TOPEKA PLANNING COMMISSION

AGENDA

Monday, January 25, 2016
6:00 P.M.

214 East 8th Street
City Council Chambers, 2nd Floor
Municipal Building
Topeka, Kansas 66603

Persons addressing the Planning Commission will be limited to four minutes of public address on a particular agenda item. Debate, questions/answer dialogue or discussion between Planning Commission members will not be counted towards the four minute time limitation. The Commission by affirmative vote of at least five members may extend the limitation an additional two minutes. The time limitation does not apply to the applicant’s initial presentation.

Items on this agenda will be forwarded to the City Council for final consideration. The progress of the cases can be tracked at: http://www.topeka.org/planning/staff_assignment/tracker.pdf

All information forwarded to the City Council can be accessed via the internet on Thursday prior to the City Council meeting at: http://public.agenda.topeka.org/meetings.aspx

ADA Notice: For special accommodations for this event, please contact the Planning Department at 785-368-3728 at least three working days in advance.
HEARING PROCEDURES

Welcome! Your attendance and participation in tonight’s hearing is important and ensures a comprehensive scope of review. Each item appearing on the agenda will be considered by the City of Topeka Planning Commission in the following manner:

1. The Topeka Planning Staff will introduce each agenda item and present the staff report and recommendation. Commission members will then have an opportunity to ask questions of staff.

2. Chairperson will call for a presentation by the applicant followed by questions from the Commission.

3. Chairperson will then call for public comments. Each speaker must come to the podium and state his/her name. At the conclusion of each speaker’s comments, the Commission will have the opportunity to ask questions.

4. The applicant will be given an opportunity to respond to the public comments.

5. Chairperson will close the public hearing at which time no further public comments will be received, unless Planning Commission members have specific questions about evidence already presented. Commission members will then discuss the proposal.

6. Chairperson will then call for a motion on the item, which may be cast in the affirmative or negative. Upon a second to the motion, the Chairperson will call for a roll call vote. Commission members will vote yes, no or abstain.

Each item appearing on the agenda represents a potential change in the manner in which land may be used or developed. Significant to this process is public comment. Your cooperation and attention to the above noted hearing procedure will ensure an orderly meeting and afford an opportunity for all to participate. Please Be Respectful! Each person’s testimony is important regardless of his or her position.

All questions and comments shall be directed to the Chairperson from the podium and not to the applicant, staff or audience.

Members of the Topeka Planning Commission

- Brian Armstrong
- Kevin Beck, Chairman
- Rosa Cavazos
- Scott Gales, Vice Chair
- Dennis Haugh
- Carole Jordan
- Katrina Ringler
- Patrick Woods

Topeka Planning Staff

- Bill Fiander, AICP, Planning Director
- Carlton O. Scroggins, AICP, Planner III
- Dan Warner, AICP, Planner III
- Mike Hall, AICP, Planner III
- Tim Paris, Planner II
- Dean W. Diediker, Planner II
- Annie Driver, AICP, Planner II
- Susan Hanzlik, AICP, Planner II
- Taylor Ricketts, Planner I
- Kris Wagers, Office Specialist
AGENDA
Topeka Planning Commission
Monday, January 25, 2016 at 6:00 P.M.

A. Roll call

B. Approval of minutes – December 14, 2015

C. Election of Chair and Vice-Chair

D. Communications to the Commission

E. Declaration of conflict of interest/exparte communications by members of the commission or staff

F. Public Hearings

1. CU16/01 by William and Angelia Rahberg requesting a Conditional Use Permit to construct a vehicle surface parking lot in association with a principal use (Employee parking lot for Shawnee County Health Agency to be located on the west side of MacVicar) on property zoned zoned "R-2" Single Family Dwelling District and located at 2440 SW 2nd Street (Northeast corner of SW 2nd Street and SW MacVicar Avenue). (Driver)

2. CPA15/2 by the City of Topeka amending the text and map of the City of Topeka’s Comprehensive Plan creating the North Topeka West Neighborhood Plan. The area affected by the amendment is bounded by Highway 24 to the north, N Topeka Blvd to the east, the Kansas River to the south, and NW Vail Ave to the west. (Hanzlik)

