

**MINUTES**  
**MANHATTAN URBAN AREA PLANNING BOARD**  
**City Commission Room, City Hall**  
**1101 Poyntz Avenue**  
**August 16, 2010**  
**7:00 p.m.**

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

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Mike Hill.

**STAFF PRESENT:** Eric Cattell, Assistant Director for Planning; Steve Zilkie, Senior Planner; Cam Moeller, Planner II; Chad Bunger, Planner II; Monty Wedel, Riley County Planning Director; Bob Isaac, Riley County Planner.

**OPEN PUBLIC COMMENTS**

No one spoke.

**CONSENT AGENDA**

**1. APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 2, 2010, MANHATTAN URBAN AREA PLANNING BOARD MEETING.**

Reynard moved that the Board approve the August 2, 2010 minutes. Morse seconded the motion, which passed on a vote of 4-0-2 (Rolley and Kratochvil abstained from voting due to their absence at the August 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting).

**GENERAL AGENDA**

**1. A PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER THE ADMINISTRATIVE REZONING OF AN UNPLATTED TRACT AT 704 MARLATT AVENUE, FROM COUNTY ZONING DESIGNATION "D-2" (LIGHT INDUSTRIAL) TO "A-1" (SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL). (PROPERTY OWNER: VANDERSTELDT)**

Wedel presented the Staff Report, with a recommendation that the Manhattan Urban Area Planning Board forward a recommendation of approval to the Board of Commissioners of Riley County.

Miller opened the Public Hearing.

Keen Umbehr spoke as representative of Melvin Vandersteldt, the property owner. Umbehr said there is a difference of opinion between Riley County planning staff and the property owner over the appropriate land use of the site. Umbehr said there is a

tremendous storm drainage problem which makes the property unsuitable for housing. Umbehr also said the lot is too narrow for a new road to be constructed going north-south, which means that access will be very limited.

Umbehr requested that the Board delay taking any zoning action on the property until a drainage study has been completed, which would provide useful information in determining what land use classifications would be most suitable and appropriate.

Miller closed the Public Hearing.

Kratochvil suggested that the subject property could be platted and split into two lots, with one having access onto Marlatt Avenue.

Wedel, addressing storm drainage, said the proposal before the Board is not a development proposal but is about setting parameters on land use. Wedel said regardless of whether the land is zoned as commercial, industrial or residential, the drainage situation will have to be addressed when it is developed. Wedel noted that the drainage affecting the site originates on agricultural property to the east.

Rolley discussed the planning process and how it begins at the Comprehensive Plan level, then zoning, and then platting. Rolley said the applicant is making the implication that every square inch of the property has to be developed and that is not the case.

Reynard noted the drainage plans that were developed for Northwing, the residential subdivision to the west, when it was platted.

Umbehr said there is time to do a drainage study now and it would be helpful in making a decision about zoning.

Rolley said that the proposal before the Board is about compatible land use and that drainage is not pertinent to the consideration of the zoning of this property.

Morse asked whether rezoning the property from light industrial to residential will cause problems for Mr. Vandersteldt related to how he is using the land currently. Wedel said the current use of the property could continue if the property was rezoned to residential but there could not be an expansion of the nonconformity. Morse said she would support rezoning the property to A-1.

Meredith moved that the Board forward a recommendation to the Board of Commissioners of Riley County to approve the request to administratively rezone the subject property from "D-2" (Light Industrial) to "A-1" (Single Family Residential) for the reasons stated in the Staff Report.

Reynard seconded the motion, which passed on a vote of 6-0.

**2. TAKE UP THE CITY COMMISSION'S REQUEST FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF STRUCTURED PARKING AND RELATED ISSUES IN THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO ARTICLE IV, SECTION 4-112 M-FRO, MULTI-FAMILY REDEVELOPMENT OVERLAY DISTRICT)**

Cattell explained that the City Commission had returned the item, at the request of City Administration, for further discussion of issues surrounding structured parking the presented the Staff Report indicting the M-FRO District has generally been working well and that the proposed amendments recommended previously by the Planning Board will help ensure that the District continues to address issues in the area. Before the M-FRO District amendments are finalized, City Administration wanted the Planning Board to discuss structured parking and related issues that might not be adequately addressed by the M-FRO District amendments, or through a building permit review process. Given the unknowns involving site layout, building design, compatibility with the neighborhood, and traffic and utility issues that structured parking will likely raise in the neighborhood setting, City Administration recommended that this type of development be addressed through the more comprehensive PUD review process, to provide better opportunity to analyze issues and impacts applicable to specific sites; and that structured parking should not be permitted under the standard M-FRO District zoning provisions. Cattell summarized the suggestion from the City Commission to consider encouraging use of native stone. He explained that the City would also be updating the M-FRO District User's Guide to explain that proposals utilizing structured parking would need to be submitted through the Planned Unit Development process. City Administration recommended adoption of the proposed amendments as revised and reflected in the Alterative 2 attachment.

