

MINUTES

MANHATTAN URBAN AREA PLANNING BOARD

City Commission Room, City Hall
1101 Poyntz Avenue

June 4, 2018

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

MEMBERS ABSENT: Gary Stith

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

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 May 21, 2018, Manhattan Urban Area Planning Board meeting.
2. Approve the **FINAL PLAT** of Kimball Place Addition, Unit Four, generally located at 1321 Laramie Street and 525 Manhattan Avenue. (*Applicant/Owner: Virginia Propp, Schrum Rentals, LLC; File no. SUB-18-022*).
3. Approve the **FINAL PLAT** of Scenic Meadows, Unit Five, generally located on Fossilridge Circle, east of Scenic Drive and north of Fort Riley Boulevard.

Reynard moved that the Board approve the Consent Agenda; Ebert seconded. Motion passed 6–0–0 on consent items 2 and 3; 4–0–2 on item 1, Nuss and Parikh abstaining due to absence from previous meeting.

III. GENERAL AGENDA

1. **A PUBLIC HEARING** to consider the request to **REZONE** 1321 Laramie Street from R-3/UO, Multiple Family Residential District with University Overlay, to C-3, Aggieville Business District, and R-M/UO, Four-Family Residential District, with the University Overlay. (*Applicant/Owner: Virginia Propp, Schrum Rentals, LLC; file no. SUB-18-022*).

Daivdson presented the staff report for the rezoning and recommended approval.

Ball asked if the applicant planned to replat the site. Davidson said yes; the replat had been approved by the Kimball Place Addition consent agenda item.

Ebert asked if the subject site is currently one lot. Davidson said yes; the replat will just shift the lot line between the apartment complex at 525 N. Manhattan Avenue and the subject site if the rezoning is approved.

Ebert asked if the replatted property will meet the minimum lot size requirements. Davidson said yes; the purpose of the rezoning and the replatting is to allow the apartment complex to continue to use the area for parking and 1321 Laramie will be redeveloped.

Nuss opened the public hearing.

There was no testimony.

Nuss closed the public hearing.

Ball moved to recommend approval of the proposed rezoning of 1321 Laramie Street from R-3/UO, Multi-Family Residential District with University Overlay to C-3, Aggieville Business District, and R-M/UO, Four-Family Residential District, with the University Overlay; Reynard seconded. Motion passed 6–0–0.

IV. WORK SESSION

1. Discussion of the **Unified Development Ordinance** – subdivision regulations, car and bicycle parking, and landscaping – Module 2.

Bunger shared that the information being presented is still a draft and staff is seeking feedback to continue developing the Unified Development Ordinance.

Davidson presented the proposed subdivision regulations.

Ball said he supports having sidewalks and there is an advantage to having them on both sides but it will cost homeowners and developers. Davidson agreed that there is a cost but said staff thinks the benefits out way the cost.

Ball commented that he would like developers' input. He said he is in favor of sidewalks but not necessarily on both sides.

Nuss commented that the result of the City's policy changing over time has created the current issues with connectivity and part of the sales tax to improve streets is dedicated to fix some of those connectivity issues. She added that the cost to fill sidewalk gaps is greater now that it would have been if they were constructed with the property and thinks the benefit to the community is greater than the cost to the developer.

Anderson commented that sidewalks on one side of the street can cause safety concerns.

The lack of a sidewalk on Fort Riley Boulevard is also dangerous and should be a high priority for the City.

Ebert said at the last advisory meeting for the UDO, the developers and builders present were not against sidewalks but said it was an additional cost that would increase the price of the property. Bunger commented that staff would make an effort to identify the costs and benefits of sidewalks, but noted that a \$2,000 sidewalk does not suddenly make a \$300,000 house less affordable.

Reynard asked what percentage of the lot is required to be open space. Davidson said it depends on the zoning district and type of development. Ebert asked how the maintenance of the open space is addressed. Davidson said by the owner.

Chmiel presented the proposed car parking regulations.

Ebert asked what the proposed parking ratio is for churches. Chmiel replied that the minimum requirement is 1 space per 6 seats and the maximum is 1 space per 1.5 seats. Bunger commented that these are minimums and maximums; churches should build according to their expected attendance.

Ebert said churches are common in residential neighborhoods and should not rely on City streets for parking as it impacts the residential neighborhoods. He suggested a valid ratio would be 1 space per 2.2–2.5 seats.

