

**MINUTES**  
**MANHATTAN URBAN AREA PLANNING BOARD**  
**City Commission Room, City Hall**  
**1101 Poyntz Avenue**  
**July 8, 2010**  
**7:00 p.m.**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Bill Meredith, Chairperson; Jerry Reynard, Vice-Chair; Linda Morse; Mike Hill; Stephanie Rolley; Nikki Miller; and Mike Kratochvil.

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** None.

**STAFF PRESENT:** Eric Cattell, Assistant Director for Planning; Steve Zilkie, Senior Planner; Lance Evans, Senior Planner; Cam Moeller, Planner II; Chad Bunger, Planner II; Rob Ott, City Engineer; Bob Isaac, County Planer.

**OPEN PUBLIC COMMENTS**

No one spoke.

**CONSENT AGENDA**

**APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE JUNE 7 AND JUNE 21, 2010, MANHATTAN URBAN AREA PLANNING BOARD MEETING.**

**APPROVE THE FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN OF LOTS 1 AND 3, NEW BOSTON COMMONS PUD FOR PROPOSED PROFESSIONAL OFFICE BUILDINGS AND THE FINAL PLAT OF LOTS 1-4 OF NEW BOSTON COMMONS ADDITION, COMMERCIAL PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT, BOTH GENERALLY LOCATED 350 FEET SOUTH OF THE INTERSECTION OF ANDERSON AVENUE AND GARDEN WAY, ALONG THE EAST SIDE OF GARDEN WAY. (APPLICANT: LITTLE APPLE INVESTMENTS, LLC. – DAVID SPEAKS /OWNERS: WEST ANDERSON PARTNERS, LLC – CHARLES BUSCH; LITTLE APPLE INVESTMENTS, LLC – DAVID AND, GREEN APPLE VENTURES, LLC – DAVID SPEAKS)**

Reynard moved that the Board approve the Consent Agenda. Kratochvil seconded the motion. Morse indicated she was abstaining from voting on the June 21, 2010 minutes because she was not present at that meeting. The motion passed on a vote of 7-0 for the June 7, 2010 minutes, and on a vote of 6-0-1 with Morse abstaining on the June 21, 2010 minutes.

**GENERAL AGENDA**

**A PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER THE CONCURRENT PLAT (PRELIMINARY AND FINAL PLAT) OF THE PROPOSED KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY ADDITION, GENERALLY LOCATED SOUTHEAST OF THE INTERSECTION OF KIMBALL AVENUE AND DENISON AVENUE. THE CONCURRENT PLAT WILL CREATE PROPOSED LOT 1 FOR THE BIOSECURITY RESEARCH INSTITUTE (PAT ROBERTS HALL); PROPOSED LOT 2 FOR THE NATIONAL BIO AND AGRO DEFENSE FACILITY (NBAF); PROPOSED LOT 3 FOR KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY; AND, TRACT A TO BE CONVEYED AT A LATER DATE TO THE K-STATE RESEARCH PARK ADDITION. (APPLICANT/OWNER: KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY)**

Zilkie presented the staff report and answered questions.

Kratochvil asked if the plat was approved tonight, would it be the last time the Planning Board would see it and asked what the zoning classification is. Zilkie said this would be the last time the Planning Board would see it, unless it was re-platted at some point in the future. He said it would still be zoned U, University District.

Rolley asked about the precedent of the University platting a project. Zilkie said the University is not required to plat, however they chose to in this instance because it is a complex project and the plat helps simplify conveying lengthy legal descriptions. He said the University had not platted before.

Kratochvil asked if the utility companies signed off on the plat. Zilkie indicated they have and that most of the easements are private, but a few are public. He said this portion of the University was annexed in 1994.

Kratochvil asked about the Kansas State Research Park plat. Zilkie said it was done by the K-State Foundation. However, this is the first time the Planning Board had reviewed a Kansas State University plat.

Miller asked if there was any concern about the traffic study not being completed when this was going through the platting process.

Rob Ott, City Engineer, replied there was a traffic study done about a year ago through K-DOT with the Highway 24 Corridor study. He said a follow-up study is being done to address road improvement design details. BG Consultants was hired to focus on the intersection at Denison and Kimball Avenue. He said the City is trying to time the road improvements with the construction of the National Bio and Agro Defense Facility (NBAF), which will take 4-5 years, so the roads will be completed when the building is completed. Ott noted that the City has been meeting ever few weeks with all the utility companies, as well as the Department of Homeland Security and Kansas State University for the last 6-9 months to address any issues.

