



## **MINUTES – Opening Remarks**

### **Planning Commission Meeting: December 8, 2025**

---

The Planning Commission convened at 7:00 p.m. to meet in regular session with **Chair Wayne Janner** presiding. Commissioners Taylor Breen, Keith Brown, Ken Chapman, and Jim Terrones were present. Commissioners Tony Bergida, Chip Corcoran, and Megan Lynn were absent.

*Recited Pledge of Allegiance.*

**Chair Janner** made introductory comments. Regarding ex parte communication, the Chair requested that if a commissioner has something to report, they specify the nature of the ex parte communication when that item is reached in the agenda.

**Chair Janner** referenced the Planning Commission Consent Agenda, which included four items. Chair Janner asked if any items needed to be removed for separate discussion or additional information.

**Commissioner Brown** requested Item B, MP25-0008, be pulled for separate discussion.

**Chair Janner** acknowledged the request and asked if there were any additional items to be pulled. Hearing none, he requested a motion to approve the remaining consent agenda items, excluding Item B.

A motion to approve MN25-1110, Planning Commission meeting minutes of November 10, 2025, was made by **Commissioner Breen** and seconded by **Commissioner Chapman**. The motion passed 5 to 0.



## MINUTES

### Planning Commission Meeting: December 8, 2025

<b>Application:</b>	<b><u>MP25-0008:</u></b> Request for approval of a minor plat for Villas at Hilltop Farms, Replat of Lot 9, containing three (3) lots on approximately 0.30 acres, located at 17340, 17344, and 17348 W. 174 <sup>th</sup> Terrace.
---------------------	---

**Commissioner Brown** requested that MP25-0008 be pulled from the consent agenda for further discussion.

**Chair Janner** invited staff to present Item B, MP25-0008.

**Mr. Hayden Grone**, Planning Intern, presented the request for approval of a minor plat for the Villas at Hilltop Farms, a replat of Lot 9. He explained that the site was located northwest of 175th Street and South Mur-Len Road within the larger Hilltop Farms development. The proposed minor plat would subdivide Lot 9 into three individual residential lots to allow for the separate sale and ownership of townhome units currently under construction. He noted that the larger development consisted of over 152 acres of single-family, multifamily, and commercial uses, rezoned in 2022 and platted in 2025. Mr. Grone stated that this was the first minor plat application within the multifamily portion of Hilltop Farms and that no public easements or rights-of-way were included, requiring only Planning Commission approval under the Unified Development Ordinance.

Mr. Grone concluded that staff recommended approval with no stipulations and indicated that the applicant was present to answer questions if needed.

**Chair Janner** thanked Mr. Grone and recognized Commissioner Brown, who had pulled the item.

**Commissioner Brown** asked clarifying questions regarding the map and whether the subdivision of three lots would be the first of multiple minor plat applications as the development progressed.

**Mr. Grone** confirmed that this was the first such application and that additional minor plats were expected in the future to allow for individual townhome sales.

**Commissioner Brown** thanked staff for the clarification.

**Chair Janner** asked if there were any further questions. Hearing none, he requested a motion on Item B [MP25-0008].

A motion to approve MP25-0008 was made by **Commissioner Terrones** as stipulated and seconded by **Commissioner Brown**. The motion passed with a vote of 5 to 0 with no stipulations.



## MINUTES

### Planning Commission Meeting: December 8, 2025

<b>Application:</b>	<b><u>MP25-0009:</u></b> Request for approval of a minor plat for Parkside Business Center, Fifth Plat, containing one (1) lot on approximately 0.84 acres, located at 590 N. Central Street.
---------------------	---

A motion to approve MP25-0009 was made by **Commissioner Breen** and seconded by **Commissioner Chapman**. The motion passed with a vote of 5 to 0 with no stipulations.



## MINUTES

### Planning Commission Meeting: December 8, 2025

<b>Application:</b>	<b><u>FP25-0036:</u></b> Request for approval of a final plat for Oak Run North, containing 25 lots and two (2) tracts on approximately 9.17 acres, located northwest of 147th Street and S. Red Bird Street.
---------------------	---

A motion to approve FP25-0036 was made by **Commissioner Breen** and seconded by **Commissioner Chapman**. The motion passed with a vote of 5 to 0 with following stipulation:

1. The Final Plat must be approved by the Johnson County Airport Commission and the Board of County Commissioners prior to recording.



