

MINUTES
MANHATTAN URBAN AREA PLANNING BOARD
City Commission Room, City Hall
1101 Poyntz Avenue
October 16, 2017
7:00 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Debbie Nuss, Vice-Chairperson; Gary Stith; Jerry Reynard; John Ball

MEMBERS ABSENT: Phil Anderson; Neil Parikh; Ken Ebert

STAFF PRESENT: Chad Bunger, Assistant Director of Community Development; Carol Davidson, Senior Current Planner; John Adam, Senior Planner, Ben Chmiel, Planner II

Nuss called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

OPEN PUBLIC COMMENTS

Nuss opened the meeting for public comments.

Sandy Griegar, 2012 Ivy Drive, a Biology major from Kansas State University, invited the City of Manhattan to become a Climate Mayor city i.e. to be a part of a coalition of 400 cities across U.S. who work together to promote sustainable communities by reducing carbon emission in accordance with the Paris Agreement. She also mentioned that she would be presenting her case to the City Commission sometime in December and wanted the support of Manhattan Urban Area Planning Board.

CONSENT AGENDA

APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 2, 2017, MANHATTAN URBAN AREA PLANNING BOARD MEETING.

Stith moved to approve the motion. John Ball seconded the motion and it passed 3—0—1 with Stith abstaining.

WORK SESSION

Bunger introduced Bret Keast, Kendig Keast Collaborative, Inc., the consultant on the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) project, who would be explaining some of the details to the Board.

Keast briefed the Board on each element of Module One of the UDO, which includes the districts, permitted and conditional uses in those districts, and design standards for the same. He outlined some of the “big ideas” of the UDO: code reorganization and unification, district realignment, resolution of nonconformities, mixed use/special area design, infill redevelopment, procedural streamlining. Keast elaborated how the various

zoning districts have been condensed into fewer districts and developers would be able to do more things by right. This would mean fewer rezoning applications and less work for the City staff without compromising the quality of development. He also described the change in nomenclature for a few districts and how each district was consolidated on standard lots. He mentioned that a floating PUD was still going to be there for certain areas but there would be fewer PUDs after the UDO.

Chmiel commented that the goal of the UDO was to integrate more mixed use into the existing zoning districts, especially the mixed use resulting from the regeneration of old shopping centers. Keast confirmed that observation. He also listed the several overlay districts and said that the stricter regulations will prevail in case of an overlay. He elaborated how non-conformities would be dealt with and how lots in separate districts would require buffer zones that include open space, landscaping, trails, parks, and the like. He explained the three new development types in the UDO—standard, cluster, and planned development—and the levels of uses that go with each of them—permitted use, conditional use, and limited use. He described open space and higher density as important elements in the new code, and he noted standards for minimum sizes of dwelling units to ensure quality living. All this would allow the City to accommodate more people and ensure quality dwelling at the same time.

Nuss asked about the process for the public to comment, express concern or dissent on any development based on the guidelines of the UDO. Keast replied that it would be the same as the process in place now: neighborhood meetings and public hearings, plus the option of appeal.

Another important element of the UDO was accessory dwelling units. Keast elaborated that accessory dwelling units would be allowed in certain districts, either as integrated with the principal home or as a separate dwelling unit above the garage. These units would be located in the backyard and would have size restrictions so they are not taller than the principal home.

Keast also mentioned the temporary uses and the districts in which they will be allowed and talked about how the Established Neighborhood overlay district would deal with non-conformities. He also covered provisions for tiny home villages: their lot sizes, parking, access, and fire protection.

Another element in the UDO is the Eureka Valley K-18 Corridor. Overlay designs, mixed-use design standards, including sidewalks and parking, were some of the elements that were being considered.

Ball emphasized the need for more pictures in the draft to make it more user friendly.

Stith commented that the community expects the whole UDO process to raise the bar in terms of design standards. Keast replied there is an entire section on design standards.

Nuss commented that the UDO should be more beneficial to the community and not just the developers. Keast said he and his team were cognizant of the needs and wishes of the community.

Stith commented that if there were options for affordable housing in the vicinity of the City there should not be a problem. Also, more affordable housing units were needed inside the City limits.

Ball said he thought the actions of the City often tend to drive lower income people away even if they are not intentional.

Stith commented that he was more concerned about raising the bar on commercial development than the residential type.

Keast explained that there were provisions in the draft for landscaping that would allow pervious surfaces, trees shrubs, roof types, and building standards which could be applied citywide.

Keast provided the timeline for next steps in the UDO. He said the consolidation of comments and suggestions would happen within a week, and that the next module, concerning parking, landscaping, site design, and lighting, and so forth, would be given to the City staff in early December. The next work session with the Board is scheduled for February 5; the Board will have it for review by January 18. The meeting regarding Module 3 will happen in early May.

Nuss asked for any more comments from the Board members or staff. As there were no further comments she adjourned the meeting at 8:07 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Annapurna Singh, Planning Intern