

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

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

MEMBERS ABSENT:

STAFF PRESENT: Eric Cattell, Assistant Director for Planning; Chad Bunger, Senior Planner; John Adam, Senior Planner.

OPEN PUBLIC COMMENTS

No one spoke.

CONSENT AGENDA

APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 17, 2016, MANHATTAN URBAN AREA PLANNING BOARD MEETING.

APPROVE THE FINAL PLAT OF THE HARTFORD, UNIT TWO, GENERALLY LOCATED 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/OWNER: BURTON LAND COMPANY, ZAC BURTON)

APPROVE THE FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN OF LOT 2, STONECREEK, COMMERCIAL PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT, GENERALLY LOCATED SOUTHEAST OF THE INTERSECTION OF SCENIC DRIVE AND ANDERSON AVENUE. (APPLICANT: MOHAMMAD NOMANI OWNERS: J AND S PROPERTIES, LLC, MJT PROPERTIES, LLC).

Ball moved that the Board approve the Consent Agenda. Nuss seconded the motion which passed on a vote of 5-0-2 with Nuss and Stith abstaining on the Minutes; and 7-0 on items 2 and 3.

GENERAL AGENDA

A PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER THE REZONING AND THE PROPOSED PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN OF THE GENESIS HEALTH CLUB PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT (PUD), A 5.14 ACRE TRACT OF LAND GENERALLY LOCATED 350 FEET WEST OF THE INTERSECTION OF SETH

CHILD ROAD (K-113) AND ALLISON AVENUE, ON THE NORTH SIDE OF ALLISON AVENUE, FROM PUD, FLINT HILLS HOSPITALITY COMMERCIAL PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT, TO PUD, GENESIS HEALTH CLUB PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT. (APPLICANT: GENESIS HEALTH CLUBS – RODNEY STEVEN OWNERS: AFAD, INC., RUSS BRIGGS,)

Chad Bunger, Senior Planner, presented the staff report and recommended approval with fourteen (14) conditions of approval, as stated in the staff report.

The Planning Board asked questions of City Administration on the project. Phil Anderson asked for clarification on the City's condition of approval for screening along Allison Avenue. Bunger clarified the intent of condition #6 of the staff report.

Gary Stith asked about the relationship of the residential properties to the west of the subject site and the development. Bunger provided an overview of the distance, landscape, terrain and elevation of the two (2) areas. Stith asked if there was a need for a drainage or conservation easement on the natural ravine on the west side of the subject site. Brian Johnson, City Engineer, and Bunger discussed the need for such easements in the steep ravine.

Stith discussed the need for having less parking for the development because the PUD proposal has more parking spaces than required by the Zoning Regulations. Bunger deferred the question to the applicant's representative.

John Ball asked about the detention requirements of the City and how the required release rates would impact future floods on Wildcat Creek. The City Engineer addressed his question. Ball also asked about the site's proposed access and the City Fire Department requirements.

Bunger stated that the Fire Department was fine with the proposed site layout and the access, but was requiring additional fire hydrants and wider access aisles to accommodate fire trucks

Debbie Nuss asked if the Fire Department could access the site from Allison Avenue because of the steep grade. Bunger stated that the Fire Department never indicated that they could not access the site due to the grades on Allison Avenue, but he would clarify with the Fire Department on the issue and report back during the Final Development Plan.

Ken Ebert asked several questions. He asked about the Fire Department's review of the access to the site and building, the grading of the site in regard to stormwater detention and stormwater infrastructure. Bunger addressed these questions. The Fire Department has reviewed the site layout and has requirements for driving aisle widths, and hydrant

locations. The City Engineer is requiring the downstream infrastructure be analyzed to ensure that various infrastructure is adequate to handle the runoff from the site.

Ebert also asked about the policies of the 2035 Comprehensive Plan and the intent of allowing appropriately scaled commercial uses within a residential neighborhood. Bunger and Eric Cattell, Assistant Director of Planning, explained the policies in the updated Comprehensive Plan. Ebert expanded on his thoughts on the policies and if the site and use is appropriate in scale to the development and if this would encourage spot zoning for commercial uses in residential areas.