## MINUTES

### Planning Commission Meeting: December 8, 2025

<b>Application:</b>	<b><u>SU25-0005:</u></b> Request for approval of a special use permit for Motor Vehicle Sales (golf and utility carts) for McCoy Custom Carts on approximately 1.30 acres, located at 19950 W. 161st Street.
---------------------	--

**Taylor Vande Velde, Planner II**, presented the request for a special use permit for motor vehicle sales, specifically for golf carts, at the subject property. She explained that the site, located west of U.S. 169 Highway and north of 161st Street, is surrounded by existing industrial uses. She stated that the property's zoning is M-2 (General Industrial), which allows motor vehicle sales with approval of a special use permit, and that the Future Land Use designation of Industrial and Greenways was compatible with the proposed use.

Ms. Vande Velde described the existing building and site layout, noting that the majority of the space would be used for warehousing and indoor storage of golf carts and supplies. She identified areas designated for a showroom and entrance, office space, and parking. She reported that no exterior building changes or additional landscaping were proposed and that existing landscaping would remain.

Ms. Vande Velde confirmed that all public notice requirements had been met, that no neighborhood meeting was required, and that neither staff nor the applicant had received public correspondence regarding the application.

Ms. Vande Velde stated that the applicant had requested a 10-year approval period for the special use permit. She explained that staff supported the request due to the industrial context of the site, limited visibility from major streets, and the fact that the golf carts would be stored indoors. She concluded by noting that staff recommended approval of Special Use Permit (SU25-0005) with stipulated conditions.

**Chair Janner** thanked Ms. Vande Velde and invited questions from the Commissioners.

**Commissioner Terrones** thanked staff for the presentation and asked for clarification regarding the stipulation requiring complete screening if outdoor storage were proposed. He inquired whether verification would be required to ensure compliance with the Unified Development Ordinance.

**Ms. Vande Velde** responded that any proposed outdoor storage would be required to be fully screened using landscaping, fencing, or another appropriate method and would be subject to staff review for compliance with the ordinance.

**Chair Janner** asked if there were additional questions.

**Commissioner Breen** asked whether this was the first special use permit application for the applicant at this property and requested clarification on what factors influenced the proposed 10-year approval period. He also asked whether approval durations were typically five years or varied on a case-by-case basis.

**Ms. Vande Velde** confirmed that this was the first special use permit application for the property. She explained that five years was the standard approval period unless otherwise requested; the applicant had requested a 10-year term. She stated that staff found the longer duration appropriate based on the site's industrial setting and surrounding development patterns. She added that other special use permits may receive shorter approval periods depending on context, allowing for more frequent review and potential adjustments to conditions.

**Chair Janner** opened the floor for Commissioner questions, but there were none. Chair Janner then asked whether there were any questions for the applicant. Hearing none, Chair Janner provided an overview of public hearing procedures.

**Chair Janner** then formally opened the public hearing for the request and noted that two speakers had signed up to speak.

**Speaker #1, Mary Pacey, 11734 S. Deer Run Street**, a resident of Foxfield Reserve, expressed concerns regarding traffic access to the area. She questioned why there were only two roadway entrances serving the development area and raised concerns about the impact of industrial truck traffic on nearby neighborhood streets. She described existing traffic congestion during school hours near Lone Elm Road, noting two nearby schools, and expressed concern that additional industrial traffic could exacerbate delays for local residents.

**Speaker #2, Brian McCoy, 19950 W. 161<sup>st</sup> Street**, owner of McCoy Custom Carts, thanked staff for their assistance during the review process. He clarified that his business was located in an industrial area where no residences were located on the same street. Mr. McCoy explained that outdoor storage of golf carts was not feasible due to security concerns and financing requirements, noting that the business relied on indoor storage within the existing 8,000-square-foot building. He stated that storing carts outdoors would present significant security risks and was not part of the business plan. He concluded by offering to answer any additional questions.

With no other speakers signed up to speak, **Chair Janner** asked for a motion to close the public hearing.

