

MINUTES
MANHATTAN URBAN AREA PLANNING BOARD
City Commission Room, City Hall
1101 Poyntz Avenue
January 21, 2016
7:00 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT: John Ball, Chairperson; Ron Hageman, Vice-Chairperson; Phil Anderson; Gary Stith; and Debbie Nuss.

MEMBERS ABSENT: Neil Parikh; Jerry Reynard

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

OPEN PUBLIC COMMENTS

No one spoke.

CONSENT AGENDA

APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 4, 2016, MANHATTAN URBAN AREA PLANNING BOARD MEETING.

Stith moved that the Board approve the minutes of the January 4, 2016, Planning Board meeting. Anderson seconded the motion, which passed on a vote of 5-0.

GENERAL AGENDA

REMOVE FROM THE TABLE AND CONDUCT A PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER AMENDING THE MANHATTAN ZONING REGULATIONS, ARTICLE VI, SIGN REGULATIONS, TO DEFINE AND ALLOW TRI-VISION BILLBOARDS AS A PERMITTED TYPE OF OFF-PREMISE SIGN. (APPLICANT/OWNERS: THOMAS OUTDOOR ADVERTISING INC. – BART THOMAS)

REMOVE FROM THE TABLE AND CONDUCT A PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER AMENDING ORDINANCE NOS. 6730, 6915 AND 7008 OF THE PENNY'S CONCRETE INDUSTRIAL PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT TO ACCOMMODATE AN EXISTING "TRI-VISION" OFF-PREMISE ADVERTISING (BILLBOARD) SIGN ON LOT 3, PENNY'S ADDITION, UNIT TWO (APPLICANT/OWNER: THOMAS OUTDOOR ADVERTISING INC. – BART THOMAS)

Stith moved that the Board remove the items from the table. Anderson seconded the motion, which passed on a vote of 5-0.

Bunger presented the Staff Reports with the recommendation of approval for both items and four conditions of approval on the PUD amendment. He explained that in addition to the sign having rotating panels, the size of the existing sign was also too big and was apparently due to a misunderstanding about inclusion of the border around the display in the surface area calculation.

Nuss asked if tri-vision signs had been discussed during the recently updated sign ordinance.

Bunger said the focus had been placed on digital signs, but not for off-site advertising. Tri-vision signs had not been discussed.

Stith asked why the proposal was for tri-vision signs to be a conditional use.

Bunger said staff wanted to be sure the community had a chance to review the context in which a proposed tri-vision sign is located.

Stith asked if the separation distance between billboard signs would also apply to tri-vision signs and if the signs can be illuminated.

Bunger explained that all the provisions for off-site advertising signs, including the separation between signs will apply to tri-vision billboards and that they can be externally illuminated.

Ball opened the public hearing.

Jim Bowers, White - Goss, attorney representing Thomas Sign, said they received and agree with the Staff Reports on both items and accept all the conditions identified in both Staff Reports. He explained that the issue regarding the sign's size was due to a misunderstanding of how sign size is measured.

Ball closed the public hearing with no one else speaking.

Stith made a motion that the Manhattan Urban Area Planning Board recommends approval of the proposed amendment to allow for "Tri-Vision" Off-site Advertising, based on the findings in the Staff Memorandum.

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

Stith made a motion that the Manhattan Urban Area Planning Board recommends approval of the proposed amendment of Ordinance Nos. 6730, 6915 and 7008 and the Final Development Plan of the Penny's Concrete Industrial PUD to accommodate the existing "Tri-Vision" off-site advertising sign, subject to the four (4) conditions of approval listed in the Staff Report, as follows:

1. The amendment of the Manhattan Zoning Regulations, Article VI, Sign Regulations shall be approved to define "Tri-Vision" Billboards as a type of Off-Site Advertising Sign along with the Use Limitations and other provisions

- identified in the Staff Report on the concurrent Sign Regulation amendment of Article VI of the Zoning Regulations.
2. A Sign Permit Application and applicable fee shall be submitted by the applicant to the City, which accurately reflects the Tri-Vision Sign's dimensions and display type that was constructed at Penney Concrete PUD.
 3. The Tri-Vision Sign located at Penny Concrete PUD shall be operated in compliance with all applicable provisions of the Manhattan Zoning Regulations, as amended.
 4. The existing Tri-Vision Sign located at Penny Concrete PUD, may be no greater than 297 square feet per face including any border trim.

