



MINUTES

Planning Commission Meeting: July 14, 2025

Application:	<u>RZ25-0004:</u> Request for approval of a zoning amendment to Ordinance 05-25 to allow additional monument signage within the Sunnybrook development on approximately 74.3 acres, located southwest of College Boulevard and S. Lone Elm Road.
---------------------	---

Mr. Nathan Jurey, Senior Planner, presented RZ25-0004, a request to approve a zoning amendment to Ordinance 05-25 to allow individual monument signage within the Sunnybrook development, located southwest of College Boulevard and S. Lone Elm Road. Mr. Jurey commended Mark McKenzie (the applicant) for getting 12 of the 14 property owners in the Sunnybrook Shops development to sign onto this request. Mr. Jurey explained the subject properties are zoned BP (Business Park) and CP-2 (Commercial Planned) Districts, under Ordinance 05-25. Mr. Jurey provided historical context: Originally, in 1998, individual monument signs were prohibited in favor of major complex signs. The 2005 amendment expanded the size of the development but retained that sign prohibition. Mr. Jurey continued that the request would allow businesses to pursue individual monument signs per the sign code. Mr. Jurey stated staff supported the change since the development is larger than initially planned, and the request aligns with PlanOlathe policies including the policy to support local businesses.

Mr. Jurey stated all public notification requirements were met. He noted a neighborhood meeting was held in June with ten residents attending. Based on the meeting minutes, the neighbors seemed to be in favor of the proposal. Staff corresponded with five residents who had general inquiries; staff answered all questions with no additional inquiries made.

Mr. Jurey concluded, stating the request meets the Golden Criteria as outlined in the staff report. Staff recommends approval of the request to amend zoning Ordinance 05-25 and remove the restriction on monument signs for individual businesses associated with this application.

Chair Janner opened the floor for Commissioner questions.

Commissioner Creighton asked for clarification on the design consistency of the monument signs and whether the sample illustration in the packet would reflected what would be expected.

Mr. Jurey confirmed that the illustrative sign was reviewed preliminarily and would meet the City's sign design criteria, but the location of the sign would need to be reviewed in order to avoid any easement and to accommodate sight triangles.

Commissioner Creighton asked whether the vision was for relatively consistent designs among all the businesses.

Mr. Jurey answered each lot could design its own sign as long as it met City code, so signs would generally be consistent with each property but not necessarily be uniform throughout the shopping center.

Commissioner Corcoran inquired about possible covenants for signage consistency which are typical for commercial centers, and whether only City code would apply or if additional requirements were expected for this development.

Mr. Jurey answered that no overarching covenant existed and City code is the standard, but noted that signage follows building design and the buildings themselves are varied in design.

Commissioner Corcoran asked if this were instead a new development, whether the City would typically require a signage covenant.

Mr. Jurey responded that for brand-new shopping centers, consistency in building and signage is reviewed in the development plan.

Commissioner Chapman referenced the staff report and sought clarification on whether both major complex signs and individual monument signs would be allowed, and who would qualify for each.

Mr. Jurey explained that larger-acreage properties could have larger monument signs, but most individual pad sites in this case did not qualify because they were smaller.

Commissioner Chapman asked about the current state of signage in the developed area.

Mr. Jurey said he believed there was only one major complex sign with the development's name, "Sunnybrook Development," at Valley and College.

Commissioner Brown asked to confirm that future signs would still be regulated by City sign ordinance (ie, size, etc).

Mr. Jurey confirmed the current City sign code regulates the sign's size, height, location, and design. He added signs are reviewed administratively by staff.

Commissioner Brown asked whether the zoning amendment included the potential for a monument sign with a listing of all tenants at the development's entrance.

Mr. Jurey clarified a major complex sign is already allowed by code for the shopping center itself due to its larger acreage, but the amendment primarily affected the individual pad sites. The shopping center did not choose to be part of this application.

Commissioner Brown asked about specifics regarding ownership and whether a large, development-wide sign would be allowed.

Mr. Jurey noted on the map and explained that a group of property owners could pursue a large development wide sign, but it would depend on cooperation between owners. Mr. Jurey noted the Applicants expressed the desire for individual signs but not specifically a shared joint major complex sign.

With no further Commissioner questions for staff, **Chair Janner** invited the applicant, Mark McKenzie, to make any presentation.

Mark McKenzie, Applicant, 12248 W 128th Street, Overland Park, Kansas, on behalf of Sunnybrook Management and McKenzie Family Limited Liability Company. He stated that the goal was to "clean up" the old ordinance and allow monument signs as individual businesses have no desire to pursue a large, overarching monument sign which he noted seemed unlikely due to ownership fragmentation. He emphasized the goal was ensuring compliance and simplification for businesses and City staff when handling new signage requests.

Chair Janner thanked Mr. McKenzie. With no further discussion, he opened the public hearing. However, after confirming no one had signed up to speak, Chair Janner entertained a motion to close the hearing.

Commissioner Corcoran moved to close the public hearing, and **Commissioner Chapman** seconded. The motion passed 9 to 0.

Chair Janner called for any final discussion from the Commissioners.

Commissioner Terrones stated he supported the amendment, and his questions have been answered. He noted this is a growing intersection and that the businesses are primarily situated east-facing, with limited visibility from College Boulevard. He added that signage would help make businesses more visible to travelers along College Boulevard or Lone Elm.

Chair Janner called for a motion on the item.

Commissioner Terrones moved to approve RZ25-0004 as submitted by staff, and **Commissioner Bergida** seconded the motion. The motion passed by a vote of 9 to 0 as follows:

A. Staff recommended approval of RZ25-0004 for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development complies with the policies and goals of the PlanOlathe Comprehensive Plan.
2. The requested zoning amendment meets the Unified Development Ordinance criteria for considering zoning applications.

B. Planning Commission recommended approval of the requested zoning amendment to remove Section 8.D from Ordinance 05-25 and permit freestanding monument signs for individual businesses on the properties associated with this application.