

MINUTES

MANHATTAN URBAN AREA PLANNING BOARD

City Commission Room, City Hall
1101 Poyntz Avenue

February 5, 2018

MEMBERS PRESENT: Debbie Nuss (chair), Phil Anderson, John Ball, Ken Ebert (vice-chair), Jerry Reynard, Gary Stith

MEMBERS ABSENT: Neil Parikh

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

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

I. OPEN PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were none.

II. CONSENT AGENDA

1. Approve the **MINUTES** of the January 18, 2018, Manhattan Urban Area Planning Board meeting.

Stith moved that the Board approve the Consent Agenda; Anderson seconded. Motion passed 6-0-0.

III. WORK SESSION

1. **2019-2023 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM:** Planning Board discussion of suggestions for the 2019 to 2023 Capital Improvements Program.

Bunger presented the current project recommendations for the Capital Improvements Program for the City of Manhattan.

Stith asked for an update and the current status of the Aggieville Campus Edge Parking Garage that was listed as a 2017 CIP project for \$5 million that is being presented tomorrow at the city commission meeting.

Adam explained that the draft outlines tiered structured parking options based on low, medium, and high levels of growth. Based upon public input, medium growth seems most likely but the garage should be expandable to accommodate higher growth. The purpose of this is to build a parking garage to encourage development then add to the parking structure in the future if needed.

Stith asked if it was likely that the Aggieville parking project be included in 2019–2023 CIP. Bunger replied yes. A price tag has not been placed on specific options; just a general estimate. Funding sources have been identified for the project and the city commission meeting will establish a direction for those funding opportunities. If the discussion goes well at the meeting, a CIP project will be included for the parking garage.

Stith asked if the purpose of the discussion was to solicit ideas from the board and a future session will discuss what will be included in the CIP. Bunger responded yes, ideas will be gathered and organized through the various city departments and will be presented to the planning board and the city commission in July to confirm the projects follow the comprehensive plan.

Ebert asked what the action items are for the Aggieville parking garage at the city commission meeting. Bunger responded that a review of the draft infrastructure and parking study that was done by Olson Associates and Walker Parking will be presented and discussing the possibility of selling city land at Bluemont Avenue and 12th Street.

Ebert asked if it was just an update and no formal action was taking place. Bunger confirmed it was just an update.

Nuss asked what the implications of the sale of the land will be for the parking as it is intended to be a hotel. Adam commented that the reason the sale is being considered is because the hotel intends to construct all necessary parking onsite. Nuss asked if there was any intention for a public–private partnership. Adam replied no.

Bunger said there are two items included in the city commission agenda; considering the Aggieville parking analysis and considering the sale of real estate at 12th and Bluemont. His understanding is that the financial gain was being considered to be put into a future parking garage.

Stith confirmed that was the recommendation, along with using tax increment financing for a future parking garage.

Stith asked if the \$50,000 for sidewalk improvements in the CIP was necessary due to the sales tax that was approved for recreation money for safe routes to school that would include sidewalks and trails. He assumed this new tax would negate the need for the sidewalk improvement in the CIP.

Bunger replied that the sale tax for street improvements and safe routes to school was for specific improvements that have already been identified; the other sales tax for recreation improvements was for the new recreation center and trail connectivity improvements. Bunger stated that there is still a need for the sidewalk improvement CIP.

Nuss agreed that sidewalk improvements should continue to be included in the CIP. Bunger stated that the sidewalk improvement funds get used effectively every year.

Anderson suggested that Darwin Abbot be included in the Aggieville parking garage process because he has been very involved in Kansas State’s parking garage. Bunger said he would relay that information to the city manager’s office.

Anderson also commented that the \$50,000 for sidewalk improvement is very little considering how costly it is to construct sidewalks. Nuss added that it is a similar scenario for the alleyway improvement project because it is so costly to fix an alley. Anderson commented that his alley is approximately \$250,000 to repair, which is five years' budget. Bunger replied that a formal process has been initiated to repair the alleys in the city to set priority and cost sharing of repairs with property owners.

Stith commented that the city is careful to consider sidewalks for new roadway projects and that subdivisions also require sidewalks to be developed, hopefully this will continue in the UDO. The sidewalk improvements budget is for infill where sidewalks were not included in the past. Stith added that he is very pleased with the sales tax and safe routes to school.

Nuss reminded the board that Community Development Block Grant funding can also be used for sidewalk improvements and sidewalk improvements will most likely be completed around the South Manhattan Neighborhood Recreation Center.