G. Discussion Items

1. Topeka Pedestrian Master Plan Presentation
   Digital copy of the plan draft is available at:
   http://www.topeka.org/pdfs/planning/FinalPedPlannoappendix_C.pdf

   Appendices available here: http://www.topeka.org/pedplan/index.shtml

H. Adjournment
CITY OF TOPEKA
TOPEKA PLANNING COMMISSION

MINUTES

Monday, December 14, 2015
6:00PM – Holliday Building – 620 SE Madison, 1st Floor Holliday Conference Room

Members present: Scott Gales (Chair), Brian Armstrong, Rosa Cavazos, Dennis Haugh, Patrick Woods (5)

Members Absent: Kevin Beck, Carole Jordan, Katrina Ringler (3)

Staff Present: Bill Fiander, Planning Director; Mike Hall, Planner III; Dan Warner, Planner III; Susan Hanzlik, Planner II; Kris Wagers, Office Specialist

A) Roll Call

Mr. Fiander informed the Commissioners that Mr. Nicholas Jefferson resigned from the Planning Commission, effective immediately, as he had accepted a position with the City of Topeka and, as a City employee, is unable to serve on the Planning Commission.

5 Members present for a quorum.

B) Approval of Minutes from November 16, 2015

Motion to approve as typed; moved by Mr. Haugh, second by Mr. Woods. APPROVED (5-0-0)

C) Presentations and Discussion Items

1) Bikeways Presentation

Mr. Fiander presented information about the Bikeways Master Plan. Information was included in the December packet.

Ms. Cavazos asked how educational information would be relayed to the community. Mr. Fiander stated that the bulk of educating would begin in late winter.

2) North Topeka West Neighborhood Plan Preview

Ms. Hanzlik presented information about the North Topeka West Neighborhood Plan, thanking Ms. Theresa Miller, NIA President, for attending and showing support for the plan.

Mr. Haugh asked about possible plans to mitigate sound from the railroad. Ms. Hanzlik explained that a solution would be to find other partners with different funding sources that don’t the same limitations based on noise levels.

3) CIP 2017-21 Preview
Referring to the handout in the packet, Mr. Fiander gave a brief overview regarding projects that could impact growth.

4) Quick Updates

a) Downtown D-1 District – Mr. Warner provided an update on what had been happening since the last update on August 12, 2015. Memo in Planning Commission packet. Mr. Warner added that a consultant is currently working on design standards for the Downtown Historic District, and those guidelines will work with the D-1 District guidelines.

b) Early Site Plan Review – Mr. Hall reviewed the need for early site plan reviews, stating that it’s an effectiveness and efficiency issue. Flowcharts provided in the Planning Commission packet were reviewed.

Mr. Fiander added that the effect of the D-1 District guidelines and early site plan review will be that the City will be more design-sensitive. Ultimately there will be a set of design standards city-wide.

Ms. Cavazos asked if there is a fee each time plans are submitted, and Mr. Hall stated that there is no fee charged for site plan review.

D) Other

Mr. Fiander reminded Commissioners that the January meeting will be on the 4th Monday, in Council Chambers.

E) Adjournment at 7:03 PM
APPLICATION INFORMATION

APPLICATION CASE NO: CU16/1 – William P. and Angelia M. Rahberg

REQUESTED ACTION / CURRENT ZONING: A Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for “Parking, Surface Lot In Association With A Principal Use” on property presently zoned “R-2” Single-Family Dwelling District, as indicated by TMC 18.60 Use Matrix.

