

**LOUISBURG PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 28, 2026**

Livestream link:

<https://boxcast.tv/view/louisburg-planning-commission-w3qdme4vnlqrp0yzk8ocPlan 1-28-26>

The Planning Commission of the City of Louisburg, Kansas, met at 6:30 p.m. in the City Hall Council Chambers with Chairperson Mike Johnson presiding.

ATTENDANCE:

Commission Members: Andrew Ball, Stephanie Parker, Thorvald McKiernan,
Christian Brown

Mayor: Donna Cook

Councilmember: Steve Town

City Administrator: Nathan Law

Communicators Coordinator/Recording Secretary: Jean Carder

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Stephanie Parker led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA:

Thorvald McKiernan asked to have a discussion of subdivision inspections added to the agenda. Christian Brown moved, seconded by Andrew Ball and carried 5-0, to adopt the amended agenda.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES:

McKiernan moved, seconded by Parker, and carried 5-0, to approve the minutes of Nov. 19, 2025, meeting.

ITEM 6: SCHEDULED VISITORS:

Aaron Young, the vice president of planning and development with Summit Homes, spoke to the Planning Commission to outline Summit Homes' desire to submit a new standard R-1 development and comply with the zoning. This new plan will reduce the density of lots from 131 to 91. Young said all lot sizes and setbacks will comply with current regulations. He asked planners if there are any considerations they should make before submitting. He said as Summit Homes

moves forward they would like to work with the Planning Commission and City Council to answer any questions and thanked the planning commission for its support. McKiernan said if the development meets all R1 requirements he didn't think there would be a problem and didn't have any concerns. Parker asked if there will be any considerations for sidewalks and getting to schools. Young said the development plans include sidewalks within the development. McKiernan said some of points made during the prior conversation, like offsite sidewalks, was out of the developer's control. McKiernan recommended the developer pay close attention to stormwater. Johnson said he thought the previous plan was well done. McKiernan agreed. Johnson recommended Young read the last City Council minutes.

NEW BUSINESS

None

OLD BUSINESS

ITEM 8: Potential Text Amendment – Variances – Roof-Mounted Screening – Johnson opened the discussion and said he has issues with the potential cost component item 2.c.i in the suggested regulation changes. Ball agreed and didn't think the cost of the screening should be a factor. Johnson said rather than factoring in low-lying topography thinks a point should be chosen. McKiernan suggested any screening match the height of the equipment. Ball said that should limit line-of-sight issues. Johnson said he is unsure about existing buildings and thinks there should be a threshold to be expanded upon for existing buildings. Johnson also was not in favor of 2.c.iv. City Administrator Nathan Law said this language is written to include all future situations and was former Planning & Development Director Katherine Louderbaugh's attempt to encompass all situations that may come up in the future. Johnson said he doesn't think there is anything Planning can do now. Law suggested Planning Commission table this until a new director is hired. Parker asked what is the plan moving forward to prevent this situation in the future. Law said better internal methods.

ITEM 9: Lot Split – Case # 26001-LS – Starbrooke Phase 6, Lots 135A & B and 134A & B – Law said this diagram shows specifically where the duplex will be split on an already constructed unit. Law noted current regulations indicate lot

splits are to occur before building permits but that didn't happen this time nor has it happened in the past and wanted to bring that to your attention. Law said this follows previous lot splits but going forward the expectation will be lot splits before building permits or change our regulations. Law said this would require a text amendment to make any changes. Johnson said it makes sense to do it after in case there are issues in the building process. City staffer Jean Carder noted the reasons why, in the surveyor's opinion, lot splits are difficult before the construction of the foundation and provided reasons from the surveyor to support that reasoning. McKiernan noted the accuracy would probably be better after construction. Johnson asked if there is a negative to approving the split after. Law said nothing comes to mind but is sure there would be pros or cons. McKiernan said a duplex could be built and years later could be split. Law said that might depend on the requirements of the development plan. McKiernan said a consideration of changing the lot split could include if it is to happen before the first sale or if it could be allowed in the future. He said if the regulations are changed, those changes can be whatever Planning Commission determines is appropriate. Johnson said it sounds like we either need to follow our regulations or shift the approach. Ball moved, seconded by Christian Brown and carried 5-0, to approve the lot split for Lots 135A & B and Lots 136A & B pending approval from the Miami County reviewer and forward to the Governing Body for final approval.

