5.6 SP-A26-0018 — REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF THE REVISED SITE PLAN FOR BUTLER COMMUNITY COLLEGE, GENERALLY LOCATED AT 715 E. 13<sup>TH</sup> ST., ANDOVER, KANSAS**

Chairperson Bonebrake called the next agenda item pertaining to the review and approval of the revised site plan for Butler Community College, generally located at 715 E. 13<sup>th</sup> St.

Julie Boyd introduced the agenda item by stating that Butler Community College has two drive approaches onto 13<sup>th</sup> street. They are intending to remove the easternmost approach on the north end of the property and replace it with the one depicted at the southern end of the property connecting to east Commerce Street. Julie stated that this construction would actually bring the property into alignment with the revision to its access plan that was made back in 2018 and was not implemented until now. There will still be two street connections, just located differently.

Homer Henry asked if this drive approach change would take away any parking spaces. Julie responded that the number of spaces is not changing, just the number of places where the parking lot connects to the road. Kevin Graham stated they could stripe additional spaces if they wanted to in the future.

Zach Smith asked if they had given a specific reason for removing the east drive approach instead of the western one. Les Mangus stated this goes back 8 years to when Butler Community College platted the property and had traffic engineering involved. The traffic engineers wanted these major driveways to be further from the intersection of Yorktown Pkwy, so they chose to keep the western driveway on 13<sup>th</sup> and the primary is off of Yorktown.



Zach Smith asked if there will be a future driveway off of Yorktown. Mr. Mangus responded that the driveway is already in place as it was built along with Yorktown. He stated the aerial does not depict it as the photo is a bit outdated.

Homer Henry asked who conducted the traffic study. Les Mangus stated that PEC was the engineer for the platting process and Trans Systems did the traffic engineering.

Homer Henry then asked if staff had any issues with the proposal. Julie Boyd stated that staff has no concerns, as the circulation still works as intended. Mr. Henry then asked if the Fire Department had any input. Mr. Mangus stated that the Fire Department was involved in the discussion when the access plan was revised in 2018.

Zach Smith asked if staff knew when they planned to begin work. Julie stated that as far as she knows, they plan to start as soon as possible. Mr. Martin then asked if any traffic control measures would be needed during the construction process. Kevin Graham stated that in reality, there will probably be some minor lane closures while crews work to remove portions of the driveway, but he does not see that being a big issue.

Homer Henry made a motion to approve the revised site plan for Butler Community College. Seconded by Chairperson Bonebrake. Motion passed 5-0.

**5.7 SP-A26-0019 — REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF THE SIGN PLAN FOR EMPOWER PHYSICAL THERAPY, GENERALLY LOCATED AT 826 E. FOUNDERS PKWY., ANDOVER, KANSAS**

Chairperson Bonebrake called the final agenda item pertaining to the review and approval of the sign plan for Empower Physical Therapy, generally located at 826 E. Founder Pkwy.

Julie Boyd introduced the agenda item by stating this building is the Andover Optometry building that has Edwards Jones as a tenant. The final tenant is to be taken by Empower Physical Therapy, and they plan to move the wall signs from their old location and combine it with part of a new sign to create a new logo on the front of the building. There will also be lettering visible on the rear of the building, like the rest of the tenants in this space. The signage would be internally lit. Julie stated that on the western side of the building, their wall coverage reaches about 4%, so no concerns there.

Kevin Graham stated that similar to the rest of the building, there are dual frontages along Yorktown and Founders Pkwy and that is the reason that both sides of the building have been dressed up.

Homer Henry asked if they had gotten permission from the Heritage to install these signs. Les Mangus stated that the city does not get into that relationship and we can only enforce our sign codes.

Homer Henry made a motion to approve the sign plan for Empower Physical Therapy. Seconded by Chairperson Bonebrake. Motion passed 5-0.