Meredith opened the public hearing.

Bob Williams, Travis Pruitt & Associates and engineer for the project's design team, presented more information regarding the design and reasoning of the project. He said the plat is going through this process partially because Lot 2 will eventually be transferred to DHS and DHS is trying to meet all City, County, and State codes and regulations.

Williams said the Denison Avenue entrance will be a staff entrance, not a delivery entrance, with a long driveway to allow cars to queue before entry into the parking lot. The entrance on Kimball will be a right in and right out, service and delivery entry. The traffic was segregated to prevent having conflicting traffic uses. The Kimball point of access exceeds sight distance requirements, but is restricted to a right in and right out entry. Also, the curbs along Denison Avenue have been designed to be temporary in nature, so the cost will be reduced when the City improves the road in several years. It is expensive to remove concrete curbs, thus the team is working with the City to "put in what is needed to be safe during the construction period, but won't be a big burden in cost in the front end or to tear it out on the back end".

Williams spoke about storm water basins. He said there will be four new basins, at least a 16% reduction of run-off that leaves the site from pre-development levels.

Williams explained that the access from Kimball Avenue serves for NBAF delivery, access to the Westar substation, and for the Kansas State to get access to Lot 3. This access point will also eventually replace the gravel road entrance to the feed mill near the Kimball and Denison intersection, which will be eliminated to improve safety.

Morse asked why Lot 3 includes the long skinny portion to the west of the property next to Lot 2. Williams replied the Department of Homeland Security needed an entrance road on Denison Avenue, but did not need the rest of the Denison frontage, while KSU needed the area for utility lines. This lot configuration was worked out to reduce the amount of paperwork and confusion allowing KSU to have space for their utility lines and a pedestrian easement.

Morse asked Williams to explain the drainage basin areas and the calculations.

Williams responded saying the 16 percent number is in reduction from the pre-construction runoff conditions and might be closer to a 20 percent reduction. Currently there are two basins at the site and the project proposes four detention basins, which will greatly reduce the amount of run-off that goes to the southern part of the campus.

Morse asked how much the area will be cut or filled. Williams replied that portions of the site will have cuts of 8-10 feet, and fills of 10-15 feet.

Morse asked about storm water from Lot 3 and who pays for the water redirection.

Ott responded the water would go to the pond on the north side of Kimball Avenue and would eventually go to the Marlatt ditch system to help out the existing watershed.

Mark Taussig, Kansas State University, said the storm drainage, including the drainage north of Kimball, would be paid for by the state as a part of the entire project that the estate is doing to clear the site.

James Johnson, Director, Office of National Laboratories, US Department of Homeland Security, gave an overview of the NBAF project, including the research that would be conducted at the site and the desire to take advantage of research being conducted by K-State and other animal science research in the region. He spoke about job creation and the various risk assessments that are being conducted, including a review by the National Academy of Sciences. He summarized the construction timeline, saying the facility would be operational in 2018. He the Department of Homeland Security will continue to engage the community and to promote a transparent process with the community and public.

Robert Schaeffer, 2391 Grandview Terrace and Professor of Sociology at KSU, mentioned the project might be in violation of the International Convention on Biological and Chemical Weapons, the project is hazardous in two ways because it is potentially hazardous and people can carry ideas and knowledge out of the building. He asked the Planning Board to consider these issues.

Torry Dickinson, 2391 Grandview Terrace, said at some point there will be an accident with loss of life. She spoke about the process behind the Bio Research Institute (BRI), saying twelve years ago citizens were told the BRI was going to be the highest level of secure lab in Manhattan. She said the process behind NBAF was a secrete process that the public had no opportunity to speak upon. She said it was a germ warfare lab next to housing and students. She said the University squelched opposition to the project from its employees and that the university should have used a democratic process. She asked the Planning Board to table the project until everyone had a chance to vote openly on the project.

Bill Dorsett, 1715 Leavenworth, said the secretive nature of the research makes it so public services, police, fire, and first responders, won't know what they are facing when they arrive on the scene. He questioned if the subdivider had made reasonable efforts to mitigate impacts on public welfare. He asked about secure airspace and its impact on the Manhattan airport. He said this will fundamentally change the feeling of the community. He asked about decommissioning of the site, because it has a life of 30 years, and asked what will happen to it when it is done. He mentioned a worker strike at the Plum Island facility. He questioned the concurrent plat process suggesting it limits public input. He asked the Planning Board to table the plat until the National Academy of Sciences releases their review of the DHS risk assessment.