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

REMOVE FROM THE TABLE AND CONDUCT A PUBLIC HEARING TO AMEND ORDINANCE NOS. 6607, 7062 AND 7139 AND THE APPROVED PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN OF LOT 2, HERITAGE SQUARE SOUTH COMMERCIAL PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT, UNIT FOUR, TO ALLOW FOR A PROPOSED FAMILY ENTERTAINMENT CENTER. (APPLICANT: STACEY NIEDFELDT OWNERS: TIM SCHULTZ)

Stith moved that the Board remove the item from the table. Anderson seconded the motion, which passed on a vote of 5-0.

Bunger presented the Staff Report with a recommendation of approval.

Stith commented that the level of landscaping seemed minimal and asked if the number of trees was consistent with the number of trees required in other zoning districts.

Bunger said it was, and that the applicant chose to place the trees closer to the building as opposed to placing them in the parking lot islands.

Ball opened the public hearing.

Joe Stock, Timber and Stone Architects representing the owners, came forward to answer any questions.

Ball asked Stock if this was the first family entertainment center.

Stock said that it is the first and is not a chain, but is run by a local family.

Stith asked if the center would have food service.

Stock said that it will have a full commercial kitchen with a dining area with movable tables and chairs.

Stacey Niedfeldt, 4668 Meadow Lane, Wamego and a joint owner of the proposed center indicated it will be a locally owned and family run business with several relatives being involved.

Ball closed the public hearing.

Stith made a motion that the Manhattan Urban Area Planning Board recommends approval of the proposed amendment of Ordinance Nos. 6607, 7062, and 7139, and the approved Preliminary Development Plan for Lot 2, Heritage Square South Unit Four, Commercial Planned Unit Development, to be known as the Final Development Plan of Family Entertainment Center, Lot 2, Heritage Square South, Unit Four, Commercial Planned Unit Development, based on the findings in the Staff Report.

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

Ball said he likes to see local investment in the locally operated businesses.

CONSIDER ANNEXATION OF THE PROPOSED THE HARTFORD SUBDIVISION, AN APPROXIMATE 25.7 ACRE TRACT OF LAND GENERALLY LOCATED 1,300 FEET NORTH OF THE INTERSECTION OF COLBERT HILLS DRIVE AND GRAND MERE PARKWAY, ON THE WEST SIDE OF THE FUTURE EXTENSION OF GRAND MERE PARKWAY. (APPLICANT: SMH CONSULTANTS, ASHLEY JADERBORG, OWNER: BURTON LAND COMPANY, ZAC BURTON)

A PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER REZONING AN APPROXIMATELY 25.7 ACRE TRACT OF LAND IN THE PROPOSED THE HARTFORD SUBDIVISION FROM RILEY COUNTY AG, GENERAL AGRICULTURE DISTRICT, TO R-1, SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT AND R-3, MULTIPLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT. THE SITE IS GENERALLY LOCATED 1,300 FEET NORTH OF THE INTERSECTION OF COLBERT HILLS DRIVE AND GRAND MERE PARKWAY, ON THE WEST SIDE OF THE FUTURE EXTENSION OF GRAND MERE PARKWAY. (APPLICANT: SMH CONSULTANTS, ASHLEY JADERBORG, OWNER: BURTON LAND COMPANY, ZAC BURTON)

A PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER THE PRELIMINARY PLAT OF THE PROPOSED THE HARTFORD, AN APPROXIMATE 25.7 ACRE TRACT OF LAND GENERALLY LOCATED 1,300 FEET NORTH OF THE INTERSECTION OF COLBERT HILLS DRIVE AND GRAND MERE PARKWAY, ON THE WEST SIDE OF THE FUTURE EXTENSION OF GRAND MERE PARKWAY. THE SUBDIVISION CONSISTS OF 14 SINGLE-FAMILY LOTS AND 7 MULTIPLE-FAMILY LOTS AND 1 TRACT. (APPLICANT: SMH CONSULTANTS, ASHLEY JADERBORG, OWNER: BURTON LAND COMPANY, ZAC BURTON)

Bunger presented the Staff Reports, recommending approval of the three items.

Stith asked if Lot 10 on the Preliminary Plat had access to Grand Mere Parkway and if a restriction on access to the lot to prevent that would be necessary.

Bunger said that it was not to have direct access to Grand Mere Parkway and that the restriction will be added.

Stith asked about the triangular tract near Lot 10 and if it has access to Grand Mere Parkway.

Bunger said it belonged to a lot in the neighboring subdivision and does not have direct access.

Hageman asked where the western street between the multi-family lots would lead.

Bunger said the applicant or consultant could answer that as it is dependent on future development phases.

Ball suggested acting on the annexation, before opening the public hearings on the rezoning and Preliminary Plat.

