

MINUTES
Special Joint Meeting of the
MANHATTAN URBAN AREA PLANNING BOARD
And the
RILEY COUNTY PLANNING BOARD
City Commission Room, City Hall
1101 Poyntz Avenue
Monday, March 2, 2015
7:00 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT: **Manhattan Urban Area Planning Board:** Phil Anderson, Chairperson; John Ball Vice-Chairperson; Gary Stith; Ron Hageman; Jerry Reynard; Linda Morse and, Neil Parikh. **Riley County Planning Board:** Loren Clement, Chairperson; Tom Taul, Vice Chairperson; Diane Hoobler; Julie Henton; and John Wienck

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Karen Davis, Director of Community Development; Eric Cattell, Assistant Director for Planning; Chad Bunger, Senior Planner; Lance Evans, Senior Planner; Chase Johnson, Planner; Ben Chmiel, Planner; Everett Haynes, Planning Intern; Monty Wedel, Riley County Planning and Special Projects Director; Bob Isaac, Riley County Planner.

PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER UPDATING, AMENDING AND SUPERSEDING THE CURRENT MANHATTAN URBAN AREA COMPREHENSIVE PLAN FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OR REDEVELOPMENT OF THE MANHATTAN URBAN AREA AND THE CITY OF MANHATTAN, KANSAS BY THE ADOPTION, BY REFERENCE, OF THAT CERTAIN DOCUMENT KNOWN AS THE “MANHATTAN URBAN AREA COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, DATED MARCH 2015.”

Eric Cattell, Assistant Director for Planning, addressed the Boards explaining how the joint hearing would be conducted and introduced the consultants: Darcie White, Clarion Associates; Christopher Kinzel, HDR; and Mark Bachamp, Olsson Associates.

Darcie White, Project Manager Clarion Associates, presented an overview of the Manhattan Urban Area Comprehensive Plan Update.

Christopher Kinzel, Senior Professional Associate at HDR Engineering presented an overview of the Manhattan Area Transportation Strategy (MATS).

Cattell reminded the Boards that the item is an update of the 2003 Manhattan Urban Area Comprehensive Plan and the MATS which are intended to provide policy guidance for approximately the next 20 years, and are being adopted pursuant to state statute as the official policy guide for future land use and transportation decisions in the Manhattan area, which includes the jurisdiction of the Manhattan Urban Area Planning Board and

portions of the jurisdictions of the Riley County Planning Board and the Pottawatomie County Planning Commission.

Cattell said it was inevitable that with this large a document there would be some errors that were being corrected as noted on the “List of Known Corrections” that was included in the meeting packet, and that any additional typographical corrections to errors that are found, such as to page format, labels, numbering and spelling will also be made in the final documents.

Cattell said the process has been a collaborative effort involving many different groups and individuals throughout the community, including: citizens; business, neighborhood and other interest groups; public agency officials and staff, and the Project Advisory Committee (PAC) and Technical Advisory Committee, over a 15-month period. There had been seven community workshops and seven PAC and TAC meetings. He said the Project Management Team, consisting of staff and the consultant, believe the proposed Comprehensive Plan and Manhattan Area Transportation Strategy are a good reflection of the diverse views and competing interests within the community, as well as the general consensus reached by the Project Advisory Committee through the planning process.

Cattell said that City and County Administrations recommend that the Manhattan Urban Area Planning Board approve and adopt Resolution No. 030215-A, updating, amending and superseding the current comprehensive plan for the development or redevelopment of the Manhattan Urban Area and the City of Manhattan, Kansas by the adoption, by reference, of that certain document known as the “Manhattan Urban Area Comprehensive Plan, dated March 2015”, as presented, which includes the new Manhattan Area Transportation Strategy, dated March 2015 and includes previously adopted Plans noted in the Resolution; with the List of Known Corrections being made and with any additional typographical corrections; and,

Forward a recommendation of approval to the City Commission and the Board of Commissioners of Riley County.

Monty Wedel, Riley County Planning and Special Projects Director, reminded the Riley County Planning Board that the area of most significant change for Riley County is outside the jurisdiction of the City of Manhattan along the Highway 24 corridor around the County Shops. He said this area had been identified in the Vision 2025 Plan future long term growth and that this update provided the opportunity to do more detailed planning and study of the area and how to utilize the sanitary sewer force main to promote development in that area. He said the County is very comfortable with both the proposed Comprehensive Plan update and the Transportation Strategy. Wedel recommended that the Riley County Planning Board approve its resolution and forward a recommendation of approval the County Commissioners.

Anderson opened the public hearing.

Mel Borst, 1918 Humboldt Street, said the Park East neighborhood as well as some other older neighborhoods has been identified as a priority to protect in the Historic Resources

Board's 2011 action plan. He discussed the importance and effects of down-zoning ten years ago that has stabilized neighborhoods west of City Park and south of Poyntz Avenue, which resulted in noticeable reinvestment and improvement to those areas. He voiced support for down-zoning the neighborhood east of City Park as proposed in the plan. Borst voiced concern for three potentially historic homes in the 800 block north and south of Bluemont Avenue and that the proposed expansion of the M-FRO District up-zoning west of Bluemont School could have negative effects. He supported further study of the Bluemont Corridor.

