city of south hutchinson
2 south main
south hutchinson, kansas 67505
620-663-7104

12/1/2025 @ 6:00 pm at city hall

**A. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL**

Erin Cokeley____Mark Estes____Jim Chastain____Marge Bryant_____
Pam Crank____Kraig Blackwater____Chad Duvall____Mike Blackburn_____

**B. Approval of Agenda (additions/deletions)**

**C. Approval of minutes for November 3rd, 2025**

Motion Second Vote

**D. Public Hearings**

No public hearings.

**E. Action Items**

**1. Approval of capital improvement project of new benches and picnic tables in the parks department. Not to exceed FY26 Budget, and to stay under $15,000**

Motion Second Vote

**2. Approve applying for Waste Tire Grant Application – Tables and Benches SFY 2026 (50% reimbursement)**

Motion Second Vote

**F.** Discussion Items

1. Comprehensive Plan Review

**G. New Business**

No new business.

**H. ADJOURNMENT**

Motion Second Vote

Next regularly scheduled January 5th, 2026
Prepared by Paige Harman Administrative Assistant

## CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

The South Hutchinson Planning Commission met in regular session. The following members were present:

- Erin Cokeley
- Mark Estes
- Jim Chastain
- Marge Bryant
- Kraig Blackwelder
- Chad Duvall
- Mike Blackburn
- Pam Crank

*All members were present.*

## APPROVAL OF AGENDA (ADDITIONS/DELETIONS)

**Planning and Zoning Administrators:**

- Administrative Assistant, Paige Harman advised the council and the public that Case 2025-12 at 10 North Poplar has been removed from the agenda for the lack of authority under the existing Zoning Regulations, and as a result, the public hearing that was advertised is no longer being held. The property is currently zoned for R-2- Multi-Dwelling Residential and in our regulation the City only outlines the building dimensions of the front, side, and rear yard that they need to follow when building.
    - After discussions from public and commissioner Chastain, Estes, and Bryant, Harman stated the parcel is in the flood plain and would need to follow FEMA flood plain regulations along with the drainage for that. That FEMA regulations are very strict and are followed to the letter. It would need to be elevated at least 1 foot above the base level due to being in the flood plain as well but does not know the base level off top of her head. Building inspections are done in-house by Matt Mock, Public Works Superintendent, and would ensure setbacks are adhered to when doing onsite inspections and examining design plans/survey. City would also, prior to issuing building permits would need design plans and plat for the building. Harman did not know the exact date of the zoning map from the top of my head, but it is the office that the City can reference and public can reference.
- Public Works Superintendent, Matt Mock aided in answering questions that were posed by the public and commissioner Chastain, Estes, and Bryant. Matt stated the map had been done years ago and did not know the exact date of when it was done. The map is accessible on the

wall in his office for the zoning of the whole City. Concurred that the development would need to be raised at least 1 foot in elevation of the base level and that the FEMA Flood plain is regulated by the Federal Government. Mock also expressed that yes, the setbacks would be inspected in person by himself, and that we have not gotten design plans for the duplexes but would need those to also exam prior to a building permit issued.

**Public Comment:**

- Neighbors to the property at 10 North Poplar asked what was the date of the zoning map that is referenced because to his knowledge it was Single Residential and not Mult-Dwelling Residential. The neighbors are concerned about increased traffic to their neighborhood, renters' behavior, and the runoff of water to their backyard ruining that area by their fence.

**Commissioner Discussion:**

- Commissioner Chastain asked about drainage plan for the property.
- Commissioner Estes asked if we knew how much of an elevation would be raised and how that drainage of elevation could affect the area.
- Commissioner Bryant asked about our regulations for building and construction and how the City could ensure the sizes of the duplexes. Commissioner Bryant stated that the City better ensures setbacks are regulated and followed. Advised the public to talk with the City Council and City Administrator.

## APPROVAL OF MINUTES

**Approval of minutes for October 6th, 2025**

Commissioner Chastain moved, seconded by Commissioner Cokeley.

*Vote: 8-0, Motion Carried with amendment to minutes to add Pam Crank in attendance and correct spelling of Commissioner Bryant last name in the Adjournment section.*

## PUBLIC HEARINGS

**Case No. 2025-11 – Proposed conditional use permit to allow the use of a sheet metal fence**

Commissioner Bryant moved, seconded by Commissioner Crank.

*Vote: 8-0, Motion Carried.*

**Applicant Presentation:**

- The applicant presented the commission pamphlet of colors and textures the fence could be. Currently there is not a ton of metal fencing in this area, but that it is becoming a poplar trend for fencing. They are redoing their fence to keep their dogs in their backyard that are currently getting out through the wooden fence that is there. The texture they were wanting to do for the fence is a wood texture and brought swatches of colors for the fence. The metal fence does come with a 20-year warranty.

- Answers to Commissioners' questions:
  - She let the commission know they would not tear down the back portion of the fence, but it is already a metal fence and would paint that portion to match the new side portions they would be putting in.
  - They are going to be doing the rough cedar texture and a dark brown color. The fence paneling would go vertically.
  - The fence height would be the exact same as what it is now at 5 feet.

**Planning and Zoning Administrators:**

- Public Works Superintendent, Matt Mock stated it would help beautify the area, and that metal fencing is becoming a popular option for fencing. He answered Commissioner Estes' question, yes there is another residential property that has half a metal fence and a couple of commercial properties that have metal fencing.

**Public Comment:**

- A neighbor of the property stated they have no problem with the metal fence going in and currently live directly to the side of the property.