Susan Humphreys, 2504 Rogers Boulevard, expressed concerns with the project asking what will happen during the decommissioning process of this superfund site. She also asked about the type of detention pond and if it would be dug out or impoundments and where the storm water will go if there are any impacts.

Julie Clingan, 2216 Seaton Avenue, said she has not met a single person who wants this

facility in Manhattan. She questioned who benefits and was concerned about toxic material escapes. She indicated if this project goes through she will be moving after retirement because she does not want to live in a community with this type of project.

There being no further public comments, Meredith closed the public hearing. There were no further questions from the Board.

Hill said the Board's duty is to look at the Preliminary and Final Plat and that there has been a long community debate about the project. He saw no reason to deny the plat.

Hill moved that the Planning Board approve the Preliminary and Final Plat of the Kansas State University Addition, based on conformance with the Manhattan Urban Area Subdivision Regulations. Reynard seconded the motion.

Rolley recused herself from the vote, saying taking action on the plat is a conflict of interest with her position at Kansas State University. She indicated she understands and concurs with the city attorney's position that there is no conflict of interest under the state statute that deals with substantial interests. However, she is the department head and professor of the K-State Department of Landscape Architecture and Regional and Community Planning. She said an important aspect of the education that we give our students is to apply planning and design approval processes. Rolley said she was confused why the Planning Board is reviewing a Kansas State University plat. She said review of K-State development proposals is outside the purview of the Planning Board and that consideration of the plat is an irregularity in the established process and sets a precedent for the Planning Board reviewing K-State development proposals. She said approval or denial of the plat also suggests a much more complete engagement with the entire planning, zoning, and development process of the University. A considered decision to change the Board's engagement in review of University developments may be appropriate, but to make that decision by considering this plat is not a sound process. She thinks there has been a very rigorous and detailed review of the project, but it has not involved the Planning Board and the Board is a little late to the review process. She respectfully recused herself from voting.

Morse said each planning board member should make a statement about their position rather than just vote yes or no.

Morse said she is an employee of Kansas State University and had inquired about conflict of interest. She said the Planning Board needs to represent the community and she represents the community. She said that back during the Capital Improvements Program process she asked that the Planning Board get an opportunity to consider future K-State development and NBAF. Because the Board's focus is narrow and limited to evaluating the plat using the Manhattan Urban Area Subdivision Regulations, she is in support of the project. She knows the project is divisive in the community and she has talked to many people about the project, but ultimately she said she has to have faith in the leadership of the University and the people of the community.

Meredith said he agreed with Morse's comments. He said the plat meets the criteria of

the Subdivision Regulations and has been studied at many different levels over several years, thus he will vote in favor.

Kratochvil agreed with what other Board members had said. He stated that while not everything about the project has been public, the NBAF project has been brought to Manhattan by K-State and by the City Commissioners, County Commissioners and state and national representatives and it has gotten very political. He mentioned again that the scope of the Planning Board is very minimal, towards reviewing this plat for conformance with the Subdivision Regulations. He said he is in favor of the plat.

Miller said she was torn because she has listened and understands that it is a controversial subject for the community, but the Board's scope is limited to reviewing the plat for conformance with the Regulations for the platting, and traffic and utilities. She has seen nothing that falls outside of those guidelines, so she will vote for the plat.

The motion passed on a vote of 6-0, with Rolley recusing herself from voting.

**CONTINUATION OF A PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER AN AMENDMENT OF THE MANHATTAN ZONING REGULATIONS CONCERNING MODIFYING ARTICLE IV, SECTION 4-112 M-FRO, MULTI-FAMILY REDEVELOPMENT OVERLAY DISTRICT, INCLUDING PORTIONS OF THE USE LIMITATIONS, COMPATIBILITY STANDARDS, AND DEFINITIONS. (APPLICANT: CITY OF MANHATTAN)**

Meredith continued the public hearing started on June 21, 2010.