Kathy Dzewaltowski, 100 S. Delaware Avenue, voiced support for the down-zoning of the neighborhood east of City Park. She indicated she had lived in an area that was down-zoned from R-2 to R-1 and saw the positive benefits of helping to stabilize neighborhoods and protecting older houses and making them less desirable to convert to rentals. She said she was not against rentals, but that there is a difference between four people and eight people living in a house and the impacts on traffic and infrastructure load. She reiterated concern for the Bluemont corridor in which potentially three historic homes, one owner occupied, designed by Henry Winter, a local historic architect, who designed three other properties in Manhattan that are listed on the National Register. She asked the Board to think about the impact up-zoning could have in that area.

Josh Adrian, 3508 Churchill Street, said he lives far from the University and has neighbors that are college students and it was ridiculous that students live out in Blue Township. He discussed the importance of providing more housing close to the University and expanding the urban core area since many students are currently living far from campus and must commute. He said much of the Urban Core Area identified is either owned by the University or recently developed. He suggested expanding the Urban Core east and west of campus. He was in favor of studying and redeveloping the Bluemont Avenue corridor as it is used as a main street and has a lot of crummy houses that are not really historic.

Ball commented that the City is interested in expanding the Urban Core but is challenged with basic infrastructure needs to support higher density housing. He said they are sensitive to keeping students closer to campus.

Bryan Elsey, 2530 Heartland Drive, said he is a local real estate developer, and encouraged the Boards to increase the size of the Urban Core area. He suggested having developers perform studies of utilities to extend infrastructure to support higher density development. He supported the down-zoning east of City Park and suggested expanding the M-FRO four to five blocks to the east, north of Bluemont, would protect other properties along Bluemont and to the south. He also discussed the need for structured parking in Aggieville and proposed the city put out a request for proposals and seek a public-private partnership to finance the project. He said he had proposed some projects in the M-FRO and other areas with structured parking that were not approved.

Ball stated that the City Commission is currently reviewing options for structured parking in Aggieville. He also said the action plan identifies relooking at some regulations to make development easier.

Cattell added that in addition to the City Commission's consideration of alternatives for developing a parking garage in Aggieville, the Planning Board has submitted a Capital Improvements Program item for structured parking in Aggieville.

Jeff Adams, 909 Humboldt and Regional Planner of the Flint Hills Regional Council, thanked the Boards and City and Counties in investing time and money to plan for the future of the area. He thanked and recognized the caliber of staff and consultants for their work and the excellence of the Plan. Adams stated that the Plan is responsive to the area's needs and has excellent priority action items, including up-zoning and down-zoning, and relooking at codes. He stated the need for more affordable, workforce, and general housing in the Flint Hills region and Manhattan area, adding that Blue Township is the future of growth and housing in the area. He also added that performance metrics can aid in measuring the success of development and planning in the area by creating measures that can be generalized to other areas which are becoming necessary to obtain certain funding sources. He said it's a great plan and he looks forward to working with the areas partners and to keep up the collaborative effort.

Anderson asked Adams about strategies to create affordable housing in the area without mandating rental prices.

Adams indicated that some jurisdictions had tried inclusionary zoning, which has been successful to varying degrees and can be contentious and legally challenged in others. He suggested trying different techniques such as land trusts and TDR's (transfer of development rights), and developing public-private partnerships to create more affordable housing.

Anderson closed the public hearing and asked for comments from the Boards.

Ball indicated he served on the Project Advisory Committee for the project and voiced support for down-zoning in particular areas to stabilize neighborhoods and also for up-zoning in neighborhoods around the University to allow for the needed student housing. He said keeping a balance between the up-zoning and down-zoning of districts is key to the success of the plan and the Plan did a good job of that. He commented that on page 150 of the Action Plan it talked about considering reinstating the Rental Inspection Program to maintain and enhance the quality of life in neighborhoods. He said the City Commission will determine what it wants to do regarding that issue. Ball elaborated that there is little community support to reinstate the former program, but there is support to develop some type of rental inspection program. He said that restating that action item to "some type of rental inspection program" is the only change to the Plan that he suggests, or it could be left as is, and the City Commission will do what it desires. He said it is a great plan that will guide the strategic direction of the community into the future.

Morse said she is pleased with the Plan and that it is very good quality. There were several in the community that have some reservations and she wants to make sure we

figure out how to balance that. She was pleased to see the reference to the new Community Needs Assessment and it is good to have these types of evaluations and benchmarks for future reference.

Clement said the Plan was excellent work and he was very impressed and had no issues with anything in it.