Ebert then asked about the location of the building to the adjoining property line with the City's pump station. Johnson explained the layout of the City's pump station building and how it is accessed. Bunger explained that through the PUD process, the setback for buildings is established. Bunger stated that the Public Works Department and the Building Code Department did not raise any concerns with the site plan review.

Ebert also asked about the fundamental difference between a digital sign and an internal illuminated sign. Bunger stated that the Sign Regulations do not have an illumination level standard for internally illuminated signs, but does limit the illumination levels for digital signs. Ebert and Bunger discussed the community's perception of brightness of digital signs compared to an illuminated sign. Cattell discussed the day and night functions of digital signs, which are typically brighter during the day compared to other types of illuminated signs that are turned off during the day. Ebert then asked about the orientation of the proposed pylon sign on Ft. Riley Boulevard. Bunger described what was shown on the site plan and deferred the question to the applicant's consultant.

Stith and Parikh addressed the community's desire to limit the size of digital signs in the City. Anderson also noted that signs in other PUDs have been approved to be larger in the past. Bunger addressed that statement and how it applies to this development proposal.

Ebert asked for clarification on the locations of the existing trees on Allison Avenue and the relationship to the proposed off-street parking lot. Bunger answered the question.

Parikh opened the public hearing.

Phil Meyer, Baughman Company and applicant's consultant stated that the applicant is in agreement with the staff report as written, but has concerns on condition #11, which deals with requiring the public sidewalk on Allison Avenue. If the Planning Board would consider allowing a larger digital sign, the applicant would be interested in discussing the possibility. Meyer addressed the question on the number of off-street parking spaces. The proposed number of spaces was a design requirement of the applicant/developer.

Greg Ferris, applicant's representative, addressed the question of the proposed pylon sign. The sign was proposed to have a digital sign that would be one-sided and face to the east. Ferris commented on studies that show larger signs are safer for the driving

public and thus the desire to have the 150 square foot digital graphic sign on the northern pylon sign as proposed. Ferris stated that the applicant is not opposing the staff recommendation of limiting the digital graphic sign to 32 square feet and would most likely eliminate that sign element from the sign package. Ferris encouraged the City to look at allowing larger signs in the future.

Jerry Reynard asked about the digital graphic sign's function for the business. Ferris addressed the question with the variety of advertisements for the business that would be displayed on the digital sign. Reynard then stated his opinion that the sign would have limited function for the business as it only could be viewed by 2 lanes of traffic in the area. Ferris described what the pylon sign would be if the recommendation to limit the digital sign to only 32 square feet was followed and described the other advertising efforts that the business will do to direct people to the health and fitness club.

Meyers asked the Planning Board to reconsider the requirement for the sidewalk on Allison Avenue. He stated that the sidewalk would be an extra burden on the developer to construct the sidewalk that would adequately address drainage on Allison Avenue, preserves the existing vegetation on the right-of-way, and doesn't disturb the existing utility infrastructure in the area.

Stith asked Johnson about the future of sidewalks in Allison Avenue. Johnson described the design of the diverging diamond intersection on Seth Child Road and Ft. Riley Boulevard. Johnson also discussed the options available to the developer for the location and financing of the sidewalk along Allison Avenue. These include moving the sidewalk closer to the roadway if the grades or other obstacles exist along Allison Avenue.

Nuss asked about planned improvements on Allison Avenue. Johnson stated that there were no plans to rebuild or widen the road, but there are roadway improvements on Stagg Hill Road, which would include sidewalks. Johnson reiterated that the goal is to improve pedestrian connectivity for the area so they can access commercial and residential properties throughout the area. Bunger reminded the Planning Board that sidewalks are a requirement for properties developing along a collector street, such as Allison Avenue.