PLANNING & ZONING  
1609 E. CENTRAL AVE.  
ANDOVER, KS 67002  
316.733.1303

## SITE PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE MINUTES

JUNE 2, 2026 | 6:00 P.M.

ANDOVER CITY HALL | 1609 E. CENTRAL AVE.

### 6. MEMBER ITEMS

Homer Henry stated that in the future, he would like to see a more in depth site plan packet that shows views from the street, etc. Mr. Henry also congratulated Bark 44 on celebrating 1 year of being open for business.

### 7. ADJOURN

Chairperson Bonebrake made a motion to adjourn. Seconded by Homer Henry. Motion passed 5-0.

Meeting adjourned at 6:50pm.



To: Site Plan Review Committee  
From: Les Mangus  
Date: July 7, 2026  
Subject: Committee & Staff Report

---

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:** No action is necessary. Please review and file the development-related meeting minutes.

**SUMMARY:**

The Committee & Staff Report encompasses all development-related meetings that have occurred since the last Site Plan Review Committee meeting. These minutes provide an overview of recent discussions and actions taken regarding community development in the City of Andover.

The June draft Planning Commission meeting minutes are attached. The Subdivision Committee did not meet in June.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

[Draft Planning Commission Minutes - 06/16/26](#)

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 7:01pm by Chairperson Garwood.

**2. ROLL CALL**

**Committee Members present:** Chairperson Vance Garwood, Gary Israel, Kemp Smith, Marshal Martin, Dan Colson.

**Staff Members present:** Les Mangus, Director of Community Development; Julie Boyd, Planning & Zoning Administrator.

**3. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MAY 19, 2026 MEETING**

Gary Israel made a motion to approve the minutes of the May 19, 2026, meeting as presented. Seconded by Kemp Smith. Motion passed 5-0.

**4. COMMUNICATIONS**

- A. COMMITTEE & STAFF REPORT**
- B. POTENTIAL RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT REPORT**

**5. AGENDA**

**5.1 ELECTIONS — NOMINATION AND ELECTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION VICE-CHAIRPERSON**

Gary Israel made a motion to nominate Dan Colson as the Vice-Chairperson. Seconded by Kemp Smith. Motion passed 5-0.

**5.2 Z-SU26-0002 — PUBLIC HEARING AND RECOMMENDATION ON AN APPLICATION FOR A SPECIAL USE TO PERMIT AN INTERMEDIATE CARE FACILITY, ON A PROPERTY ZONED MXR MULTIPLE-FAMILY / MIXED RESIDENTIAL USE DISTRICT, AND GENERALLY LOCATED AT 224 E CENTRAL AVE., ANDOVER, KANSAS**

Chairperson Garwood called the first and only agenda item pertaining to the public hearing and recommendation on application for a Special Use to permit an intermediate care facility, on a property zoned MXR Multiple-Family / Mixed Residential Use District, and generally located at 224 E Central Ave.

The public hearing was opened at 7:04pm.



PLANNING & ZONING  
1609 E. CENTRAL AVE.  
ANDOVER, KS 67002  
316.733.1303

**PLANNING COMMISSION & BOARD OF  
ZONING APPEALS MINUTES**  
**JUNE 16, 2026 | 7:00 P.M.**  
ANDOVER CITY HALL | 1609 E. CENTRAL AVE.

Julie Boyd introduced the agenda item by stating this parcel is approximately 2.7 acres with the MXR Multiple-Family Mixed Use Residential District zoning and was the previous location of a skilled nursing facility which closed around the time of the pandemic. In March of 2024, a Special Use permit was approved for an intermediate care facility. Unfortunately, Special Use authorizations are valid for 1 year from the date of the effectuating ordinance being published, which was March 2, 2024. In order to keep the Special Use on the property, the owner must apply for and receive a zoning permit within 1 year of the ordinance being published. The applicant did not apply for or receive a zoning permit within that period, so the Special Use expired and the ordinance was voided. The ownership of the building has since changed, and the new owners would like to revitalize the effort to open an intermediate care facility at this location and are applying for the same Special Use that was granted a couple of years ago. Julie further stated that the conditions on the property have not changed and no building permits have been pulled. Julie stated that it is City Staff's understanding that they have already received State authorization to operate this facility, as there are some inspection and security requirements that go above what the City of Andover requires. Lastly, Julie stated that there is an approved site plan for this property from many years ago that covers landscaping etc. It is staff's understanding through the various ownership changes that some of that landscaping may have fallen into disrepair, Julie has been talking with the applicant about the landscaping, and they are working towards bringing it back within compliance.