**Commissioner Terrones** moved to close the public hearing, and **Commissioner Chapman** seconded the motion. The motion to close the public hearing passed with a vote of 5 to 0.

**Chair Janner** called for any additional discussion on the item. Hearing none, he called for a motion on item SU25-0005.

**Commissioner Chapman** moved to approve SU25-0005 as recommended by staff, and **Commissioner Breen** seconded the motion. The motion passed 5 to 0 as follows.

A. Staff recommends approval of SU25-0005 with conditions, for the following reasons:

1. The proposal conforms to the Goals, Objectives and Policies of the Comprehensive Plan.
2. The proposal complies with the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) criteria for considering special use permit requests.

B. Staff recommends approval of SU25-0005 subject to the following stipulations:

1. The special use permit allows motor vehicle sales for golf and utility carts only, to be stored and sold indoors only, and is valid for a period of ten (10) years following the date of Governing Body approval. The sale of any other type of motor vehicle is prohibited.
2. No outdoor storage of equipment or materials is permitted unless completely screened per UDO 18.30.130.





## MINUTES

### Planning Commission Meeting: December 8, 2025

<b>Application:</b>	<b><u>RZ25-0009:</u></b> Request for approval of a rezoning from the NC (Neighborhood Center) District to the R-3 (Residential Low-Density Multifamily) District for Lone Elm Townhomes, located northeast of W. 119 <sup>th</sup> Street and S. Lone Elm Road.
---------------------	---

**Nathan Jurey, Senior Planner**, presented the request to rezone the 7.7-acre site from NC (Neighborhood Commercial) to R-3 (Low-Density Multifamily) with an associated preliminary plan for Lone Elm Townhomes. He explained that the property is located northeast of 119<sup>th</sup> Street and Lone Elm Road. He noted that the proposal included 71 townhomes at a density of approximately nine units per acre and extended public streets, connecting W. 118<sup>th</sup> Terrace and S. Deer Run Street, through the site.

Mr. Jurey presented that the site had been zoned for mixed-use development since 2005 and that staff recommends denial of the requested “downzoning” as it does not meet multiple rezoning Golden Criteria, including conformance with the Comprehensive Plan and suitability of uses.

Mr. Jurey stated that the Comprehensive Plan encouraged mixed-use and complete neighborhoods. He emphasized the importance of maintaining the limited amount of commercially zoned land in northwest Olathe to support a balance of jobs and housing. He further added that this site was deemed suitable for commercial development in 2005 and the suitability is increasing due to the current 119th Street Extension, which is expected to change travel patterns from K-7 and K-10 Highways; he opined that rezoning prior to realizing those impacts was premature.

Mr. Jurey summarized public input, noting neighborhood meeting attendance of 40 residents and written correspondence from 41 residents, most of whom expressed opposition due to concerns regarding density, building massing, traffic and safety, parking, amenities, property value impact, and desire to retain commercial zoning. He concluded that staff recommended denial due to inconsistency with the Comprehensive Plan and failure to meet multiple Golden Criteria.

**Chair Janner** invited questions from the Commission.

**Commissioner Brown** asked for clarification regarding the 119th Street extension and its proximity to the site.

**Mr. Jurey** explained the alignment of the road extension and stated that the subject property was located approximately one and one-half miles west of the planned roundabout connection.

**Chair Janner** then invited the applicant to present.

**Mr. Curtis Holland**, attorney for the property owner, addressed the Commission on behalf of the development team, and introduced the applicant team which he noted contained highly experienced development and real estate professionals. He stated that the Applicant disagreed with staff's recommendation and asserted that the site had not been viable for retail development during the 20 years it had been commercially zoned. He explained that multiple attempts to attract retail or other commercial uses had been unsuccessful and that even with the 119th Street Extension project, the market conditions were unlikely to change. He added that the property owner had been patient, holding the property for 20 years without any development materializing and he did not believe the market would change significantly for this site. Mr. Holland described the surrounding development as predominantly residential, including adjacent townhomes, and argued that the proposed townhomes were compatible with the area. He summarized the conceptual plan for 71 townhomes, cited The Clearing as comparable and noted that the proposed density was lower than nearby developments. In response to neighborhood meeting comments, he added that W. 118<sup>th</sup> Terrace and S. Deer Run Street are both public streets, not private. He also referenced a prior rezoning in the area (Crestone Senior Living) where commercial land had been downzoned in response to market realities and just east of Olathe West High School where townhomes were built in NC District zoning. He emphasized that increased traffic alone did not ensure retail success and gave several examples. Mr. Holland concluded by requesting approval of the rezoning and offered to answer questions. He requested time later to be able to answer additional questions.