Cattell reminded the Board that he presented the history of the Traditional Neighborhood Study and how the M-FRO District was developed at the previous meeting. He reviewed the proposed amendments and identified three additional revisions that had been made to the proposed draft amendments, based on input received at the June 21<sup>st</sup> hearing. The first change was to add a provision requiring 1.5 off-street parking spaces for one-bedroom dwelling units. This was based on previous input from the Planning Board and public identifying the need to consider modifying the parking ratio for one bedroom dwelling units, due to the greater potential for these smaller units to be occupied by more than one person per bedroom, compared to other configurations that have more bedrooms per dwelling unit where it is less common for tenants to share a bedroom. The second change involved screening of structured parking not located along one of the major street corridors, N. Manhattan Ave, Bluemont Avenue or N. 11<sup>th</sup> Street, to clarify that such screening is not required along the alley side of structured parking. The third change was in response to a suggestion by the Board to add an opening statement of intent, under Section 4-112 (F)(2) Building Design Standards to address the issue of designing street facing facades in a manner that adds visual interest and relates to the public streetscape, and encourages authenticity in the use of various architectural features and materials, as opposed to just adding ornamentation to the facade. He also showed slides of butterfly and flat roofed buildings and asked for the Boards thoughts on if either roof form should be allowed in the M-FRO District.

Cattell indicated that if the Board finds that the proposed amendments, or amendments as modified by the Board, adequately address the issues, concerns and changing conditions in the redevelopment area, the Board should forward a recommendation of approval to the City Commission, based on the findings in the Staff Memorandums.

Hill asked for clarification of exterior mechanical equipment being below the roof surface and if that meant the roof eave or roof peak. Cattell said it refers to the plane of the roof surface. He added that he had spoken with Code office about the draft wording regarding the mechanical equipment.

Hill asked about the proposed off-street parking requirement of one additional parking stall for every four dwelling units in buildings containing eighteen (18) or more dwelling units, and where to start counting that ratio. Cattell said it starts with the first dwelling unit.

Hill suggested to start counting after the eighteenth unit, instead of with the first unit, to be equitable with other buildings having less than eighteen dwellings.

In the Building Design Standards section on variation in wall planes on street facing façade's, Hill suggested modifying the wording to be more flexible regarding the 24 foot wide variation, so that there could be several variations, such as two, 8 by 12 foot, or three, 8 by 8 foot variations, which may provide a better product in the end. He suggested the wording be changed to: "In addition for every 120 feet of wall plane on street facing facades, there shall be variations in the wall plane of at least 8 feet in depth and a total of at least 24 feet in width". Cattell asked if it should include that no variation should be less than eight feet in width.

Rolley and Miller agreed with Hill and with a minimum width of 8 feet for the variation. Hill restated his suggested wording to be: "In addition for every 120 feet of wall plane on street facing facades, there shall be a variation(s) in the wall plane of at least 8 feet in depth and a total of at least 24 feet in width, but no less than 8 feet in width for any variation."

Miller said she had watched the DVD of the previous meeting and the discussion that the architect had raised about flat roofs. However, she said she did not want to see flat roofs in the M-FRO District, and that she agreed with the proposed wording regarding roof pitch. Morse and Meredith agreed.

Rolley said she appreciated the new intent statement that was added under the Building Design Standards and that while it is subjective, it allows for more focused discussion when proposals come before the Board. She discussed the six inch requirement on window and door surrounds, indicating she thought it was too detailed a standard, and suggested removing the six inch requirement from the definition, because it might be promoting some of the chaotic designs, and not what was intended. To get away from universal application of an architectural feature on a façade, she also suggested adding,

“Establishing a hierarchy of architectural elements is encouraged.” to the end of the Building Exterior paragraph under Section 4-112 (F)(2)(a).

Kratochvil elaborated on the reasoning for the six inch minimum surround detail. He thought that came from Professor Coates’ presentation to the Planning Board when the Board was enacting the M-FRO District. He said Coates was extremely detail orientated, which works well on houses, but maybe not as well when multiplied out over the large expanse of an apartment building. He cautioned going too far the other way in not specifying the level of detail that is wanted on the facades.

Cattell said that is the challenge with zoning regulations, which can’t regulate good design, but if they don’t specify minimum requirements they might not result in what you are expecting.

Reynard asked if the Board is trying to over regulate and wondered if there should be a Design Review Committee for the M-FRO District.

Hill said as a builder he likes having both options, and that is what the Board is trying to create. He liked having guidelines so he knows what he can do that are acceptable to the community, and also the PUD process which can be used if someone has a really creative idea and can bring to the Board for consideration. That way a builder has both options available to them.