Gary Israel stated that remembers when this case came before the Planning Commission for the first authorization and that the only big question he has revolved around the state of the building as it has been sitting empty for a couple of years at this point.

Nick Motu from Ascension Recovery Services was present and spoke at the podium to answer any questions the Committee may have. Mr. Motu stated that he has been working with the ownership group for a little over a year now and they have decided to select Andover as the location for their new intermediate care facility. Mr. Motu stated he made a site visit to Andover before they decided to purchase 224 E. Central Ave., and that he felt the community was wonderful. Before the purchase was final, he stated they were assured that all permits and licenses were up to date. After the building was purchased, the ownership group found out that a Special Use permit was required and that is the reason he is before the Committee tonight. Mr. Motu stated that they have already made many improvements to the property, including replacement of the A/C units, flooring, paint and a security camera system. He further stated that the intention is to house residential treatment occupants and a detox area. There will be no methadone treatment at the facility. The license they received from the State allows them to have up to 80 beds; however, they plan to max out at 65 occupants at any given time. Ascension Recovery Services is one of the largest operators of intermediate treatment facilities across the county, with over 100 locations, and they will be managing the care facility in Andover as well. Mr. Motu stated they are hoping to hire between 30-40 people once fully open and operational. Additionally, the building will be monitored 24/7 and they do not take in dangerous patients.

Gary Israel asked if a lot of people showed up to the open house a couple of weeks ago. Mr. Motu stated that they had about 100 people show up to the open house, including the Mayor of Wichita and the Majority Leader of the Kansas Senate.



Gary Israel asked if the Special Use permit is granted by the Planning Commission and the Andover City Council, when do they plan too officially open. Mr. Motu stated that they plan to open immediately if the Special Use is granted. Gary Israel then asked if they plan to host another open house. Mr. Motu stated that they could host another open house, but what they really would like to do is host a private tour for the Andover City Council members and City Staff.

Doug Leech, Founder & CEO of Ascension Recovery Services, spoke at the podium as well. Mr. Leech shared the background behind the founding of Ascension Recovery Services, describing the experiences and circumstances that inspired him to establish the organization and pursue its mission.

The public hearing was closed at 7:23pm.

**STAFF ITEMS**

|   |
|---|
| <p>1. Do adequate sewage disposal and water supply and all other necessary public facilities including street access exist or can they be provided to serve the uses that would be permitted on the subject property if the change in zoning were approved?</p> <p>STAFF   The property has existing access to Wichita Water, Andover sewers, and the public street system.</p> |
| <p>2. If the special use request was approved, would the subject property need to be platted or replatted, or have in-lieu-of dedications made, in order to provide needed rights-of-way, easements, building setback lines, or access control?</p> <p>STAFF   The subject property is already platted, and no additional dedications are expected to be necessary.</p>         |
| <p>3. If the special use request was approved, would the subject property need a screening plan for existing or potential uses?</p> <p>STAFF   The subject property has an existing Site Plan in place, which includes screening. No additional screening would be required under the proposed use, so long as the approved Site Plan is complied with.</p>                     |
| <p>4. What fact-based information in support of or in opposition to the requested zoning change has staff received?</p> <p>STAFF   Staff support the proposed Special Use application.</p>  |
| <p>5. If there has been an error in the application of these Zoning Regulations to the subject property, would the requested zoning change correct the error?</p>   |



|       |                             |
|-------|-----------------------------|
| STAFF | No error is known to exist. |
|-------|-----------------------------|

