

MINUTES

MANHATTAN URBAN AREA PLANNING BOARD

City Commission Room, City Hall
1101 Poyntz Avenue

February 18, 2019

MEMBERS PRESENT

Ken Ebert, *chair*
Phil Anderson
John Ball

Neil Parikh
Jerry Reynard, *vice-chair*
Gary Stith

MEMBERS ABSENT

Debbie Nuss

STAFF PRESENT

Chad Bunger, Asst. Community Development Director; Barry Beagle, Senior Planner;
John Adam, Senior Planner; Ben Chmiel, Planner II

1. CALL TO ORDER

- 1.1. Ebert called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Staff called roll and stated there was a quorum.
- 1.2. Open Public Comments: there were none.

2. CONSENT AGENDA

- 2.1. Approve the minutes of the February 4, 2019, Manhattan Urban Area Planning Board meeting

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

3. GENERAL AGENDA

- 3.1. A PUBLIC HEARING to consider an AMENDMENT of the Aggieville Commercial (C-3) zoning district regulations to allow greater building height, add design standards, and modify parking requirements (*applicant: City of Manhattan; file no. DCA-19-014*).

Chmiel presented the staff report and covered the proposed amendments for the Aggieville Commercial (C-3) zoning district.

Reynard asked how many living units staff is anticipating in the Aggieville area. Chmiel said in the core they envision more mixed-use, commercial, and residential

development but on the perimeter they anticipate more single-use, high-density residential. The parking study that was completed for Aggieville was based upon the addition of approximately 150 living units.

Reynard asked when staff anticipates the two envisioned parking structures will be constructed. Chmiel replied the City Commission is considering the parking structure on the west side in the coming weeks. The second parking structure is a long-range plan which could be 5–10 years; it will depend on the demand for parking.

Reynard asked if the east parking garage would replace the existing bank and the restaurant. Chmiel confirmed.

Public hearing open.

Dennis Cook, 6854 Chinkapin Circle, vice-president of the Aggieville Business Association Board of Directors, voiced his support for this amendment as it will support the future vision of Aggieville.

Anderson asked if he anticipates use of the parking garage will be for free or for a fee. Cook replied both; there will need to be some pay structure during the day and potentially free at night. Discussions on the potential pay structure are ongoing.

Public hearing closed.

Stith said this is a move in the right direction. He still has concerns that one parking space per bedroom will limit redevelopment opportunities and is unnecessary but he will not pursue changing the proposed amendments at this time. The parking can be monitored over time and adjustments can be made in the future. Stith hopes the UDO will provide more detailed design guidelines; specifically to prevent stucco from being used on the ground level. He also suggested reviewing land uses, like miniature golf, for this district in the UDO.

Stith moved to recommend approval for the proposed amendments of the Aggieville Commercial (C-3) zoning district regulations to the City Commission; Reynard seconded.

Anderson asked Stith to clarify his concern, asking if Stith would reduce the parking requirement for apartment complexes in Aggieville. Stith replied that there still needs to be some parking requirement for residential uses but based on circumstances one space per bedroom is unnecessary. His concern is that they are envisioning 3–5 stories of development and with the parking requirement it will be difficult to achieve. He is also concerned that the staff report cites survey results as justification for the ratio.

Anderson said he agrees with Stith's comments on parking. He is inclined to reduce the requirement but he understand that staff is trying to placate other points of view as well.

Ebert asked if it will still be possible to request an alternative parking ratio in the UDO. Chmiel said yes, exceptions can be requested.

Ebert said he compared the originally proposed ratio of 0.75 spaces per bedroom to the current 1 space per bedroom and there is a significant difference but he understands the parking concerns. He asked Chmiel to clarify the origins of the parking study. Chmiel replied that it was a local study.

Ebert asked if KansasState University has data on the number of full-time, local students that bring cars to town. Chmiel replied no, there are parking permit and address data but there are many discrepancies.

Anderson said proposed parking garage spaces could be rented out to local businesses or residents. Stith replied that could affect the tax-exempt status that finances the garage.

Ball commented that he is on the board to listen to the recommendations of the experts, listen to the business owners, serve as a representative to the citizens of Riley County, and try to synthesis what is best based upon everyone's opinions. He does consider the parking study results, however analyses may not always be correct. He thinks the amendment is going in the right direction by reducing the cost of construction and parking. He supports this because the business owners support it and it is reasonable based upon the survey results and studies.

Motion passed 6–0–0.

4. WORK SESSION

4.1. Capital Improvements Program. Planning Board discussion of recommendations for the 2020–24 CIP.

Bunger said the purpose of this meeting is to get consensus on what the board would like to include in the Capital Improvement Program. Last year's suggestions included sidewalk and alleyway renovations, the Aggieville parking garage, bus stops, and roadway improvements.

Stith asked if the housing market analysis and policy strategy would be for the Manhattan incorporated boundaries, the urban area, or a larger regional review. Bunger said it will need incorporate the urban area so we can factor in some of the immediate rural areas including Green Valley. He would not suggest extending farther than that as housing studies can be tricky. He would support a regional study but recommends focusing on Manhattan at this time.

Stith asked if there has been any discussion with the other jurisdictions to see if they would be willing to participate in a regional study. Bunger replied no, but the Region Reimagined project manager has talked with other communities about the possibilities.

Bunger noted that there are more CIP projects proposed than there are funds available.

Stith commented the board has requested \$50,000 for the sidewalk gap fund for many years and there have been improvements made around the city. He asked if all of the money is typically spent annually. Bunger said yes.

