

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

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Neil Parikh, Vice-Chairperson; Gary Stith; Jerry Reynard; Phil Anderson; Debbie Nuss; and Ken Ebert.

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** John Ball, Chairperson.

**STAFF PRESENT:** Eric Cattell, Assistant Director for Planning; Chad Bunger, Senior Planner; Doug May, Planner; Kiel Mangus, Assistant City Manager; Karen Davis, Director of Community Development; Rob Ott, Public Works Director; Eddie Eastes, Director of Parks and Recreation.

**OPEN PUBLIC COMMENTS**

No one spoke.

**CONSENT AGENDA**

**APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE July 7, 2016, MANHATTAN URBAN AREA PLANNING BOARD MEETING.**

**APPROVE THE FINAL PLAT OF KIMBALL PLACE, UNIT THREE, GENERALLY LOCATED GENERALLY LOCATED TO THE SOUTHWEST OF THE INTERSECTION OF W. LARAMIE STREET AND N. MANHATTAN AVENUE. (APPLICANT: GREG GILMAN, TRUSTEE OF GREG GILLMAN REVOCABLE LIVING TRUST, OWNER: GREG GILMAN, TRUSTEE OF GREG GILLMAN REVOCABLE LIVING TRUST AND RYAN M. PLATT AND ANDREA M. PLATT)**

**APPROVE THE FINAL PLAT OF LEGACY RIDGE, GENERALLY LOCATED GENERALLY LOCATED SOUTH OF THE INTERSECTION OF GRAND MERE PARKWAY AND MACKINTOSH COURT. (APPLICANT/ OWNER: THIERER CONSTRUCTION, LARRY THIERER, PRESIDENT)**

Stith moved that the Board approve the Consent Agenda.

Ebert seconded the motion, which passed on a vote of 6-0.

**GENERAL AGENDA**

**PUBLIC HEARING TO REZONE 2815 AMHERST AVENUE, A 1.42 ACRE LOT FROM PUD, PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT TO C-5, HIGHWAY SERVICE COMMERCIAL (APPLICANT/OWNER: MEAD LUMBER REAL ESTATE, LLC)**

May presented the staff report and recommended approval, based on the findings in the staff report.

Parikh opened and closed the public hearing with no one speaking.

Stith asked why the applicant was rezoning to the C-5 District.

May explained that the existing PUD designation on the site is out of date as the PUD has been abandoned and the rezoning to the C-5 District makes it consistent with the surrounding properties.

Stith moved that the Planning Board recommend rezoning 2815 Amherst Avenue from PUD, Commercial Planned Unit Development, to C-5 Highway Service Commercial District, based on the findings in the Staff Report.

Anderson seconded the motion, which passed on a vote of 6-0.

**A PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER AMENDING ORDINANCE NOS. 4093 AND 7069 AND THE FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN OF THE BRIARVIEW ADDITION COMMERCIAL PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF A PROPOSED A NEW AMBULATORY HEART AND VASCULAR SURGICAL CLINIC. THE PROPERTY IS GENERALLY LOCATED 200 FEET NORTH OF THE INTERSECTION OF AMHERST AVENUE AND RESEARCH DRIVE, ALONG THE EAST SIDE OF RESEARCH DRIVE. THE AMENDMENT IS IN THE FORM OF A FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN. (APPLICANT/OWNER: AUCKLAND PROPERTIES LLC, PRIYANTHA RANAWEERA)**

Bunger presented the staff report and recommended approval with five (5) conditions.

Ebert asked if the new parking lot expansion was part of the 2014 amendment.

Bunger confirmed that is was.

Anderson asked if bicycle parking had been considered.

Bunger said it had not been discussed, but City Administration can ask the applicant about adding it.

Anderson said it is about providing convenience to the neighborhood.

Stith asked if the Board was also approving the future building addition shown on the plans with this Final Development Plan.

Bunger confirmed that approval of the proposed amendment will include the future building addition as shown on the plans.

Parikh opened and closed the public hearing with no one speaking.