Cattell indicated that the M-FRO District was developed to provide that minimum level of design guidelines for the district. A design review committee, whether it was the Planning Board or some stand alone committee, would still need review standards, so both the committee and the applicant would know where the bar is set for review of proposals and the standards need to be clear. That is what the M-FRO District is providing.

Reynard wondered if it would be easier to do a PUD, than following the zoning regulations. He acknowledged that while not all PUD’s are approved, some are approved.

Hill commented that some of the designers are exceeding the minimum M-FRO District standards and the resulting buildings are very attractive and he commended the architects on their work. He said he didn’t think the M-FRO standards were difficult to meet, and many designers were going beyond what was required and are making the district sustainable.

Morse asked about the off-street parking requirement for buildings with 18 or more dwelling units, and why the threshold was not a lower number around ten or eleven units, because parking is at a premium in these areas.

Cattell responded that it is a balancing act in trying to provide enough parking. The thought was that the larger buildings should provide more parking which is balanced with the reduced ratios in the M-FRO District to provide incentives for developers.

Hill commented that the balancing act includes storm water runoff, green space, and getting the correct amount of parking. However, he thought it was important to provide incentives for smaller buildings through the lower parking ratio. He said it is important to get the right amount of parking and not excess parking.

Meredith opened the public hearing.

Bryan Elsey, 2530 Heartland Drive said he is a developer of student housing in Manhattan, and it is difficult for developers with the moving target of regulation changes. They are in limbo waiting for decisions regarding the regulations before they can move forward with their Moro Street project. He said it is a good idea to have guidelines that he understands. He suggests a time frame until the changes go into effect, so mid or pre-projects can be finished before changes happen. He said his building at 1030 Vattier, if the regulations were changed, would be a legal non-conforming use, which would lead to issues for financing and rebuilding in the event of a fire. He agreed that parking is an issue, but he suggested that the “green” on-street parking zone should be changed. His solution for the green zone was to have every 20 linear feet of street frontage on a lot, get one parking pass for guest parking, which wouldn’t count in the parking requirement for the building. He said the on-street parking could provide the guest parking, instead of needing the additional one stall per dwelling for buildings with eighteen or more units. He said old houses which have been converted to apartments don’t provide enough parking on site, thus residents park on the street taking away the guest parking that could be on the street. He said changes to the structured parking section would eliminate open parking garages, which would now be classified as “enclosed” parking garages needing ventilation which is more expensive. He asked if there was a way to screen parking, but not make it an expensive “enclosed” parking structure.

Chris Elsey, 2052 Hunting Avenue, agreed with the 1.5 parking stall requirement for one bedroom units. He said that is realistic. He suggested separate dwelling density calculations to address the need for one bedroom apartments. He said with a 45,000 square foot lot he can build forty five units, consisting of either one bedroom, two, three, or four bedroom units. He said he would like to build more than 45 one bedroom dwelling units, without going through the PUD process. He said some other cities have single bedroom dwelling density standards that allow up to a 50 percent allowance. He suggested allowing a one bedroom unit for every 666 square feet of lot area, which would enable him to build 68 one bedroom units. He suggested one bedroom apartments in the M-FRO District should have a different standard so he doesn’t have to go through a PUD to build more units.

Hill asked city staff to look into Code Regulations for enclosed parking and determine what is applicable.

Cattell said that issue came up at the previous meeting and he spoke with the Code office about it. He said there are open and enclosed parking structures. The open structures need something like 40% of the structures’ perimeter to be open to not be required to have mechanical ventilation. He said the 4 foot tall screen wall draft requirement would still allow the structure to be open. The parking structures that are required to be hidden

behind the dwelling units, along N. Manhattan, Bluemont and N. 11 Street, might need the mechanical ventilation. He said this proposed screening requirement is trying to prevent having buildings on stilts along the major community corridors.

Meredith asked when, if the draft regulations are approved, the changes would go into effect.

Cattell explained that once proposed changes are advertised for a public hearing, projects must meet the current and proposed regulations. He said the changes go into effect after two readings of the ordinance at the City Commission and publication in the paper, which would take about a month.

Meredith said the M-FRO amendment seemed to be in reaction to the Vattier project.

Kratochvil asked if there was a way to change the density of one bedroom units in the Zoning Regulations to give developers an extra 20 percent allowance for one bedroom units.

