

Minutes

MANHATTAN URBAN AREA PLANNING BOARD

City Commission Room, City Hall

1101 Poyntz Avenue

Thursday, July 6, 2017

7:00 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Neil Parikh, Chairperson; Debbie Nuss, Vice-Chairperson; Gary Stith; Ken Ebert; John Ball

MEMBERS ABSENT: Jerry Reynard; Phil Anderson

STAFF PRESENT: Eric Cattell, Director of Community Development; Chad Bunger, Assistant Director; Bob Isaac, Riley County Planner; Rob Ott, Public Works Director

OPEN PUBLIC COMMENTS

No one spoke.

CONSENT AGENDA

APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE JUNE 5, 2017, MANHATTAN URBAN AREA PLANNING BOARD MEETING.

REMOVE FROM THE TABLE AND APPROVE THE FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN OF THE BODY FIRST WELLNESS & RECREATION CENTER, COMMERCIAL PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT, TO ALLOW FOR A PROPOSED BUILDING EXPANSION AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF HUDSON AVENUE AND CLAFLIN ROAD.

Stith moved to approve the consent agenda; Nuss seconded. Motion passed 5-0-0.

GENERAL AGENDA

A PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER THE REQUEST FOR THE REZONING OF A 1.79-ACRE UNPLATTED TRACT OF LAND, FROM "AG" (AGRICULTURAL DISTRICT) AND "A-PUD" (AGRI-BUSINESS PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT) TO "A-PUD" (AGRI-BUSINESS PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT), GENERALLY LOCATED APPROXIMATELY 800 FEET NORTH OF THE INTERSECTION OF PILLSBURY DRIVE (K-177) AND DEEP CREEK ROAD, ON THE WEST SIDE OF PILLSBURY DRIVE. RILEY COUNTY APPLICATION (AUSTIN)

Isaac presented the staff report and recommended that the Manhattan Urban Area Planning Board forward a recommendation of approval to the Board of Commissioners of Riley County for the rezoning requests.

Stith stated that generally in a rezoning there are either platted lots, lot lines or metes and bounds. He asked how the area in this PUD is being defined; by metes and bounds? Isaac replied yes.

Stith asked if there had been problems with improper storage on the existing PUD. Isaac replied no and explained the Applicant has gone to great lengths to make the area look attractive and that the area is very well maintained.

Parikh opened the public hearing. There were no concerns from the public. The hearing was closed.

Stith moved that the Manhattan Urban Area Planning Board recommend approval to the Board of Commissioners of Riley County, to rezone an unplatted tract of land from “AG” (Agricultural District) and “A-PUD” (Agri-Business Planned Unit development) to “A-PUD” (Agri-Business Planned Unit development), for the reasons listed in the staff report.

Nuss seconded the motion. Motion passed on a vote of 5–0–0.

Isaac announced that the Board of County Commissioners will hear the request on July 24, 2017, at 9:00 a.m., in the County Commission Chambers.

A PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A MUNICIPAL FACILITY REVIEW OF THE SOUTHEAST NEIGHBORHOOD RECREATION CENTER (SENRC), AN APPROXIMATELY 17,000-SQUARE-FOOT RECREATION CENTER IN THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF DOUGLASS PARK.

Chad Bunger presented the staff report. He elaborated on how the proposed annexation and improvements to the existing facility will be a benefit to the public. The following were some of the improvements proposed:

1. New 17,000-square-foot recreation building with a basketball court, class room, locker rooms, office space, and a walking track.
2. 7,000-square-foot building expansion for the recreation center.
3. The freezer facility for the Flint Hills Bread Basket currently located on the property to be relocated to either the south or the west of the building to make space for a parking lot.
4. On-street parking to be created along Yuma and South 10th Street.

He made the following remarks about the design of the façade:

1. The proposed recreation building does not meet some of the City’s setback and parking requirements.

2. The design has been reviewed by city engineers and it has been concluded that this facility will not cause any disturbances to traffic.
3. The minimum number of parking spots required has been calculated to be 185 but the city proposes 108 spots since it is a neighborhood facility and most people are likely to walk or bike to the center.
4. City of Manhattan is significantly deficient in terms of neighborhood recreation centers hence this concept was born.
5. This project is still in the preliminary phase and some minor changes e.g. the name of the facility is likely to change later.

City Administration recommended approval of the proposed amendments with two conditions.

1. Addressing the lighting conditions so that it does not glare the neighborhood.
2. Future buildings in the facility will have a similar architectural style like the proposed SENREC building.