APPLICANT / PROPERTY OWNER: Shawnee County Health Agency (purchaser under contract)/ William P. & Angelia M. Rahberg (owners)

APPLICANT REPRESENTATIVE: Kevin Holland, Cook, Flatt, and Strobel Engineers

PROPERTY ADDRESS & PARCEL ID: 2440 SW 2nd Street/ 0972503026007000

PHOTO: (Photos taken: January 6, 2016)

PARCEL SIZE: 0.64 acres (27,878 sq. ft. approximate)

STAFF PLANNER: Annie Driver, AICP, Planner II
## PROJECT AND SITE INFORMATION

### PROPOSED USE / SUMMARY:
A maximum 48 vehicle stall, employee parking lot for the Shawnee County Health Agency- Local Health Division (State-mandated programs: WIC, immunizations, environmental health, child care licensing) that will be re-located to the former State office building at 2600 SW East Circle Drive, directly across SW MacVicar from the subject property.

### DEVELOPMENT / CASE HISTORY:
There is an existing, 992 sq.ft. partially boarded, single-family dwelling on the property, constructed in 1904. The property has historically been zoned for single-family residential uses and was annexed in approximately 1905. The subdivision was platted in 1887. There is no recent case history on the property.

### ZONING AND CHARACTER OF SURROUNDING AREA:
The character of the neighborhood to the north, south, and east of SW MacVicar Avenue is residential and zoned "R-2" Single Family Dwelling District. A stream channel (Ward Creek) separates the residential properties that front on MacVicar and the dead-end SW 2nd Street from the remainder of the residential neighborhood east of MacVicar. The character of the neighborhood west of MacVicar and opposite the subject property is institutional, zoned “PUD” Planned Unit Development for Mixed-Uses and currently under construction with various educational, medical, and office-related uses.

## COMPLIANCE WITH DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES

### BUILDING SETBACKS:
Not applicable

### OTHER DIMENSIONAL STANDARDS:
Not applicable

### OFF-STREET PARKING:
Not applicable. The intended use of the parking lot is for additional parking to accommodate employees of the Shawnee County Health Agency- Local Health Division. The building at 2600 East Circle Dr. will have a total of 35 parking stalls on-site plus 15 stalls in an adjacent State parking lot. The subject proposed parking lot will provide 48 additional stalls for a maximum of 98 stalls total for the 22,000 sq. ft. building. Health Clinics require 1 stall per 300 sq. ft. by code (73 are required).

### LANDSCAPING:
The CUP Landscape plan demonstrates compliance with TMC 18.235 Landscape Regulations. A 4 ft. landscape setback between the property line and the parking lot is required. The site plan proposes 10 ft. from the property line to the parking lot (i.e. There is at least 20 ft. from the City sidewalk to the parking lot.). Based on developed area, 159 points are required and 165 points are
SIGNAGE:
The CUP site plan currently states maximum signage shall not exceed 20 sq. ft. and 5 ft. in height. Staff is recommending there be no signs other than typical regulatory enforcement signs for parking.

OPERATION CHARACTERISTICS:
The CUP site plan limits hours of use between 7:00 am and 7:00 pm, Monday through Saturday.

PUBLIC FACILITIES
TRANSPORTATION:
SW MacVicar Avenue is classified a minor arterial street and is currently five lanes, including center turn lane. KDOT – April 2013 traffic counts indicate the ADT on MacVicar is 12,000 trips per day, north of 6th Street. The parking lot takes access from off the existing alley (to be improved to City standard) and SW 2nd Street (dead-end). The CUP site plan proposes a sidewalk along the north side of 2nd.

As indicated on the CUP site plan, the applicant will provide a “pedestrian-activated rapid flashing beacon signal” at the time of site development, including signage and ADA crossing to be reviewed by the City Traffic Engineer prior to Parking Lot Permit approval by City Development Services.

UTILITIES:
Connection to sanitary sewer is not necessary for the parking lot. An 8” water main exists on the west side of MacVicar. If automatic irrigation is used, connection to this main and a new water meter is needed.

The CUP site plan indicates exterior lighting is to be “shielded or recessed with cut-off angles to prevent the cast of lighting beyond their property”. The CUP site plan does depict light fixture locations, but does not address light source type, pole height, illumination, or maintained “Light loss” factors (i.e. A factor used in calculating the lighting level over a long term period that is demonstrated as a percentage).

