

MINUTES
MANHATTAN URBAN AREA PLANNING BOARD
City Commission Room, City Hall
1101 Poyntz Avenue
November 3, 2014
7:00 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT: John Ball, Vice-Chairperson; Gary Stith; Linda Morse; and Jerry Reynard

MEMBERS ABSENT: Phil Anderson, Chairperson; Ron Hageman; and Neil Parikh

STAFF PRESENT: Eric Cattell, Assistant Director for Planning; Chad Bunger, Senior Planner; Lance Evans, Senior Planner; Chase Johnson, Planner; and Ben Chmiel, Planner.

OPEN PUBLIC COMMENTS

No one spoke.

CONSENT AGENDA

APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 20, 2014, MANHATTAN URBAN AREA PLANNING BOARD MEETING.

APPROVE THE FINAL PLAT OF THE MUIRFIELD ADDITION, GENERALLY LOCATED 1300 FEET NORTHEAST OF THE INTERSECTION OF GRAND MERE PARKWAY AND COLBERT HILLS DRIVE (APPLICANT: SMH CONSULTANTS – JEFF HANCOCK ON BEHALF OF THE OWNER BACK 9 LAND DEVELOPMENT, LLC – T.J. VILKANSKAS)

Morse moved that the Board approve the Consent Agenda. Reynard seconded the motion which passed on a vote of 4-0.

GENERAL AGENDA

REMOVE FROM THE TABLE AND CONDUCT A PUBLIC HEARING FOR A MUNICIPAL FACILITY REVIEW FOR A PROPOSED EXPANSION TO THE MANHATTAN CITY HALL, 1101 POYNTZ AVENUE, TO CREATE MORE OFFICE SPACE FOR THE PARKS AND RECREATION DEPARTMENT. (APPLICANT/OWNER: CITY OF MANHATTAN)

Stith moved that the item be removed from the table and conduct a Public Hearing. Reynard seconded the motion which passed on a vote of 4-0.

Bunger presented the staff report and recommended approval with one (1) condition.

Morse asked if the parcel on which City Hall sits will be rezoned into one zone because City Hall currently sits in two zoning districts.

Bunger explained that it will not be rezoned because the City is following the Municipal Facilities process.

Morse asked if utilities would be elevated.

Bunger explained that the area is protected by the levee in Zone X and there are no regulatory requirements to elevate the equipment.

Stith asked if it was necessary to take out trees along N. 12th St. for the parking.

Bunger explained that eight (8) proposed parking spaces would be lost if the trees were left in place.

Eddie Estes, Director of Parks & Recreation, addressed the Board and explained that the City Forester evaluated the trees and indicated that the trees are in poor condition and should be removed and new trees can be planted in other available spaces on the site.

Stith asked how many trees would be added.

Estes could not give a definite answer because the City Forester is concerned with appropriate spacing, species, location and type of irrigation. He said the existing turf irrigation is not that great for trees. However replacement trees are intended to be planted (about two to three trees).

Ball asked what the existing Parks and Recreation office building would be used for or done with.

Estes elaborated that one option includes demolishing the existing building, while another option includes repurposing the facility potentially into a dance studio since it is still a useable space.

Ball stated that if there were other project proposals presented to the Board that would provide less than the fifty (50) percent of the required parking, it would be a major shortfall of the project. The expansion project would be 358 parking spaces short if fully occupied.

Bunger explained that the maximum required number of required parking spaces is based on every separate use in the building being at full capacity and that there is not a need to accommodate the maximum parking spaces since different spaces are used at different times throughout the day and night, depending on specific events.

Ball asked about the approximate daily customer load created by moving Parks and Recreation.

Bunger explained that the customer load is similar to City Hall's daily customer load and should not overwhelm provided parking spaces. There will be consolidated customer service as well as on-line registration for programs.

Ball opened the public hearing.

Bruce McMillan, Architect for the project, explained that there were originally four design and expansion options. Two of these options incorporated the use of the existing building as either an expansion or removal. The current proposed option is the direct result of the City Commission's actions and direction.

