

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

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

MEMBERS ABSENT:

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

OPEN PUBLIC COMMENTS

No one spoke.

CONSENT AGENDA

APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 18, 2016, MANHATTAN URBAN AREA PLANNING BOARD MEETING.

APPROVE THE FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN OF KANSAS STATE FEDERAL CREDIT UNION PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT, AND THE FINAL PLAT OF THE MP ADDITION, UNIT 1, GENERALLY LOCATED NORTHEAST OF THE INTERSECTION OF MCCULLOUGH PLACE AND MCCALL ROAD. (APPLICANT: KANSAS STATE FEDERAL CREDIT UNION – LARAE KRAEMER, OWNER: THE MCCALL PATTERN COMPANY, VINCE PLACEK, CFO.)

APPROVE THE FINAL PLAT OF RAINBOLT ADDITION, GENERALLY LOCATED SOUTHWEST OF THE INTERSECTION OF SUNSET AVENUE AND THACKREY STREET. (APPLICANT/OWNER: ROSELLA RAINBOLT TRUSTEE OF THE ROSELLA RAINBOLT TRUST.)

SET ASIDE THE FINAL PLAT OF THE LINKS AT MANHATTAN, PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT AND APPROVE THE REVISED FINAL PLAT OF THE LINKS AT MANHATTAN, UNIT TWO, PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT, GENERALLY LOCATED 1,000 FEET WEST OF THE INTERSECTION OF CASEMENT ROAD AND MARLATT AVENUE ON THE NORTH SIDE OF MARLATT AVENUE. (APPLICANT: BLEW & ASSOCIATES, PA, OWNER: THE LINKS AT MANHATTAN, LLC)

Anderson requested that the Final Plat of Rainbolt Addition be moved to the first item on the General Agenda to discuss the item.

Stith moved that the Board approve the remainder of the Consent Agenda.

Anderson seconded the motion, which passed on votes of 5-0-2 with Anderson and Nuss abstaining on the Minutes, and 7-0 on the remainder of the Consent Agenda.

GENERAL AGENDA

APPROVE THE FINAL PLAT OF RAINBOLT ADDITION, GENERALLY LOCATED SOUTHWEST OF THE INTERSECTION OF SUNSET AVENUE AND THACKREY STREET. (APPLICANT/OWNER: ROSELLA RAINBOLT TRUSTEE OF THE ROSELLA RAINBOLT TRUST.)

Bunger presented the staff report with the recommendation of approval.

Stith asked if the fifteen (15) foot utility easement protected the drainage way along the south edge of the property.

Bunger said it is not in a mapped floodplain and that the utility easement covers the area and does not need a drainage easement.

Stith asked if the utility easement would protect that area from being built on.

Bunger said that while drainage easements are more restrictive, the utility easement is appropriate and restricts development.

Anderson asked if drainage easement was private property or city property.

Bunger said it is the homeowner's property, a public easement on private property; requiring the property owner to maintain it.

Ball opened the floor for public comments.

Mal Hoover, 1925 Montgomery Drive, said she was concerned about increasing density in the neighborhood as well as the proposed driveway that would be associated with the new lot due to traffic along Sunset Avenue.

Mark Knackendoffel, 726 Sunset, said he was concerned about public safety in terms of traffic and the ability to turn into the driveway on the new lot being difficult, additional congestion created and the small lot size. He also commented on the drainage ditch, stating its importance for drainage in the area and it should be maintained. Knackendoffel asked about the proposed curb cut not conforming to City standards.

Bunger replied saying that the proposed driveway would be non-conforming.

Lauren and David Conderman, the proposed developer, were interested in purchasing the divided lots and building a home that was consistent with the architecture in the older neighborhood. She said she will renovate the existing home and has extensive experience in renovating older homes in historic areas of Kansas City. She said the existing driveway off Sunset would be removed, and the new lot would have a driveway with a three point turn around to address some of the concerns about turning in and out of the lot.

Anderson asked if it was possible to create a driveway that exited onto Thackrey as opposed to Sunset.

Conderman said it was possible, but thought it would detract from the value of the existing house as it takes away from green space in the backyard.

Anderson asked if there could be a shared driveway and Conderman said she thought potential property owners would not want that.

Rodney Franz, 2000 Thackrey, said he felt a lot of the neighborhood's concern stemmed from uncertainty of who would possibly live in the new structure as it is possible with students and the associated problems with renters.

David McNamara, 815 Harris, shared similar concerns over maintaining the single family, home owner occupied character of the neighborhood.

Brett Robinson, 2015 Thackrey, voiced his desire to maintain the green space and landscaping of the existing property.

Bunger addressed concerns about renter over occupancy. He said over occupancy concerns in the neighborhood have been enforced by the City and will continue to be if neighbors come forward with information that can be acted upon.

Ball closed the floor for public comments and opened for Board discussion.

Stith wanted to clarify that the Board is considering the final plat and if it conforms to the regulations, the Board must approve it. There is a variation associated with the driveway, which the Board has the authority to allow. He commented that it is not a PUD and there is no guarantee of what gets built as long as it conforms with the single family guidelines as regulated by the zoning district. Stith said that while he understood the concerns of the neighborhood, he supported the item to support infill development in the City.

Ball stated his concerns over the proposed driveway's proximity to Anderson Avenue and drainage.

Bunger commented that a drainage easement could be placed on the lot.

Ball asked if there were additional maintenance requirements with a drainage easement.