Cattell responded that zoning regulations are a reflection of the Comprehensive Plan's density policies and density is measured in units per net acre. If exceptions are made around the units per acre standard, there could be unforeseen consequences. He cautioned the Board that they would need to go into that with their eyes open.

Kratochvil responded saying parking is going to dictate how much a developer can build with the new standard for one bedroom units.

Cattell said it is complicated enough of an issue that it would take some time to study and asked if the Board wanted to hold up adoption of the proposed revisions to perform a study that may take several months to complete. He said the PUD process is available for one bedroom proposals that exceed the density standard, and the Board had approved one PUD that was pushing the density standard.

Rolley said the PUD option already allows consideration of a proposal with all one bedroom units, and it's not as though someone is not allowed to do all one bedroom units. She said if consideration is given to the ramifications of building all one bedroom units, it can be compared to building a motel. Everything the Board had just been considering with the proposed amendments is not leading towards building structures that look like motels. She said it might be possible to develop standards that would allow for that to fit in the district, but suggested that is what the PUD process is for. She recommended not holding up the amendment to study the issue and try to develop regulations to add to the M-FRO District, which would make it more cumbersome. She suggested allowing creativity in design by going through the existing PUD process.

Cattell said the intent of the M-FRO District is not to develop dormitories in the older neighborhoods.

Chris Elsey said he had a concern with the PUD process, because they were denied because they were way over on the unit density. His last project had seventy two dwelling units with ninety bedrooms, but the density was too high.

Rolley responded saying it is not just a density issue, but also what is created by the length of the building. If someone works within the proposed guidelines then it's a different story.

Chris Elsey said he is not really concerned with the length of the building; he can break up the building into several shorter buildings. He questioned if he provides enough parking, what is the issue with one bedroom units.

Morse expressed concern about ninety, one bedroom apartments in a residential area, saying a high density like that is off the scale of the existing community standards.

Elsey said it's all about people, not units.

Rolley said it is not just about people, but other things as well, because each unit comes with its own utilities and HVAC systems.

Elsey said calculations for sewage are done on a per person basis.

Rolley said it is not just the about the numbers. The design of the proposed building is also important to be within the M-FRO District standards. She said it is possible to do more one bedroom units within a PUD.

Elsey asked in a PUD, how many how many units are too many.

Morse responded saying it depends.

Meredith closed the public hearing.

Rolley said she was comfortable proceeding with the specific modified language proposed by Hill and herself, as edited by Staff.

Cattell asked the Board to confirm its modifications to the amendments.

The Board confirmed Rolley's suggestion to add: "Establishing a hierarchy of architectural elements is encouraged." to the end of the Building Exterior paragraph under Section 4-112 (F)(2)(a).

After discussion by the Board, it confirmed that the street facing wall variation item under Section 4-112 (F)(2)( a)(4) would be changed to: "In addition for every one-hundred twenty 120 feet of horizontal wall plane on street facing facades, there shall be variation(s) in the wall plane of at least eight (8) feet in depth and a total of at least 24 feet in width, which may be divided into multiple segments of at least eight (8) feet in width."

The Board confirmed in the definition of Surround the following clause would be eliminated: “of at least six (6) inches in width”.

The Board confirmed that it had no changes to the proposed Roof Pitch section.

The Board then discussed the proposal for an additional one parking stall per every four units, in buildings containing eighteen or more dwelling units.

Hill indicated he did not want too much parking and suggested counting after the eighteenth unit. Miller asked why eighteenth was proposed in the draft.

Cattell said it was based on looking at buildings that have been built in the M-FRO District, which consisted mostly of 12-plexes, with one 15-plex and one with 37 units.

Meredith agreed with Hill’s suggestion.

Morse said the counting should start with the first dwelling unit in buildings with eighteen or more dwellings, saying the parking ratio in the M-FRO District is already reduced, so the extra stalls would be good. She said the new building on Vattier is the first one that would have been required to follow the provision. She said this would bring balance to make sure there is the right amount of parking and would not be overdoing parking.

Kratochvil agreed with Morse. Miller agreed to start at unit one.

Rolley said she agreed with Hill, to start counting at the eighteenth unit, because lack of parking is already addressed with the 1.5 stall requirement for one bedroom units. Additional parking would increase storm water runoff and impervious surfaces.

