

MINUTES
MANHATTAN URBAN AREA PLANNING BOARD
City Commission Room, City Hall
1101 Poyntz Avenue
January 24, 2013
7:00 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Gary Stith, Chairperson; Linda Morse, Vice-Chairperson; Phil Anderson; and, John Ball.

MEMBERS ABSENT: Jerry Reynard and Mike Kratochvil.

STAFF PRESENT: Eric Cattell, Assistant Director for Planning; Steve Zilkie, Senior Planner; Chad Bunger, Planner II; Lance Evans, Senior Planner; Kevin Credit, Planner; Monty Wedel, Planning and Special Projects Director; and, Bob Isaac, Riley County Planner.

OPEN PUBLIC COMMENTS

No one spoke.

CONSENT AGENDA

APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 7, 2013, MANHATTAN URBAN AREA PLANNING BOARD MEETING.

Morse moved that the Board approve the Consent Agenda. Ball seconded the motion, which passed on a vote of 3-1, with Stith abstaining because he did not attend the Jan. 7th meeting.

GENERAL AGENDA

A PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER THE REZONING OF AN UNPLATTED TRACT, FROM "AG" (AGRICULTURAL DISTRICT) TO "R-PUD" (RESIDENTIAL PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT), GENERALLY LOCATED APPROXIMATELY 3,700 FEET WEST OF SCENIC DRIVE, ON THE NORTH SIDE OF ANDERSON AVENUE.

A PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER THE CONCURRENT PLAT OF WELLS LANDING, A 25.01-ACRE PARCEL OF LAND, GENERALLY LOCATED APPROXIMATELY 3,700 FEET WEST OF SCENIC DRIVE, ON THE NORTH SIDE OF ANDERSON AVENUE.

Isaac presented the staff reports and recommended approval of the rezoning and concurrent plat.

Anderson asked about a note on the plat prohibiting manufactured homes because he was concerned about excluding Ward Craft homes manufactured in Clay Center. Isaac said manufactured home is a defined term and is different from a manufactured home of residential design.

Anderson said the site was close to Wildcat Creek and several environmental groups had reviewed the plat. He asked if the Wildcat Creek Working Group had seen the plat and signed off on it. Isaac said they had not.

Anderson then asked if the Board would support the idea that the developer comply with the recommendations of the Working Group because the site is close to Wildcat Creek. He said he didn't think there would be an undue burden on the developer to meet the recommendations. Ball added that future improvements to the site were unknown, which could increase impermeable surface and the potential impact of runoff. Isaac said certain items were factored in with runoff calculations, but not including grading. He said there is an existing house on the property and there will be three new houses on 25 acres, all about an eighth of a mile from Wildcat Creek. Ball asked if there were other checks when a building permit was applied for and Isaac said a building permit is applied for and there's no other review.

Morse said it was hard for the Board to consider projects like the one proposed because there was no information on the number of structures and amount of impervious area.

Stith opened the public hearing.

Tom Abbott, representing the partners in the development, said several buildings were removed and three new houses will be built, and maybe outbuildings with each house, so not much is changing on the property. He said they are planning on building a detention or water feature at the top of the cul-de-sac but it isn't calculated into the drainage. Stith said the detention isn't shown on the plan so it wouldn't be required and Abbott said they would build it.

Monty Wedel, Riley County Planning and Development, said there was a conscious decision by the City not to extend city utilities to the site based on the Comprehensive Plan, which does not encourage development of the site.

Tim Schultz, Schultz Construction, said they previously owned surrounding property and one of the problems is serving the site with adequate water pressure.

Stith closed the public hearing.

Anderson said the staff report notes the site is generally in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan which suggests some part may not be in conformance. Isaac showed

the Board the Comprehensive Plan map and said the site is shown as agricultural and close to rural residential.

Stith said a deciding factor for him is not encouraging higher density, which would require city services, but extending city services would not make sense to serve only four houses. He said higher density is in conflict with the Joint Land Use Plan which discourages higher density. If the site will develop, the low density proposal is appropriate and should have a minimal impact on Wildcat Creek compared to a higher density.

Anderson asked Abbott if the partnership would be willing to agree to any recommendations of the Wildcat Creek Working Group. Abbott said he didn't know what the Group would recommend but timing is important to the development. His concern was how long it may take for recommendations to be enacted and his partnership needs to move forward. He said they will do a water feature and agreed the Board could make a recommendation about it.