**STAFF & COMMISSION/COUNCIL ITEMS**

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>6 How suitable or unsuitable is the subject property for its current use?</b>   |   |
| STAFF  | The subject property is reasonably suitable for its current use as a skilled nursing facility, despite being vacant for several years.  |
| PLANNING   | Concur  |
| COUNCIL  |   |
| <b>7 Is the length of time the subject property has been vacant or undeveloped under its current zoning a factor in the special use request?</b>   |   |
| STAFF  | Yes. The subject property has been vacant for several years. A Special Use was obtained in 2024 for this same purpose, but was not acted on within the period of validity, and the property remains vacant as a result. |
| PLANNING   | Concur  |
| COUNCIL  |   |
| <b>8 How reasonably well-suited will the requested special use of the subject property be with the current zoning of nearby properties.</b>  |   |
| STAFF  | The Special Use would be well suited with the current zoning of nearby properties, which are similarly mixed-use in nature, and which already feature similar medical-type uses.  |
| PLANNING   | Concur  |
| COUNCIL  |   |
| <b>9 Has the special use been requested because conditions in the area of the subject property have changed or are changing? If so, what is the nature and significance of these conditions?</b> |   |
| STAFF  | Yes—the building sat vacant for many years, and, despite efforts to open as an intermediate care facility in 2024, remains so.  |
| PLANNING   | Concur  |
| COUNCIL  |   |



**PLANNING COMMISSION & BOARD OF  
 ZONING APPEALS MINUTES**

**JUNE 16, 2026 | 7:00 P.M.**

ANDOVER CITY HALL | 1609 E. CENTRAL AVE.

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>1f) What are the current land uses, character and condition of the subject property and the surrounding neighborhood?</b>  |  |
| STAFF   | The subject property abuts a residential neighborhood to the north, similar medical facility uses to the south and east, and a large commercial parcel (a multi-tenant retail space) to the west. Across E. Central Ave., further to the south, is another residential neighborhood.   |
| PLANNING  | Concur   |
| COUNCIL   |  |
| <b>1g) Would the proposed special use of the subject property allow land uses which might have detrimental effects on nearby properties, and if so, how?</b>                                      |  |
| STAFF   | The proposed use is no more intense than the existing permitted skilled nursing care facility use.   |
| PLANNING  | Concur   |
| COUNCIL   |  |
| <b>1h) How would the requested special use conform with the City's Comprehensive Plan and other adopted master plans and policies?</b>  |  |
| STAFF   | The subject property is designated with the City Center place type, which encourages "...larger-scale tenants, restaurants, commercial retailers, mixed-use developments, and small-scale office uses." A "Medical Campus/Hospital" is listed as a typical land use which may be found in this place type, making the proposed Special Use well-suited for the area. |
| PLANNING  | Concur   |
| COUNCIL   |  |
| <b>1i) Do any professional persons knowledgeable on conditions that affect this special use request have information or recommendations to provide, which would be helpful in its evaluation?</b> |  |
| STAFF   | Staff support the proposed Special Use.  |
| PLANNING  | Concur   |
| COUNCIL   |  |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| 1. How would the potential loss in value or hardship imposed on the Applicant compare to the relative gain to the public health, safety and welfare, if there is a change from the current use to the requested use? |   |
| STAFF  | Staff anticipate no detrimental effects to public health, safety, and welfare associated with this minor change in use. |
| PLANNING   | Concur  |
| COUNCIL  |   |

Gary Israel made a motion to recommend approval to the Governing Body of case Z-SU26-0002 based on findings #7, #8, #10 & #12. Seconded by Dan Colson. Motion passed 5-0.