Miller asked for public input and comments.

Karen Mayse (3340 Newbury Street), President of the League of Women Voters, asked that the Board that as it reviews structured parking and related issues, to remember the spirit and intent of the M-FRO District in considering the proposed amendments. She said the M-FRO District was adopted through lengthy community discussions that were only a few years ago, and in the spirit of compromise with the intent preserving the older neighborhoods and limits impacts of density, parking and building aesthetics. She said League members feel it is important to be mindful of unintended consequences that could result if the M-FRO regulations were to allow apartment buildings with structured parking, and more density. There was also a concern about buildings with an excess of one-bedroom dwelling units that may have more than one person and car per unit. She said structured parking raised two concerns, taller buildings and screening issues and that buildings on stilts would not be in character with the neighborhood and should be rejected. Mayes spoke of the concern about a large increase in density, parking impacts, and pressure on the capacity of existing infrastructure in the older neighborhoods. She said the League requests that the Planning Board carefully consider these ramifications and don't compromise the intent of the district to preserve the older neighborhoods. She said the

rental inspection program should be given a chance to work before these areas are written off.

Mary Ann Fleming (215 S. 8<sup>th</sup> Street) said she was one of the citizens who worked to accomplish the creation of the TNO and M-FRO regulations. She said the construction of overly large apartment buildings was not the intent of the M-FRO District. Fleming said the original intent was that new development be built at a human-scale with sensitive placement of parking areas and trash enclosures. She said that allowing structured parking that increases per lot density does not seem to be the way to go. Fleming said neighborhood residents should not have to feel overwhelmed by large, institutional-looking buildings. She said the proposed amendments seem to work toward meeting the intent of the M-FRO District.

Kathy Dzewaltowki (100 S. Delaware) spoke representing the Manhattan/Riley County Preservation Alliance. She said the Preservation Alliance supports there being adequate off-street parking that is located behind buildings or possibly below ground level, but is not supportive of allowing unscreened parking at ground level located underneath a building on stilts. She said high density infill development should be sensitive to the existing neighborhood.

George Kennedy (1029 Bertrand) said he is a long time resident who is in agreement with the other comments that have been made. He said there is lots of concern about the impact of new development on these neighborhoods and, in particular, concerns about density and character.

With no other public comments, Miller asked the Board if it had any questions.

Rolley asked for clarification of the public comments regarding parking.

Cattell said he could not speak for the public, but understood the public's comments as being in support of the proposed amendments to increase the parking ratio for one bedroom units and in support of prohibiting structured parking and requiring it to go through the PUD process.

Rolley commented that the Board had already supported the changes and asked if the citizens that had spoken were in support of the proposed changes.

Mayse confirmed that her comments were in support of the recommendations of City Staff.

There being no further discussion, Kratochvil moved that Board recommend approval of the proposed amendments to Article IV, Section 4-112 M-FRO, Multi-Family Redevelopment Overlay District, of the Manhattan Zoning Regulations, as reflected in Alternative 2, based on the findings in the three Staff Memorandums to the Planning Board, dated June 15, 2010; June 30, 2010; and August 5, 2010.

Reynard seconded the motion, which passed on a vote of 6-0.

**WORK SESSION**

**3. DISCUSS PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE MANHATTAN ZONING REGULATIONS TO ALLOW HOME OCCUPATIONS IN MANUFACTURED HOMES AND MOBILE HOMES AND TO ALLOW RECREATIONAL VEHICLES IN THE R-5, MANUFACTURED HOME PARK DISTRICT.**

Zilkie indicated both items were the result of requests from the public. He presented information on the possibility of adding home occupations as a permitted use in mobile home parks.

The Board generally supported the concept and had questions about the intensity of some home occupations, such as day care homes.

Bunger introduced the discussion about permitting Recreational Vehicles to be used for housing of transient workers associated with NBAF and other regional projects in the area.

Kratochvil had questions about utility connections and concerns about lowering standards for a temporary workforce issue. Rolley suggested the City address the issue of housing temporary workers in the area. Morse recognized the need for housing transient workers, suggesting it be placed in a certain portion or percentage of a mobile home park. Meredith agreed that RV's should be placed in identified areas and not scattered around. Miller expressed concern about impacts on the more permanent residents of mobile home parks and agreed there should be a percentage of total stalls allowed for RV's. Rolley agreed and suggested identifying how to arrange RV's in a way that creates a sense of community for the residents.

Zilkie indicated staff would continue to work on the two issues and come back to the Board.

**4. REPORTS AND COMMENTS BY BOARD MEMBERS**

There were no comments or reports.

There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,  
Cam Moeller, Planner II