Bunger asked the applicant if they were agreeable to providing a bike rack.

Tiffany Zachary, the applicant's representative, indicated they will provide a bike rack.

Stith moved that the Planning Board recommend amending Ordinance Nos. 4093 and 7069 and the Final Development Plan of Briarview Office Park Commercial Planned Unit Development, for Lot R.P. 1, University Heights Addition, First Unit, located at 200 Research Drive, as proposed, based on the findings in the Staff Report, with the five (5) conditions of approval in the staff report and with the addition of a sixth condition that bicycle parking be provided.

Reynard seconded the motion, which passed on a vote of 6-0.

**REVIEW PROPOSED 2017-2022 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM FOR CONFORMANCE WITH THE MANHATTAN URBAN AREA COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND REVIEW OF URBAN SERVICE AREA BOUNDARY.**

Cattell introduced the item, indicating that the Board should primarily look at the proposed projects listed in the various functional areas and departments. The intent of the review is to determine if any projects are not in conformance with the general policy recommendations and future growth areas identified in the Comprehensive Plan. In addition, the Urban Service Area Boundary is reviewed annually along with the CIP.

He said the Urban Service Area Boundary (USAB) encompasses those areas adjacent to, or in the vicinity of the City, which the Comprehensive Plan and Utility Master Plans identify as growth areas that could be served in the future through extension of existing systems. The USAB was revised and adopted as a part of the recent update of the Manhattan Urban Area Comprehensive Plan in April, 2015. Because the USAB was recently revised in 2015 with the Comprehensive Plan update, no further action is needed at this time from the Planning Board regarding that boundary.

Cattell summarized the five projects that the Planning Board had recommended for the CIP. He said that City Administration finds the proposed 2017-2022 CIP to be in general conformance with the Comprehensive Plan and recommends that the Manhattan Urban Area Planning Board make a similar finding.

Stith asked about projects that have no dollars assigned to them and if they are not being

recommended by City Administration.

Mangus explained that they either don't have a budget impact on the general fund, because they are in out years, are covered by grants or other funding such as temporary financing, or they are currently unbudgeted items.

Ebert asked with regard to sidewalk and alley improvements, who decides where the dollars are spent.

Cattell indicated that the Public Works Department has prioritized alley improvements and sidewalk gaps based on certain criteria.

Mangus provided an overview of the City-University Projects and the process for how those projects are identified and vetted through Kansas State University and the City. He then summarized the 2017 projects and answered questions.

Anderson commented that the pedestrian crossing projects recently constructed along Denison Avenue were a better approach to stop both traffic and pedestrians, as compared to the ones on N. Manhattan Avenue.

Davis provided an overview of the Community Development Department's project which consists of rewriting the Zoning and Subdivision Regulations into a unified development ordinance. She said it would be over a two-year period.

Stith asked when a consultant would be underway on the project.

Davis said the RFQ will go out in August and a consultant would be on board by December.

Eastes provided an overview of the 2017 projects in the various Park and Recreation Department divisions.

Nuss asked about the project to repurpose the Park offices in City Park and what they will be used for.

Eastes indicated that is under study with the City Park master plan effort, as well as uses for other structures including the round house and Community House.

Anderson commented that he would like consideration given to planning a future vision for Fairmont Park and the river frontage along it.

Nuss asked about the Depot on-ramps and curb and gutter project.

Eastes indicated the City was hoping KDOT could assist with funding some stabilization of the site to help improve long term maintenance challenges due to erosion. He said the other Depot projects were also to help stabilize the building.

Nuss said the Preservation Alliance has some dollars that could be applied for to assist with stabilization efforts. She asked how much income the Depot generates a year.

Eastes said around \$30,000.

Ott provided an overview of the Public Works Department's major functional areas and the big picture projects they are working on through the CIP, including water, waste water, storm water and transportation.

Reynard asked about the Eureka Valley water plant concept.

Ott explained the limitations of the existing system, including well fields, water plant and transmission mains. He said a west side water plant has its pro's and con's and is under study.