Stith made a motion that the Manhattan Urban Area Planning Board recommends approval of the annexation of The Hartford, a 25.7 acre tract of land generally located in the southeast corner of the Hartford Hill Master Plan area, based on conformance with the Future Land Use Map of the Comprehensive Plan for the Manhattan Urban Area and the City of Manhattan, Kansas, the Growth Vision, and the Capital Improvements Program (CIP).

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

Ball opened the public hearing for the rezoning item.

No one spoke.

Ball closed the public hearing.

Stith made a motion that the Manhattan Urban Area Planning Board recommends approval of the proposed rezoning of The Hartford, generally located in the southeast corner of the Hartford Hill Master Plan area, from Riley County AG, General Agriculture, to R-1, Single-Family Residential District and R-3, Multiple-Family Residential District, based on the findings in the Staff Report.

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

Ball opened the public hearing for the Preliminary Plat.

Jeff Hancock, SMH Consultants, addressed Hageman's question about the road leading to the west, saying that the road will be extended with future development of the area, to most likely create two loop roads.

Stith asked if there were any easements for the provisions of bike trails.

Hancock said there was a pedestrian easement which connects to adjacent subdivision to the northeast. While there are currently no easements for bike trails, there will be bike lanes that will be built on the ring road.

Anderson asked about the Hartford Hill Master Plan's provision for a school.

Zac Burton, Field House Development - applicant, said that at this time there were no definite plans for a school and that decision is up to the Riley County School District. He said the District has hired a demographer to assist them in planning for future needs.

Anderson asked if most students would come from this neighborhood and is the school to make it more attractive.

Burton indicated that all of Hartford Hill is in the Riley County School District as well as much of the western portions of Grand Mere and that there are several busses serving the area.

Anderson asked how long it would take to develop Hartford Hill.

Burton indicated that will be dependent upon the market conditions and that the development will be done in phases. He indicated that half of this first phase is already sold.

Hageman asked if the buyers were builders or home owners and expressed concern about not overbuilding.

Burton indicated lots have been sold to both. He talked about the level of growth and development in the whole Grand Mere area and that when Old Chicago moved to its new location in Grand Mere Village; it has seen a tripling in sales.

Stith asked about trail development in the area.

Burton said it will take several years for the area to be developed, when completed the ring road surrounding the subdivision will have bike lanes along it and there are provisions for a 48 acre open space bike park in the western portion of the development that will include rougher single-track, natural area bike trails. He indicated he has been in discussions with the Parks and Recreation Advisory Board and Parks staff, and that there is also provision for a smaller neighborhood park with a playground.

Ball closed the public hearing.

Stith made a motion that the Manhattan Urban Area Planning Board approves the Preliminary Plat of The Hartford, based on conformance with Manhattan Urban Area Subdivision Regulations with the three (3) conditions of approval, as follows:

1. Street names shall be approved by the Riley County Emergency Management Department and Manhattan Fire Department at the time of application for the Final Plat.

2. An analysis for best management practices requirements for stormwater runoff quality shall be completed with the application of the Final Plat.
3. Sidewalks shall be provided on both sides of Hartford Drive and 17 Mile Drive and on one (1) side of the cul-de-sacs.

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

AUTHORIZE CITY ADMINISTRATION TO INITIATE THE REZONING PROCESS, PURSUANT TO SECTION 15-102 OF THE ZONING REGULATIONS, FOR IMPLEMENTING THE R-3/M-FRO, MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT WITH MULTI-FAMILY REDEVELOPMENT OVERLAY EXPANSION AREA, GENERALLY LOCATED EAST OF THE EXISTING R-3/M-FRO DISTRICT AS IDENTIFIED IN THE STAFF MEMORANDUM, PURSUANT TO AND IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE MANHATTAN URBAN AREA COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, DATED MARCH 2015, ORDINANCE NO. 7131, AS AUTHORIZED BY KANSAS STATUTE 2014 SUPP. 12-757, ET. SEQ. THE AREA CONSISTS OF FIFTY-SEVEN (57) PARCELS GENERALLY ALONG PORTIONS OF THE 900 AND 1000 BLOCKS OF THURSTON STREET; 800 BLOCKS OF VATTIER STREET, BLUEMONT AVENUE, AND MORO STREET; AND THE 900 BLOCK OF LARAMIE STREET.

Evans presented the Staff Memorandum, explain that the proposed rezonings to expand the R-3/M-FRO, Multi-Family Residential District with Multi-Family Redevelopment Overlay, was based on the area identified in the recently updated and adopted Manhattan Urban Area Comprehensive Plan, and that the action was part of the implementation process.

