



CITY OF TOPEKA  
**TOPEKA PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**C A S E M I N U T E S**

Monday, February 20, 2017

**6:00PM – Municipal Building, 214 SE 8<sup>th</sup> Street, 2<sup>nd</sup> floor Council Chambers**

**Members present:** Katrina Ringler, Wiley Kannarr, Rosa Cavazos, Scott Gales, Brian Armstrong, Ariane Burson, Dennis Haugh, Patrick Woods (8)

**Members Absent:** Carole Jordan (1)

**Staff Present:** Bill Fiander, Planning Director; Dan Warner, Planner III; Mike Hall, Planner III; Annie Driver, Planner II; Kris Wagers, Office Specialist; Mary Feighny, Legal

**PUD17/01 by Charles and Joseph Schmidt et al (Schmidt Vending)** requesting to rezone property located at 1903 NW Lower Silver Lake Road, 1911 NW Lower Silver Lake Road, and approximately 187 ft. of property to the west from R-1 Single Family Dwelling District TO PUD Planned Unit Development (I-1 Uses). **(Driver)**

Ms. Driver reviewed the staff report and the handout provided to Commissioners. Said handout listed revised condition numbers 3 and 5 and Ms. Driver stated that the applicant is agreeable to the conditions recommended by staff.

With no questions for staff, Mr. Mark Boyd of SBB Engineering came forward representing the owner, who was also present. Mr. Boyd stated he had nothing further to add and confirmed that the owner is agreeable to all conditions, including the revisions to numbers 3 and 5.

Mr. Haugh inquired about the landscape buffering and Mr. Boyd explained that a more detailed landscape plan would be required and submitted with the building permit application. Ms. Driver stated that the siteplan calls for 5' setbacks on all new buildings, leaving room for landscaping. Storage would be fenced and landscaped. Mr. Gales asked Ms. Driver for verification that detailed landscape plans are not due until the time of building permit application and she confirmed.

With no further questions, Mr. Kannarr declared the **public hearing open**. With none coming forward, Mr. Kannarr declared the **public hearing closed**.

Mr. Gales asked if there would be an obligation to fence/screen the entire property. Ms. Driver explained that due to the nature of the area, staff waived the necessity of a fence along the entire length of the property. Mr. Gales asked if the owners could later be required to put up a fence, assuming the neighborhood changes, and Ms. Driver explained that the City could only require it if the applicant returned asking for an amendment to the PUD.

**Motion** by Mr. Gales to accept staff recommendation of approval, subject to the conditions given. **Second** by Mr. Haugh.

Mr. Kannarr noted that only one person attended the Neighborhood Information Meeting (NIM); there was no opposition and the land has been undeveloped for a long period of time.

**Approval (8-0-0)**

**DRAFT**