

CITY OF DE SOTO
SITE PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE

City Hall, 32905 West 84th Street
Tuesday, October 14, 2003, 7:00 P.M.

MINUTES

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Crumbaker at 7:00 p.m.

1. Agenda Items:

- A. Review site plan submitted by Archetype Design Group on behalf of John and Carla Mabry, for an establishment located in the "M-1" Industrial - Light zoning district, generally located between 9680 and 9760 Lexington Avenue, De Soto, Kansas.

Public Works Director Mike Brungardt stated that this is the applicant's first submittal of this plan. The property was approved for a concrete batch plant several years ago. One of the main issues with the current submittal is the appropriateness of allowing the existing single-family residence to be a legal non-conformity. This will need to be discussed with the City Attorney. This arrangement would not meet the minimum requirements for septic systems. The location of the tank and lateral fields need to be verified, and soil testing performed. Although septic systems are allowed for commercial uses, the leach field area does not appear to be large enough. Brungardt continued that a drainage study will need to be submitted as well.

Committee member Mary Guntert asked about the force main running down Lexington Avenue. Brungardt responded that the force main is 4 inches and is at or near full capacity. The force main may be considered if the applicant were to prove the connection would be sound, but others in the area have requested to tap into the main before and have been turned down by the City. Committee member Richard Hemphill stated that the majority of the Prospector's Point apartments sewer use would be in the evening, with this commercial use mainly during the day. Brungardt stated that there has been talk of forming a benefit district for this area, and an agreement of non-opposition would be warranted.

Mike Pollard of Archetype Design Group said most of the items on the staff report can be addressed before the Planning Commission meeting. Pollard asked about the obtaining information about tying into the force main. Brungardt responded that staff will work with the applicant, but discourages tying into the main. Chairman Crumbaker asked the applicant why they want to leave the one residence. Pollard replied that it is an income generating rental property and the applicant wants to leave it intact if possible, but it may have to go.

Guntert stated that she liked the look of buildings, and thought the design was interesting. After some discussion about the gas tanks on the property, property owner John Mabry stated that only

the lift remains. There was some sort of environmental study done in 1996. The committee members agreed that the applicant should produce this study, or conduct a new one, to address the concerns of possible contamination to the area. Hemphill stated that the lot doesn't look like it can hold all four buildings. Mabry responded that one of the four buildings may be removed, and the square footage of another increased if this is the case.

Brungardt stated that the entrance onto Lexington Avenue isn't large enough to allow large truck movements in and out without impeding onto other lanes. He would like to see the templates of potential truck turns in the lot. Crumbaker said that with the 100-foot diameter, the location of the docks may need to change, or traffic may be limited to one truck at a time. He asked about the outdoor utility hub. Pollard responded that all of the utilities (i.e. internet, cable, etc.) will be centrally located at this location, and a screen will be built around the unit. Brungardt stated that this screening will need to be denoted on the plan, and utility easements and fire hydrants will need to be shown as well.

Brungardt continued that the Commission may see the need for an additional 10-feet of right-of-way on Lexington Avenue as it is to be one of two primary arterials to the Sunflower Army Ammunition Plant site. A good title commitment search will show the exact amount of right-of-way present. City Planner Sean Ackerson of Bucher, Willis & Ratliff stated that there is substantial buffering from the adjacent residential uses, but the applicant may want to show a cross section of their screening on the plan. Hemphill noted that Building 2 appears to be set 10-foot higher than Building 1. Pollard replied that this appears to be a typographical error in the grading plan.

Ackerson stated that the individual tenants leasing these four buildings may have to seek special use permits depending upon what they are wanting to do. The applicant may choose to designate what industrial uses will be allowed in the plan so that the tenants could avoid having to obtain a permit, though the permitted uses will be bound by the site plan. Another concern is that parking required for Building 1 is being met by using 3 spots from Building 2. The proposed signage is typical for such a site, but under the current regulations individual placards are not permitted. This may be pursued as a text amendment. The applicant also needs to present their landscaping plan and elevations of building materials.

Ackerson noted that the property is located within the K-10 Highway Overlay District, which would prohibit outdoor storage that is not fully enclosed. Additional parking and buffering requirements may apply. Hemphill stated that the site appears to be too congested, but if the numbers work should be alright. Guntert stated that there are too many buildings and she has concerns regarding water retention. Crumbaker said that he likes the design and thinks that the plan could be very positive and is an appropriate use for the property.

The meeting was adjourned by Chairman Crumbaker at 8:24 p.m.