Morse said the density was supportable and appreciated the LESA evaluation and score, which strongly recommended the development. She also appreciated Abbott and Schultz's comments.

Wedel asked for clarification about the rate of runoff will be zero and as long as the condition is for rate of runoff versus volume of runoff.

Morse moved that the Planning Board recommend approval to the Board of Commissioners of Riley County to the rezoning of a tract of land from county zoning district "AG" (Agricultural District) to county zoning district "R-PUD" (Residential Planned Unit development), based on the findings in the Staff Report.

Anderson seconded the motion, which passed on a vote of 4-0.

Ball moved that the Planning Board approve the Concurrent Plat of Wells Landing, based on the findings in the Staff Report, and conformance with the Manhattan Urban Area Subdivision Regulations, with the following condition of approval:

1. The building permit mitigating the increased rate of runoff to zero.

Anderson seconded the motion, which passed on a vote of 4-0.

A PUBLIC HEARING TO AMEND ORDINANCE NO. 6607 AND THE APPROVED PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN OF LOT 3, HERITAGE SQUARE SOUTH COMMERCIAL PUD, PROPOSED AS A FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN. THE AMENDMENT IS FOR A DOLLAR GENERAL STORE ON LOT 3, GENERALLY LOCATED SOUTHEAST OF THE INTERSECTION OF SOUTH PORT DRIVE AND U.S.-24 HIGHWAY. (APPLICANT: ABELN & ASSOCIATES ARCHITECTS, PA, ON BEHALF OF

5700 HOLDINGS, LLC- TYLER OLIVER/OWNER: HERITAGE SQUARE LAND COMPANY-TIM SCHULTZ)

Zilkie presented the staff report and recommended approval.

Morse asked about the size of the proposed ground signs to be sure the sizes were at or under the size requirements, and that the Board was not setting a precedent regarding sign size. Zilkie explained the size of the signs with respect to the sign regulations of the C-2 Neighborhood Shopping District, which are the general guidelines for PUD signage, and that all of the proposed signs will conform to the sign requirements for commercial PUD signage.

Stith opened the public hearing.

Tyler Oliver, applicant and developer of the project, said he would answer questions.

There were no questions.

Stith closed the public hearing.

Ball moved that the Planning Board recommend approval of the of the proposed amendment of Ordinance No. 6607 and the approved Preliminary Development Plan of Lot 3, Heritage Square South Commercial Planned Unit Development, to be known as the Final Development Plan of Lot 3, Heritage Square South Commercial Planned Unit Development, based on the findings in the Staff Report.

Anderson seconded the motion.

Morse said the proposal was easy to support because the Preliminary PUD was well designed and the proposed project was needed in the area.

On a vote, the motion passed 4-0.

IV. WORK SESSION AGENDA

**CONTINUATION OF THE ANNUAL REVIEW OF COMPREHENSIVE PLAN:
PLANNING BOARD REVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF THE COMPREHENSIVE
PLAN AND COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE PUBLIC INPUT SESSION.**

Cattell reviewed the comments received from during the public input phase of the annual review of the Comprehensive Plan on December 3, 2012, and explained how the Comprehensive Plan does or does not address each identified issue.

High Density Student Housing. The first suggestion was for the city to establish a very high density development area on the west side of the Kansas State University campus to accommodate new student housing with structured parking and no setbacks. Cattell indicated that identifying areas for high density student housing in close proximity to Kansas State University has been an issue in Manhattan for a number of years and that the City has taken a proactive role in promoting high density redevelopment next to the campus, while preserving single-family oriented neighborhoods as much as possible. The Comprehensive Plan incorporates the results of the Traditional Neighborhood Study conducted by the Community Development Department and identifies a twenty-two (22) block redevelopment area located east of campus and Aggieville. This redevelopment area was implemented in 2003 – 2005, through up-zoning incorporating the M-FRO, Multi-Family Redevelopment Overlay District, for high density apartments and this area has seen the construction of 44 new apartment buildings containing 422 dwelling units. To a lesser extent, the Comprehensive Plan also identifies additional high density areas along the west edge of the KSU Campus.