**6. MEMBER ITEMS**

Gary Israel commented on the Meyer’s Automotive pole sign that was recently installed. He stated that he drove by it on his way to the meeting tonight and the LED sign was quite bright. Julie Boyd stated that she would look into the brightness levels.

Chairperson Garwood stated that he was a little surprised that there were no members of the public present at the meeting tonight.

**7. ADJOURN**

Gary Israel made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Seconded by Kemp Smith. Motion passed 5-0.

Meeting adjourned at 7:31pm.



To: Site Plan Review Committee  
From: Les Mangus  
Date: July 7, 2026  
Subject: Potential Residential Development Report

---

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:** No action is necessary. Please review and file the Potential Residential Development Report.

**SUMMARY:**

The Potential Residential Development Report provides a general overview of single-family and multi-family development within the City of Andover. The report compares the total number of platted lots versus the total number of building permits issued.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:**

None.

**LEGAL IMPLICATIONS:**

None.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

[Potential Residential Development Report](#)

**POTENTIAL RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT**

| <b>SINGLE - FAMILY</b>                         | Platted<br>Lots | Permits<br>Issued | 2024<br>Permits | Available for<br>Construction | Unplatted<br>Lots  | % with<br>Bldg Permits  | % with<br>C of O's | #-Cof O's<br>Issued  |
|--|-----------------|-------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| Aspen Creek                                    | 31              | 27                |                 | 4                             | 0                  | 87.10%                  | 87.10%             | 27                   |
| Cedar Park                                     | 52              | 51                |                 | 1                             | 0                  | 98.08%                  | 98.08%             | 51                   |
| Chateauroux                                    | 38              | 36                |                 | 2                             | 0                  | 94.74%                  | 94.74%             | 36                   |
| Cornerstone 1st                                | 105             | 105               |                 | 0                             | 0                  | 100.00%                 | 99.05%             | 104                  |
| Cornerstone 3rd                                | 135             | 133               |                 | 2                             | 160                | 100.00%                 | 98.50%             | 131                  |
| Cornerstone 6th                                | 33              | 33                |                 | 0                             | 0                  | 100.00%                 | 96.97%             | 32                   |
| Cornerstone 10th                               | 32              | 31                | 5               | 1                             | 0                  | 96.88%                  | 96.88%             | 31                   |
| Cornerstone 11th                               | 40              | 39                | 4               | 1                             | 0                  | 100.00%                 | 92.31%             | 36                   |
| Courtyard @ Cornerstone                        | 58              | 25                | 2               | 33                            | 0                  | 43.10%                  | 39.66%             | 23                   |
| Cottages @ Cornerstone                         | 80              | 0                 |                 | 80                            | 0                  | 0.00%                   | 0.00%              | 0                    |
| Crescent Lakes                                 | 84              | 83                |                 | 1                             | 0                  | 98.81%                  | 97.62%             | 82                   |
| Crescent Lakes 5th                             | 117             | 117               |                 | 0                             | 0                  | 100.00%                 | 97.44%             | 114                  |
| Diamond Creek                                  | 0               | 0                 |                 | 0                             | 185                | 0.00%                   | 0.00%              | 0                    |
| Flint Hills Phase 1                            | 23              | 20                |                 | 3                             | 0                  | 86.96%                  | 86.96%             | 20                   |
| Flint Hills Phase 2                            | 36              | 35                |                 | 1                             | 0                  | 97.22%                  | 94.44%             | 34                   |
| Flint Hills Phase 3 (FHN Club Estates)         | 33              | 29                |                 | 4                             | 0                  | 87.88%                  | 81.82%             | 27                   |
| Flint Hills Phase 4                            | 31              | 25                |                 | 6                             | 0                  | 80.65%                  | 80.65%             | 25                   |
| Flint Hills Phase 5                            | 23              | 21                | 1               | 2                             | 13                 | 91.30%                  | 82.61%             | 19                   |
| Flint Hills Phase 6                            | 30              | 12                | 1               | 18                            | 13                 | 40.00%                  | 40.00%             | 9                    |
| Heritage 1st                                   | 75              | 75                | 2               | 0                             | 0                  | 100.00%                 | 98.67%             | 74                   |
| Heritage 2nd                                   | 72              | 38                | 2               | 34                            | 0                  | 55.88%                  | 36.76%             | 25                   |
| Heritage 3rd                                   | 44              | 23                | 13              | 21                            | 0                  | 52.27%                  | 43.18%             | 19                   |
| Heritage Mixed-Use                             |                 | 0                 |                 | 0                             |                    | 0.00%                   | 0.00%              | 0                    |
| Hilltop  | 7               | 7                 |                 | 0                             | 0                  | 100.00%                 | 100.00%            | 7                    |