ITEM 10: Site Plan – Case # 26001-SP - Hound Lounge Site Plan – Staff informed Planning members a site plan showing the building on the lot was provided at the dais. Johnson asked what the gauge of steel that will be used in the building's construction. Morgan Messer, the applicant, said the submitted documents indicated 29 gauge but she will use 26 and the plans have been updated. Johnson asked if the building will have two different types of material. McKiernan said this would only include three sides of the building as the back side will be enclosed by fence. Messer said the plan is to use two different colors. McKiernan asked about roof lines. Law said the porch on the front of the building could be included in that calculation. Messer described the back of the building, its uses and the plans for fences. Johnson asked about dog runs. Messer described the operation of the outdoor runs, which will only be available to the dogs during business hours, and the leashed and unleashed areas. Johnson said in his opinion this is not the same as runs you might find in a kennel. Johnson asked about the

footing and post and how it attaches to the concrete porch floor. He said he doesn't think it can be recessed into the concrete and thinks it has to be sleeved. Ball asked about a continuous foundation. Discussion occurred. Brown asked what was the final answer on the building's exterior. Law said the regulations call for a combination of one or more is allowable and could be contradictory. Parker asked if the two-tone color would be appropriate. Messer's father noted it would be similar to the metal-constructed building at S. First and Metcalf. McKiearnan suggested striking language in Stipulation 17 to remove "with no construction permitted on Sundays" and changing 25 to 20 in Stipulation 20. Brown moved, seconded by McKiearnan and carried 5-0, to approve Case 26001 SP (Site Plan) for the Hound Lounge, 108 E. Crestview Dr. with the stated stipulations.

ITEM 11: Site Plan – Case #25004-SP – Change Approval Requested – Law said the original site plan for the JV fields included additional paved parking off Countryside Drive. There has been concerns from neighbors in that area about increased traffic so the school has voluntarily agreed to shift the parking area to the location of Wildcat Drive and plans to make additional improvements to that lot than what was originally proposed. During the last City Council meeting the school had asked for consideration of some temporary gravel on the lot off Wildcat but since that meeting have decided to pave the entire lot. Law also reviewed new information on the dugouts noting the desire is to move away from the shipping containers and build with CPU construction. McKiearnan asked when the school plans to use these fields. Law said he thinks 2027 but the school is planning to make the lot improvements this summer. McKiearnan suggested incorporating this into their official plans for the build and tying it to occupancy. Law asked if commission members want it on the site plan drawing or the construction drawings. Johnson suggested tying it to the final inspection. McKiearnan moved, seconded by Brown and carried 5-0, to approve the revised site plan with the stipulation the parking lot is constructed and completed before final occupancy.

ITEM 12: 2024 Planning & Development Annual Report and 2025 Year-End Wrap-Up – Law said this was in the December packet and staff is providing it one more time.

ITEM 13: 2027 Budget Considerations / Joint Workshop 2026 Planning Commission Calendar – Law asked if commission members had any items to be

considered for budget to bring to the joint workshop. That time could also be used to ask the planning representative to address any other items with Council. Law suggested one of the things that could be discussed is vision and how to make improvements. Parker noted that Planning member Chris Hoffman, absent tonight, has previously asked about a third-party reviewer. Johnson suggested either he or Hoffman could be the representative at the joint workshop.

ITEM 14 - 2026 Planning Commission Calendar – Law said the calendar is already set and this information just serves as a reminder.

ITEM 15 – Subdivision Inspection – McKiearnan asked when a new subdivision goes in how is it verified it is completed properly. Law said he will need to verify that information and return it to the commission. McKiearnan asked how public utilities are installed. Law said those are inspected. McKiearnan asked if those are spot inspections and asked if the inspections really happen. Law said he believes they are. McKiearnan asked what is the final acceptance (of sewers for example). Law said it is reviewed in its entirety and that inspection can be completed by wastewater personnel and a two-year maintenance bond is required. McKiearnan asked if Rolling Rock utilities have been accepted and why there are no street lights yet in the development. He thinks that those were to be installed as the development was being built. McKiearnan said he believes there is a gap in the acceptance procedures. Law said he will look into it and return information. McKiearnan also said he believes the entrance monument is too big and the side structures are either in the lots or on public easement.

ADJOURNMENT

At 7:41 p.m. McKiearnan moved, seconded by Parker and carried 5-0, to adjourn the meeting.