OTHER FACTORS
SUBDIVISION PLAT:
Existing lot of record and platted as Glendale Subdivision, Lots 32-44 (even), platted 1887.

FLOOD HAZARDS, STREAM BUFFERS:
A stream runs along the east property side. A stream buffer is not required by Water Pollution Control since staff indicated the stream has already been compromised.

HISTORIC PROPERTIES:
Not applicable
NEIGHBORHOOD MEETING: The applicant conducted a neighborhood information meeting on Wednesday, January 6, 2016 at Capital City School (500 SW Tuffy Kellogg Drive). The property lies within the Greater Auburndale Neighborhood Association (NA). 2 people attended the meeting, including a representative for the NA. The City Traffic Engineer attended as well. Key issues identified at the meeting included: compatibility with the neighborhood, access to the adjacent residential properties during re-construction of the alley, pedestrian signal, and traffic on MacVicar. The applicant’s meeting report and sign-in sheet are attached.

REVIEW COMMENTS BY CITY DEPARTMENTS AND EXTERNAL AGENCIES

Public Works /Engineering: As noted on the CUP site plan, the City Engineer will review a stormwater report for drainage quantity at the time of City Parking Lot Permit approval to identify the need for detention based upon what is being added to the existing storm system from the new impervious areas. The property presently slopes to the east. Detention may be required, but more information is needed from the applicant’s engineer at the time of Parking Lot Permit approval to determine the future location of detention.

Water Pollution Control: Water quality measures are not required since the developed area is less than 1 acre. However, City staff suggested the parking lot drainage design address measures to prevent erosion of the stream bank.

Fire Department: No issues. All service drives are two-way, 24' wide and satisfy Fire Department standards.

Development Services: The alley shall be paved and improved to City standards past the parking lot driveway opening at the time of site development.

Topeka Metro: Topeka Metro is re-routing a bus line in order to serve the Kanza campus on the west side of MacVicar. The new route will run south down MacVicar with a stop on the west side of MacVicar at this intersection (on the opposite side of the street from the subject property, but next to the future Health Agency building). The applicant will work with Topeka Metro and the City Traffic Engineer to adequately place this bus stop so that it coordinates with the pedestrian signal.

Police Department: Reviewed for CPTED concerns. Indicated lighting locations are sufficient. The Police indicated they have concerns with visibility to site on the proposed Landscape Plan. Staff has addressed these concerns in the conditions of approval.
KEY DATES

SUBMITTAL: December 4, 2015
NEIGHBORHOOD INFORMATION MEETING: January 6, 2016
LEGAL NOTICE PUBLICATION: December 28, 2015
PROPERTY OWNER NOTICE MAILED: January 4, 2016

STAFF ANALYSIS

EVALUATION CRITERIA: In considering an application for a Conditional Use Permit, the Planning Commission and Governing Body will review the request following standards in Topeka Municipal Code Section 18.245(4)(ix) in order to protect the integrity and character of the zoning district in which the proposed use is located and to minimize adverse effects on surrounding properties and neighborhood. In addition, all Conditional Use Permit applications are evaluated in accordance with the standards established in the Section 18.215.030 for Land Use Compatibility, Site Development, Operating Characteristics, and consistency with the Comprehensive Plan.

1. The conformance of the proposed use to the Comprehensive Plan and other adopted planning policies: The subject property lies within an area designated Urban/Suburban Low Density Residential by the Land Use and Growth Management Plan – 2040. This category is generally characterized with “a cohesive display of single- or two-family development up to a maximum of six dwelling units per acre. (pg. 43)”. As provided for in the Zoning Land Use Matrix TMC 18.60, “Parking, Surface Lots in association with a principal use” are allowed in the “R-2” District with approval of a CUP and provided they satisfy design requirements as a part of the CUP approval process. The CUP guidelines for evaluation in TMC18.215 used when reviewing a CUP application indicate one factor in determining land use capability is the presence of major natural features that separate the use from surrounding uses. One significant land use compatibility factor limiting the feasibility of the subject site for new residential uses could be attributed to the property’s lack of connection with the rest of the neighborhood caused by the physical barrier of the stream channel and the physical disconnect of 2nd Street from the neighborhood.