| Jaguar Estates                                 |                 | 0                 |                 | 0                             |                    | 0.00%                   | 0.00%              | 0                    |
| Lafayette Addition                             | 8               | 1                 | 0               | 7                             | 0                  | 8.33%                   | 0.00%              | 0                    |
| Meadowbrook 2nd                                | 17              | 17                | 9               | 0                             | 0                  | 100.00%                 | 100.00%            | 17                   |
| Meadowbrook 4th                                | 43              | 20                |                 | 23                            | 0                  | 166.67%                 | 41.67%             | 5                    |
| North Meadows 3rd Addition                     | 59              | 58                | 2               | 1                             | 0                  | 98.31%                  | 98.31%             | 58                   |
| Prairie Creek 6th                              | 45              | 45                | 22              | 0                             | 0                  | 100.00%                 | 100.00%            | 45                   |
| Reflection Lake @ Cloud City 2nd               | 65              | 65                |                 | 0                             | 0                  | 100.00%                 | 100.00%            | 65                   |
| Reflection Lake 3rd                            | 81              | 81                |                 | 0                             | 0                  | 100.00%                 | 98.77%             | 80                   |
| Scattered Lots                                 | 86              | 10                |                 | 76                            | 0                  | 11.63%                  | 9.30%              | 8                    |
| Shadow Rock                                    | 60              | 60                | 1               | 0                             | 0                  | 100.00%                 | 98.33%             | 59                   |
| Southern Hills                                 |                 | 0                 |                 | 0                             |                    | 0.00%                   | 0.00%              | 0                    |
| Speyside @ Terradyne                           | 28              | 13                | 5               | 15                            | 0                  | 46.43%                  | 39.29%             | 11                   |
| Summerlin                                      | 33              | 6                 | 1               | 27                            | 0                  | 18.18%                  | 6.06%              | 2                    |
| Terradyne 2nd Addition                         | 43              | 43                |                 | 0                             | 0                  | 100.00%                 | 97.67%             | 42                   |
| Tuscany 3rd                                    | 19              | 18                | 3               | 1                             | 0                  | 100.00%                 | 88.89%             | 16                   |
| Tuscany 5th                                    | 26              | 14                |                 | 12                            |                    | 116.67%                 | 50.00%             | 6                    |
| Valsong  | 3               | 1                 |                 | 2                             |                    | 33.33%                  | 33.33%             | 1                    |
| <b>Total Single Family</b>                     | <b>2800</b>     | <b>2420</b>       | <b>73</b>       | <b>380</b>                    | <b>719</b>         |                         |                    | <b>2344</b>          |
| <b>MULTIFAMILY</b>                             | Units           | Permits<br>Issued |                 | Available for<br>Construction | Unplatted<br>Units | % with<br>Bldg. Permits | % with<br>C of O's | #-C of O's<br>Issued |
| Cornerstone 5th                                | 29              | 27                | 10              | 2                             | 0                  | 93.10%                  | 31.03%             | 9                    |
| Prairie Creek 2nd - Duplex                     | 41              | 41                |                 | 0                             | 0                  | 100.00%                 | 92.68%             | 38                   |
| Hodges 6th - Duplex                            | 17              | 30                |                 | -13                           | 0                  | 96.77%                  | 96.77%             | 30                   |
| Hodges 7th - Duplex                            | 11              | 7                 |                 | 4                             |                    | 100.00%                 | 100.00%            | 7                    |
| Prairie Pointe @ Cornerstone - Duplex          | 17              | 17                |                 | 0                             | 0                  | 100.00%                 | 100.00%            | 17                   |
| Prairie Pointe 2nd @ Cornerstone - Duplex      | 17              | 17                | 8               | 0                             | 0                  | 100.00%                 | 100.00%            | 17                   |
| Prairie Pointe 3rd @ Cornerstone - Duplex      | 17              | 0                 | 0               | 17                            | 0                  | 0.00%                   | 0.00%              | 1                    |
| The Residences @ Heritage West                 | 60              |                   |                 |                               |                    |                         |                    |                      |
| Buffalo Ridge Apartments                       |                 | 7                 |                 | -7                            |                    | 100.00%                 | 0.00%              | 0                    |
| <b>Total Multifamily</b>                       | <b>195</b>      | <b>107</b>        | <b>18</b>       | <b>-2</b>                     | <b>0</b>           | <b>54.87%</b>           |                    | <b>175</b>           |
| <b>Total Dwelling Units</b>                    | <b>2995</b>     | <b>2527</b>       | <b>109</b>      | <b>378</b>                    | <b>719</b>         | <b>84.37%</b>           |                    |                      |
| <b>Total Lots/Units, Platted and Unplatted</b> | <b>3714</b>     | <b>2527</b>       |                 | <b>1906</b>                   | <b>719</b>         | <b>68.04%</b>           |                    |                      |

