

MINUTES
MANHATTAN URBAN AREA PLANNING BOARD
City Commission Room, City Hall
1101 Poyntz Avenue
Thursday, February 18, 2016
7:00 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT: John Ball, Chairperson; Ron Hageman, Vice-Chairperson; Gary Stith; Neil Parikh; Jerry Reynard.

MEMBERS ABSENT: Phil Anderson; Debbie Nuss.

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

OPEN PUBLIC COMMENTS

No one spoke.

CONSENT AGENDA

APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 1, 2016, MANHATTAN URBAN AREA PLANNING BOARD MEETING.

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

GENERAL AGENDA

A PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER REZONING OF MANKO IV ADDITION, GENERALLY LOCATED TO THE EAST OF HAYES DRIVE AND AT THE END OF SERVICE CIRCLE. (APPLICANT: MANKO WINDOWS, STEVE JONES AND GARY JONES OWNERS: MANKO WINDOWS, STEVE JONES AND GARY JONES AND ABBOTT ALUMINUM, CARL REED) THE REZONING CONSISTS OF 3 TRACTS:

- Tract 1 – I-2, Industrial Park District, to C-5, Highway Service Commercial District (approximately 5,000 square feet)**
- Tract 2 - C-5, Highway Service Commercial, to I-2, Industrial Park District (approximately 3,000 square feet)**
- Tract 3 - C-5, Highway Service Commercial, to I-2, Industrial Park District (approximately 20,000 square feet)**

CONSIDER APPROVAL OF THE FINAL PLAT OF MANKO IV ADDITION, GENERALLY LOCATED TO THE EAST OF HAYES DRIVE AND AT THE END OF SERVICE CIRCLE. (APPLICANT: MANKO WINDOWS, STEVE JONES AND GARY JONES OWNERS: MANKO WINDOWS, STEVE JONES AND GARY JONES AND ABBOTT ALUMINUM, CARL REED)

Bunger presented the Staff Reports on both items and recommended approval of the three rezonings and the Final Plat.

Ball opened the public hearing.

No one spoke.

Ball closed the public hearing.

Stith moved that the Manhattan Urban Area Planning Board recommend approval of the rezoning of the Manko IV Addition, as proposed, based on the findings in the Staff Report, as follows:

- Tract 1: from I-2, Industrial Park District, to C-5, Highway Service Commercial District
- Tracts 2 & 3: from C-5, Highway Service Commercial District, to I-2, Industrial Park District.

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

Stith moved that the Manhattan Urban Area Planning Board approve the Final Plat of Manko IV Addition, based on conformance with the Manhattan Urban Area Subdivision Regulations.

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

A PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER AMENDING ORDINANCE NO. 4581 OF THE GREENBRIAR RESIDENTIAL PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT TO ALLOW FOR MORE BEDROOMS THAN ORIGINALLY PERMITTED IN THE APPROVED PUD, WHICH IS GENERALLY LOCATED TO THE NORTHWEST OF THE INTERSECTION OF KIMBALL AVENUE AND COLLEGE AVENUE. THE PUD AMENDMENT IS IN THE FORM OF A FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN. (APPLICANT: WEARY DAVIS, OWNER: WOODWAY M, LLC)

Lewis presented the Staff Report, indicating that the 76 rooms called “studies” have already been used as bedrooms and no increase in the number of tenants or visitors is anticipated. There are 300 existing parking stalls as required in the original PUD, and the City has received no complaints nor experienced any spillover parking. City

Administration recommended approval based on the findings in the Staff Report, with the three conditions listed in the Staff Report.

Ball opened the public hearing.

No one spoke. Ball closed the public hearing.

Stith moved that the Manhattan Urban Area Planning Board recommend approval of the proposed amendment of Ordinance No. 4581 and the approved Final Development Plan of the Greenbiar Residential Planned Unit Development, based on the findings in the Staff Report, with following three (3) conditions of approval:

1. Modify Condition No. 5 to increase the number of bedrooms to 286, as requested by the applicant.
2. Modify Condition No. 6 to increase the total occupancy from 250 to 286 occupants.
3. Eliminate Condition No. 8, as the parking sticker system is unneeded.

Reynard seconded the motion.

Ball commented that he was a little uncomfortable waiving the parking requirement, though five (5) additional parking stalls is not a substantial amount considering the total number of spaces provided. The Board is generally sensitive to parking ratios.

Bunger said the City had considered it, but because the development has been consistently used with the increased number of bedrooms and tenants, with no additional spaces or impacts, and there being bike parking, the additional five stalls did not seem necessary.

Ball said he understood and agreed with staff's analysis and recommendation on parking.

On a vote, the motion passed 5-0.

A PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER REZONING APPROXIMATELY 9.96 ACRES OF LAND CONSISTING OF 57 PARCELS GENERALLY LOCATED: (AREA 1) ALONG THE SOUTH SIDE OF THE 900 BLOCK OF THURSTON; (AREA 2) ALONG BOTH SIDES OF THE 1000 BLOCK OF THURSTON STREET; AND (AREA 3) THE SOUTH SIDE OF THE 800 BLOCK OF VATTIER, BOTH SIDES OF THE 800 BLOCKS OF BLUEMONT AVENUE AND MORO STREET, AND THE NORTH SIDE OF THE 900 BLOCK OF LARAMIE STREET, AS FOLLOWS:

Area 1: From R-2/TNO Two-Family Residential District with the Traditional Neighborhood Overlay, to R-3/M-FRO, Multiple-Family Residential District with the Multiple-Family Redevelopment Overlay District;

Area 2: From R-1/TNO, Single-Family Residential with the Traditional Neighborhood Overlay, to R-3/M-FRO, Multiple-Family Residential District with the Multiple-Family Redevelopment Overlay District; and,

Area 3: From R-M/TNO, Four-Family Residential District with Traditional Neighborhood Overlay District, to R-3/M-FRO, Multiple-Family Residential District with the Multiple-Family Redevelopment Overlay District.

Evans presented the Staff Report and recommended approval, based on the findings in the Staff Report.

Reynard asked about the owner versus renter occupied housing around Bluemont School.

Evans explained maps showing owner versus renter occupied housing in the whole area, indicating that it is heavily renter occupied. He said the broader intent of the rezonings is to try and keep higher density housing for students closer to campus, while helping to preserve the lower density areas to the east.

Reynard commented that a couple months ago the City had down-zoned an area farther to the south, east of City Park to help protect that area for single family homes. He asked if the proposed M-FRO rezoning area should be expanded farther east to Juliette Avenue.

Evans said while there may be some demand, the intent of placing more multi-family units near campus is to keep the students closer to campus without spreading into existing single-family neighborhoods as much as possible.

Reynard asked about the rezonings on the west side of campus.

Evans reminded the Board about the two areas that were already up-zoned from lower density zones to the R-3, Multi-Family District to accommodate higher density housing along the west side of campus.

Reynard said that while development had not occurred there yet, the Board is just providing the opportunity.

Evans said it is a long term plan of identifying where the best places for higher density redevelopment should occur.

Stith commented that these types of rezonings need to be done incrementally, instead of rezoning large areas to Juliette Avenue or beyond, because then you would get a scattering of development and the market would have a harder time absorbing it. It is better to keep redevelopment more concentrated now and it can be looked at again in the future. He said to keep the bigger picture in mind of the need for 20,000 housing units by the year 2035 and only a few thousand can be accommodated by redevelopment in the core area of the city. It's just a portion of what is needed to meet the future housing needs

of the community. Increasing the density in the identified areas and on the west side of campus takes pressure off some of the single-family neighborhoods and off the area that was already down-zoned, to shift where the market should build this type of housing away from the lower density areas.

Evans mentioned there are still a number of lower density lots within the redevelopment area that present an opportunity for development. The Comprehensive Plan update also identifies the proposed Urban Core Residential District along N. Manhattan for even higher density development in the future.

Ball commented that in regard to up-zoning, infrastructure capacities were looked at as part of the Comprehensive Plan update process to identify areas where increased density can occur. This is all part of the balance, along with incremental rezonings.

Cattell clarified some data that had been mentioned earlier, saying the projected 20,000 person population increase would require around 11,000 additional housing units. The core areas will accommodate some of that development on the west and east sides of campus.

Ball commented that infill development in the core areas is much more cost effective than sprawl, and the city needs a good mix and balance between infill and new development at the edges of the community, as identified in the Comprehensive Plan.

Ball opened the public hearing.

Charles Fehrenbach, 815 N 8th Street, said he is one of the few homeowners in the rezoning area and voiced his concerns over the rezonings, saying he hoped the Board shared his sense of sadness over what has already happened in the area with removal of an example of a turreted, second empire home, while not in good condition, it was a textbook example of that style. He said there were other examples of good architecture and cautioning against the removal of Manhattan's architectural history in the neighborhood. While the rezoning might not cause immediate removal, it would have an impact over time. The increase in density would have negative effects on infrastructure and traffic flows. He mentioned that his house had experienced several sewer backups. He said 8th Street has recently been designated as a bicycle route but it is difficult to cross Bluemont Avenue at 8th Street due to traffic volumes. He commented that the City has been inconsistent on the parking standards along 8th Street, which makes it difficult with the location of Bluemont School. Traffic is a problem at the start of school, with overnight parking blocking parents trying to drop off children. It's supposed to be no-parking during school hours but is not enforced. He said the area is within walking distance of KSU, but that a lot of people drive. The redevelopment area has a mixture of high and low density structures and their spacing might make it challenging to redevelop. He didn't think the M-FRO Overlay and the density is really addressing housing needs of students, due to the lack of amenities such as a grocery store in the area. He said the area is good for families with children, some of whom do walk to school.

With no one else speaking, Ball closed the public hearing.

Parikh mentioned the email received from board member Phil Anderson, who was absent, which expressed concern over the rezonings.