In addition, the site plan demonstrates the parking lot is being set back consistent with that of the adjacent residential uses and provides landscaping along a major arterial street frontage and major roadway entrance from Interstate 70. Finally, the parking lot will not directly access SW MacVicar Avenue. Access to the parking lot will be from SW 2nd Street to the south, as well as, via the improved alley to the north. As approved under the CUP, the proposed use is in conformance to the Comprehensive Plan.

2. The character of the neighborhood including but not limited to: land use, zoning, density, architectural style, building materials, height, structural mass, sitting, open space and floor-to area ratio: The neighborhood is characterized by single-family dwellings lying east of SW MacVicar and an educational campus/office park lying west of MacVicar (Kanza Educational and Science Park). The residences along SW MacVicar front on to five-lane, arterial roadway. The widening of MacVicar to five lanes caused these properties to lose front yard space, which limits their redevelopment potential. The average front yard setback for the existing single-family dwellings along MacVicar is now less than 15 ft. Ward Creek (east of the property) establishes a line of demarcation between the residential uses fronting MacVicar and the remainder of the neighborhood. The creek further limits any future connection of SW 2nd Street with the neighborhood and...
separates this property from the neighborhood. The established land use arrangement for the residences along MacVicar has existed since the subdivision was platted in 1887.

3. **The zoning and uses of nearby properties, and the extent to which the proposed use would be in harmony with such zoning and uses:** The zoning and uses of nearby properties is for single-family dwellings and has been such since platted in 1887 with 25 ft. wide lots. “Parking, surface lot in association with a principal use” is allowed with a Conditional Use Permit in the “R-2” Single-Family Dwelling District. The zoning of the property is not changing and the landscaping and other features of the parking lot render it compatible with surrounding uses. As approved under the CUP, the proposed use is in harmony with surrounding zoning and land uses.

4. **The suitability of the property for the uses to which it has been restricted under the applicable zoning district regulations:** The subject property has become less suitable for single-family dwellings due to the increased traffic along SW MacVicar, widening of the street, and the property’s lack of connection with the rest of the neighborhood. The residential land uses along MacVicar either face the arterial street or have double frontage on both MacVicar and the parallel NW Story Street. This type of land use arrangement is no longer the ideal pattern for new single-family residential uses.

5. **The length of time the property has remained vacant as zoned:** The subject property has contained one existing single family residence since 1904. The existing house has been partially boarded-up since at least April 2013 (Google Street View).

6. **The extent to which the approval of the application would detrimentally affect nearby properties:** Based upon the surrounding land uses and physical site development barriers, approval of the application should not have a detrimental effect upon nearby properties, as approved under the CUP. The dead-end street restricts any potential cut-through traffic from MacVicar through the neighborhood. The applicant will pave and improve the alley past the point access is taken, which in turns also provides improved access for the residences to the north that also access off the alley. The applicant has indicated these residences will continue to have access during the construction phase when the alley is closed.

Detrimental effects may arise to nearby properties if the proposed landscaping does not allow a clear line of sight from the street or alley to the parking lot or the exterior lighting is insufficient or inadequate. This may harm both the neighborhood residents and Shawnee County employees using the parking lot if users or neighbors feel unsafe. The site plan demonstrates light fixtures will be provided at key locations around the parking lot: near entrances and exits; along the alley, street, and rear of the parking lot where adequate lighting is desirable. The fixture type, illumination intensity, and other factors have not been addressed by the applicant with the CUP application. The applicant should consider CPTED (Crime Prevention and Environmental Design) and follow accepted national guidelines in the development of their parking lot lighting plan.

