

**PLANNING COMMISSION
February 10, 2026 Minutes**

A regular session of the Edgerton Planning Commission (the Commission) was held in the Edgerton City Hall, 404 E. Nelson Street, Edgerton, Kansas on February 10, 2026. The meeting was convened when Chair Tina Mathos called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM.

1. ROLL CALL

Jeremy Little	present
Tina Mathos	present
Adam Draskovich	present
Ray Soemer	absent
Jordyn Mueller	absent

With a quorum present, the meeting commenced.

Staff in attendance: Zachary Moore, Development Services Director
Chris Clinton, Planning and Zoning Coordinator
Hailey Vaughn, Customer Service Representative II
Beth Linn, City Administrator

Elected Officials in attendance: Mayor Donald Roberts

2. **WELCOME** Chair Mathos welcomed all in attendance to the meeting.
3. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE** All present participated in the Pledge of Allegiance.

CONSENT AGENDA

4. Minutes from January 13, 2026, Planning Commission Meeting.

Commissioner Draskovich moved to approve the Consent Agenda. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Little. The Consent Agenda was approved, 3-0.

Regular Agenda

5. **Declaration.** There were no declarations made.

New Business

6. **UDCA2026-0001 AMENDMENTS TO ARTICLE 12, PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT, OF THE CITY OF EDGERTON UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT CODE**

Mr. Zachary Moore, Development Services Director, proposed an update to Article 12 to the Unified Development Code (UDC). As a result of recent developments, there are a couple of

items that staff wanted to update before the overall re-write of that section. Mr. Moore has put together a presentation in addition to including a summary of the additions listed in the staff memo. Modifications include combining signs in commercial districts, monument signs in industrial districts (General Industrial (I-G) and Heavy Industrial (I-H) districts), external directional signs, Home Occupational Signs in residential districts, Interstate/Highway Monument signs, Planned Unit Development signs, and adjustments to language, as well as clarification about the correct enforcement officer depending on the project.

Commissioner Soemer entered the meeting.

The most substantial change is to the Monument Signs. Monument Signs in Edgerton's Commercial Districts have specific requirements for the sign base and the material it is made of. For this presentation staff is focused on maximum size and height of the signs. Current commercial zoning districts include C-1, which would be like business along 56 Highway; C-2, which is the Edgerton Crossing development, which is more auto-oriented; and C-3, which is Edgerton's Highway Service Commercial District, which includes larger developments.

Another item that is included in the update is the appropriate number of signs that a development is permitted. Currently, the code states that a development permits one (1) monument sign per street frontage. When collecting information for this update, staff conducted research about sign heights in our commercial zoning districts and neighboring jurisdictions. Staff also went on a tour to help determine what kind of signs would look best in Edgerton. When the sign code was originally updated, it inadvertently allows large signs for individual tenants instead of a large sign for the overall development. Staff is suggesting that for spaces like Edgerton Crossing, there would be one (1) large 25-foot tall sign in front of the entire development, then each tenant could get their own, smaller monument sign on out lots. Staff proposed that commercial sign standards be set at a maximum height of six (6) feet tall with a 25 square foot sign face for monument signs. The sign face would be where the messaging is, and the structure itself would apply to maximum height permitted. Staff proposed one sign per standalone building. For developments with multiple tenants, one (1) larger sign at the entry points and allowing each tenant to have their own smaller sign. This would draw people's attention to what is inside the shopping center, and once you are inside the shopping center, you would be able to see the individual tenant's monument sign, the size being six (6) feet high and the sign being a maximum 25 square feet. The reason that staff felt that six (6) feet height and 25 square foot size was the best was that when on the sign tour, staff liked the newer developments in Olathe. These developments have a similar sign code of 25 square feet maximum size and six (6) feet height for their standalone developments. Then they had different escalators as you increased in shopping complex size, the height and size of the sign increase.

Chairperson Mathos asked if this would be proposed for all commercial districts. Mr. Moore explained that each individual district would have its own outline, but they would all have the same standard. The overall goal would be to change it during the major sign update so that we do not have the same language repeated four (4) different times.