Nuss asked if the current architectural style refers to the annexed building or the existing Douglass Center as the two are different. Bunger explained that the condition references to any future building additions to the SENREC building, not the Douglass Center Annex or other buildings on the site. Nuss expressed concern over enough parking.

Stith commented that the newly proposed fixed system funded by the City would be initiated in January 2018. It has a route down the Yuma Street and has a stop at the Douglass Center. Also, there are going to be bike racks to encourage people to bike and being a neighborhood center a lot of people are likely to walk and bike to the facility. Hence, the amount of parking proposed by the City should be sufficient.

Nuss commented that the Flint Hills Breadbasket has used the facility for a long time and they might have some concerns regarding this project. Bunger stated that no expansion requests have been made from them other than an effort to move the freezer facility.

Nuss commented that placing the freezer along the Fort Riley Boulevard is not an aesthetically pleasing move.

Stith asked if the building could be moved further north to make room for some street trees along Fort Riley Boulevard. Bunger answered that it was possible. Stith asked if the Board Members can put suggestion or conditions for more trees and Bunger confirmed that they can.

Nuss asked why the City Commission was not bound by the suggestions or conditions of the Board as it makes the Board's suggestions less meaningful.

Ken Ebert asked if 108 parking spots were a firm number and Bunger reassured that it was. Ebert was concerned that this number might be more than what is required.

Bunger explained that people might want more parking but the City administration proposes this number to preserve the functionality of the facility and the site.

Stith asked if the project was funded by the new increased sales tax and Bunger informed that this project was funded by a Community Development Block Grant and the money was guaranteed by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. Cattell briefly described the nuances of the funding source.

Parikh opened the public hearing and three people came up to speak up on the topic.

Amada Tross, 1000 Colorado Street, expressed concerns about the parking along Yuma Street. She said that the proposed parking might be a safety issue for those playing on the playground and the basketball court. Also, the lack of sidewalks at certain locations was a safety concern. She also expressed concerns over a lack of stop signs along the 9th Street where the turn in to the parking has been proposed. Bunger deferred the concerns to other staff members.

Wyatt Thompson, Assistant Director of Parks and Recreation, replied that there are sidewalks on both sides of the street. There are no direct crossings between the existing Douglass Center on the North Side of Yuma Street and the Douglass Park. However, there are ADA compliant ramps on both corners that would facilitate that crossing. There is also a 4- to 5-foot-high fence along the Yuma Street to act as screen. Whyte confirmed that there were no stop signs on Yuma Street and he deferred the concern to the Public Works Department.

Tross repeated her concern that due to heavy traffic at 10th Street, more traffic control needs to be done and a turn light is needed there.

Rob Ott from the Public Works Department explained that lack of turn light keeps the traffic down. Also, since the Board already pointed out that the Fort Riley Boulevard was aesthetically unpleasant; adding 12 feet of concrete lane for a 180 feet stretch is not the best idea. This will also increase the walking distance for pedestrians from one safe point to another safe point on the Boulevard.

Nuss asked about the plans for the north side of Fort Riley Boulevard. Thompson stated that the sidewalk which is currently there will be retained to maintain pedestrian connection.

Cameron Tross, 1000 Colorado Street, thanked Amanda Tross for raising those concerns. She informed that there was a deficiency of decent sidewalks. She pointed out that there was no sidewalk for half a block between South 8th Street and Douglass Center. She urged the city administration to lean on the city and ensure that there are sufficient walkable sidewalks to serve pedestrians.

Mary Ana Flemming, 215 South 8th Street, expressed her concerns on quality pedestrian and bicycle access throughout the area. She said that there are several sidewalk in the area that are in poor shape.

Anthony Williams, Pastor of Pilgrim Baptist Church, 831 Yuma Street, was concerned about the traffic on Sunday mornings due to church services. Thompson clarified that the facility would be closed on Sunday mornings except for occasional tournaments.

The Planning Board discussed the municipal facility proposed for the site.

Stith moved that the Manhattan Urban Area Planning Board finds that the public interests to be served by the proposed Municipal Facility, outweigh the impacts upon the legitimate community interests and recommends approval of a proposed SENREC Building, modifications to the Flint Hills Breadbasket and site improvements to the Douglass Park, based on the findings in the Staff Report, with the following two (2) conditions of approval recommended by City Administration:

1. The future building addition shall be designed with the same architectural style as the original building and shall use similar exterior materials.
2. Exterior lighting shall be shielded to minimize glare on adjacent properties.