Staff has raised a concern with the landscape plan about visibility and whether the proposed “Yellowwoods” along MacVicar should be replaced with the “Red Oaks” since “Red Oaks” have higher branching tree canopies, which allow for better visibility underneath. The applicant has indicated they are agreeable to re-locating these if recommended. Other than the concern raised above, Planning believes the proposed landscape plan provides adequate visibility. Trees along MacVicar are spaced approximately 40 ft. apart and interspersed with low growth shrubs (“Boxwood” and “Sea Green Junipers”) that should provide adequate visibility to the parking lot. The applicant should keep shrubs trimmed to no higher than 2 - 3 ft. in height. Trees along MacVicar are set back from the City sidewalk 10 ft. and should not conflict with pedestrian access. Landscaping along the alley and SW 2nd Street is limited to trees spaced 30 – 40 ft. apart to allow for visibility to the parking lot under tree canopies.

7. **The extent to which the proposed use would substantially harm the value of nearby properties:**
The extent to which the proposed use would adversely affect the capacity or safety of that portion of the road network influenced by the use, or present parking problems in the vicinity of the property:
The proposed use should not have an adverse impact upon the road network and will instead help to prevent future parking problems in the vicinity of the subject property for the Health Agency. The City’s Traffic Engineer has reviewed the site plan for its impact on the road network. At the recommendation of the City Traffic Engineer, applicant will construct a “pedestrian-activated yellow flashing beacon signal” and crosswalk that will address pedestrian safety. The City uses criteria in the Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices that establishes the warrants for this type of pedestrian signal. All of the following must be met: 1.) More than 25 pedestrians per hour; 2.) Speed limit of 40 mph; 3.) Average daily traffic of 12,000 vehicles per day and 4.) Four or more lanes of traffic or a signal may be warranted based on an engineering study and judgement of the traffic engineer.

The City Traffic Engineer finds that the alley access opening meets the City’s design criteria for location and spacing. The driveway location along SW 2nd does not meet the standard driveway spacing criteria, but is waived in this instance since the street is a dead-end and this driveway will have no impact on roadway users.

The applicant will further extend a public sidewalk along 2nd Street at the time of site development, as indicated on the CUP site plan. Staff is further recommending two additional sidewalk connections be made from public sidewalk to the parking lot – one off 2nd Street and one off MacVicar. A future bus stop on west side of SW MacVicar will also improve the road network for all modes of transportation.

The extent to which the proposed use would create excessive air pollution, water pollution, noise pollution or other environmental harm: The subject use will need to comply with the City’s stormwater quantity requirements for any impacts it may have on the existing storm sewer system. If the City Engineer determines that it is required, detention will be provided in order to retain the additional increase in runoff, but further information needs to be provided from the applicant. Water quality treatment is not required, but City staff suggested the applicant address measures in the drainage design of the parking lot to prevent erosion of the stream bank. The noise impact on adjacent properties should be minimal due to the physical separation from the neighborhood and restricted hours of use of the parking lot (7 am to 7 pm).

The economic impact of the proposed use on the community: Other than the removal of a partially boarded up house from the neighborhood, there would be little economic impact upon the community from the proposed parking lot.

The gain, if any, to the public health, safety and welfare due to denial of the application as compared to the hardship imposed upon the landowner, if any, as a result of denial of the application: There is no apparent gain to the public health, safety and welfare by denial of the application since approval of the application will remove a boarded up house from the neighborhood and replace it with a viable use on the property that allows the property to be improved and maintained. Alternatively, denial of the application will leave the property in its present unmaintained state.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION AND CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

The project demonstrates compliance with standards for evaluation as provided for in TMC 18.215.030 Conditional Use Permits for Land Use Compatibility, Site Development, Operating Characteristics, and consistency with the Comprehensive Plan. Based upon the above findings and analysis, Planning staff recommends APPROVAL of this proposal, subject to the following conditions.
1. Use and development of the site in accordance with the approved Conditional Use Permit Site Plan for the Shawnee County Health Parking Lot (CU16/1).

2. The note under Traffic notes shall be revised to indicate: “... alley shall be improved past the access opening” instead of “up to the access opening” and indicating “... pavement markings shall be white in compliance with FHWA Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices.”