Anderson asked about the Bluemont roundabout widening to 5 lanes.

Ott said that project is actually providing turn lanes along portions of Bluemont Avenue, west of the roundabout.

Stith asked if that will impact the street trees.

Ott said it likely will, which is a concern of the City's as well.

Anderson suggested that paved alleys that are in poor condition should be temporarily converted to gravel, until they can be repaved.

Ott explained the prioritization for repaving alleys, particularly in the M-FRO Multi-Family Redevelopment Overlay areas. He said the challenge is to get 51 % of the owners to agree to a benefit district. The City Commission has given direction to create benefit districts by public hearing to address the challenge of getting alleys paved.

Ebert asked if all the water, sewer and storm sewer projects were to address maintenance issues, or to address growth pressures.

Ott said it is to address both issues, and with regard to water it is to address growth, fire flows and red water issues.

Anderson asked about charging a fee for parking at the Airport.

Mangus said that is under study.

Stith moved that the Manhattan Urban Area Planning Board find that the proposed 2017-2022 Capital Improvements Program is in general conformance with the Manhattan Urban Area Comprehensive Plan.

Reynard seconded the motion, which passed on a vote of 6-0.

## **REPORTS AND COMMENTS BY BOARD MEMBERS**

Cattell indicated that Riley County and the City are holding two property owner informational meetings on the draft corridor overlay districts that were developed by County and City planning staff to implement the goals of the Eureka Valley-K-18 Corridor Plan, and the Gateway to Manhattan Plan to promote compatible development.

The first meeting is on Thursday, July 21, 2016, 6:30 pm in City Commission Room to review the draft Gateway Corridor Overlay District for the K-177 Corridor. The second is on Thursday, July 28, 2016, 6:30 pm at Fire Station Headquarters, Large Assembly Room, to review the draft Eureka Valley Corridor Overlay District for the Eureka Valley – K-18 Corridor.

Parikh asked about the joint meeting with the Pottawatomie County Planning Commission and if the Manhattan Urban Area Planning Board had forwarded a recommendation to the City Commission, to include Pottawatomie County representation on the Board.

Davis said that while the issue was discussed briefly at that meeting, it was for discussion purposes only and did not include formal actions by the Boards. She said the Urban Area Board hasn't taken that action; however the Comprehensive Plan makes that recommendation and the Plan has been adopted by the Board.

She said City Administration plans on debriefing with Pottawatomie County staff and that their Planning Commission might also determine if it wants to make any recommendation on the issue. She said the Urban Area Planning Board could put it on an agenda to make that recommendation.

Cattell reminded the Board that the issue is identified in the Manhattan Urban Area Comprehensive Plan which was adopted by the City and both Counties. He said the City has been talking with Pottawatomie County administration about the idea for the past ten years.

Stith suggested not taking further action on that issue until after the election, because things could change.

Davis said Riley County will also need to play a role in the discussions.

Nuss said she has heard the suggestion of adding one representative from Pottawatomie County, but she suggested 2 or 3, to provide equity. She asked if that has been communicated to the County.

Cattell said no formal discussion has occurred regarding the specific makeup of the Board, should Pottawatomie County decide to join. He said it will take discussion and action by all three entities, including Riley County, because the Inter-local Agreement will need to be modified. From the City's perspective, it makes sense for the City to have a majority on the board as most items are within the City and it's an urban board. It's

unusual that due to the current makeup of 3 city, 3 county and one alternating appointment, there is a three-year period during which the County has a majority on the Board. He said the challenge is to not have too large a board that it becomes unwieldy and that it will take extensive discussion by all three entities to determine the best structure for the Board.

Stith suggested putting the issue on a future agenda for the Board to discuss and make a recommendation. However, he suggested it wait until after the upcoming election.

Ebert asked for clarification on the Board's current jurisdiction. Cattell explained the jurisdiction in relation to other boundaries.

Ebert asked for clarification of the PUD process. Cattell provided an overview of the PUD process.

Respectfully submitted,

Eric Cattell, AICP  
Assistant Director for Planning