Reynard asked about line-of-sight at the intersection with landscaping blocking the view. Johnson noted that the required sidewalk would require that the landscape be pulled back to accommodate the sidewalk and that the entrance to the site would be a manicured landscape area, as shown in the landscape plan.

Ferris requested that the construction of the sidewalk along their property be delayed until other sidewalk improvements in the area are installed. Ferris also raised the issue of maintenance of the required sidewalk, especially during the winter season. Johnson offered different options of financing and timing of the sidewalk. The Board considered the request.

Bob Hughes, 2721 Allison Avenue, asked about the effects on taxes on his property. He said he was not concerned on the amount noise, lights or traffic from the proposed

development. He was also in favor of installing the sidewalk, as there are a number of people in the area that walk on the Allison Avenue roadway.

Ball stated that this project and the rezoning would not directly impact the property tax on his property. Anderson asked about why he supported the sidewalk on the property. Hughes stated that there is always someone walking on Allison Avenue.

Robert Weil, 2604 Sumac Drive, supported the recommendations of the staff report. He asked the Board to carefully consider the rezoning and factoring what was previously approved. He supported the requirement of the sidewalk. He did have concerns over the aesthetics of the building, especially when compared to the previously approved hotels. Weil expressed concerns that there is a traffic safety issue along Allison Avenue, as the posted speed on the street is not followed. He asked that the Planning Board place a recommendation that a supplemental traffic study be required to ensure that the Seth Child Road/Allison Avenue intersection is designed safely. Weil stated that his neighborhood views the proposed development as an amenity to the neighborhood.

Arlo Biere, 2605 Woodhaven Court, stated that he and his neighborhood is supportive of the proposal. He also supports the requirement of the sidewalk. Biere asked that the Planning Board consider the quality of illumination and sign design for digital signs.

Parikh closed the public hearing.

Stith briefly explained the PUD process and for future rezoning.

Stith then addressed the requirement for the sidewalk and that it is a need for both the business and the area. It is also a requirement of the Manhattan Area Subdivision Regulations.

Anderson asked how the sidewalk would be funded. Stith said that should be negotiated with the City Commission and City Staff.

Anderson recommended to City Staff that signage should be added in the area to direct people to the Linear Trail further to the east and northeast.

Nuss commented that she is pleased that the applicant is willing to forego the digital sign.

Parikh asked if the issue with the digital sign is an issue of safety or because of aesthetic or character.

Nuss felt it was an issue because the community did not want large digital signs and she felt the need to uphold that community decision. She also commented that the sidewalk is an important aspect of the project. The sidewalk was more important than preserving the existing landscape.

Ball stated that he supports the project. He also addressed the signage issue that it was a

community standard for the size of the digital sign and it was not necessarily a safety factor. He also supported the sidewalk requirements.

Stith moved that the Planning Board recommend approval of the proposed rezoning of Genesis Health Club PUD from PUD, Commercial Planned Unit Development to PUD, Commercial Planned Unit Development District, based on the findings in the Staff Report, with the fourteen (14) conditions recommended by City Administration and with an additional condition that a conservation or drainage easement on the west side of the site shall provided by the applicant, if deemed necessary by the City Engineer.

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

REPORTS AND COMMENTS BY BOARD MEMBERS

Cattell outlined upcoming meetings saying in December there will likely be a couple discussion items including an update on the Aggieville Vision planning effort and a presentation from the MPO on the Bike/Pedestrian Count.

Stith said the Bike/Pedestrian Count went well and has interesting information.

Anderson mentioned that the house on Sunset that was replatted into two lots has not had the second house constructed; however the renovated house will have an open house on Saturday from 4pm to 6 pm with a \$3 fee to go to Habitat for Humanity.

He said the new KSU Welcome Center, designed by Ebert Design Group, is worth visiting. He mentioned that a firm called MOD Design and Construction is doing a great job of renovating homes in the older neighborhoods and should help to serve as an example for others to follow.

Respectfully submitted,

Chad Bunger, Senior Planner