3. The site plan shall be revised to reflect sidewalk connections from the public sidewalk on SW 2nd Street to connect with the parking lot on the east side of the entrance and one connection from MacVicar to connect with the parking lot (i.e. from MacVicar through the mid-section of the property).

4. The Landscape Plan shall be revised to:
   a. Dimension the Landscape Plan, label landscape parking lot setbacks and label the property/ROW line on the Landscape Plan.
   b. Revise Landscape Plan to show the two landscape peninsulas that are shown on the site plan, as these are required per City Landscape Regulations.
   c. Re-locate the higher branching “Red Oaks” to the MacVicar frontage to ensure better visibility.
   d. Add note indicating shrubs shall be kept trimmed to no higher than 2 – 3 ft. in height to ensure better visibility.
   e. Address whether automatic irrigation will be used or, if not, indicate how plants will be watered.

5. The Signage note shall be revised to indicate: “No signage shall be allowed other than typical regulatory enforcement signs for parking lots.”

6. The note under Lighting shall be revised to state: “Lighting shall full cut-off, shielded and recessed with cut off angles to prevent the cast of lighting beyond the property. Exterior lighting shall follow accepted national guidelines for parking lot lighting. The type, illumination, pole height and quantity shall be approved by the Topeka Planning Director prior to Parking Lot Permit issuance by City of Topeka Development Services.”

ATTACHMENTS:

   Aerial Map
   Zoning Map
   CUP site plan
   CUP landscape plan (Pgs. 1 & 2)
   NIM report and Sign-In sheet
2600 East Circle Drive
Future site of Shawnee Co. health clinic)

Subject Property

CU16/1 By: William P. & Angelia M. Rahberg
CU16/1 By: William P. & Angelia M. Rahberg
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE</th>
<th>EMAIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loyd Clayton</td>
<td>319 S. Elmwood</td>
<td>351-1619</td>
<td><a href="mailto:clay.joy@yaho.com">clay.joy@yaho.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annie Driver</td>
<td>City Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deb Carlson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry Coder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Holland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Fiander</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td>806-5491</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Memorandum

To: Annie Driver

CC:

From: Kevin Holland

Date: 01/08/2016

Re: Public Meeting for CUP at 2440 SW 2nd St

A public information meeting was held Wednesday, January 6, 2016 from 5:45 PM until 6:45 PM at Capital City School for the Conditional Use Permit for a new parking lot for Shawnee County parking lot.

Two persons attended the meeting, one that owns property to the north and south of the project and the other a representative of the Neighborhood Association that covers the lot. Both individuals expressed that they were happy the existing structure would be removed due to the crime that occurs on the rear of the property.
CPA15/2 by the City of Topeka
MEMORANDUM

Date: January 25, 2015

To: Topeka Planning Commission
From: Bill Fiander, AICP, Director

Re: CPA15/2 – North Topeka West Neighborhood Plan

Background

- The North Topeka West NIA was awarded one of two SORT (Stages of Resources Targeting) grants to begin in 2015.
- This is a two-part process with neighborhood planning occurring in the first year and implementation occurring in the second and third years.
- The NIA worked with Planning staff since July 2015 to create their neighborhood plan.
- The planning stage of this process was completed and the final neighborhood meeting held on December 7, 2015.
- The draft North Topeka West Neighborhood Plan was released for public comment from December 1 – December 21, 2016. No comments were received.

Process

- Staff notified all property owners in the planning area and held a Kickoff meeting on July 6, 2015 to present a “current conditions” analysis.
- 4 steering committee meetings were held to receive input and ideas for the new plan over the summer.
- All property owners and renters throughout North Topeka West received a mailed notice advertising the Final Meeting on December 7.
- At the Final Meeting, attendees were presented with the draft of the final plan and were asked to rate their implementation priorities. These are included in the final document.
Current Neighborhood Conditions

- The neighborhood’s block group east of NW Taylor St has an “At Risk” health rating; the block group west of NW Taylor has a “Healthy” health rating.