**Commissioner Discussion:**

- Commissioner Cokeley asked about the back fencing on the property.
- Commissioner Crank asked what the height of the fence would be and were there any concerns from neighbors.
- Commissioner Chastain asked if they were going to do a color on the pamphlet that was handed out and what color they were going to do.
- Commissioner Blackburn asked how would you match the back portion of fence to the new fence in color.
- Commissioner Blackwelder asked if the paneling of the fence would be horizontal or vertical.
- Commissioner Estes asked if there was any other place in town that has sheet metal fencing and if the property backed up to the alley that was behind the church.

**Motion to Close Public Hearing:**

Commissioner Cokeley moved, seconded by Commissioner Bryant.

*Vote: 8-0, Motion Carried.*

**Recommendation to City Council: Approval of the CUP for the metal fence**

Commissioner Bryant moved, seconded by Commissioner Duvall.

*Vote: 8-0, Motion Carried.*

**Case No. LS25-001 – Proposed lot split of parcel 126230100301300 into two parcels**

Commissioner Bryant moved, seconded by Commissioner Chastain.

*Vote: 8-0, Motion Carried.*

**Applicant Presentation:**

- Applicant did not show to the Planning Commission Meeting.

**Planning and Zoning Administrators:**

- Administrative Assistant Paige Harman provided information from the application that was submitted. Harman stated the parcel is being split with the intent of selling the parcel and that improvements to the parcel would be a driveway access to the sale barn. In doing that the parcel frontage to street if that is the intent would not be at the required feet it needs to be.
    - Harman answered questions from commissioners:
        - Harman stated she did not know if the applicant owned also the sale barn.
        - Harman did not know if the sale barn or applicant had a agreement for the driveway or why they were wanting to do the lot split.
- Public Works Superintendent, Matt Mock provided information for the parcel by showing on the survey and arial map that was printed out and brough by Commissioner Crank and Cokeley what was being split and that it was the back of the portion of the property. He also explained that the semi-trucks or larger trucks have a hard time right now turning around at the sale barn location and that could be why they are looking to create the driveway access for easement of the trucks. He also concurred that the Redemption Animal Rescue is who purchased Prairie Vista.

**Public Comment:**

- A resident confirmed that Redemption Animal Rescue and another company who was looking to go into the Prairie Vista were the same company.

**Commissioner Discussion:**

- Commissioner Cokely asked for clarification on the survey about what parcel was being sold and if that portion was what is becoming the driveway.
- Commissioner Bryant asked for clarification on if the application also owned the sale barn and if they agreed to become a driveway. Bryant had brought up that she thought another company had bought the Prairie Vista. Bryant agreed and stated there is not enough information to decide on the lot split application at this time.
- Commissioner Chastain asked to table the discussion due to not having the full context of the application and desire of the application for splitting the parcel.
- Commissioner Crank asked for clarification on the survey layout and location of the driveway.

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

For Case No. 2025-11, the Commission made the following findings in accordance with K.S.A 12-757

1. **Notice:** Notice of the hearing was properly published in the official city newspaper, mailed to residents within a 200 ft radius of property, and posted on sight of property at least 20 days in advance.
2. **Review Criteria:** The Commission considered:
    a. Conformance with the City's Comprehensive Plan.
    b. Current R-2 Two-Family Residential District Regulations.
    c. Current Supplementary Use Regulations; Conditional Uses; Accessory Uses; Prohibited Uses in section 27-108 Regulations.
    d. Land Development Code in section 27-109 Regulations.
    e. Conditional Use Application.
3. **Conclusion:** The commission determined that the proposed conditional use permit for a sheet metal fence was appropriate after reviewing all documents and in person references provided by the applicant.

For Lot Split Case No. LS25-001, the Commission made the following findings in accordance with K.S.A 12-757 and Article 3. Tract or Lot Splits

1. **Notice:** No notice is required for tract or lot splits.
2. **Review Criteria:** The Commission considered:
    a. Conformance with the City's Comprehensive Plan.
    b. Current Land Development Code in section 26-103-3 (Easements) Regulations.
    c. Current I-2 Medium Industrial District Regulations.
    d. Current Tract or Lot Splits Regulations.
    e. Lot Split Application.
    f. Survey Descriptions
    g. Survey Outline of Parcels
3. **Conclusion:** The commission determined they did not have enough information to approve or disapprove the application. Tabled the case until the applicant can attend the planning commission to present the application themselves.

## NEW BUSINESS

**Planning and Zoning Administrators:**

- Administrative Assistant Paige Harman stated that the commission will be reviewing the comprehensive plan at the next meeting and asked if any commissioners would want a printed copy at the next meeting. That next year 2026 the planning commission will be

creating the new comprehensive plan because it is required to be redone (or rewrote) every 10 years.

- Public Works Superintendent, Matt Mock answered Commissioner Estes' questions. Matt informed the commission that the dirt work for Wichita Tractor was done by the county, and we have no control of that being brought in by them. The pond they dug out will help with run off for the residents that live on that county road there. Matt believes they took the county road due to the executed route they took to bring it in and to avoid the busy Blanchard road. Matt concurred that it did tear up that county road with those trucks coming in and told the commission that the county would be the ones to repair it or Wichita Tractor may be reliable as well. Matt concurred that there is a sign placed by the Veterans Memorial that states no semi-trucks pass that point.

**Commissioner Discussion:**

- Commissioner Estes asked who did the dirt work for Wichita Tractor, will the pond they created help with run off, and can the two sides (county and city) work together to repair that county road. Commissioner Estes also stated he had a sign placed (with the help of the city) by the Veterans Memorial that states no semi-trucks pass that point.
- Commissioner Bryant made the comment that the semi-trucks coming in with the dirt happened inside the City though.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Commissioner Byrant moved, seconded by Commissioner Estes.
*Vote: 8-0, Motion Carried.*

**Minutes Prepared By:**
Paige Harman, Administrative Assistant