

MINUTES

MANHATTAN URBAN AREA PLANNING BOARD

City Commission Room, City Hall
1101 Poyntz Avenue

March 4, 2019

MEMBERS PRESENT

Ken Ebert, *chair*
Phil Anderson
John Ball

Debbie Nuss
Jerry Reynard, *vice-chair*
Gary Stith

MEMBERS ABSENT

Neil Parikh

STAFF PRESENT

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

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 18, 2019, Manhattan Urban Area Planning Board meeting.

Stith moved that the Board approve the Consent Agenda; Reynard seconded.

Ball made an amendment to page 3; clarifying under Ball's comment from the previous meeting that he *does* consider the parking study results but they may not always be correct.

Stith and Reynard accepted the friendly amendment. Motion passed as amended 5–0–1 (Nuss abstaining).

3. GENERAL AGENDA

Note: Items 3.1 and 3.2 were considered together in a single staff report.

- 3.1. A PUBLIC HEARING to consider the request for the RESIDENTIAL USE DESIGNATOR-EXTRANEIOUS FARMSTEAD for a 3.09-acre unplatted tract of land, generally located approximately 1,150 feet south of the intersection of Priboth Road and Moehlman Road, on the east side of Priboth Road (*Applicant: Peterson; file no. RCF-19-020*).
- 3.2. A PUBLIC HEARING to consider the CONCURRENT PLAT for a 3.09-acre tract of land

into a single lot, generally located approximately 1,150 feet south of the intersection of Priboth Road and Moehlman Road, on the east side of Priboth Road (*Applicant: Peterson; file no. RCF-19-020*).

Isaac presented the staff report which described the history, location and physical characteristics of the subject property.

Staff recommended that the Board approve the request to receive a Residential Use Designator–Extraneous Farmstead, as it had been determined that it met the minimum requirements of the Riley County Zoning Regulations.

Staff also recommended that the Planning Board approve the Concurrent Plat of Priboth Acres Subdivision, as it had been determined that all requirements of the Manhattan Urban Area Subdivision Regulations, Riley County Zoning Regulations and Sanitary Code had been met.

Reynard asked why the property owner had to seek a Residential Use Designator; was it to insure the land is raised above the flood level?

Isaac explained that zoning regulations changed in 2012 eliminating non-agricultural single family residential as a permitted use in the agricultural district. Mr. Isaac explained that the Residential Use Designator was an option to rezoning property to residential once a farmhouse was no longer needed as part of an agricultural operation.

Stith asked if the subdivision regulations have limitations as to how many driveways can be off the road.

Isaac explained the subject site is within the boundaries of the Manhattan Urban Area and the Manhattan Urban Area Subdivision Regulations, not the Riley County Subdivision Regulations, apply. He stated there already is an existing driveway to the site, which most likely will not be altered.

Anderson asked how much the property will be raised to be above flood elevation.

Isaac said one foot above base flood elevation, but stated he did not know the base flood elevation of the site.

Ebert opened the public hearing and asked if anyone had any comments. There were none.

Ebert closed the public hearing.

Stith moved to approve the request to receive a Residential Use Designator–Extraneous Farmstead, as it had been determined that it met the minimum requirements of the Riley County Zoning Regulations; Ball seconded. Motion passed 6–0–0.

Stith moved to approve the Concurrent Plat of Priboth Acres Subdivision, as it had been determined that all requirements of the Manhattan Urban Area Subdivision Regulations, Riley County Zoning Regulations and Sanitary Code had been met; Ball seconded. Motion passed 6–0–0.

Isaac announced that the Board of County Commissioners would hear the plat request on March 14, 2019, at 9:20 a.m., in the County Commission Chambers.

- 3.3. A PUBLIC INPUT MEETING for the ANNUAL REVIEW of the Manhattan Urban Area Comprehensive Plan to receive comments to determine if there are any significant issues that might need further study or other action (*file no. CPA-19-018*).

Adam announced that this public hearing session is to gather input on the comprehensive plan. Riley and Pottawatomie Counties have been contacted for comments they may have. He said staff will present all comments in May and present staff's proposal for upcoming projects to fulfill the comprehensive plan provisions. Additional comments and suggestions from the board may be received in May.

Stith commented that the planning staff has done a great job of proceeding with implementation of the comprehensive plan and have helped the board through the process of that implementation. He hopes the progress can continue. Adam thanked Stith for his comments and reminded the board there is fifteen years remaining for the current plan.

Stith said he thinks it will need to be updated prior to that. Adam agreed, suggesting it will probably need to be reviewed in five years.