Brian Johnson, City Engineer said drainage easements are typically more restrictive and there are certain improvements that can be made with them. Johnson said there are

existing sanitary sewer and gas mains in the easement and there are some underlying rights to utility companies and if the property owner wanted to move them they would need to contact those companies. He said that the reality of an infill project attempts to align development with existing traffic infrastructure.

Anderson said he had concerns over future property owners, however thought Conderman's designs and intention to renovate the existing home would add value to the neighborhood and said he would support the item.

Nuss said that with concerns over the existing traffic along Sunset Avenue and the character of the existing lot, she did not think she could support the item.

Parikh said he often felt disappointed in the state of existing homes in Manhattan and thought this could add value to the homes in the neighborhood, though he expressed concern over the driveway as well. As the plat follows the subdivision guidelines and is an infill development project, he was leaning towards supporting the item.

Hageman said he shared the same concerns about the traffic on Sunset Avenue and wanted to listen to the neighbors even if it conformed to the plat guidelines. He felt the project was a good idea, but in the wrong location and could not support the item.

Reynard also expressed concern over the traffic and the proposed driveway, suggesting a right in and right out only.

Johnson said that was discussed with the applicant, who came back with plans for a three point turn driveway.

Reynard said he thought he could only support it with the right in and right out.

Hageman asked if the lot was big enough for a house, a three point turn around driveway and adequate green space.

Bunger said driveways and sidewalks were not considered in lot coverage, though there was a maximum driveway width. He said that the lot does meet the minimum lot standards.

Johnson said it would be a fifteen (15) foot wide single access driveway with a turn around.

Stith commented that there are regulations for paving in the front yard.

Bunger said that was correct, but the site is big enough to allow for adequate green space requirements.

Stith suggested adding a second condition of approval that a drainage easement be created on the lot.

Fred Gibbs, BG Consultants, said that the utility easement covered Stith's concerns.

Stith removed the request for the additional condition of approval.

Stith moved that the Planning Board approve the Final Plat of the Rainbolt Addition based on conformance with the Manhattan Urban Area Subdivision Regulations with the one condition of approval listed in the Staff memo, as follows:

1. A Variation of the access management requirements along a collector street shall be approved for the proposed access point for Lot 2.

Reynard seconded the motion, which passed on a vote of 4-3 with Hageman, Ball and Nuss voting in opposition.

REVIEW AGGIEVILLE PLAN SCOPE OF WORK AND APPOINT A PLANNING BOARD REPRESENTATIVE TO SERVE ON THE STEERING COMMITTEE

Evans presented the new proposal for a year-long Aggieville Plan. This includes the two blocks on Moro, Bluemont on the north, 11th Street on the east, 14th Street on the west and the southern boundary between Laramie and Fremont which is open for discussion.

Nuss asked about people who have already been appointed to the Steering Committee.

Evans said the Technical Committee has been formed with police and City staff, Kevin Ingram from Manhattan Christian College, Jackie Hartman from KSU, a KSU student being the current and future student body president of KSU. The Aggieville Business Association will be submitting their representatives soon.

Nuss asked if the citizen at large had been chosen.

Evans said Catherine Hessler will be the citizen. Cattell added she is a resident on the west side of City Park.

Anderson asked if there would be an architect on the board or if an architect will help consult on the plan.

Evans said he felt the plan would be a larger policy based document and as the plan advances, the required expertise will be brought on.

Anderson asked about City owned property in the area.

Evans said that was one of the issues driving the plan.

Brian Johnson, City Engineer, serving on the Technical Committee, added that infrastructure improvements and city utility updates are being considered from the Public Works division.

Stith said he thought this plan would be beneficial for the University and the City. He said he thought he hoped implementation would be a factor in the plan.

Anderson made a motion that Stith be the Planning Board Representative for the Aggieville Plan Steering Committee.

Parikh seconded the motion which passed on a vote of 6-0, with Stith abstaining.

DISCUSS AND TAKE ACTION ON PROPOSED MANHATTAN URBAN AREA PLANNING BOARD RESOLUTION NO. 030716-A IN SUPPORT OF ACTIVE ENFORCEMENT OF HEALTH, SAFETY, PROPERTY MAINTENANCE AND BUILDING CODES IN CORE AREA NEIGHBORHOODS, AS IDENTIFIED IN CHAPTER 8, POLICY HN-2.1B OF THE MANHATTAN URBAN AREA COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

Anderson said he thought it was important for the Planning Board to support this item. Ball said he agreed that it was important to maintain the quality of all homes in Manhattan.

Stith said he felt this was a way to implement recommendations outlined in the Comprehensive Plan.

Nuss said she was struggling with urging City Commission to implement policies without the Board providing recommendations. Cattell said the Code Offices were working with the Commission on addressing the issue. Parikh addressed Nuss' concerns, stating that it was an action to advise and encourage City Commission to take action on the issue.

Anderson moved that the Planning Board approve Resolution No. 030716-A based on conformance with the Manhattan Urban Area Comprehensive Plan.

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

REPORTS AND COMMENTS BY BOARD MEMBERS

Cattell reviewed the upcoming meeting schedule.

Anderson asked if a guard rail will be added along North Manhattan Avenue at the top of the hill near the new traffic light.

Ball reminded the Board about the City Commission's work session on March 8th to discuss the Five-Year Strategic Plan for Bicycling.

Nuss indicated she is serving on the Street Maintenance Committee and if the Board has any suggestions on funding mechanisms to let her know.

Respectfully submitted,

Amelia Lewis, Planning Intern