- The neighborhood plan focused on the neighborhood between N Topeka Blvd and NW Vail, and between Hwy 24 and the Kansas River.

- Overall, this area averaged 64% homeownership but there were distinct areas with extremely low homeownership rates (25%).

- There are significant infrastructure needs in North Topeka West. Many of the roads are in need of total replacement. Installation of new sidewalks is hampered by ditch drainage systems, and some areas of ditches have not been maintained and are now causing flooding problems.

Notable Findings

- North Topeka West is rich in history. It is built on land originally deeded to the Kansa Indian Nation that was inherited by US Vice President Charles Curtis who donated to be a settlement community for Exodusters after the Civil War.

- The old McKinley School, Second Missionary Baptist Church, and Curtis Cemetery are three historic sites that North Topeka West residents are proud of.

- NW Tyler St—a narrow, two lane road with no shoulders or sidewalks—carries 25% of the traffic volume that N Topeka Blvd carries.

- Some “Big Plans” that the neighborhood and the plan support include reconstructing NW Tyler St from Paramore to Lyman and connecting to the Soldier Creek Trail, advocating for a truck stop plaza to consider locating in the area, and advocating for McKinley School to be turned into a historic site and repurposed for a community benefit.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends the Planning Commission:

2) Recommend approval to the Governing Body as an element of the City’s Comprehensive Plan.
Digital copy of the North Topeka West Neighborhood Plan (DRAFT) is available at:

MEMORANDUM
Date: January 25, 2015

To: Topeka Planning Commission
From: Bill Fiander, AICP, Director

Re: CPA15/2 – North Topeka West Neighborhood Plan Public Comments

Two comments regarding the North Topeka West Neighborhood Plan were received after public notices were mailed.

The first, a phone call, was made by Mr. Clifford Currey and was received on January 7, 2016. Notes of this conversation follow as the first attachment.

The second comment was made via email from Mr. Robert Howard on January 9, 2016 and it follows as the second attachment.
On Thursday January 7 I was contacted by Clifford Currey of 601 NW Broad St in North Topeka West regarding the North Topeka West Neighborhood Plan. Mr. Currey stated that he would most likely be unable to attend the public hearing scheduled for January 25, 2016 but that he wanted to voice his concerns about the neighborhood plan as written.

Mr. Currey was concerned that infrastructure improvements to the area would increase taxes. He was also concerned that additional commercial development along North Topeka Blvd would be a detriment to the neighborhood. He was concerned that the sections of the Plan that discussed improved code compliance would cause a hardship on residents who were unable to afford the repairs or the fines. He was concerned about people interfering with property owner rights.

Mr. Currey was supportive of the idea of a truck plaza to serve the Topeka community and noted that one has been needed ever since the one on Wanamaker was closed years ago. He supported the idea of it being located in North Topeka West.

I advised Mr. Currey that this plan was a policy document and that it did not implement or impose any regulations through its adoption. I asked him if he would like to mail or email me comments to be included with the public hearing. I said that I would relay his concerns through a memo, regardless, so that the Planning Commission would be aware of them.

Susan Hanzlik
Attachment 2:

Susan Hanzlik

From: Robert W. Howard
Sent: Saturday, January 09, 2016 10:28 AM
To: Susan Hanzlik
Subject: observation

I live at 2014 NW Lane Street. Lived there for over 30 years. Nothing has been done to our area in that time except on Iyman road. The streets in our area are in such bad shape that you can’t call them streets anymore. I’ll be glad to give you a tour. I’m basically tired of pay higher and higher taxes and getting nothing for it. I’d like to know why our residential streets are neglected why other streets that have had work done within the thirty years get help. I don’t want to hear the “more traveled” bit either.

Let’s be fair. Our Council person told me there was going to be work done in our area. Why has that changed.

Bob Howard
Topeka Pedestrian Master Plan Presentation

digital copy of the plan draft is available at:
http://www.topeka.org/pdfs/planning/FinalPedPlannoappendix_C.pdf

Appendices available at:
http://www.topeka.org/pedplan/index.shtml