Stith commented that twenty-five years for a comprehensive plan in a community that is growing is a stretch.

Anderson commented that he read that the National Agro- and Bio-defense Facility (NBAF) will be finished in two years. He said one of his concerns is the older neighborhood housing and strategies that can lead to significant redevelopment of those areas. He suggested strategies like rent abatement or accessory structures that would lead to more aggressive redevelopment, turning some of the homes back to single-family or updated rentals.

Ebert asked when Manhattan was selected to be the site for NBAF. Nuss said approximately 2012.

Ebert said at that time there was a lot of exciting statistics like doubling the population of Manhattan. He asked if the city is tracking any statistics of the direct impact NBAF has had on the community.

Nuss said that there has been an increase in construction workers while the facility is under construction but they will probably relocate after it is completed. The number of people that had been projected to staff the building was a bit ambitious when first presented so she anticipates those numbers to be less. She noted it will take some time to get commissioned; it will not be fully operational after construction is complete because Congress will need to appropriate enough funds to operate the facility. It is important to recognize that our population, while we have seen growth, has flattened out the past couple of years. NBAF may or may not lead to jumps in growth.

Ebert asked about the ambitious staff projections for the facility that Nuss mentioned. Nuss said it was initially anticipated to staff 650 individuals. Ebert said he was aware of an estimate of 300 employees.

Ball commented that he has previous experience with bio-defense facilities and what Nuss said is correct. Once they finish the construction there will be about a year of testing and certification that has to occur. The intent is to have lower-level research occurring and mature to a point of high-containment research at NBAF. He said ancillary research facilities have not been built in this area. While the smaller facilities do not have to be in close proximity to NBAF it will contribute to growth and he does not see that occurring in Manhattan.

The population has not been growing and may be declining; this is evident based on tax revenues. Changes to property tax, sales tax, and a cost of living will impact people's decision to live here, in the county, or elsewhere. He said we need to consider these impacts when considering increasing the cost of living for residents. The most recent employee estimates he has heard for NBAF was 120 along with ancillary employees to support facilities operations. Nuss commented that the initial proposal had inflated estimates.

Ebert asked staff about an exhibit they had in previous years showing the progress of the items in the comprehensive plan. Adam said staff did supply a progress table of the action items in the past and planned to do it again in May. He said he will update the progress document and send it to the board in the next couple weeks.

Ebert asked if the priority indicators have been adjusted from the original plan. Adam replied no.

4. REPORTS AND COMMENTS BY BOARD MEMBERS AND STAFF

4.1. Planning updates from staff

Adam announced upcoming agenda items. He commented that staff is working through the complete draft of the UDO. Staff should complete the review by April 1. After amendments and final corrections are made it will be given to the board for a review.

Ebert commented that Manhattan was attracted to the consultant specifically because they offered an interactive component for the public. He asked if component was completed. Adam said yes; he understands that is has not been released yet. After the full review is completed by staff that option should be available for the public.

Ebert asked if staff has used it. Adam said yes; staff has been working in the software currently.

Ebert asked if the steering committee and planning board will simultaneously review the UDO. Adam replied that he does not know the exact sequence of events.

4.2. Comments from Board members

Nuss asked if the City has received any proposals for the Community House. Adam said he has not aware of anything.

Anderson announced that on Wednesday at 9:30 a.m. JoAnn Sutton will be interviewed on KMAN, talking about filling the high-rise apartment units. They have approximately 30 out of 88 filled. The HUD guidelines make it a long and difficult process.

Anderson also announce that the riverfront development committee will meet at Radina's in Aggieville on Thursday, March 7, at 4:00 p.m. and everyone is welcome.

Nuss asked what the status of the discussion with that group. Anderson replied that by the end of April they should have funds for Gina Ford to begin the 8–10 month public input process, then form a development plan. It will cost \$140,000 and there are individuals in Manhattan that are willing to donate to the cause.

Stith asked if there has been discussion to make this an opportunity to look at river development beyond just Manhattan. Anderson replied that is part of the discussion as river

trails are linked to Wamego, Junction City, and Lawrence.

Ebert asked if the entities that have jurisdiction over the river and levee are included in these discussions. Anderson there are individuals attending the meeting that have connections and they hired Gina Ford because she has experience working with those entities.

4.3. Next meeting. Chair announced the next meeting is Monday, March 18, 2019.

5. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting was adjourned at 7:55 p.m.

Submitted by Lesley Frohberg, Planning Intern