Anderson asked if the rezoning was being driven by something in town, when it seems that there are a number of available rental properties. He said he wanted to see a plan that would integrate the existing single family homes more cohesively with the multi-family development. He questioned the need to move this quickly on the up-zoning. He agreed with the M-FRO design standards and was in agreement with multi-family development but suggested the process hasn't been completed to better integrate and rehabilitate the existing single-family structures. He suggested developing a strategy to integrate them better. He asked if there are infrastructure capacity issues, citing the poor alley conditions, especially with a potential increase in development and suggested an infrastructure study. He also suggested implementing more proactive code enforcement to facilitate maintenance of the existing older housing stock. He said properties need to renovate or sell to someone who will maintain them. He said there are three historic houses in the area.

Evans indicated the Board had considered two rezonings at its previous meeting which indicates there is a market for the development.

Ball said the two and a-half year Comprehensive Plan update process included evaluating where there is infrastructure capacity for higher density development. He said there are already individuals working on development in the area. He said it is important to follow

the recommendations in the Comprehensive Plan and to support the Plan. He said there is still a public hearing process involved with the rezonings.

Stith commented that the Comprehensive Plan process identified this area as a transition area for increased density closer to campus and that it takes the development pressure off other older neighborhood areas to help preserve and protect them. While this is an up-zone area, there are other areas that have been down-zoned such as east of City Park, trying to balance future growth within the urban core. He said that infill development utilizes existing infrastructure and that the infill will only address about a tenth of the anticipated demand for housing. He said the market will determine how fast the area redevelops and that the Planning Board can help create opportunities. He recommended the Board needs to move forward with this implementation of the Comprehensive Plan.

Anderson said he is not opposed to apartments, but said there needs to be a strategy for promoting reinvestment in single-family structures.

Stith made a motion that the Manhattan Urban Area Planning Board authorize initiation of the rezoning process, pursuant to Section 15-102 of the Manhattan Zoning Regulations, for implementing the R-3/M-FRO, Multi-Family Residential District with Multi-Family Redevelopment Overlay generally located east of the existing R-3/M-FRO as identified in the Staff Memorandum, pursuant to and in compliance with the Manhattan Urban Area Comprehensive Plan, dated March 2015, Ordinance No. 7131, as authorized by Kansas Statute; and,

Direct City Administration to:

- a) Finalize applications based upon this action of the Manhattan Urban Area Planning Board, and showing the MUAPB as the applicant;
- b) Establish dates at which the public hearings can be conducted upon such applications; and,
- c) Provide the appropriate notice of such public hearings as required by law.

Nuss seconded the motion.

Nuss said she appreciates what Anderson is saying but also listened to what Stith said. This was a community compromise and tradeoffs were made on what areas were identified for redevelopment. She said the rezoning involves a public hearing process during which all comments and concerns will be listened to and considered.

Ball called for the vote on the motion, which passes on a vote of 4-1, with Anderson voting in opposition.

DISCUSSION OF DRAFT M-FRO, MULTI-FAMILY REDEVELOPMENT OVERLAY DISTRICT TEXT AMENDMENTS

Evans presented the proposed text amendments including a reduction in vehicular parking and modification of definitions in the design standards to add minimum dimensions on certain architectural features. He said the parking reductions were based on the parking study the City had conducted last year in the M-FRO areas which showed

as much as 35% vacant stalls in parking lots associated with newer apartment buildings during early morning hours before classes start at KSU.

Stith agreed that there is too much parking which adds to cost and other issues. He said that a reduction in parking for vehicles needs to be balanced with bike parking and asked if there was a requirement for bicycle parking in the proposed amendments.

Cattell said there is a proposed definition for bicycle parking and a requirement for residential buildings containing three or more dwelling units, of one bicycle parking space for every two bedrooms.

Stith asked for clarification on the revised definition for a balcony and staff explained that the 2 foot dimension could be a projection of indentation.

Stith questioned the ability to construct 43 units per acre.

Cattell clarified that the underlying R-3 District requires no more than 1 dwelling unit per 1,000 square feet of lot area, which may be more feasible with the reduced parking requirement proposed in the text amendments, although there are some existing apartment buildings in the area that are that dense. Evans and Cattell said the density is not the main goal of the M-FRO District, but the intention is to ensure residential units transition into the existing neighborhoods and incorporate certain characteristics found in the area.

Anderson agreed that the picture shown is more of a fake balcony and agreed with the proposed amendments and reduction in parking is a good move.

Ball said it is important to allow for architectural diversity.

Stith said not to loosen the architectural standards in the overlay district.

REPORTS AND COMMENTS BY BOARD MEMBERS

Anderson asked that the resolution he proposed to be considered by the Board at its next meeting, be moved to March as he will be gone for the February meetings.

Cattell said next week the City Commission's work session would discuss storm water infrastructure issues in the older areas of the City.

Ball adjourned the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Amelia Lewis, Planning Intern