Cattell said it is anticipated that the issue of identifying appropriate potential areas for very high density housing that incorporates structured parking and follows a more vertical urban form will be addressed as part of the update to the Manhattan Urban Area Comprehensive Plan that is scheduled to begin in 2013 through 2014. He said the Plan was last updated in 2003 as a joint project with Riley County and the city is in the process of discussing with Riley and Pottawatomie Counties their level of involvement with this new update.

Identifying Additional Housing Areas and Tracking Land Absorption Rates. The second issue brought up by the public was identifying new areas for housing and tracking land absorption rates. Cattell explained that the Future Land Use Maps in the Comprehensive Plan identify future growth areas around the edges of the community and that the Comprehensive Plan update process will identify new growth areas at the fringe of the community. He said the city does track land absorption and development rates which will be presented in a minute.

Temporary Transient Housing. Cattell explained that while the Comprehensive Plan does not specifically address temporary transient housing, the Planning Division has held several work sessions with the Planning Board to discuss alternative approaches for addressing this issue to accommodate the anticipated influx of construction workers associated with NBAF and other regional projects. These alternatives primarily involve modification of existing manufactured home parks to allow for temporary RV (Recreational Vehicle) housing. Those discussions are ongoing with the owners of the manufactured home parks.

Ball asked who had raised that issue in Manhattan. Cattell explained that it first came from the manufactured home park owners who had been approached by construction workers coming to the area for large regional projects such as K-18, the Army hospital and NBAF.

Park Planning. Cattell said the Parks and Recreation Department has already identified the KDOT barrow site, on the north side of K-18 as a potential new regional open space park. While this area is currently not shown in the Comprehensive Plan, this and other future parks and open space areas will be identified through the Comprehensive Plan update process.

Land Use – Transportation Linkages. Cattell indicated that Chapter 8 of the Comprehensive Plan generally addresses the land use - transportation linkage issue. The Manhattan Area Transportation Strategy is the more detailed transportation element of the Comprehensive Plan that addresses the full range of infrastructure needs and issues. The Comprehensive Plan update process will address issues involving the relationship between future land uses and transportation infrastructure needs. While it is anticipated that this process will include updating the Manhattan Area Transportation Strategy, the recently formed Flint Hills Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) will also be addressing transportation planning and infrastructure issues at both the local and regional level and coordination will need to be facilitated between the two projects.

Drainage Plan. Cattell said a citizen had identified a specific draining problem in her neighborhood, in the Johnson Valley Drive area. He said the Comprehensive Plan does not address detailed drainage basin planning and infrastructure needs. That is addressed in the City's Storm Water Management Plan and the City is currently analyzing existing storm water infrastructure throughout the city to identify and prioritize current a future needs and this will be a multi-year project. Drainage infrastructure in the Johnson Valley Drive area will be analyzed as part of this process.

Cattell summarized the amendments that had been made to the Comprehensive Plan since its adoption in 2003 and asked for questions.

Ball asked if the city has a very high density residential category or if that will need to be developed.

Cattell explained that the Comprehensive Plan currently recognizes a higher density urban form of residential housing, but restricts it to the down town area, where you would expect to find that type of development. He said the issue of identifying other areas in the community that would be appropriate for this type of development is something that will need to be discussed as part of the comprehensive plan update process. And if the city needs a new implementation zoning tool for that type of development to define the parameters that should be followed.

Ball asked if the city would also be considering how to measure that type of development density, such as by bedrooms per acre.

Cattell said that could be considered as part of the overall issue. Currently density is measured by the number of dwelling units per net acre. He said it might be a matter of very high density developments being measure one way, (i.e. beds per acre), and lower density developments another way (i.e. dwelling per acre).

Anderson said he appreciated staff's comments on the very high density issue and that a related issue that also needs to be considered and along with it is public transportation to serve these new high density areas and to move people efficiently around the city. He said the two issues need to be considered together.

Morse mentioned the need for sidewalks to serve the Northeast community park. She also expressed the need to be updated on what planning has been going on in the Blue River Valley to address the flooding issues.

Cattell explained that the City had been working with the Corps of Engineers on the Levee Recertification and that the City could provide the Board with a work session on that and related issues involving the new Riley County FEMA Flood Plain maps and the Corps study the Base Flood Elevations in the Blue River Valley. He said all these studies will help to inform the update of the Comprehensive Plan regarding where new growth areas should be located.

