

MINUTES
MANHATTAN URBAN AREA PLANNING BOARD
City Commission Room, City Hall
1101 Poyntz Avenue
March 23, 2015
7:00 p.m.

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

MEMBERS ABSENT: 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 MARCH 2, 2015, MANHATTAN URBAN AREA PLANNING BOARD MEETING.

APPROVE THE FINAL PLAT OF THE WESTPORT COMMONS, UNIT FOUR, GENERALLY LOCATED SOUTHEAST OF THE INTERSECTION OF DICKENS AVENUE AND BROWNING AVENUE (APPLICANT/OWNER: WESTPORT COMMONS DEVELOPMENT, LLC —TIM SCHULTZ).

Stith moved that the Board approve the Consent Agenda. Ball seconded the motion, which passed on a vote of 5-0.

GENERAL AGENDA

TABLE THE PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER AN AMEND THE TRAILS AT MANHATTAN, RESIDENTIAL PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT (PUD) AND ORDINANCE NO. 7094, TO ALLOW A REDESIGN OF THE PROPOSED MULTIPLE-FAMILY APARTMENT COMPLEX (APPLICANT: BLEW & ASSOCIATES, P.A. ON BEHALF OF THE OWNERS, THE LINKS AT MANHATTAN).

Ball moved that the Board table the Public Hearing to the April 6, 2015 Manhattan Urban Area Planning Board meeting. Stith seconded the motion, which passed on a vote of 5-0.

A PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER THE REZONING OF THE PROPOSED PRELIMINARY DEVELOP PLAN FOR THE COURTYARDS AT LMH, AN APPROXIMATELY 8.7 ACRE TRACT OF LAND, GENERALLY LOCATED TO THE SOUTHWEST OF THE INTERSECTION OF MILLER PARKWAY AND LOMA RIDGE DRIVE, OR 150 NORTHWEST OF THE INTERSECTION OF LOCHENSIRE DRIVE AND MILLER PARKWAY FROM R-3/AO, MULTIPLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT AND AIRPORT OVERLAY DISTRICT TO PUD/AO, RESIDENTIAL PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT AND AIRPORT OVERLAY DISTRICT. (APPLICANT/OWNER: PERFECTION SIGNATURE PROPERTIES, LLC – SCOTT LEHNE.)

Bunger gave the staff report and indicated that City Administration recommended approval of the request, based on the findings in the Staff Report, with the seven (7) conditions of approval listed in the Staff Report.

Morse asked if the proposed homes would be single storey.

Jason Gish, ALSA with MKEC Engineering, Inc. representing the applicant, explained the development layout indicating some homes would have two levels, either upper level suites or walkout basements. He said the proposed single-family “courtyard” home style rotates the structure ninety degrees so that the narrow end faces the street and each home has a blank sidewall that helps to define a private courtyard for the adjoining property. Each home has a private courtyard that the kitchen, living room, dining room, and bedroom look out on, to provide a unique feature. Each home exterior is slightly different, but they will all follow an overall “European Country style” including stone masonry. He said the owners would be part of a Home Owner’s Association which would be responsible for the exterior maintenance of the homes, the front yards and the landscape buffer area along Miller Parkway, as well as the development’s entrance.

Gish explained that Perfection Builders, the developer, is a franchisee for EPCON Communities to develop detached single-family patio home communities, with courtyards to the side or back of the home. He said they had done several courtyard communities in the Wichita area that have been very popular for retirees, as well as with younger buyers. Those developments were in areas with existing single-family neighborhoods with similar sized homes on larger lots.

Morse asked for clarification on the location of the city park land to the west of the site.

Stith asked if there were plans for developing the park. Bunger indicated the Parks Department envisioned it as more of a natural park area with trails.

Anderson asked if the park was to stop sprawl from extending to the west. Bunger indicated the park site was a combination of donated land from Schultz Development and the City was purchasing the rest. It consisted partially of lower ravine areas, as well as high ground in the airport’s airspace.

Morse asked what the front yard setback of the homes would be and if there would be

room for two cars back-to-back on the driveway.