**Chair Janner** asked whether Commissioners had any questions for the applicant. He then opened the public hearing.

**Speaker #1, Thomas Bart, 11764 S. Marion Street**, a resident of Foxfield Village whose property abutted the site, spoke in opposition to the rezoning. He stated that the homeowners' association supported staff's recommendation to deny the request. He expressed concerns about rental townhomes changing the character of the neighborhood, increasing use of Foxfield amenities without contribution, and reducing green space. He stated that residents preferred retaining commercial zoning or a small-scale commercial or church use rather than a 70-unit townhome development. He noted that the HOA members were unanimously opposed to the rezoning.

**Speaker #2, Gary Williams, 21100 W. 118<sup>th</sup> Terrace**, a nearby resident, also opposed the rezoning. He cited traffic congestion concerns, particularly at Monroe Street, 118th Terrace, and Deer Run Road, and stated that the addition of 71 units could significantly

increase traffic on local streets lacking traffic controls. He noted that many residents had already submitted written comments including concerns about density and reiterated broad HOA opposition.

**Speaker #3, Lucienne Caron, 11788 S. Marion Street**, a resident and HOA board member, opposed the rezoning and raised concerns about traffic impacts on private streets, particularly Marion Street. She stated that while some access roads were public, drivers would likely use private HOA-maintained streets to cut through the neighborhood, increasing maintenance costs for residents.

**Speaker #4, Arthur Rinehart, 11777 S. Marion Street**, a nearby resident, opposed the proposal due to concerns about rental properties, traffic congestion especially during school hours, maintenance standards, and use of neighborhood amenities by non-residents. He stated that homeowners were more invested in property upkeep and that the proposal would negatively affect neighborhood financial stability.

**Chair Janner** confirmed all registered speakers who wished to had been heard and called for a motion to close the public hearing.

**Commissioner Breen** moved to close the public hearing, and **Commissioner Terrones** seconded the motion. The motion to close the public hearing passed by a vote of 5 to 0.

**Chair Janner** then allowed the applicant an opportunity to respond.

**Mr. Curtis Holland**, attorney for the applicant, addressed concerns raised during the hearing. He stated that approximately 50 percent of the site would remain as open space and that the development complied with City regulations. He explained that traffic increases were already anticipated due to planned roadway improvements, including right-of-way acquisition and a future traffic signal. He clarified that access to the site would be limited to public streets and that access limitations along 119th Street and Lone Elm Road restricted direct driveways. He stated that the early discussions with the neighborhood included an offer to join the HOA with reimbursement options, but the neighborhood declined the offer. He added the development would not have access to Foxfield amenities as amenities are usually secured and controlled by key-fob or other security access. He noted that townhome developments commonly did not include on-site amenities.

**Mr. Aaron Messmer**, representing the proposed developer, addressed concerns regarding rental housing. He stated that the company specialized in Class A developments and had a record of reinvesting in and maintaining properties at a high standard. He provided an example of Pinecrest Townhomes rentals where they invested greatly in the property. He noted that rental housing provided opportunities for families who wished to live in the area but were not yet able to purchase homes.

**Chair Janner** closed applicant comments and invited Commissioner discussion.

**Commissioner Chapman** stated that the Comprehensive Plan designated the area for mixed-use and emphasized the lack of commercial services in northwest Olathe. He expressed concern that rezoning would conflict with long-term planning goals, particularly in light of expected traffic increases along 119th Street and the Hunt project across from Bass Pro Shop. He stated that he would likely not support the rezoning.

**Commissioner Terrones** echoed those concerns, stating that the request did not conform to the Unified Development Ordinance or Comprehensive Plan policies. He expressed concern about the use of a concept plan rather than a full preliminary plan and stated that he struggled to support the rezoning.