While it might not apply to the M-FRO District, Hill stated that his experience in other parts of town is that the larger the complex, the lower a ratio of parking to units is needed, because people are gone over the day or vacant units lead to open spaces.

Meredith said it appeared there were four (4) Board members who supported starting the count with the first unit, and three (3) who supported counting at the eighteenth unit.

Rolley moved that the Manhattan Urban Area Planning Board recommend approval the of the proposed amendments to Article IV, Section 4-112 M-FRO, Multi-Family Redevelopment Overlay District, of the Manhattan Zoning Regulations, based on the findings in the Staff Memorandums, with the three modifications made by the Board.

Kratochvil seconded the motion, which passed on a vote of 7-0.

**A PUBLIC HEARING to consider AMENDMENTS to Section 9 – F Zones (Floodplain) of the Riley County Zoning Regulations. (Board of County Commissioners of Riley County)**

Isaac presented the staff report recommending approval and answered questions.

Morse asked for an example of a non-residential structure that would require a flood proofing.

Isaac answered it is dealing with wet and dry flood proofing and could be any structure that is non-residential for example an accessory structure or a commercial structure.

Meredith opened and closed the public hearing with no one speaking.

Morse moved to forward a recommendation of approval the Board of Commissioners of Riley County of the proposed amendment to the Riley County Zoning Regulations as published.

Reynard seconded the motion, which passed on a vote of 7-0.

Isaac announced the Board of County Commissioners will hear the request July 19<sup>th</sup> at 9:15 am in the County Chambers.

### **ANNUAL ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING AND ELECTION OF THE CHAIRPERSON AND VICE-CHAIRPERSON.**

Hill nominated Nikki Miller to be the new Chairperson and Bill Meredith as the Vice-Chairperson.

Kratochvil seconded the motion. Miller accepted the nomination and the motion passed on a vote of 7-0.

### **UPDATE ON GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE PLANNING.**

Evans presented an overview of the green infrastructure planning initiative that the Planning Division has undertaken with the Public Works and Parks and Recreation Departments, to identify future trail and pedestrian routes in the western growth areas of the community, located generally between the Miller Parkway Corridor and Anderson Avenue Corridor, as well as in the northeastern part of the community along Marlatt Avenue. The purpose of the initiative is to improve pedestrian and bicycle connectivity between neighborhood areas and from neighborhoods to the Linear Trail and park system, as part of an overall green infrastructure and neighborhood planning effort.

Evans presented a number of photographs and maps showing several conceptual routes leading from the western portions of Miller Parkway, northward into the Stone Pointe neighborhoods and connecting up with the sidewalk system and the new pedestrian bridge over Wildcat Creek to Anneberg Park. He also showed a route connecting southward from Anderson Avenue and Cumberland Road, across the Wildcat Creek

Bridge on Scenic Drive, to connect with the Stone Pointe and Highland Ridge neighborhoods along Scenic Drive. Evans identified a potential future western extension of the Linear Trail west of Scenic Drive, along the north side of Wildcat Creek. He also showed the new pedestrian underpass at US 24 and Marlatt Avenue and how the sidewalk system and future Linear Trail extension would interconnect in that part of the community.

Rolley asked why it was being called green infrastructure planning if it wasn't addressing storm water. The presentation was about pedestrian and bike connectivity.

Evans responded saying this is connecting the green infrastructure along the natural creek areas and parks identified in the Comprehensive Plan.

Cattell said the effort at this point is specifically looking at connectivity issues and that they haven't gotten to storm water issues yet. Most of the trails are located in open space areas that most likely will not be developed and are part of the green infrastructure network.

Rolley asked four questions. 1) Is there going to be a flashing pedestrian light at the crosswalk on Scenic Drive south of the Wildcat Creek Bridge. Evans indicated that ideally there would be one, but they are not to that level of detail yet. 2) Is the round-about at the entrance of Anneberg Park going forward. Cattell said it is in the design phase. 3) Will there be sidewalk along west Marlatt Avenue. Cattell indicated it is a part of the Linear Trail extension that is planned along the north side of Marlatt Avenue and there are two alternate routes at the west end near the Rogers Subdivision. 4) Is the Marlatt Trail extension in the CIP. Cattell said he didn't think it was in the CIP yet.

### **REPORTS AND COMMENTS BY BOARD MEMBERS**

There were no reports or comments from the Board.

Respectfully submitted,  
Ashley Myers, Planning Intern  
Eric Cattell, Assistant Director for Planning