Multitenant Monument Signs in Commercial Districts will require their own specific standards. The current code allows for a lot of square-footage allows but it must set 30 feet from property line. This allows for a much larger monument sign than typical standard monument signs, but

it also sits back much two (2) to three (3) times further away from the property line than other jurisdictions allow. While Staff are creating the updates for this section they are keeping in consideration the specific standards for the Multitenant complexes and a way to escalate the height and sizes of a sign depending on the size of the development. Commissioner Draskovich recommended that the City could grant each tenant the same size sign but depending on the number of tenants per development would determine the overall size of the monument sign. Mr. Moore explained how Olathe is set up for their shopping centers. When they build their shopping centers they typically have plans for subdivision spaces. The example presented was the Alden Center at 135th Street and Alden Street. This development could have anywhere from 15 tenant spaces. Using the recommendation, you would have to multiply 15 tenants by the 25 square foot sign space to get the overall square footage of the sign. Something that could come up is if a tenant decides to acquire more than one lease space and how we would be able to adjust that overall signage. Mr. Moore agreed that escalation is a key factor in decision and finding the right size for it.

Commissioner Draskovich suggests that having each tenant, no matter the size, have a limit to one sign of certain set measurements. He explained that this would help limit big business from getting a larger sign space. Mr. Moore agreed that this could be a good option. Something that may want to be considered if going on that route would be to add a tier system. Allowing for a wall sign along the street with a small monument sign for the tenants who are along the outside, while providing spaces for the second-tier interior development spaces on a larger monument sign. Something to take into consideration when looking at the monument signs is the location, primarily using the hierarchy of streets. Johnson County adopted the Comprehensive Arterial Road Network Plan (CARNP), which identifies arterial streets. The City will adopt a version of a major streets plan at some point, if we tie the highest hierarchy of street with the amount of frontage a shopping center has on an arterial road could determine the number of monument signs.

Mr. Moore explained that in the 119th Street and Black Bob Road example, the two (2) arterial streets would be 119th Street and Black Bob Road, which is where the two (2) monument signs are located. Something to take into consideration with this example is that they have seven tenant spaces on the monument sign closest to Black Bob Road, and a different tenant space listed on the other monument sign closest to 119th Street. So, potentially breaking up tenant spaces if you have more than one (1) sign. City staff will reach out to Olathe staff to see if they have any different policies or procedures that they use to help determine monument signs in their shopping centers.

Commissioner Draskovich asked if address for the tenant's spaces were street-related or if they had individual suite numbers that they went by. Mr. Moore stated that he believed the interior tenants are suite-based, and the exterior businesses are addressed independently but he would have to do more research to say for certain. Commissioner Draskovich was curious because that could help determine which sign a tenant could be assigned to. He also mentions that this could help with the flow of traffic. Mr. Moore agreed that it could be a good idea, but he mentioned that City Staff would have to do more research since sign codes are very litigious. Planning and Zoning staff have set limits on what staff can and can't set regulations on. If that is something that we cannot add to our UDC, staff could investigate the possibility of adding some kind of verbiage to our purpose statement for the Article. Commissioner Draskovich states that if we limit each tenant to one sign each, it could allow a business to

choose which one of the 25 square foot sign they would like to use while limiting them from having multiple large signs. He also explains how this could potentially encourage business to choose a sign closest to the side of the street they are on. Commissioner Little added the idea of a possible development split, which could determine which sign a tenant would be assigned to depend on their location within the shopping center. Mr. Moore replied saying that Staff could look at different sign codes around the Metro area to see if that is a possibility.

Looking back at the shopping center at 135th Street and Alden Street in Olathe, the arterial street would be 135th Street, but the center does not have a second frontage on an arterial collector, therefore there is only one smaller monument sign in front of the multitenant building. Mr. Moore asked the Commissioners about their thoughts on using the street hierarchy as a determining factor for multitenant signs. Chairperson Mathos replied that it makes sense. She said in comparing the 135th Street shopping center to the 119th Street one, the 119th Street center would need more signage due to the amount of traffic in that area compared to the 135th Street location. Commissioner Draskovich mentioned another idea for the sign code is to set a separate sign code for the development, so that the overall development can stand out and would help ensure the overall sign would not be too large. Mr. Moore stated that, depending on the size of the monument sign, 25 square feet may be too large of a space for tenants. Commissioner Draskovich agreed. Chairperson Mathos asked if Staff has a size in mind for the monument sign. Mr. Moore said at this time Staff does not, but can reach out to other jurisdictions and planning staff to see if they could share public records to help get ideas.

Mr. Moore explained that the landscaping requirement will remain the same. He added that the current code requires a monument sign to have a base that is at least 50% of the width of the sign face. Staff believes that in order to be a true monument base, the base should be at least the width of the sign face itself. The Commission agreed.