[Path]Chris Tracking

7/2/2026



To: Site Plan Review Committee  
From: Julie Boyd  
Date: July 7, 2026  
Subject: Sign Plan: 231 S. Andover Rd. (Integrity Urgent Care)

---

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:** APPROVE the sign plan for Integrity Urgent Care, generally located at 231 S. Andover Rd.

**SUMMARY:**

The subject property is located just north of US 54/400 along S. Andover Rd., and houses the Integrity Urgent Care facility. The applicant intends to modify the existing wall signage on the building, by removing the logo sign above the entryway, and replacing the existing channel letters with a sign cabinet which would be mounted in the same location.

The new cabinet would replace the existing channel letters in the center of the eastern wall, which show the prior Xpress Wellness branding, and would be 30" by 120" in size (approximately 2.5 by 10 feet). The cabinet would be internally lit with typical LEDs for such signage, and is not expected to significantly affect the overall lighting of the site.

The new signage would constitute less than 5% total wall coverage on the structure's eastern face (toward S. Andover Rd.), and meets all other requirements as presented.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:**

None.

**LEGAL IMPLICATIONS:**

The Site Plan Review Committee (SPRC) considers the final application for approval or disapproval, with or without conditions, based on the Site Plan Review Standards in Chapter 3.4 of the City of Andover Unified Development Manual (UDM).

The SPRC is a committee of final action. If the site plan is approved, no further action is required by the applicant.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

[Sign Plan](#)

INTEGRITY URGENT CARE  
231 S ANDOVER ROAD  
ANDOVER, KS 67002



Remove Existing Channel Letters  
Install New Cabinet Sign With Embossed Pan Face  
Cabinet Size: 30" x 120"  
Embossed Pan Face To Have White Background And Pan Draft  
Blue: PMS 2576  
Orange: PMS 1505  
Bottom Of The Cabinet To Align Where The Bottom Of The Capsue Comes Down



INTEGRITY URGENT CARE  
231 S ANDOVER ROAD  
ANDOVER, KS 67002



REMOVE EXISTING X LOGO  
ABOVE ENTRANCE



SWAP CHANNEL LETTERS  
FOR CABINET SIGN