Nuss shared the current CIP list; sidewalk improvements, alley rehabilitation, parking garage, and the grant match for bus stops and confirmed members accepted all items.

Anderson asked if the new bus routes were active yet. Nuss replied no, but they would be in operation soon. During the last meeting they had planned for the new route to begin in February, there have just been some delays. Anderson suggested that bus stops with a shelter use advertising as a funding source.

Nuss referred to staff's memo detailing suggested CIP projects: update of zoning and subdivision regulations, development of safe streets implementation plan, and the flood mitigation grant match. Nuss asked the board if they had additional recommendations for the CIP.

Ball asked if the update of zoning and subdivision regulations and the development of safe streets implementation plan drop off the list as they are currently being executed. Nuss replied yes.

Stith asked for the timeline on the safe streets implementation plan and if it was out for RFP yet. Adam confirmed that it is not out for RFP. It is being scoped now to see what the end product will be. It may be possible to wrap it up within this year.

Stith suggested that money for design guidelines for the Eureka Valley and K-118 corridors and 177 coming in from south be set aside. Bunger said that there are site and building standards written into both corridors. Stith asked if there were guidelines related to building standards in the UDO. Bunger replied yes. Stith asked if there was a need for a set of separate design guidelines to exist. Bunger said that the city and county feel comfortable with the standards in the UDO for those entries into Manhattan.

Stith asked if the staff felt that they could accomplish the update to the downtown plan in house or if staff felt funding was necessary. Adam replied that staff feels like they can accomplish it in house and referring to funding, staff wouldn't be able to make this cycle but hopes to begin on it later this year. It would be nice to throw in as a placeholder so if staff can't get started this year and it could be completed next year.

Stith recommended funding for a three-dimensional fly through, similar to what was done with the Aggieville Vision Plan, so staff does not get overwhelmed. He feels this is necessary to visualize what is being recommended. Adam responded that Chmiel has skills in City Engine and feels he will be able to accomplish a task quickly.

Anderson asked about a roundabout at Colbert Hills for the safe streets because it is under-designed and over-utilized. This should be on the list of safe streets issues. Nuss agreed, especially since the completion of the roundabout at Scenic Drive and Anderson Avenue. Stith agreed because there continues to be a lot of development in that area. Anderson commented that drivers are getting more skilled at using roundabouts. Nuss agreed but said there are still complaints about the roundabouts in the city.

Nuss suggested that Mel Borst has come forward about the Bluemont corridor and suggested a corridor study to create a plan to make development more deliberate. Anderson added that lighting and landscape plans need to be included because it is a major corridor through the city.

Stith commented that the Bluemont Corridor was included in the comprehensive plan because a realtor thought it would be a ideal area for strip commercial development from 4th street to Aggieville. He thinks this would be terrible and wants to preserve the character of Bluemont. The study could be directed at preservation but he is nervous about the study because a bad decision could ruin the corridor.

Nuss agreed and felt this would be good way to manage and set expectations for development in the corridor. Stith added that the street trees need to be preserved and widening the roadway would eliminate those trees while also speeding up traffic.

Anderson said two homes in the corridor, on the 500 and 600 blocks, were built by Henry Winter, a prominent architect of the 20th century, and across the street was the first dean of architecture's home. There are many other nice homes along that corridor.

Nuss asked staff if the Bluemont corridor study was something that could be accomplished in house. Stith suggested funding for a historic survey to be conducted along the corridor to create historic district. Adam said he would have to check with HRB as they created a prioritization of studies to be done in the community. An analysis was done around 4th Street and Bluemont a few years ago but not a survey. The next priority is an Aggieville study but will mention the suggestion to the Historic Resources Board.

Nuss commented that it would be a good idea to complete the Aggieville survey and then do a Bluemont corridor study to connect the analysis from 4th street to Aggieville. Ball said it could be a part of a corridor study to set boulevard parameters on the corridor and to look at historic aspects and future vision of the road. Nuss suggested the potential of a historic district along the corridor.

Adam added that the inclusion of the Bluemont Corridor in the Comprehensive Plan was due to the desire for strip commercial development but its current zoning prevents it from turning into strip commercial. Historic preservation will not protect anything on its own; standing fast on the existing zoning will. With respect to that, the aim of a study would need to be preservatory. Bluemont will not be a boulevard because it is a central spine of

the community and could not lose a lane. He noted that staff was looking at doing a road diet on Poyntz Avenue long term to restore it to being a boulevard. A transportation analysis will show that Poyntz doesn't need five lanes as it is no longer a highway. Staff is talking with Public Works to get money for the Poyntz study rather than focusing on Bluemont.