Commissioner Draskovich suggested that staff structure the verbiage to help limit potential monument sign size issues. He recommended that each tenant on the monument sign have a certain percentage, and the amount of tenants per development would determine the size of the shopping center sign. Commissioner Soemer stated that every sign example given has related back to how commerce or square footage gets factored into the final decision of the tenant sign. Commissioner Draskovich stated that limiting the size of the sign prior to knowing who the tenant is can help eliminate having multiple sign sizes. Mr. Moore shares another factor to consider, if going the per tenant direction could potentially limit the property owner from letting the market speak for itself. Commissioner Soemer stated that market-dictating makes sense. He said that for every shopping center, there is typically an anchor tenant that draws people in. There are going to be people who are in support and people who are not of each development, but once it is developed, the City wants it to succeed while making sure the development is still within the Comprehensive Plan purview. Chairperson Mathos agrees, stating that she would rather see one smaller sign spot empty compared to seeing 15 open spots of the same size on a multitenant monument sign. Mr. Moore added that these multitenant monument signs typically have less sign spaces than there are tenants in the shopping center.

Commissioner Draskovich stated that there still needs to be a stipulation in place to help dictate the size of the sign to the size of the development. Mr. Moore expands on that,

explaining that a one (1) acre development may not require an escalator larger than the one (1) sign proposed earlier. City Staff are still discussing the right mechanisms to determine what warrants the larger monument signs. Commissioner Draskovich stated that it may be best to decide the sign sizes during the Final Site Plan stage of development since each development would be different. Mr. Moore explained that the Commission does not review signage at the Final Site Plan stage and is reviewed by staff and all of the signage must meet the UDC. Since a development may not know exactly what tenants will occupy the available spaces, the developers will typically put a dashed box on the plans that states this is the location where their general signage will be once the sign permit has been approved. This is when the UDC becomes very important because those are the standards that the signage will follow. Commissioner Draskovich stated that the developer should have an idea of how much square footage the development should have, which then could help determine the size of the sign. Commissioner Soemer asked how this affects the blue advertisements on the interstates. Mr. Moore answered that he believed this is handled by the Department of Transportation.

Commissioner Soemer requested clarification as to what Staff is requesting. Mr. Moore stated Staff is requesting the Commission direct them on how to proceed with amending the sign code. He explained that after reviewing examples of Olathe's sign code, does the City of Edgerton think this kind of escalation would be appropriate for the City, and would the Commission approve City staff of updating the sign code to mirror Olathe's standards with the City of Edgerton's language. Chairperson Mathos asked if the Olathe Pointe development was developed under a previous or current sign code. Mr. Moore answered that the development went before the Olathe Planning Commission around 2004, so it was under a previous sign code. Commissioner Soemer stated that signage is meant to help direct the public to these businesses and that the philosophy should be to help businesses succeed. Mr. Moore stated that based on the discussion today, the Commission likes the size of sign escalation based off the size of the development parcel. With that feedback Staff will do more research into places with similar sign codes to find the right size of escalation for the City of Edgerton and then work on updating Article 12.

Mr. Moore stated that Staff is also proposing amendments to monument signs in the General Industrial (I-G) and Heavy Industrial (I-H) Districts. The current code has standards that allow for very large monument signs. Staff is recommending updating the standards for those districts to align with what has already been approved in the Logistic Parks (L-P) District. Staff have found that the I-G and I-H are more similar to the L-P District than to any of the commercial districts.

For directional signs Staff is recommending that every district be allowed to have directional signs that must be put on a solid base. Currently, home occupations are allowed to have a small monument sign in the front yard and a sign next to the door, though this can seem like it is commercializing people's properties. Staff is recommending the removal of that sign from the allowable signs list. Current code for Interstate and Highway Adjacent Monument Signs states that if you are a certain distance from the Interstate or Highway, then you are permitted up to a 30-foot tall monument sign with 200 square feet in size. Concerns about this code is that it not only applies to Interstate 35 but to 56 Highway as well, allowing a large sign to be put up on property along that Highway. Staff recommends taking out the 'highway' portion of this definition to help protect the residential feel while keeping the Interstate section the

same. Then, in the Business Park (B-P) District, the non-monument sign code says refer to the commercial district. Staff is recommending this be updated to align with the Logistics Park (L-P) District.

Mr. Moore informed the Commission that Staff will be taking the Planned Unit Development (PUD) updates from the previous meeting to the Governing Body at this week's City Council meeting, with hopes that it will be adopted at the second meeting in February. Staff will get feedback from the Governing Body about what to do with signs in the PUD district. In the last Planning Commission meeting, there was discussion about not deviating from the sign code in the PUD District. If that is the case, when a development comes in, the applicant will need to specify that all signs are to follow the standards listed in the UDC instead of creating a Unified Sign Package. The final amendment is to have the Zoning Administrator as the sign violation enforcement, rather than the Building Official. The Zoning Administrator should be the one to initiate violations when there are issues with sign codes, making it so that it is an executive administrative official's responsibility.