Bunger indicated the front setback would be the normal 25 feet and it would provide room for two cars stacked on the driveway.

Morse indicated a resident in the area had expressed concern about a previous townhome development that had gone bankrupt, but that this proposal was not for townhomes. Morse continued that the Board had received an email from Rod Harms, 101 Waterbridge Road, who was a long-time resident in the area, who expressed support for the proposed rezoning and she read the email for the public.

Bunger indicated that zoning in and of itself can't prevent bankruptcy, but that a PUD can provide a higher level of protection for installation of proposed landscaping and for maintenance. He continued, saying that other than the reduced side yard setback for the homes to create the private courtyard areas, there were no other changes from a normal development.

Gish indicated that the 5 foot side-yard setback was measured from the exterior wall of the home to the property line.

Ball indicated to the public that although staff was having technical difficulties with presentation graphics in the Commission Room, the Planning Board had received the full application documents, site plans and building elevations as part of the meeting packet to review in preparation for the meeting.

Reynard asked if the homes would have fire sprinklers.

Gish said they were not required by the fire code and the homes met all the City's building and fire code requirements.

Reynard asked if the backyards faced along Miller Parkway.

Gish confirmed that they did and that the Home Owner's Association would be responsible for maintaining the extensive landscape screening that was proposed along Miller Parkway, as well as all exterior maintenance of the homes.

Stith said he liked the design of the development because it provides a more efficient use of land and provides a little higher density for the single-family homes. He asked if the developments they had done in Wichita had also used PUD zoning, or did they utilize some other method.

Gish indicated several had been PUD's and one had used a cluster development zoning district.

Ball asked about the price range of the homes.

Gish said they would range from around \$250,000 to \$500,000.

Ball said affordability of housing is an issue in the community and providing a higher density could help bring costs down.

Anderson asked for clarification that the Home Owner's Association maintains the exterior of the homes.

Gish explained that each home is purchased in its entirety including the exterior envelope and they are not condominiums. However, to make it a maintenance-free development, the Home Owner's Association maintains the exteriors and there are covenants with restrictions on what an owner can do to the exterior of the house.

Anderson opened the public hearing.

Jerry Coleman, 4725 Lichen Circle, said he thought the EPCON concept was good and that he had attended two neighborhood meetings on the proposal. However, he expressed concern that it would alter the character of the neighborhood compared to the existing homes in the area. He said the EPCON developments in the Wichita area are more stand-alone communities. He was also concerned about the development's impact on existing property values, saying that the base price of the proposed homes was \$190,000 which is lower than prices in the neighborhood. He asked if Perfection Builders would share their market study and questioned who would be purchasing these homes. He said only about seven percent of the population are seniors in Manhattan. He expressed concern that if the development doesn't sell and they have to change the design what will happen. If a PUD is abandoned then it reverts back to the existing R-3, Multi-Family zoning on the site.

Cattell clarified that zoning of an abandoned PUD does not automatically revert back and that the Planning Board and City Commission would have to take positive action to change the zoning back to the previous designation.

Ball asked if Coleman would prefer townhomes.

Coleman said that single-family homes can also go in the existing R-3 District. He suggested the applicant needs to prove the viability of the proposed product and the proposed location for creating a separate community from the rest of the neighborhood.

Ball suggested that the applicant wouldn't be investing in a product that didn't have long term viability.

Coleman asked if the neighborhood would be impacted by the special assessments on the site.

Bunger explained that with the Final Plat for the PUD, the applicant will need to work out an agreement with the City on how to reapportion the specials on the existing 16 lots, to the proposed new lots on the PUD site and that it would not impact surrounding owners.

John Casiano, 712 Leyden Ridge Circle, a 12-year resident of the area, said he didn't question the viability of the proposed development. His concern was that is not like the existing neighborhood and that "like communities" mean something. The developer was proposing a community within a community. He questioned who the developer wants to attract to the area to buy the homes and what is the bottom line. He said he had invested and gained equity in his home and questioned if he will get out of it what he has invested. He wanted proof that property values will go up. He said \$250,000 is not affordable housing. He concluded by saying his concern was with isolating a smaller community in the larger neighborhood and that it needs to maintain equity in the properties in the area.