Hoobler indicated she was also a participant in the process as a PAC member and that it was a good planning process that included electronic voting to help quickly get answers to issues and that it included many opportunities for the public to get involved. She likes the Comprehensive Plan and how the Plan mirrors Riley County's Vision 2025 document to preserve the rural areas of the county and direct redevelopment and revitalization in the urban core of the city to prevent sprawl and keep the city from dying from within.

Stith said the Plan was a very good document and he was excited about it. It reflects a balanced approach to the needs and desires of the community and that Manhattan is at a tipping point of growing from a small town into a larger community. There are a lot of opportunities that the community needs to be prepared to take advantage of and this document will help do that. Stith said the most important chapter is the Action Plan in Chapter 12, which is critical to implementation and makes the Plan of value to the community. It identifies a lot of work for the staffs and the Planning Boards to implement the Plan. He said the City has indentified a CIP project to look at reviewing and updating the Zoning and Subdivision Regulations. He said the proposed new Urban Core Residential district will be very important, but it will be a challenge to address parking needs when students will still want to have their cars when living next to campus. That issue will need to be addressed to achieve the proposed densities. He said transit will be helpful but changing the community's way of thinking from the automobile to transit will be a long range effort and goal. The details of writing the Urban Core district will be tricky and he hopes it is done well so that it works economically and is an addition to the community that we can be proud of. He thanked the consultants and staff for doing a great job on the project and for the level of community involvement in the process which makes the Plan more effective and valuable by reflecting the community's needs and desires. He said he was pleased to have been involved and that the Plan will serve the community well into the future.

Anderson said he agreed with the previous positive sentiments about the whole process and that the Plan is a planning document framing how we grow in the future. In reference to Ball's comments about rental inspection, Anderson said that on page 91 the Plan phrases the issue in a different way, through active enforcement of public health, property maintenance codes, and safety violations. He said maybe it's not going back to the previous rental inspection program, but finding a way to achieve broad support from the community in a positive way, because it's good for the City, renters, owners, the tax base and the viability of neighborhoods. He said it's something that was also brought up in the Community Needs Assessment for safe, quality housing. He said safe housing and addressing transportation needs is what jumped out for him in both the Comprehensive Plan and the Community Needs Assessment.

Morse discussed the success of Manhattan's downtown area through deliberate planning over a long period of time and private investment.

Anderson reiterated the importance of downtowns for communities.

Anderson invited the Riley County Planning Board to proceed with its formal action.

Clement said the Riley County Planning Board has a proposed resolution that Staff is recommending for adoption. He asked if there was any discussion or a motion.

Hoobler moved that the Riley County Planning Board approve Resolution No. 030215-A, a resolution updating, amending, and superseding the current Comprehensive Plan for the development or redevelopment of the Manhattan Urban Area, by the adoption, by reference, of that certain document known as the Manhattan Urban Area Comprehensive Plan, dated March 2015, and amending Vision 2025, a comprehensive plan for Riley County, Kansas, by incorporating the Manhattan Urban Area Comprehensive Plan dated March 2015; and forward a recommendation of approval of the same to the Riley County Board of Commissioners.

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

Anderson asked for discussion or a motion from the Manhattan Urban Area Planning Board.

Ball moved that the Manhattan Urban Area Planning Board approve and adopt Resolution No. 030215-A, updating, amending and superseding the current comprehensive plan for the development or redevelopment of the Manhattan Urban Area and the City of Manhattan, Kansas by the adoption, by reference, of that certain document known as the Manhattan Urban Area Comprehensive Plan, dated March 2015; with the List of Known Corrections being made and with any additional typographical corrections; and, forward a recommendation of approval of the same to the City Commission and the Riley County Board of Commissioners.

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

There being no further business Anderson closed the joint meeting and said there would be a five minute break before the next meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Everett Haynes, Planning Intern
Eric Cattell, AICP, Assistant Director for Planning

MANHATTAN URBAN AREA PLANNING BOARD
City Commission Room, City Hall
1101 Poyntz Avenue
Monday, March 2, 2015
8:20 PM

OPEN PUBLIC COMMENTS

No one spoke.

CONSENT AGENDA

APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 19, 2015, MANHATTAN URBAN AREA PLANNING BOARD MEETING.

APPROVE THE FINAL PLAT OF GRAND ESTATES ADDITION, GENERALLY LOCATED APPROXIMATELY 200 FEET TO THE WEST OF THE INTERSECTION OF VANESTA DRIVE AND KAUFFMAN DRIVE. (APPLICANT: SMH CONSULTANTS – JEFF HANCOCK, OWNER: THIERER CONSTRUCTION – LARRY THIERER)

Stith moved that the Board approve the Consent Agenda. Ball seconded the motion which passed on a vote of 7-0.

GENERAL AGENDA

REPORTS AND COMMENTS BY BOARD MEMBERS

There were no reports or comments.

Respectfully submitted,

Everett Haynes, Planning Intern