Mr. Moore summarized the timeline of the overall Code update. Next month, Staff will be doing a quick update for Article 5, I-G and I-H Districts. Following that, staff will move onto "Bucket Two", which will include Zoning Districts, Uses, Use definitions, and Bulk regulations. "Bucket Three" consists of development standards. Then "Bucket Four" will include procedures, agencies, enforcement, bylaws, and everything else.

Commissioner Little asked about home occupations, specifically in-home daycares, like near his home, if the wall sign that is currently up would be allowed. Mr. Moore responded by saying this update would allow her to operate her business in her home, but she would not be able to have a sign on her house. Commissioner Little stated that when someone is new to the area, it could be beneficial to see the advertisement for this local business. Mr. Moore corrected himself and stated that there is a different allowance for an in-home daycare since there is the expectation of being able to drop off and pick up people. Commissioner Little stated that an in-home daycare has different regulations than if he wanted to start a tax accountant business out of his home. Mr. Moore stated that is correct.

Chairperson Mathos opened the Public Hearing. There were no public comments made. Commissioner Little moved to close the public hearing. Commissioner Draskovich seconded the motion. The public hearing was closed, 4-0.

Commissioner Draskovich moved to direct staff to evaluate neighboring jurisdictions code and multitenant signs for the proposed amendments. Commissioner Mr. Soemer seconded the motion. Motion carried, 4-0.

7. Future Meeting Reminders

Chairperson Mathos stated that the next regular sessions are scheduled for March 10, 2026, at 7:00 PM; April 14, 2026, at 7:00 PM; and May 12, 2026, at 7:00 PM.

8. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Moore announced that the Streets and Storm Water Dedicated Sales Tax, which Ms. Linn had mentioned in the last meeting, ballots will be in the mail next Tuesday, February 17, 2026. They will need to be submitted by March 3, 2026. Ms. Linn will share a few more slides regarding this topic in the work session to follow.

Secondly, the animal vaccine clinic will be held at City Hall on March 21, 2026, starting at 8:00 AM. There are appointments that you can make online to get your pet vaccinated.

9. **ADJOURN**

Commissioner Mr. Little moved to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Mr. Soemer seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 7:59 PM, 4-0

Submitted by Hailey Vaughn, Customer Service Representative II

UDCA2026-0001

UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT CODE UPDATES

ARTICLE 12 – SIGNS

PUBLIC HEARING

FEBRUARY 10, 2026

Monument Signs (Commercial Districts)

Current standards:

Zoning District	Max. Size*	Max. Height	Max. Amount	Min. Setback
C-1	120 sq. ft.	10 feet	1 per street frontage	12 feet
C-2	250 sq. ft.	25 feet	1 per street frontage	30 feet
C-3	250 sq. ft.	25 feet	1 per street frontage	30 feet

* $\frac{1}{2}$ square foot per linear foot of street frontage

Proposed Standards:

Zoning District	Max. Size	Max. Height	Max. Amount	Min. Setback
Commercial	25 sq. ft.	6 feet	1 per standalone building	TBD

Multitenant Monument Signs (Commercial Districts)

- Specific standards for multi-tenant complexes
- Escalating size and height allowances as developments with multiple buildings increase in size
- Intended for multi-tenant shopping centers (not just multi-tenant building)

Example: Olathe Pointe at 119th and Black Bob Road (appx. 42 acres)



Example: Alden Center, 135th Street and Alden Street (appx. 31 acres)



Additional Changes

- Monument signs in IG and IH – update standards to align with L-P District.
- External Directional Signs – require to be built on solid base, no posts.
- Home Occupation – removing sign allowance.
- Interstate/Highway Monument Sign – removing “Highway” from allowance.
- Non-monument sign types in B-P District – update standards to align with L-P District.
- Signs in PUDs – follow direction provided by Governing Body when presented.
- Sign violation enforcement – Zoning Administrator rather than Building Official.

March 2026 – Article 5 Industrial Districts quick update



Bucket 2: Zoning Districts, Uses, Use Definitions, Bulk Regulations

Bucket 3: Development Standards (Architecture, Landscaping, Site Design, etc.)

Bucket 4: Procedures, Agencies, Enforcement, Bylaws, and everything else

What's Next
for Overall
Code
Update?



Questions?