Bunger provided a brief summary of the anticipated timeline for these flood plain projects.

Stith concurred that the issue of identifying high density student housing areas around the University was important and that the Comprehensive Plan update might need a finer grain to provide guidance on that issue.

Cattell said a related issue is transportation planning and utility capacity planning which will be looked at as part of the update process.

Stith said it is fortunate that all these studies are going on, but there is a need for good coordination between them, as well as the MPO planning and the Comprehensive Plan process, because all these issues of transportation, density and housing are related. He also suggested the Plan needs to identify street classifications as part of that process.

Morse said there is a need to plan for impacts from NBAF.

Cattell said the city has been working on an analysis of potential bioscience spin-off industry that might come to the area as a result of both NBAF and the K-State Vision Plan for expanded research, and what their needs will be from a locational and zoning standpoint.

Stith said he was disappointed that K-State's Campus Master Plan did not address the need for identifying bioscience and agricultural research locations for spin-off firms. And that they had missed an important economic development opportunity.

Morse identified the need to improving communication between K-State and the City and Counties as the Comprehensive Plan is updated.

Credit presented an analysis of annexation, residential land absorption, building permit and platting data for the city, to identify trends since the 2003 Comprehensive Plan and how much of the identified growth areas remain. The presentation provided six growth scenarios to use in looking at the data. Data was also provided on the number of vacant lots in the city and what they are zoned. Credit and Cattell answered questions from the Board.

Morse and Stith encouraged the City to coordinate with and include Potawatomi County on the Comprehensive Plan update, because much of the new residential growth area is likely to be to the east of the city. Stith suggested expanding the Urban Area Planning Board's boundary and include representation from Pottawatomie County on the Board.

Cattell indicated that discussion has already been initiated with Pottawatomie County.

REVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF THE DRAFT EUREKA VALLEY - HIGHWAY K-18 CORRIDOR PLAN.

Evans presented the Eureka Valley K-18 Corridor Plan background and goals.

Morse asked about the collector road designation for the conceptual street shown in the plan. Cattell explained that K-DOT has definitions of collector as well as arterial and local. Stith recommended adding the road classifications to inform future developers the expectations for road standards.

Ball expressed concern over the need for the Manhattan Regional Airport to have a second runway in order to maintain and enhance the existing runway. Evans said that the Airport Master Plan defines the future needed area for airport operations. Cattell added that Peter VanKuren, Airport Director was involved in the corridor planning process and weighed in on airport issues.

Anderson added that there is a need for public transportation to the airport to reduce the need for parking.

Stith expressed concern over the conflict created by people developing in the one-percent floodplain. Cattell said that current regulation allow development in the 1% floodplain following the floodplain requirements. The Eureka Valley Plan shows the proposed FEMA maps that will be going through the public adoption process. Bunger added that the preliminary Floodplain model is a simple overlay of the floodplain evaluation. With the recent changes with the K-18 construction the area will need to be redefined.

Cattell said that when the K-18 as-built drawings we anticipate that the 1% floodplain will be reduced in size especially around Eureka Drive. The current mapping does not take into effect the K-18 improvements. The commercial areas are based on the market pressures. Much of the area may actually become industrial because the plan's intent will be for local commercial uses rather than regional.

Anderson asked if there is already pressure for commercial uses. Cattell said that there is interest but it appears that landowners are waiting for the K-18 improvements to take action.

Stith asked if design guidelines would be the tool to implement the aesthetic policies of the Plan. Evans said yes.

Morse stated that the neighborhood commercial area designated at the Miller Parkway should be limit highway commercial uses and only allow neighborhood commercial.

Stith asked if the Plan had any areas with proposed zoning. Evans stated that the Plan only designated general land uses and that zoning would be implemented at the time of development. Stith suggested adding recommended zones to the land use definitions in appendix D.

Anderson asked if there were sufficient federal state and city regulations to preclude industrial development to add pollution to the river. Evans said that his understanding was that that is the intent of the federal and state laws.

REPORTS AND COMMENTS BY BOARD MEMBERS.

There were no comments or reports.

Respectfully submitted,

Steve Zilkie, Senior Planner