

**MINUTES**  
**MANHATTAN URBAN AREA PLANNING BOARD**  
**City Commission Room, City Hall**  
**1101 Poyntz Avenue**  
**April 3, 2017**  
**7:00 p.m.**

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

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** None

**STAFF PRESENT:** Chad Bunger, Assistant Director of Community Development; and John Adam, Senior Planner.

**OPEN PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Brandon Irwin, 4440 Tuttle Creek Boulevard, spoke to voice his concern of possible gentrification happening in Manhattan. While he was not familiar with the exact details of the Manhattan Urban Area Comprehensive Plan, he wanted to encourage the planning processes that are taking place benefit the most vulnerable people in the community. He felt the processes were not doing so already. He said someone from outside the Manhattan community could see this area as a great place due to a number of things occurring, such as the redevelopment of Downtown Manhattan, the adoption of the Aggieville Community Vision Plan, and the construction of the National Bio- and Agro-Defense Facility. He said the new apartment complex on Marlatt Avenue could be a possible place that could house lower income people who cannot afford to live closer to the city's core [Note: staff confirmed with Mr. Irwin after the meeting that the above comment was intended for the public input on the Comprehensive Plan under the General Agenda].

**CONSENT AGENDA**

**APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 20, 2017, MANHATTAN URBAN AREA PLANNING BOARD MEETING.**

Ebert moved that the Board approve the Consent Agenda.

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

**GENERAL AGENDA**

**A PUBLIC INPUT MEETING FOR THE ANNUAL REVIEW OF THE MANHATTAN URBAN AREA COMPREHENSIVE PLAN TO RECEIVE COMMENTS TO DETERMINE IF THERE ARE ANY SIGNIFICANT ISSUES THAT MIGHT NEED FURTHER STUDY OR OTHER ACTION (APPLICANT: CITY OF MANHATTAN; FILE NO. CPA-17-027)**

Adam began the public input session by stating it was Kansas law to annually review a city's comprehensive plan. He also stated the timeline for a future meeting with the Board as it relates to the annual review, such as discussing any comments received during this meeting as well as those comments already gathered from Riley and Pottawatomie County officials and community stakeholders. He said City staff has also been working on a list of activities it would like to pursue and will present those to the Board at a future meeting.

No one spoke.

Parikh closed the public input meeting at 7:09 p.m.

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

Anderson pointed out on page 91 in the Manhattan Urban Area Comprehensive Plan, in HN-2.1B: Code Enforcement, the key phrase is "active enforcement," which he felt the City does not do. He stated he does not see the City do anything that goes beyond registering properties. He wanted to make sure that concern was included in the Board meeting's minutes and passed onto City Commission.

Bunger said the City of Manhattan has four code officials and recently added another person to bring that number to five. While the City cannot go onto property at its own will, the City has improved its code enforcement compared to three years ago when code services was housed in separate departments. He said the five code services personnel are doing the best they can.

Anderson said he is aware of those changes, and it helps the City be more aggressive than it has been. He said he lives in the older neighborhoods, so he sees issues on a consistent basis, but part of his concern is also due to his impatience. He also expressed his desire for some sort of plaque or signage inside the front door of rental properties to provide information to tenant and owner that directs them to City ordinances and regulations. He felt this signage was educational. He said he has talked to realtors and property owners, and they would be happy to do it. He was not sure why there was a public perception saying otherwise.

Bunger said he will make sure Anderson's concerns were included in the minutes and passed on to City administration.

Ball said his church is annually inspected by code services officials. He has talked to tenants, and they have stated they do not want something on the back of the door. Ball felt that would be a pretty easy thing to do, however, since it would have contact information on it to help address concerns. He said the pushback was not from landlords; it was from the tenant. The City Commission has made the step to that direction with its recent ordinance. Anderson said he still has signage with contact information placed at his properties from 2011 and finds it beneficial. Ball said a sign is an important educational step for both tenants and property owners.

Stith said he appreciated the action plan matrix in the Manhattan Urban Area Comprehensive Plan. He said the City staff has done a great job of completing some of those items. During the future annual review work session, he would like a matrix highlighted with what has been done to date. He said this type of information should also be put on the City website to show what has been accomplished and show this plan has proven not to be a "plan on the shelf." He said he was excited with the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) meetings. He believes the process is going to make it easier and cheaper to develop in Manhattan. He would like to define what the next priorities will be in future work sessions with the Community Development staff. Adam said he did not provide the list of what has been done to date at this meeting, but he will bring it to the next annual review meeting.

Ebert would like to see the matrix as a running document to show what has been completed by year and what is being worked on in the future. He felt it was important that it showed the history of what has taken place. Adam said he has prepared a document with ordinance numbers and dates; if something was not done by ordinance, then it will show the action by month and year.

Bunger said he appreciated everyone coming to the joint UDO meeting on March 28. He said the UDO will streamline some efforts and bring new approaches to our current regulations. The next round of meetings will be in May, which are planned to feature the consultants working with design workshops in community to show what they have done in other places. City staff will provide information to the Board when those meeting dates and details are set.

Ball raised the concern of non-conforming properties and if the consultants from the UDO process will bring recommendations on how the City can deal with those. Bunger said the Board should expect those types of recommendations in the upcoming fall and winter. He said Manhattan is unique in how it deals with nonconformities, and the consultants will present ideas on how to handle those.

Ball said while the City cannot do much in a year, it can change the character of a neighborhood over 5 to 10 years. Bunger said the consultant team is well rounded and will bring forward some good ideas.

Anderson said a landscape architecture class from Kansas State University will present ideas and help raise awareness on how to utilize the riverfront in Manhattan. The presentations will take place on Friday, April 7, from 3:30 to 5:00 p.m., at the Manhattan Chamber of Commerce. The focus of the ideas will be on commercial and recreation development. He said he has been visiting with the class and the possibilities are intriguing. He also clarified these are just ideas to help create awareness for the city. He said a second showing will be held on May 1.

Following no additional comments or reports, Parikh adjourned the meeting at 7:26 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Chris Kutz, Planning Intern