**Commissioner Brown** asked staff how retail development could function without direct ingress/egress access from 119th Street or Lone Elm Road.

**Mr. Nathan Jurey**, Senior Planner, responded that the previously approved 2005 mixed-use plan included right-in/right-out access from both roads. He explained that access was not evaluated with the current proposal because the applicant did not propose accessing those roads.

**Commissioner Breen** stated that he shared concerns about inconsistency with Plan Olathe.

**Commissioner Breen** moved to support staff's recommendation of denial of RZ25-0009, as recommended by staff.

**Commissioner Chapman** seconded the motion.

**Chair Janner** clarified that a vote in favor of the motion constituted a recommendation for denial. He added that Council consideration should carefully evaluate impacts to the private streets and evaluation of traffic access to the site. He also reiterated the importance of respecting the Comprehensive Plan, particularly given the anticipated influence of the 119th Street expansion. He noted that he and Commissioner Breen are currently participating in the Comprehensive Plan update (Elevate Olathe), and noted the time and consideration that goes into Comprehensive Plans (PlanOlathe). The prior committee set out PlanOlathe, believing Commercial zoning would work on this site. He felt it was important to respect that Plan.

The motion to recommend denial passed by a vote of 5 to 0 consistent with staff's recommendations as follows:

- A. Staff recommends denial of RZ25-0009, Lone Elm Townhomes, for the following reasons:

1. The proposal is inconsistent with several Goals, Objectives and Policies of the Comprehensive Plan, including the following:
    - a. *ES-2.1: Balance of Jobs and Housing.*
    - b. *LUCC-4.1: Mixed-Use Neighborhoods.*
    - c. *HN-2.2 Complete Neighborhoods.*
  2. The proposal fails to meet four (4) of the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) criteria for considering rezoning requests.
    - a. *“The conformance of the proposed use to the Comprehensive Plan and other adopted planning policies.”*
    - b. *“The suitability of the property for the uses to which it has been restricted under the applicable zoning district regulations.”*
    - c. *“The length of time the property has remained vacant as zoned.”*
    - d. *“The economic impact of the proposed use on the community.”*
- B. Staff recommends denial of the rezoning request and the preliminary site development plan application.



## MINUTES

### Planning Commission Meeting: December 8, 2025

<b>Application:</b>	<b><u>RZ25-0014:</u></b> Request for approval of a zoning amendment to Ordinance 03-113 and a preliminary site development plan for 151st and Mur-Len Mixed Use, located southeast of W. 151st Street and S. Mur-Len Road.
---------------------	--

**Jessica Schuller, Senior Planner**, presented a zoning amendment and preliminary site development plan for a mixed-use project located southeast of 151st Street and Mur-Len Road, east of Heritage Square. She explained the surrounding zoning and noted that adjacent properties included both commercial uses and single-family residential neighborhoods.

Ms. Schuller stated that the request was for a zoning amendment, not a rezoning, and would retain existing permitted uses while removing outdated architectural and traffic stipulations from a 2003 approval that no longer reflected current conditions. She outlined the proposed development, which included a multi-tenant retail building with a drive-through and a three- to four-story vertically mixed-use building containing ground-floor retail and 207 residential units. She noted that 331 parking stalls were proposed, with shared parking coordination planned with the adjacent property owner.

Ms. Schuller described the site layout, including internal residential amenities, outdoor dining areas, building height transitions, and setbacks that exceeded ordinance requirements. She explained that traffic volumes would be lower than those previously approved and highlighted buffering measures such as preservation of an existing tree line, addition of berms and fencing, and screening walls. She stated that the buildings met all Unified Development Ordinance requirements with no waivers requested. Ms. Schuller said a neighborhood meeting was held with a little over 20 attending. She summarized neighborhood input with topics primarily about screening, draining and grading, traffic and access, building height, lighting/noise, and the project timeline. Staff received two letters of correspondence. She noted that the proposal aligned with the Comprehensive Plan

She concluded that staff recommended approval of the zoning amendment with stipulations, including one to maintain a minimum square footage of commercial space open to the public. She stated staff recommended approval of the preliminary development plan, subject to stipulations regarding shared parking access and building height limits.

