

MINUTES
MANHATTAN URBAN AREA PLANNING BOARD
City Commission Room, City Hall
1101 Poyntz Avenue
June 7, 2010
7:00 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Jerry Reynard, Vice-Chair; Linda Morse; Mike Hill; Nikki Miller; and Mike Kratochvil.

MEMBERS ABSENT: Bill Meredith and Stephanie Rolley,

STAFF PRESENT: Eric Cattell, Assistant Director for Planning; Steve Zilkie, Senior Planner; Lance Evans, Senior Planner; Cam Moeller, Planner II; Chad Bunger, Planner II; and, Bob Isaac, Riley County Planner

OPEN PUBLIC COMMENTS

No one spoke.

CONSENT AGENDA

APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE MAY 3, 2010, MANHATTAN URBAN AREA PLANNING BOARD MEETING.

Kratochvil moved that the Board approve the Consent Agenda. Miller seconded the motion, which passed on a vote of 5-0.

GENERAL AGENDA

REMOVE THE PUBLIC HEARING FROM THE TABLE AND CONDUCT A PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER AMENDMENTS TO SECTION 22A (RESOURCE EXTRACTION) OF THE RILEY COUNTY ZONING REGULATIONS, THAT WOULD REQUIRE ALL BORROW PITS, REGARDLESS OF SIZE, TO BE SUBJECT TO THE GENERAL REQUIREMENTS OF SECTION 22A (RESOURCE EXTRACTION), WITH THE EXCEPTION OF THOSE BORROW PITS DESCRIBED IN SUBSECTIONS (6) AND (7) OF THE GENERAL REQUIREMENTS AND THOSE EXCAVATION ACTIVITIES SPECIFICALLY EXCLUDED BY DEFINITION. (BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF RILEY COUNTY)

Morse moved that the Board remove the item from the table, which was seconded by Miller and approved 5-0.

Isaac presented the staff report and answered questions.

Morse asked if there were any recently created small borrow pits. Isaac said there were

probably several smaller borrow pits and that fill is often used to elevate sites. She also asked if removing fill from the top of a hill qualifies as a borrow pit and Isaac said that was correct.

Hill asked for a clarification on exceptions to the requirements. Isaac explained the exceptions.

Reynard opened the public hearing.

No one spoke.

Reynard closed the public hearing.

Kratochvil moved that the Planning Board recommend approval of the proposed amendments, based on the findings in the Staff Report.

Morse seconded the motion, which passed on a vote of 5-0.

REMOVE THE PUBLIC HEARING FROM THE TABLE AND CONDUCT A PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER THE REZONING OF THE PROPOSED 931 MORO STREET RESIDENTIAL PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT GENERALLY LOCATED AT 909 MORO STREET, 915 MORO STREET, 917 MORO STREET, 921 MORO STREET, 927 MORO STREET, AND 931 MORO STREET, FROM R-3, MULTIPLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT AND M-FRO, MULTI-FAMILY REDEVELOPMENT OVERLAY DISTRICT, TO PUD, RESIDENTIAL PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT. (APPLICANT: ELSEY PARTNERS/OWNERS: ZENITH INC.; PLATINUM INVESTMENTS LLC; DONALD J. WILSON TRUST AND FRANCES E WILSON TRUST; LEX H. AND PATRICIA J. PEARSON; AND, DAN R. AND KELLY SKALA-MCCANDLESS.)(NOTE: THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS TABLED AT THE MAY 17, 2010 PLANNING BOARD MEETING DUE TO THE LACK OF A QUORUM.)

Zilkie presented the staff report recommending denial and answered questions.

Kratochvil asked Zilkie to clarify about parking and density within the development. Zilkie described density and the off-street parking requirements.

Robert Ott, City Engineer, spoke about sanitary sewer capacity issues and answered questions by the board.

Reynard opened the public hearing.

Chris Elsey, the applicant, presented a PowerPoint presentation regarding his proposed development and answered questions from the board.

Anne Cowan, 415 N. Juliette, spoke against the development because she believes it is against the “spirit of the M-FRO”.

Kevin Vavrow, landlord owner of 920 Laramie, was concerned with sewer line capacity, lighting, and alley parking with the gas meters sitting right next to the alley. Also, he had a concern with construction and alley parking for his tenants.

Sara Fisher, 811 Osage and member of the East Park Neighborhood Association, had concerns for “creep” of non-conforming structures into the neighborhood.

Kathy Dzewaltowski, Manhattan Riley County Preservation Alliance Secretary, said because the project does not meet the M-FRO regulations, the Preservation Alliance supports denial of the project.

Carol Barta, 718 Laramie, said people “actually live” in the neighborhood of the development. The large scale development takes away the use of the yard and is like moving the dorms into the neighborhood.

Daryl Oard, 926 Laramie, said he had issues with the parking. He said, although the units are one bedroom, more than one person would most likely be living in each unit causing more needed parking. This parking would be pushed onto his property causing hardship to his tenants. Also, Oard noted there was not much green space on the property.

Michael Moore, landlord owner of 912 Laramie, spoke about his experience with one bedroom apartments and how at least half of his are occupied by two people. He said the board should require more parking, maybe 1.5 parking spaces per one bedroom. Also, he wondered where the potential 72 dogs were going to go to relieve themselves.

Reynard closed the public hearing.

Miller spoke against the PUD because of the parking, sewer, and the “spirit of the neighborhood”.

Hill agreed with Miller and the issue of more than one person in a one bedroom apartment. The scale, architectural features, and sewer were also issues for him. And the M-FRO intentions were not to make a mega structure.

Morse agreed with Hill and the Staff Report. She also said the PUD is an intense use that does not fit with the character of the neighborhood.

Kratochvil has issues with density of the project. He remarked maybe the definition of density and parking should be changed.

Reynard said Elsey should continue to think about his project because the mass of the project is not compatible with the size of the neighborhood.

Miller moved that the Manhattan Urban Area Planning Board recommend denial of the proposed rezoning of the 931 Moro Street PUD from R-3, Multiple-Family Residential District and M-FRO, Multi-Family Redevelopment Overlay District, to PUD, Residential Planned Unit Development District, based on the findings in the staff report, as recommended by City Administration.

Morse seconded the motion, which passed on a vote of 5-0.

(Note: The applicant withdrew the rezoning application on June 10, 2010.)

REPORTS AND COMMENTS BY BOARD MEMBERS.

Miller, Morse, and Hill said they would be absent from the next meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Ashley Myers, Planning Intern