John Pence, 2361 Grandview Terrace, asked why the City would consider demolishing the existing Parks and Recreation building that could be utilized as a storage space. Pence also asked about the relocation of customer service.

Jason Hilgers, Deputy City Manager, stated that the customer service area will be modified to accommodate both Parks and Recreation and General City business.

Pence asked if the aluminum coating on the north side of City Hall would remain.

Hilgers explained that whatever materials are currently there will remain.

Pence asked how many offices will be in the new building.

Hilgers explained that fifteen (15) individuals will be moved to the new space and will relocate the existing three legal office spaces.

Pence asked what the budget is of the project.

Hilgers answered that the budget is just under \$2 million.

Pence also asked if the budget includes improvements to the Peace Auditorium and what the cost per square foot would be.

Hilgers answered that improvements to the auditorium would require additional funds and that the current expansion would cost roughly \$1.8-1.9 million for about 7,500 square feet.

Pence asked where funding was coming from.

Hilgers explained that a \$1.9 million balance was set aside in a Capital Improvements Reserve account that the City Commission dedicated it for the project.

Ball closed the public hearing.

Stith commented that if green space is going to be eliminated for an expansion, it's best to do so on the City Hall property rather than in City Park which already has a high amount of buildings and facilities.

Stith moved that the Manhattan Urban Area Planning Board find by a preponderance of the evidence that the public interests to be served by the proposed Municipal Facility, outweigh the impacts upon the legitimate community interests and recommends approval

of a proposed expansion of City Hall, as proposed, based on the findings in the Staff Report, with the one (1) condition of approval recommended by City Administration.

1. Exterior building lighting shall be shielded to minimize glare on adjacent properties.

Reynard seconded the motion.

Morse commented that she was happy that the auditorium is being preserved and that the proposed expansion is away from the residential side of the property and neighborhood. Morse stated her agreement with parking and how events that are staggered between day and night help alleviate overcrowding and lack of parking. Morse also stated that she would otherwise oppose the project if it was an expansion of the current facility in City Park and that the consolidation of customer service is a good move for City Administration.

Ball agreed it was a reasonable solution. He agreed with Morse and other members regarding the expansion of City Hall, rather than the expansion of the existing facility in City Park which should be for green space and recreation. He was uncomfortable with parking which could become inadequate in the future.

The motioned passed on a vote of 4-0.

A PUBLIC HEARING TO AMEND ORDINANCE NO. 6451 AND THE APPROVED PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN OF THE MANHATTAN MEDICAL CENTER PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT TO INSTALL NEW DIRECTIONAL SIGNS THROUGHOUT THE MEDICAL OFFICE DEVELOPMENT, GENERALLY LOCATED TO THE SOUTHWEST OF THE INTERSECTION OF CLAFLIN ROAD AND COLLEGE AVENUE. THE AMENDMENT IS IN THE FORM OF A FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN. (APPLICANT/OWNER: MANHATTAN MEDICAL CENTER – BOB DIEBALL, MANAGER)

Bunger presented the staff report with a recommendation of approval with one (1) condition.

Reynard asked what happened to Buildings E and G.

Bunger explained that because the medial campus is in two zoning districts, the applicants submitted an application to the Planning Board for the PUD side and the Board of Zoning Appeals for the C-1 District side. The Board of Zoning Appeals will hear a sign variance request for Buildings E and G.

Morse asked about the brightness of the illuminated signs.

Bunger answered that the signs will be externally illuminated by either ground or top lights.

Stith asked if the signage will cause site distance issues.

Bunger explained that Peter Clark, City Traffic Engineer, reviewed the project and concluded that since the signs are on private property, the owners are advised to get a design professional to review the location of signs to protect safety.

Stith stated that even though it is private property, it is the Board's responsibility to determine that the design will not create any safety concerns and that the owners/designers should be careful about sign placement in order to ensure traffic safety onsite.

Bob Dieball facility manager and representative of the applicant; and Emily Koenig, architect, addressed the Board. Dieball explained that the proposed signs will help to better guide and direct customers and patients on the large medical campus. The proposed lighting will be ground mounted LED lighting of low wattage.