**Chair Janner** thanked staff and asked if the Commissioners had questions. Hearing none, he invited the applicant to present.

**Judd Claussen, Phelps Engineering**, introduced the project team and stated that the applicant and owner Epic Estates, was proposing the development. He referenced the original 2003 development plan and explained that the current proposal reduced retail intensity, improved site circulation, and created a quieter transition to nearby residential areas.

Mr. Claussen emphasized that the building design stepped down to three stories along the south edge, preserved existing trees, and added fencing and landscaping in response to neighborhood concerns. Mr. Claussen confirmed a wall had been incorporated into the plan after the neighborhood meeting.

Mr. Claussen stated that the proposed parking met ordinance requirements and that a shared parking agreement with the adjacent western property would be finalized at the final development plan stage. He summarized the architectural design, open space amenities, and screening features, and noted that the project required no variances or deviations. He concluded that the development represented a compatible infill project consistent with City goals for vertically mixed-use development and confirmed the applicant's agreement with all staff stipulations.

**Chair Janner** thanked the applicant and asked if there were questions from the Commission.

**Commissioner Chapman** posed inquired about the purpose of garage doors shown on the mixed-use building elevations.

**Mr. Claussen** explained that the doors were service and loading access points located on the west side of the building and would be used for retail deliveries, residential move-ins and move-outs, and trash service. He stated that the design allowed deliveries to occur internally rather than from public-facing areas.

**Chair Janner** asked if there was any further discussion and, hearing none, he opened the public hearing.

**Speaker #1, Margaret Kennedy, 15909 W. 152nd Place**, spoke in opposition to the proposal. She stated that while commercial buildings were acceptable, the proposed multi-story apartment building was out of place among surrounding single-family homes and one-story commercial uses. She expressed concerns about traffic congestion at the intersection of 151st Street and Mur-Len Road, particularly during peak evening hours when she sits through two to three light cycles before being able to turn left. She stated that the development would worsen existing conditions. She also raised concerns about the visibility of the building, especially during winter months when trees are not leafed,

and stated that she had lived in the area for nearly 30 years and did not support the apartment component of the project.

**Speaker #2, Denise Wallman, 15241 S. Wyandotte Drive**, also spoke in opposition. She stated that she attended the neighborhood meeting and was surprised by the proposal for a multi-story apartment building. She expressed concern that no additional traffic lanes or intersection improvements were planned despite the anticipated increase in residents. Ms. Wallman stated that her property abutted the site and that residents of upper stories would be able to see into her backyard, impacting privacy. She noted that nearby residential development at 127th Street and Mur-Len Road was more appropriately located and argued that the proposed project would appear out of place at this intersection. She requested that the Commission deny the zoning amendment.

**Speaker #3, Jennifer Slaton, 15240 S. Sturgeon Drive**, stated that her property was directly behind the proposed development. She expressed concern about the limited distance between her fence line and the property line, stating that proposed walls and landscaping would not sufficiently buffer noise or views. She noted the lack of a berm along the south side and raised concerns about traffic congestion during peak school and work commute hours, especially due to proximity to Garmin and Olathe South High School. Ms. Slaton stated that she would prefer a one- to one-and-a-half-story commercial building rather than a multi-story residential building with balconies overlooking her backyard.

**Speaker #4, Darrell Oglesby, 15104 S. Locust Street**, stated that he had lived at the address for nearly 40 years and expressed concerns about drainage and property values. He described past flooding events along Mur-Len Road and water flow through his backyard during heavy rainstorms, noting that his basement had remained dry. He questioned whether the proposed development would alter drainage patterns and asked who would be responsible if future flooding occurred as a result of the project. Mr. Oglesby also expressed concern that a four-story apartment building would significantly reduce buyer interest in nearby homes and negatively impact property values.

With no other speakers, **Chair Janner** entertained a motion to close the public hearing.

**Commissioner Breen** moved to close the hearing, and **Commissioner Brown** seconded. The motion passed unanimously 5 to 0, and the public hearing was closed.

**Chair Janner** asked staff to clarify whether traffic and apartment use were within the scope of the zoning amendment being considered.

