



MINUTES

Planning Commission Meeting: January 12, 2026

Application:	<u>RZ25-0017:</u> A rezoning from the CTY-RUR (County Rural), C-2 (Community Center), R-1 (Residential Single Family), and RP-1 (Planned Single Family) Districts to the CC (Cedar Creek) District, located south of College Boulevard and west of Cedar Creek Parkway.
---------------------	---

Ms. Jessica Schuller, Senior Planner, presented RZ25-0017, the request to rezone approximately 62.5 acres of unplatte land within the Cedar Creek Overlay District to the CC (Cedar Creek) Zoning District. She stated that the property was located southwest of College Boulevard and Cedar Creek Parkway, near the Cedar Creek Corporate Park and the recently constructed community swimming pool and amenity area.

Ms. Schuller noted that the property was currently zoned a combination of County Rural, RP-1 and R-1 Single Family, and C-2 Community Commercial Center. Ms. Schuller explained that the CC District was the preferred zoning district identified in the Cedar Creek Area Plan, adopted in 2012, because it aligns with the unique character and vision of Cedar Creek. She explained that rezoning to the Cedar Creek District would allow the developer to select either a Residential or a Mixed Use Subdistrict at the time of development; the subdistricts establish the permitted land uses. She stated that no development plans were proposed at this time and that future development would require review by the Planning Commission and staff for compliance with the Area Plan's site design, dimensional, architectural, and landscaping/buffers standards.

Ms. Schuller explained that future development is intended to align with the Cedar Creek Future Land Use map which establishes a mix of uses at the corner of College Boulevard and Cedar Creek Parkway, with residential uses further south.

Ms. Schuller stated that the request was consistent with the City's comprehensive plan and that staff recommends approval with no stipulations. Ms. Schuller also noted that two letters of correspondence had been received after the packet was published; they were distributed to the Commissioners and would be forwarded to City Council. Ms. Schuller noted the Applicant wished to make remarks.

Chair Janner asked whether Commissioners had questions for Staff.

Commissioner Terrones noted he had questions and comments but preferred to wait until after the Applicant's presentation.

Chair Janner agreed and invited the Applicant to speak.

Mr. Dan Foster, Schlagel and Associates, 14920 W 107th Street, Lenexa, KS 66215, introduced himself, as well as Len Boxler and Ron Mather who were also present. He stated that staff's presentation accurately summarized the request. Mr. Foster briefly described the history of the Cedar Creek Area Plan, explaining that it was developed between 2008 and 2012 with input from City staff and leaders, Cedar Creek residents, and the owners of the undeveloped parcels, to formalize development standards consistent with the original Cedar Creek "Green Book." Mr. Foster stated that the CC [Cedar Creek] District was established as the preferred zoning district to preserve the community's original character and vision from the 1980s. Mr. Foster explained that the rezoning would unify several existing zoning districts into one consistent District and would simplify future development while adhering to Cedar Creek standards. He concluded that the request complied with the Cedar Creek Area Plan Green Book, the Comprehensive Plan, and staff recommendations, and respectfully requested approval.

Chair Janner called for any questions for the Applicant.

Hearing none, Chair Janner opened the public hearing. He stated that no members of the public were signed up to speak and reiterated that written correspondence had been provided to the Commissioners for consideration. Chair Janner then requested a motion to close the public hearing.

Commissioner Chapman moved to close the public hearing and **Commissioner Breen** seconded. The motion passed with a vote of 8 to 0.

Chair Janner asked whether additional discussion was needed.

Commissioner Terrones requested clarification from staff regarding whether future development plans would be reviewed by the Planning Commission and City staff.

Ms. Schuller confirmed that any future development proposals would follow the standard review process, including preliminary site plan and architectural review by the Planning Commission and then final site development plan review by City staff.