Bunger commented that a study of Poyntz will address the need for commercial and the Bluemont corridor study can be completed later. The reason the project was in the Comprehensive Plan was to commercialize the corridor. Stith clarified that the Comprehensive Plan does not suggest turning the Bluemont corridor into a commercial area. Bunger agreed but stated that the reason the action item was included was based on the notion that it could become commercial.

Ball asked how to coordinate city activities and the local school board. The school board is looking at major improvements and thinks the school board and planning need to come together. Bunger stated that most of the coordination happens between the city manager's office and the district superintendent's office. Adam added that with the safe routes project, Public Works has coordinated with the district principals to create a prioritization of areas that need improvements.

Stith said there needs to be consideration with Pottawatomie County for a recreation site with the school in Blue Township which is a part of USD 383. Ball suggested that the Planning Board take a look at the school district plans with the school board as there will be other factors affected by the improvements. The school system does have an impact on the planning in the city and it needs to be coordinated. There are improvements that can be done better but need to coordinate before implementation happens so recommendations can be made. CIP funding is not needed for school improvements but need to explore coordination with the school district.

Stith questioned the status of Blue Township in Pottawatomie County becoming a part of the Manhattan Urban Area. Bunger said it has been an ongoing discussion. He said discussion among planning staff has not occurred in the last few months but conversations have been happening above the departments about involving Pottawatomie County in more city development processes.

Nuss asked if a goal could be set for when action may happen as it has been discussed for a significant amount of time. Stith added that it is in the Comprehensive Plan. Bunger replied that it is difficult because it is mostly political. Nuss stated that she understood that it was political but someone needed to bite the bullet and move forward.

Stith said that the Flint Hills Regional Council is applying for Joint Land Use Study implementation funds. One of the recommendations in the study was that more detailed neighborhood planning occur in Blue Township to ensure that it would be able to accommodate more development and take pressure off of development on the west side of Manhattan which could negatively impact the fort. It would be helpful if that area were a part of the urban area because it does have an impact on Manhattan and it is needed because there isn't a place in the city to accommodate that kind of development.

Nuss added that the Board wanted to be on record again stating the desire to see more movement in that direction opposed to just hearing that discussions are taking place. Bunger replied it has been duly noted.

Stith suggested a meeting between the two planning boards. Nuss added that elected officials should also be included so they hear directly from the planning board regarding that topic. Stith said there would be stronger political support on the Pottawatomie County side if the action came from the Pottawatomie County Planning Commission. Another meeting may encourage them to make a recommendation that the area become a part of the urban area. Anderson added that it may be suggested that Pottawatomie County request the meeting. Bunger agreed and said that there is a need and desire but one can only do so much.

Ebert asked for an update on Seth Child corridor study. Bunger replied that the City Commission heard an update on the study, but he did not attend due to illness. The study laid out a series of options; the most well-received option—with traffic improvements, cost, environmental factors, and other physical factors taken into consideration—was to make Seth Child a boulevard. Eliminating the overpasses and interchanges, by bringing everything to at-grade and signaling them, will make it a complete boulevard. He didn't believe it went over very well with the City Commission. It is a challenging corridor because the Anderson and Kimball improvements would require a significant widening of the overpasses for them to function in the future; taking away a lot of business and property. Seth Child currently functions well from north to south, except the few traffic lights and open intersections across traffic, but when you look at the congestion on Anderson and Kimball you need to improve those interchanges which are costly. The study found that to make Seth Child an expressway, several intersections would have to be removed. The study found that you can accomplish everything necessary by making intersections at-grade and signaled improvements. Not everyone agrees with the recommendation so there is still work to be done.

Ebert asked who is funding the corridor improvements and who the decision maker is. Bunger said the funding was through a grant the MPO acquired through KDOT for a corridor study. The partners are KDOT, MPO, Flint Hills Metropolitan Planning Organization, the city, and Riley County with equal match. In order to be adopted all parties would be included in the decision but primarily KDOT, the city, and the county.

Ebert asked if there was a timeframe for the project. Bunger said he did not know the timeline but the study was presented as a draft.