Stith added the following three conditions:

1. Evaluate pedestrian safety issues around the site.
2. Consider planting trees along Ft. Riley Boulevard.
3. Add bicycle racks shall be provided.

Ball seconded the motion.

Prior to the vote, Ebert asked if there were other buildings close to Ft. Riley Boulevard. Bunger and the Planning Board discussed if several buildings along Ft. Riley Boulevard that are closer to the front property line.

Nuss suggested adding public art that's appropriate on the facade facing Fort Riley Boulevard to improve aesthetics.

Following the Board's comments, the motion passed by a vote of 5-0.

A PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A MUNICIPAL FACILITY REVIEW OF A PROPOSED EXTENSION OF THE TRAFFIC SHOP FENCE AT 515 S. 11TH STREET TO ACCOMMODATE ADDITIONAL PARKING AND STORAGE.

Chad Bunger presented the staff report. He informed the Board that the facility was approved a number of years ago and it currently houses traffic operations and street maintenance for the City of Manhattan. It was also approved for some building expansion on the east and west side and provide for a combined dispatch service for Riley County and Manhattan for emergency needs. The two residential lots on both sides of the

property were annexed by the City after the facility was approved. The City proposes to enclose the entire area, screen and secure it for general storage and fleet vehicle storage. A tolling gate is also proposed on the north side.

Bunger informed that the item will go to the City Commission on 4th of August.

Ball inquired if there was a possibility to move the proposed fence a little behind the Fort Riley Boulevard and plant some trees along the way. He felt that more trees would make the boulevard aesthetically pleasing.

Bunger replied that a substantial portion of the property is already fenced and the City intends to completely fence it hence trees cannot be planted all along the property.

Ott explained since a concrete parking area and fence already exists, trees can only be planted along the eastern stretch of the facility facing Fort Riley Boulevard.

Parikh closed the public hearing.

Stith moved that the Manhattan Urban Area Planning Board finds that the public interests to be served by the proposed Municipal Facility, outweigh the impacts upon the legitimate community interests and recommends approval of the proposed fencing project of Traffic Operations Facility, the expansion area, and the existing parking and storage area, based on the findings in the Staff Report.

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

REVIEW PROPOSED 2018-2022 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM FOR CONFORMANCE WITH THE MANHATTAN URBAN AREA COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND REVIEW OF URBAN SERVICE AREA BOUNDARY.

Cattell explained that this was a review of the draft Capital Improvement Program (CIP) for conformance with the Comprehensive Plan, primarily concentrating on the major projects coming up within the next 2 to 3 years.

Jesse Romo, Airport Director, discussed the Manhattan Regional Airport Runway 3/21 Reconstruction project. He indicated that the construction phase is scheduled in 2020 and 2021. A planning study was currently underway to evaluate all the options e.g. geotechnology, subsurface study, financial feasibility study and other factors.

Stith asked about improving the appearance of the parking lots in front of the airport.

Romo explained that two different design options budgeted at \$4.5 and \$ 4.9 million for the vacant oval space in front of the airport are currently being evaluated. Some areas are showing signs of deterioration and gravel parking needs replacement. He said funding options, e.g. parking fees and sales tax to raise money, are the challenge. He also mentioned the unexpected costs for the increased security program.

Ball expressed concerns regarding reconstructing the runway without disrupting service.

Romo said that it was a challenge and that the planning study currently underway will be useful in figuring out a plan. He said the project could be done in two phases to ensure the airport remains operational.

Kiel Mangus, Assistant City Manager, discussed the City–University Fund and various projects that the fund has accomplished and has identified for the future. He discussed two future projects: the North Campus corridor along Kimball Avenue, and the South East corner lighted path at Anderson Avenue and the Beach Museum. He said the North Campus corridor required funding of \$50 million which cannot all be funded by the City–University project funds and other funding options were being considered. The South East Campus corner lighted path at Anderson Avenue and Beach museum project was scheduled for 2018. Blue Safety Light infrastructure will also be funded by the City–University project fund as part of proposals for the safety Kansas State University. A sidewalk extension from the President’s residence to Mid-Campus Drive was also a safety proposal. The City–University projects fund was also being used to fund the bicycle infrastructure on the campus.

Nuss commented that projects on the K-State Campus were not as beneficial to the Manhattan community as they were to the University. This suggested that doesn’t meet the purpose of the City–University Fund, which was meant for mutually beneficial projects. She noted, as an example, that the sidewalk from the President’s house to Mid-Campus Drive should be the responsibility of the University and not the City and that she does not encourage such projects in the future.