Chmiel said that the majority of the uses being discussed are going to be isolated from residential areas and staff is trusting that developers and churches will provide adequate parking.

Ebert said he is basing his opinion on personal experience.

Chmiel said churches are also unique in that they go unused for a majority of the time.

Parikh said hoping churches will build adequate parking may not be the best policy because churches work within strict budgets; parking would be the first thing cut. It is unfortunate to have a large, empty parking lot for these special uses but people appreciate having parking.

Ball commented that he supports limiting the excess parking but is uncomfortable using parking regulations as a tool to encourage walking or biking. He believes that commercial businesses will not undercut the amount of parking they need for customers too much but other organizations may do it to save cost.

Anderson pointed out that multiple churches downtown use public streets as parking on Sunday and it seems to work well. He said he likes the approach of limiting supply to minimize excessive parking while making it easier and safer to walk, bike, and use public transit.

Reynard commented that businesses like Walmart spend time analyzing how much parking

they will need and are willing to pay for it. He feels if a business wants the parking and is willing to pay, then they should be able to.

Nuss commented that when Walmart was developed they initially wanted more parking and the planning board suggested less because that there was too much parking.

Bunger said that staff's contention is that it adds storm water runoff, increases the heat island effect, and adds virtually no landscaping. Staff is proposing a cap on parking to reduce these added impacts on the community.

Ebert asked if Walmart would fall within the proposed range of allowed parking spaces using the proposed ratios. Chmiel said he does not recall but does not believe it is within the proposed range. Bunger noted that being over the new range would not mean that a business would have to remove parking spaces. Chmiel said that is a part of the change of use policy; if a use changes and it is over the maximum, staff will not require them to eliminate spaces.

Parikh said he would propose that Walmart wants to have more parking that they will ever need so their customers never have an issue finding parking; that is a part of customer satisfaction. He asked how a business not building out to maximum parking would be giving them more flexibility.

Chmiel clarified that staff wants to reduce the concern for developers about providing parking for future tenants if the intensity of use were to change. The policy will allow a developer to supply the minimum parking requirement, while leaving room for expansion, and have tenants fluctuate without having to add parking each time.

Anderson commented that Walmart is not the only business that is over-parked. Manhattan is sprawling and with the growth limitations, the community will have to become more dense in the future.

Nuss said she thinks the parking for the Hy-Vee shopping center is a good amount and still encourages walking.

Chmiel presented the proposed bicycle parking regulations.

Ebert asked the source of the statistic, "1 in 50 people bike to work daily" in Manhattan. Chmiel said it comes from the American Community Survey, and noted that it is three times the national average.

Anderson commented he observed that Wefald Hall has a largest amount bike parking. He suggested that bike parking be required downtown because it is a destination. Chmiel said staff did not want to require bike parking downtown as buildings are already built to the property lines and the City should provide bike parking in the right-of-way. Anderson said having bike parking in the downtown area would be positive.

Adam presented the proposed landscaping regulations. He noted that, like with parking, the new standards are modest changes that try to achieve what the citizens want the city to

look like, not necessarily what businesses want to do.

Ebert asked if the current standard that allows a 6-foot buffer with a fence and shrubs was eliminated. Bunger said that it is still an option—the business can have a buffer with greenery or the buffer yard can be reduced if they construct a fence.

Anderson commented that the vegetation and lighting in the downtown makes it more attractive and similar landscaping should be applied for businesses.

Wrapping up, Bunger asked if the only major concern from the work session was church parking. Nuss said she is not concerned with the church parking ratio. She commented that the City can do better with enforcing landscape requirements. Ball commented that getting the parking ratios right is important but generally you will hear from the public that there is not enough parking.

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

Ball commented that Wine in the Wild was a great event.

Parikh announced that the school board is discussing the future of the district and a bond issue may be brought forward to build a new school. He encouraged everyone to stay informed on the topic.

Anderson said that the brick pavement looks nice on North Juliette but the downside of the project is that the treelawn has been compacted and the landscaping has become unsightly. He urged City staff to look at the downtown's surrounding residential areas and the riverfront for the downtown redevelopment plan this fall. He also commented that the zip line was very adventurous.

Nuss said that zip lining was a field trip for seniors at the senior center and it was very popular. She also commented that the Westar substation on Seth Child by the Manhattan Area Technical College is an eyesore and apologized to the neighborhood for approving it.

Meeting was adjourned at 8:57 p.m.

Submitted by Lesley Frohberg, Planning Intern