Stith asked if the signs will be single or double faced.

Dieball answered that there will be a variety of sign types with some being double faced, depending on placement and location.

Koenig also stated that final locations for proposed signs will be determined to protect traffic patterns and visibility.

Ball opened the public hearing.

With no one speaking, Ball closed the public hearing.

Stith moved that the Manhattan Urban Area Planning Board recommend approval of the proposed amendment of Ordinance No. 6451 and the approved Preliminary Development Plan of the Manhattan Medical Center Commercial PUD, based on the findings in the Staff Report, subject to the one (1) condition of approval recommended by City Administration.

1. Signs shall be provided as proposed in the application documents, and shall allow for exempt signage described in Article VI, Section 6-104 (A)(1),(2),(3), (4),(5), (7), and (9); and, Section 6-104 (B)(2) and B(5), of the Manhattan Zoning Regulations.

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

**A PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER AN AMENDMENT TO THE
MANHATTAN ZONING REGULATIONS FOR A COMPLETE REVISION OF
ARTICLE VI – SIGNS.**

Bunger presented the staff report with a recommendation of approval.

Stith asked if the digital graphic signs would be for off or on-premise signs.

Bunger answered they would only be only for on-premise messages.

Ball asked for clarification in regards to political signs and city property.

Bunger answered that political signs cannot be on city property and those that are found on city property or rights-of-way are removed.

Stith asked how the City determines when a sign becomes nonconforming.

Bunger answered that any signs that do not meet the new regulation's requirements on the day of their implementation automatically become nonconforming and have five (5) years to come into compliance.

Morse asked about how regulations will affect the University District and Manhattan Christian College.

Bunger explained that Manhattan Christian College was not included in the University section because it is a PUD. With regard to Kansas State University, Bunger explained that if the Board of Regents owns that land and if it is zoned University District, then that land is considered by the City to be part of Kansas State University.

Ball opened the public hearing.

Echo Fairbanks, representative of Kansas State Division - Tri-State Sign Association, expressed concern that businesses may be affected by the nonconforming status and may not be aware of it, particularly in regards to reduced square footage in some districts. She also stated that the proposed regulations for digital signs are unusual because they regulate by pixels. She suggested that the pixel standard be eliminated and there be an increase in allowable square footage in order to provide maximum benefit to the consumer.

Stith asked if Fairbanks was familiar with Riley County's proposed sign regulations and if it regulated pixels.

Fairbanks said that the proposed Riley County regulations would not regulate by pixel.

Ball closed the public hearing.

Bunger explained that the City Commission had given direction to proceed cautiously with implementing digital signs in the community. He said the pixel standard originated from research of communities across the county and that the particular pixel regulation is from Minneapolis. The reason for the requirement is to ensure the quality of the image. He said the City has received comments about the low pixel quality of K-State's sign on Anderson Avenue.

Stith said ideally the City and County sign codes should use consistent language, however he understood why they might not be exactly the same.

Bunger explained that collaboration with the County has occurred, and that the county hired a consultant to create new regulations while the city did all work in-house.

Reynard moved that the Manhattan Urban Area Planning Board recommend approval of the amendment of the Manhattan Zoning Regulations to completely revise Article VI, Signs, as proposed, based on the findings in the Staff Memorandum.

Stith seconded the motion.

Morse commented that she is glad to see the city is taking on digital signs slowly and appreciates the need to do things differently than other communities. She said there may be a need in the future to define what a campus is.

On a vote, the motion passed 4-0.

REPORTS AND COMMENTS BY BOARD MEMBERS

Cattell updated the Board on the progress of the Comprehensive Plan Update. A community meeting will be held on November 19, 2014 in the City Commission Room in which the consultants will be presenting the draft plan maps and policies. Several additional meetings on November 20, 2014 with the city and county commissioners and Project Advisory Committee will review the same information.

Bunger announced that on November 5, 2014, a flood plain meeting will be held for the Big Blue River Silver Jackets project and how to modify existing homes to reduce flood risk.

Ball adjourned the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Everett Haynes, Planning Intern