**Ms. Schuller** explained that the mixed-use and retail uses were permitted by right under the existing CP-2 zoning and that the request focused on modifying outdated stipulations and approving the preliminary site plan rather than reconsidering allowable uses.

**Commissioner Breen** asked about permitted building heights within the zoning district.



**Ms. Schuller** answered that CP-2 zoning allowed heights up to 12 stories, but City staff had worked closely with the applicant to reduce the proposed building to three stories along the south edge and four stories elsewhere. Staff stated that these heights were intentionally limited to provide a transition to adjacent neighborhoods and were included as stipulations in staff's recommendation.

**Commissioner Chapman** asked to confirm this was a request for approval of the zoning amendment and the preliminary site development plan.

**Ms. Schuller** confirmed that was correct.

**Commissioner Chapman** acknowledged that the proposal aligned with the existing Heritage Square development but expressed concern that the three- and four-story apartment building on Lot 2 which appeared out of place and would be visually prominent. He also reiterated concerns about traffic congestion at 151st Street and Mur-Len Road and asked whether roadway improvements were planned.

**Chet Belcher, Chief Community Development Officer**, responded that no improvements were currently programmed in the five-year Capital Improvement Plan, noting that right-of-way constraints limited options for additional corridor turn lanes. However, he said geometric improvements including turn lanes had been completed around the time Sutherlands redeveloped.

**Commissioner Chapman** thanked staff and again noted it was challenging to turn at 151<sup>st</sup> and Mur-Len Road, requiring two to three light cycles.

**Chair Janner** asked for further discussion and, hearing none, called for a motion on Item RZ25-0014.

**Commissioner Breen** moved to approve RZ25-0014 as stipulated by staff, and **Commissioner Chapman** seconded.

**Chair Janner** noted there had not been a satisfactory answer regarding traffic, hoping City Council would review ongoing traffic concerns, but stated they were not sufficient to deny the project.

The motion passed unanimously by a vote of 5 to 0 as follows:

- A. Staff recommends approval of RZ25-0014, 151<sup>st</sup> Mixed-Use, for the following reasons:
  1. The proposed development complies with the policies and goals of the PlanOlathe Comprehensive Plan.

2. The requested amendment to Ordinance 03-113 meets the *Unified Development Ordinance (UDO)* criteria for considering zoning amendment applications.
- B. Staff recommends approval of the zoning amendment, repealing and replacing Section 2 of Ordinance 03-113 to read as follows:
1. The following site and building design requirements shall be required:
    - a. Buildings shall be designed to create a human scale with elements such as canopies, raised landscape planters, pedestrian level lighting and special building material treatments at the base of the building.
    - b. Each building shall have similar qualities and architectural elements that contribute to the overall theme.
    - c. All landscaped areas shall be irrigated.
    - d. A photometric plan, indicating the type of lighting for buildings and parking areas, shall be submitted prior to approval of the final site development plan.
  2. Within the Mixed Use building, a minimum of 24,000 square feet of commercial space that is open to the general public (not for the exclusive use of residents or tenants) will be maintained, as shown on the preliminary plan dated November 25, 2025.
- C. Staff recommends approval of the preliminary site development plan with the following stipulations:
1. At the time of Final Site Development Plan, a shared parking agreement must be established with the owner of Lot 4, Heritage Square, must be established to allow for overflow parking as necessary.
  2. Maximum building heights of each individual façade of the Mixed Use building (Lot 2) are limited to that shown on the architectural elevations, dated November 25, 2025.
  3. At the time of Final Site Development Plan review, the landscaping and fencing along the eastern property line shall be adjusted as necessary to avoid existing easements.
  4. At the time of Final Site Development Plan review, the stormwater management plan must revise the alignments of certain public and

private stormwater lines and continue to meet all water-quality and detention requirements in accordance with Title 17.

5. Exterior ground-mounted or building mounted equipment including but not limited to, mechanical equipment, utilities' meter banks and coolers must be screened from public view with three (3) sided landscaping or an architectural treatment compatible with the building architecture.



## **MINUTES – Closing Remarks**

**Planning Commission Meeting: December 8, 2025**

---

There were no announcements.

*Meeting adjourned.*