Stith asked if a work session could be scheduled for the board to see the study as traffic changes affect land use. Bunger replied that he would attempt to set that up. He asked if there were any other CIP recommendations. Hearing none, he recapped the items recommended in the 2018–2022 CIP that were being carried forward; the annual sidewalk improvement fund of \$50,000 to fill in critical gaps, the annual alley rehabilitation project of \$50,000 for alley rehabilitation and repaving, the Aggieville campus edge parking garage for \$5 million to provide a garage or garages in Aggieville, and a match for the Flint Hills Transit Authorities grant for bus stops of \$22,500 a year.

Ball asked if flood mitigation was included. Bunger replied that the city will include flood mitigation, showing the Board's support for assisting floodprone properties.

Nuss asked if the board should increase the amount for the alley rehabilitation project so that there would be enough funding to complete one alley since it cost around \$250,000 per alley. Anderson commented that not all alleys would cost \$250,000. Nuss replied that \$50,000 is still not enough. It would not hurt to ask; the City Commission can simply say no. Anderson suggested doing one alley a year.

Nuss asked the board to pick a funding amount. Ball agreed the amount should be increased but did not support increasing the sidewalk improvement project and to save that for next year. Nuss said enough to complete one alley and asked staff to find out from Rob what the average cost is to complete one alley. Stith commented that he doesn't think the Board should come up with the amount. Nuss agreed and said Rob Ott (Public Works director) should decide the amount to recommend based on the average cost of an alley. Ball agreed that the cost of an alley would be a good recommendation. Ebert asked if there was a known amount of the alleys that need done. Nuss replied that a study had been completed. Reynard commented that everything within the older grid, everything east of North Manhattan and south of Kearney or Thurston. Anderson suggested doing before and after photographs of the alleyways.

Bunger said other items discussed for CIP recommendations included the Kimball Avenue/Grand Mere roundabout redesign, Bluemont corridor study for lighting and landscape design, and a historic survey along Bluemont corridor.

Nuss asked if the downtown study was already being completed. Bunger replied that staff hopes to begin that process later this year.

Nuss asked the board if they had any other recommendations, there were none.

Nuss asked for public input.

Donna Schenck-Hamlin, 1922 Leavenworth Street, commented on sidewalk problems on Jarvis Drive. North of Claflin parking is permitted on both sides and there are no sidewalks. The pedestrian traffic is very bad during K-State games and difficult to see when dark. There is a need for sidewalks on at least one side of the street and limit parking to one side of the street. There are also bus stops on the road with no sidewalks which is dangerous.

Adam noted that a neighborhood meeting was held two weeks ago with Public Works to put sidewalks on Jarvis Drive. Property owners on the street need to show support for the sidewalk to proceed with the project. To implement a sidewalk some trees would be lost and easements may need to be obtained. There were some concerns from property owners included who would be liable for the sidewalk. Public Works is working to determine interest of property owners before the item is brought before Commission. It is being tied together with bike route improvements and linking it to the bike boulevard on West Laramie Street.

Anderson commented that parking makes the street very narrow and dangerous. It may anger the neighborhood to limit parking to one side of the street but most streets in the

city don't have parking on both sides. Bunger commented that parking on both sides of the street is an effective traffic-calming technique. Ebert agreed that parking on both sides does slow traffic significantly. Adam commented that it and an adjacent street could potentially form a couplet in the future, one being one-way north, the other being one-way south.

Stith commented that a parking analysis, like the one completed in the urban core, could be done in this area. Bunger responded that he thinks that most cars parked on the street in the neighborhood are most likely residence because there are no parking lots and no alleys in the area. Nuss agreed that there is scarce parking in that neighborhood. Residents either have to park in the small driveways or on the street.

Stith asked if staff needed action of the items presented. Nuss said that consensus was needed and asked the board if any members protest the items presented, there were none.

2. **REPORTS** and **COMMENTS** by Board Members and staff.

Anderson shared his recent visit to Chicago's waterfront area, reminding the staff about the potential for waterfront development in downtown Manhattan along the Kansas River.

Bunger commented that a work session for the UDO with Bret Keast was scheduled for February 19, 2018 but the work session has now been rescheduled to March 5, 2018. Prior to the work session, from 5:30 to 6:30 p.m., will be a public open house in the Harmon Room to discuss comments and concerns of the UDO with the consultants. The Ordinance Advisory Committee is meeting on March 20, 2018. Meeting notices have been sent out to the public. A schedule of events is being put together for a series of meetings and work sessions with the public, the planning board, and the city commission on a variety of topics that are new or topics that staff would like input on that are in the UDO.

Meeting was adjourned at 7:57 p.m.

Submitted by Lesley Frohberg, Planning Intern