Commissioner Terrones thanked staff and stated that the following comments were for the record and future consideration by Planning staff and City Council. He noted he is very familiar with the intersection of College Boulevard and Cedar Creek Parkway because he commutes daily to Lenexa using that route to avoid K-7 and K-10. Commissioner Terrones acknowledged the intersection is already on the City's Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) for the future, but he wanted to emphasize how critical it is that College Boulevard be widened because the intersection is dangerous. He specified his

safety concerns are based on personal experience. When traveling west on College Boulevard, there is a hill that limits visibility. At the bottom of the hill near Green and College, and again approaching Cedar Creek Parkway, drivers cannot clearly see cross traffic. He indicated vehicles coming from Cedar Creek Parkway can be hard to see, and some drivers speed, increasing the risk. He noted he believes it has only been luck so far that no serious accidents have occurred. In addition, he also described issues when traveling east on College Boulevard. When crossing Cedar Creek Parkway, visibility to the left is very limited until almost at the stop sign. Drivers must slow down significantly because it is hard to judge how fast oncoming vehicles are traveling.

Chair Janner stated that he agreed with Commissioner Terrones and supported prioritizing College Boulevard improvements in the CIP.

Commissioner Breen asked, in relation to the Subdistrict, whether there was any indication whether future development would be residential or mixed-use.

Ms. Schuller responded that no specific intent had been identified by the developer, but noted that the Cedar Creek Area Plan designated the area as mixed-use, allowing a mix of residential and commercial uses.

Commissioner Chapman requested clarification on what qualified as mixed-use. For example, would C-2, R-1, RP-1, R-2, R-3 all be considered acceptable as mixed use?

Ms. Schuller explained that mixed-use could include multiple compatible residential and commercial uses if it aligned with the Area Plan. She added that steep topography significantly limited developable areas, and she demonstrated the topography on the map. For that reason, she noted that was part of the interest to consolidate the property under a single zoning district rather than retaining older fragmented zoning.

Commissioner Bergida observed that most of the developable land, except for southern and southeastern portions, appeared to be zoned Commercial and asked staff to confirm.

Ms. Schuller confirmed this and demonstrated it on the zoning map.

Commissioner Bergida noted he was sympathetic to combining some districts. He asked whether rezoning without a development plan was common.

Ms. Schuller responded that while uncommon citywide, the Cedar Creek Area Plan specifically allowed it due to its detailed, thorough, and robust standards that were vetted over the four-year span when that Area Plan was created.

Commissioner Bergida then asked whether the Applicant could discuss potential development options.

Ms. Schuller invited the Applicant to speak.

Mr. Foster stated that much of the land east of Cedar Creek Parkway was already zoned CC [Cedar Creek District] for similar reasons and occurred before a plan was in place. He explained that the request aimed to consolidate zoning to simplify future planning and eliminate conflicts between existing zoning boundaries. He noted that no development plan had been finalized and that the site's rugged terrain limited traditional commercial development, with future plans expected to work within the Cedar Creek District's permitted uses and topographic constraints.

Commissioner Bergida asked whether consolidating the ridge area under CC zoning while leaving southern and southwestern portions (the "legacy areas") as R-1 would be a way forward to overcome the challenges related to buffering, character, or development flexibility.

Mr. Foster responded that while some areas could remain Single-Family, the CC District allowed a broader range of residential types, such as patio homes or attached single-family units, that were not permitted under standard zoning. He stated that the property owners were mindful of protecting surrounding neighborhoods and future marketability and believed a single CC Zoning District provided consistent standards and greater flexibility than splitting zoning late in the process.

Chair Janner asked if there was further discussion.

Commissioner Seeling, noting he was new to the Commission, asked Ms. Schuller to further explain why the CC District was the preferred zoning in Cedar Creek.

Ms. Schuller explained that rezoning to CC required development to follow the Cedar Creek Area Plan rather than the standard UDO, applying specific standards for architecture, landscaping, buffering, and site design drawn from the Cedar Creek Area Plan.

Commissioner Seeling asked whether the CC District expanded allowable uses compared to current zoning.

Ms. Schuller confirmed that it did and explained that a detailed Cedar Creek Area Plan Use Matrix governed development, allowing a wide range of residential and commercial uses, from estate lots to patio homes and live-work units.

Chair Janner called for any final discussion. Hearing none, he requested a motion on RZ25-0017.

Commissioner Terrones moved to approve RZ25-0017 as recommended by staff with no stipulations. **Commissioner Seeling** seconded the motion. The motion passed with a vote of 7 to 1 with no stipulations.