Ebert commented that the University was visited by people from the community so these projects are beneficial to the community as well.

Ball agreed with Nuss’s concern and pointed out that K-State doesn’t pay property taxes and the City–University Fund is joint money and should be spent on mutually beneficial projects.

Mangus stated that not all projects can be equally beneficial for both parties.

Eddie Eastes, Director of Parks & Recreation, discussed some of the major projects among the 63 that were identified the Parks and Recreation Department. He discussed the South East Neighborhood Recreation Center, a Zoo parking lot, and the Asian Exhibit, which will include more accessibility improvements and sidewalks. He also discussed possible funding sources for these projects.

Nuss inquired about the proposed Anthony Indoor Gymnasium location.

Eastes explained the sales tax proposed projects including the proposed two recreation centers at the middle schools, improvements at CICO Park and expanded trails around the community.

Stith commented that it was smart for the City to collaborate with school district to create recreational facilities. Nuss expressed her agreement with the efforts made by the City to work with the school district to establish these facilities. Ball asked about funding the ongoing operation and maintenance of these facilities after they were constructed.

Eastes said that a feasibility study demonstrates that each of the projects will have a deficit of \$60,000–\$70,000 and part of this deficit will be met from the tournaments that will be held in these facilities.

Parikh asked if there was a possibility of a turf field at the CICO Park.

Eastes said that it was a CIP project for 2023.

Stith elaborated on why the City should also invest in trails as a means of connectivity.

Rob Ott, Public Works Director, talked about the three divisions of the Public Works Department and the CIP projects that they were currently working on. He briefly mentioned water and waste-water master planning, active construction projects, snow operations, new storm water crews, safe routes to school, the Kimball Avenue corridor, the K-113 corridor, street maintenance and use of Intelligent Transportation Systems for traffic control.

Stith asked Ott to describe the project on Bluemont Avenue from 6th Street to 4th Street.

Ott explained that the Public Works Department plans to provide center turn lanes at 6th and 5th Streets. Stith commented on saving the trees along Bluemont Avenue. Ott indicated the trees will be preserved.

Stith expressed his concern over the roundabout at Grand Mere and Kimball Avenue. He said that it was a problem intersection and the Board was apprehensive of approving any more projects at the intersection as it would increase traffic and aggravate the problem. Stith also asked if the Department had plans to develop bikeways.

Ott explained the studies that have been done regarding the roundabout. He also commented on bicycle infrastructure improvements.

Ebert asked about who is responsible to build or pay for sidewalk improvements to fill sidewalk gaps.

Ott explained the process by which sidewalks are constructed and maintained.

Cattell discussed Community Development Department's CIP project, consisting of a Safe Streets Implementation Plan, which will be a joint project with the Public Works Department. The project will take the recommendations from the Manhattan Area Transportation Strategy and the FHMPO's Intermodal Integration Plan to develop design standards for multi modal infrastructure.

Cattell also discussed the Urban Service Area Boundary as identified in the Comprehensive Plan and indicated no revisions to where currently needed, as it was just updated in 2015.

Cattell said that City Administration finds the proposed 2018–2022 CIP to be in general conformance with the Comprehensive Plan and recommends that the Manhattan Urban Area Planning Board make a similar finding.

Stith made a motion that the Manhattan Urban Area Planning Board finds that the proposed 2018–2022 Capital Improvements Program is in general conformance with the Manhattan Urban Area Comprehensive Plan. Nuss seconded the motion which passed on a vote of 5–0.

REPORTS AND COMMENTS BY BOARD MEMBERS AND STAFF.

Cattell said that he and Monty Wedel from Riley County will be meeting with the Pottawatomie County Planning Commission on Thursday to explain how the Manhattan Urban Area Planning Board functions and how the City and Riley County coordinate planning and zoning reviews.

Stith asked about the plans for the burned-out building in Aggieville. Cattell replied that the City was being lenient by giving the owner sufficient time to determine how they want to proceed.

Stith asked about the City's plans on hiring a consultant for Aggieville. Cattell indicated the City has received the RFQ responses and the Selection Committee is determining which firms to interview.

Ebert commented that while municipal facilities are not bound by zoning regulations of the city, there were two items on the agenda about municipal facility reviews. Cattell explained that the city can impose a zoning regulations on a municipal facility and that the municipal facility process is a way to weigh and balance the requirements of zoning provisions compared to the mission of the proposed facility.

There be no further business, Parikh adjourned the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Annapurna Singh, Planning Intern