Ball summarized the email for the public, which expressed concerns about moving too quickly on the rezoning and the effect on some existing residences and Bluemont School.

Stith addressed Fehrenbach's concern over maintaining some of the architectural history by saying the only real way to preserve those structures is by designating them as historic which has been done on the south side of the city, with the establishment of a historic district. He suggested a future action could be to identify more structures that could go through the historic designation process, though it is difficult.

Evans commented that the older neighborhood areas have already been surveyed for potential historic home designation and the survey is available for owners to utilize. The survey provides the groundwork for someone to push the process forward, most likely the property owner or an active group.

Reynard asked if the future rezoning of the five blocks along N. Manhattan for the much higher density Urban Core Residential District had been considered to be two blocks wide.

Evans responded that the intent through the Comprehensive Plan update process was to see how it would work on the five blocks first, which would provide a lot of housing and take a while for the market to absorb.

Stith said the community needs a range of housing stock for varied options, locations and opportunities. He said developing high-rises takes a certain type of developer.

Ball said the proposed five block Urban Core area could help reduce the future need to expand the M-FRO area in the future beyond what is being considered tonight.

Parikh mentioned that the Board received an email from John Pence asking to expand the M-FRO rezoning area beyond what is being considered. Parikh reminded the Board that it would not be appropriate to consider that expansion at this time, and that the Board can only consider what has been advertised.

Ball asked that the minutes reflect that the Board had received an email from John Pence asking to expand the rezoning area, as well as an email from Phil Anderson which have already been discussed. Both emails were duly considered by the Board. He said it is not appropriate for the Board to consider expanding the rezoning area tonight without additional study. It is something that could be looked at in the future, but for now this is what has been advertised and what was identified in the Comprehensive Plan.

Stith moved that the Manhattan Urban Area Planning Board recommend approval of the

proposed rezoning of Areas 1, 2 & 3, consisting of 57 parcels, generally located along the south side of the 900 block and both sides of the 1000 block of Thurston Street; the south side of the 800 block of Vattier; both sides of the 800 blocks of Bluemont Avenue and Moro Street; and the north side of the 900 block of Laramie Street, as follows:

Area 1: from R-2/TNO Two-Family Residential District with the Traditional Neighborhood Overlay to R-3/M-FRO, Multiple-Family Residential District with the Multiple-Family Redevelopment Overlay District;

Area 2: from R-1/TNO, Single-Family Residential with the Traditional Neighborhood Overlay to R-3/M-FRO, Multiple-Family Residential District with the Multiple-Family Redevelopment Overlay District; and,

Area 3: from R-M/TNO, Four-Family Residential District with Traditional Neighborhood Overlay District to R-3/M-FRO, Multiple-Family Residential District with the Multiple-Family Redevelopment Overlay District; all based on the findings in the Staff Report.

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

PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER AMENDING ARTICLE IV, SECTION 4-112 M-FRO, MULTI-FAMILY REDEVELOPMENT OVERLAY DISTRICT, OF THE MANHATTAN ZONING REGULATIONS, REGARDING PARKING REQUIREMENTS, REQUIRING BICYCLE PARKING, AND AMENDING SEVERAL ARCHITECTURAL DEFINITIONS.

Evans presented the Staff Report with the recommendation of approval.

Ball opened the public hearing.

No one spoke. Ball closed the public hearing.

Stith said he has reservations about design guidelines and that it is difficult to regulate aesthetics. However these are a good attempt and the City will get a better product with them compared to without them, so he will support the proposed amendments.

Reynard asked about the amount of bicycle parking on campus.

Stith said he did not know how much there is, however the Green Apple Bike Share program is planning on expanding its numbers of available bikes.

Reynard suggested prohibiting on-street parking east of campus.

Stith said that will result in pushing commuter storage parking farther out into the neighborhoods. He said the Intermodal Study is looking at fixed transit routes and that the ATA buses have bike racks on them.

Stith moved that the Manhattan Urban Area Planning recommend approval of the proposed amendments to the Manhattan Zoning Regulations to revise Article IV Section 4-112, Multi-Family Redevelopment Overlay District as proposed, based on the findings in the Staff Memorandum.

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

REPORTS AND COMMENTS BY STAFF AND BOARD MEMBERS

Cattell reviewed items on upcoming meetings, including the annual review of the Comprehensive Plan. He mentioned there will be an RFQ for a unified development code as well as a future amendment to day care regulations.

Ball asked about the potential addition of a Pottawatomie County representative to the Board.

Cattell said that is still being discussed with a potential joint meeting between the two Planning Boards to discuss issues.

Ball said in regard to Anderson's proposed resolution, the City Commission is making plans for a rental inspection program and the Board might need to know where the Commission was heading on that.

Stith asked about the tri-vision signs that were considered in the last meeting. Cattell said the City Commission did not want to change the regulations city wide for one particular sign and asked City Administration to investigate how they can keep the existing one in the PUD without changing the regulations city wide.

Ball adjourned the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Amelia Lewis, Planning Intern