Tim Schultz, Schultz Development, said he was the primary developer of the Lee Mill Heights area and they had specifically set this PUD site aside for this type of development. He said the proposed development was similar to other unified developments around the community that consisted of homes on smaller lots with clubhouses, or townhome developments, such as his Stone Valley project. He said that project was very successful and he was almost out of lots. He said a mixture of housing types is what the City needs to promote. He said the main demographic for this type of project is the empty-nester and that he and his father had envisioned this type of development for the site.

Anderson asked if there was a \$190,000 home in and area with higher valued housing, what is the impact.

Schultz indicated that his developments have a range of prices consisting of slab homes mixed in with homes with basements and this is the type of diversity and choice that buyers are wanting. He said the proposed development will work fine in that location and that he supports the PUD proposal and applauds the applicant for its design.

Morse asked Mr. Coleman if he was representing or speaking on behalf of his neighborhood.

Coleman said he lives within 200 feet to the west of the PUD site and was representing himself.

Anderson closed the public hearing.

Stith indicated that the newly adopted Comprehensive Plan identifies the need to promote housing choices and options around the community, such as seen in Grand Mere where there is a range of single family, townhomes and apartments. He said if it's high quality, it works well. Housing doesn't have to all be exactly like all the other homes in an area. He pointed out that the only difference with the proposed homes in the PUD is that they have a smaller side-yard setback. He said property values in Grand Mere are strong with the mixture of choices and that values in the proposed area will be maintained. The Chamber of Commerce is attracting retirees to the City and NBAF will attract young professional who will also desire the proposed type of housing. He suggested the proposed PUD will be a strong addition to the neighborhood and that people have

different housing needs at different points in life.

Morse indicated she was glad to see the development has two points of access for residents and emergency services and is not a dead-end cul-de-sac. She said the new Comprehensive Plan promotes a mixture of housing options and maintenance of housing values. She thought the PUD was a good proposal for the site which she could support. She appreciated Mr. Schultz's comments about similar developments around town and Stone Valley which had all been very successful.

Ball said that one definition of affordable housing is what someone can afford to buy. The point is that the City needs a range of housing choices and a lower overall cost of housing, not a lowering of property values. He said the site in question has always been zoned separately from the surrounding neighborhood and that single-family homes next to multi-family can still maintain their value. The developer has a good track record in Kansas and they wouldn't invest in something that won't work. The proposal conforms to the Comprehensive Plan, will enhance property values and he can support the project. He said he appreciated the public comments.

Anderson indicated the new park land to the west of the site will help define the edge of the City. He cited a development along the west edge of Lawrence along the interstate that consisted of houses that all look the same. He said diversity in housing choices and neighborhoods is good for Manhattan. He also thanked the public for their comments and input.

Stith moved that the Manhattan Urban Area Planning Board recommend approval of the proposed rezoning of The Courtyards at LMH Residential Planned Unit Development from R-3/AO, Multiple-Family Residential District and Airport Overlay District, to PUD/AO, Residential Planned Unit Development and Airport Overlay District, based on the findings in the Staff Report, with the seven (7) conditions recommended by City Administration.

The motion was seconded by Reynard and passed on a vote of 5-0.

REPORTS AND COMMENTS BY BOARD MEMBERS

Cattell updated the Board on the Comprehensive Plan adoption process and that the three planning boards and the two county commissions had all approved it unanimously. The City Commission will consider adoption the next night.

Bunger updated the Board on a HUD grant that the City was involved in applying for with the State of Kansas for floodplain mitigation activities. He said there is a public comment period on the draft application and the public can find the draft on the City's website at www.KnowYourFloodRisk.com.

Stith indicated there was a public open-house meeting on the North Campus Corridor Plan that Kansas State University is developing that will be held at 5:30 pm in the City

*March 23, 2015, Manhattan Urban Area Planning Board
Page 7*

Commission Room, on Wednesday, March 25th.

There being no further business, Anderson closed the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Eric Cattell, AICP, Assistant Director for Planning