Stith said he realized that resources are tight but the board has requested \$50,000 for years and there should be consideration for increasing that fund to account for inflation. He is also wondering if the sales tax that was adopted for existing city streets includes sidewalks. Bunger said he thinks the tax was strictly for street improvements. Staff is looking for a variety of funding sources for sidewalks through City-University Funds, CBDG, Community Development Block Grants, and Safe Routes to School.

Anderson asked how much sidewalk would \$50,000 buy. Bunger said he would guess about half a block. Ebert clarified that this is for infill not repair. Bunger confirmed.

Anderson commented that the second issue is the alley rehabilitation project. His alleyway would cost approximately \$200,000 and they have only allocated \$150,000 per year. Bunger said he does not know if that has been funded or the progress of that project.

Stith commented that the City Commission had a discussion on policies for alleyways in the older neighborhoods.

Bunger said there are many alleys in the ward districts that are still gravel. The City Commission created a process for residents to create a benefit district to pave the alley. It is state statute that if you have a paved surface, the City is responsible for repairs so a benefit district could not be created to repair existing paved alleys.

Stith said it seems to be particularly critical in the areas that have been upzoned and more traffic is occurring in the alleys, especially in the Urban Core. He asked if there is a set of criteria to elevate which alleys are prioritized for repair.

Bunger said Rob Ott, Public Works Director, and Brian Johnson, City Engineer, have a list of prioritized alleyways but alleys take a backseat to the roadways.

Stith asked if the City can require alley improvements for development in the Urban Core. Bunger said that has been discussed but requirements have not been imposed.

Anderson commented that benefit districts are an issue because the alleys that are in disrepair are heavily populated with rentals. Bunger said that paved alleys do not qualify for a benefit district.

Ebert commented there was a recent Sunset area historical survey, and he knows

the Historic Resources Board has been requesting a historic study of Aggieville. He would encourage staff to give heed to the Historic Resource Board request.

Reynard recommended they continue the list they had last year.

Anderson asked about the estimated cost of the Aggieville parking garage. Bunger said the parking garage that is being discussed on the west side of Aggieville is budgeted around \$12–15 million for a 500-stall parking garage.

Anderson asked if the correct estimate is \$15 million, not \$5 million as listed in the staff report. Bunger said yes, if everything goes according to plan the funding for that garage will be established within the next 90 days so it will be irrelevant for the CIP project. The funding mechanism for the garage and improvements will be a tax increment finance district .

Anderson asked if there are designs or cost estimates for the bus stops. Adam replied that there are three different designs ranging from a simple seat to a more sheltered design. He has not heard any cost estimates.

Bunger said the designs were completed by Kansas State Landscape Architecture students and the fabrication work will be done by the Manhattan Area Technical College students. Cost has not been established yet.

Anderson commented that he thinks sponsorship of the bus stops will be popular depending on what the price would be to alleviate some of the stress on the City. Bunger said funding has not been requested from the City at this point, other funding sources are being used. He does not know what they are considering for advertisements or sponsors at this point.

Anderson said he thinks this will be a good possibility to ease the funding stress for the City. He thinks the Bluemont corridor historical survey is important.

Ebert asked for a status update of the Aggieville streetscape. Bunger said the City hired Olsen and subcontractors to design the garage and conduct a charrette of the streetscape design. If the TIF district is formed, a series of master plans will be created, and that is when the final design will be produced and the funding sources identified.

Bunger clarified that the board wished to keep the same list as the previous year but increase the annual sidewalk improvement fund. He asked what the amount the board would like to request. Reynard suggested \$100,000.

Ball commented that \$100,000 is fine but the board needs to be cognizant of the downward trend of income for the City and show fiscal restraint. There is also significant property tax increases coming from the City and School Board.

The board was in consensus for \$100,000 for the sidewalk improvement fund.

Bunger asked if the Aggieville parking garage should be removed unless the project goes sideways. Ball said he likes the visibility of the project on the CIP request.

Anderson asked if the parking garage design includes commercial space on the ground level. Bunger replied that he has not seen the final design but the Community Development Department is advocating for space on the ground floor.

Adam asked if Ebert's recommendation to heed the HRB's desire to do a survey in Aggieville should be regarded as encouragement from the planning board. The board agreed.

Stith asked if the board could be briefed on the proposed Aggieville improvements. He thinks it would be helpful to the board to see the vision of the district. Bunger replied yes.

5. REPORTS AND COMMENTS BY BOARD MEMBERS AND STAFF

5.1. Planning updates from staff

Bunger announced that the final draft of the UDO will be delivered this week and staff will begin the final review process. It will then be sent out to the advisory committee, planning board, and the public. It is anticipated to be completed by this summer.

5.2. Comments from Board members

Stith announced that Flint Hills Regional Council received an EPA Grant for brown-field assessments. There will be a public presentation on February 27, 2019, at 7:00 p.m. in the City Commission Room. The consultants will be present to discuss the project which is 100% grant so individuals with contaminated property may seek assistance. Ebert asked what area the grant covers. Stith replied it is a seven county area including Pottawatomie, Riley, Geary, Wabaunsee, Morris, Lyon, and Chase counties.

Anderson announced that the Riverfront Development Committee will meet at Radina's on Thursday, February 21, 2019, from 4:00 to 5:00 p.m.

Parikh commented he will be absent for the March 4 meeting.

5.3. Next meeting. Chair announced the next meeting is Monday, March 4, 2019.

6. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting was adjourned at 7:57 p.m.

Submitted by Lesley Frohberg, Planning Intern