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.

All information forwarded to the City Council can be accessed via the internet on Thursday prior to the City Council meeting at: https://topeka.novusagenda.com/agendapublic/

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 role 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

Wiley Kannarr, Chair
Brian Armstrong
Ariane Burson
Rosa Cavazos, Co-Vice Chair
Marc Fried
Dennis Haug
Carole Jordan
Katrina Ringler, Co-Vice Chair
Matt Werner

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
Annie Driver, AICP, Planner II
John Neunuebel, Planner II
Taylor Ricketts, Planner I
Tim Esparza, Planner I
Kris Wagers, Administrative Officer
AGENDA
Topeka Planning Commission
Monday, December 18, 2017

A. Roll call

B. Approval of minutes – November 20, 2017

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

D. Public Hearing

1. CU17/02 by the City of Topeka requesting a Conditional Use Permit to allow for replacement of a public utility structure (sanitary sewer pump station) on property zoned “PUD” Planned Unit Development located on a 4,355 square feet site located in the southwestern portion of subject parcel located south of NW Williams Street and east of NW Tyler Street. (Neunuebel)

E. Action Item

1. PUD17/04 Aqua Blast Laundry by: Chamberlin Properties, LLC, (Remanded by Governing Body December 5, 2017) Reconsideration of 1) the laundromat’s 24 hour per day operation, and 2) the laundromat’s traffic impact as part of Planning Commission’s original recommendation of APPROVAL to amend the District Zoning Classification from “O&I-2” Office and Industrial District to “PUD” Planned Unit Development (O&I-2 Use Group and Laundry) for development of a self-service laundromat on the 2.44-acre property located at the Northeast corner of SW Westport Drive & SW 22nd Terrace. (Neunuebel)

F. Communications to the Commission

1. Presentation to Outgoing Commissioner Rosa Cavazos

G. Adjourn
Members present: Wiley Kannarr (Chair), Ariane Messina, Rosa Cavazos, Katrina Ringler, Matt Werner, Marc Fried (6)

Members Absent: Dennis Haugh, Carole Jordan, Brian Armstrong (3)

Staff Present: Mike Hall, Planner III; Kris Wagers, Administrative Officer; Mary Feighny, Legal; Dan Warner, Planner III

Mr. Kannarr opened the meeting and roll was called– six members present for a quorum.

Approval of Minutes from October 16, 2017

Motion to approve; moved by Ms. Cavazos, second by Ms. Ringler. APPROVED (6-0-0)

Presentation

Building Design Standards & Sign Code Update

Mr. Hall explained that Mr. Mark White of White & Smith, LLC, has been hired as a consultant to assist the City of Topeka Planning Department in revising the sign, zoning and building design regulations as found in Chapter 18 of the Code of the City of Topeka. Mr. Hall explained that two committees have been formed, one each to assist with building design code update and sign code updates. First meeting will be December 11. Staff is also preparing a Visual Quality Assessment (VQA) that will be taken by the public beginning in early January 2018.

Mr. Hall introduced Mr. Brent Trout, City Manager, and Virginia Baumgartner, both of whom were in the audience.

Mark White gave a presentation with PowerPoint slides and took questions from commissioners. He began by giving some of his work background/experience, then moved on to an overview about sign codes, concluding with a list of things to focus on:
- Develop content neutral (physical) sign categories (Detached v attached & temporary)
- Address Design
- Incorporate modern illumination/digital sign standards
- Consider context
- Use neutral allocation systems
- Creativity through individual/channel letters, discretionary review
- Building and site design shapes signs.
Mr. White reviewed building design code elements and considerations, concluding with a summary of general drafting principles:
Establish strong planning policies which allow flexibility
Establish strong legislative findings
Establish reasonable standards
Establish by-right (administrative) options
Be assertive
Be realistic
Establish public outreach
Careful drafting
Use cross-references
Use graphics to illustrate, not to supplant, textual standards

Questions and discussion included the topic of art/murals and when they are considered signs, along with buildings that are branded by the owner (i.e. KFC). Parking, with minimum regulations was discussed.

Ms. Cavazos asked where Wayfinding signs would fall in the new sign code regulations. Mr. Hall stated that he doesn't believe they would fall into the scope of what would be affected by new sign code regulations because they are located in the Right of Way.

Feedback on VQA

Mr. Hall pointed out that commissioners had been asked to take the VQA survey in draft form to give input on the survey itself. Commissioners offered opinions on what worked and what didn’t, making suggestions about changing out some of the photos because they were confusing and perhaps giving different instructions and including information about what staff are expecting to determine with the data collected.

Adjourned at 7:22PM
CU17/02
by City of Topeka
APPLICATION INFORMATION

APPLICATION CASE NUMBER/NAME: CU17/02 By: City of Topeka Utilities Department

REQUESTED ACTION / CURRENT ZONING: A Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for “Public Utility Facility, Type II (Sanitary Sewer Pump Station)” on property zoned PUD “Planned Unit Development” with designated residential use groups of R-1, R-2, and M-2, along with Recreation & Open Space.

APPLICANT/ PROPERTY OWNER: City of Topeka Utilities Department (Michele Neiswender and Zack Stueve, Project Engineers)

APPLICANT REPRESENTATIVE: Alex Darby, PE, Professional Engineering Consultants

PROPERTY ADDRESS & PARCEL ID: The subject site is located on the south side of NW Williams Street, approximately 185 feet east of NW Tyler Street

PHOTOS:

View from south side of Williams Street facing south along access driveway for existing pump station equipment on right, with North Topeka YMCA building beyond.
Above-ground equipment for existing Sanitary Sewer System Pump Station adjacent to residential property to the west including privacy fence, storage shed, and single-family residence. (Pump station telemetry antenna located atop stainless steel pole on right.)

PARCEL SIZE: Subject site comprises approximately 5,000 square feet. (The site is contained within an easement on a platteled 3.57-acre parcel owned by the Topeka Housing Authority.)

STAFF PLANNER: John Neunuebel, Planner II

RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL subject to conditions in the staff report

RECOMMENDED MOTION: Based on the findings and analysis in the staff report I move to recommend to the Governing Body APPROVAL of the Conditional Use Permit (CU17/02) to provide for construction of a Sanitary Sewer System Pump Station to be operated by the City of Topeka Utilities Department.

PROJECT AND SITE INFORMATION

PROPOSED USE / SUMMARY: The City of Topeka Utilities Department proposes to construct and operate a new Sanitary Sewer Pump Station immediately adjacent to an existing pump station that requires replacement and will be taken out of service and equipment removed. The visible, above-ground elements of the new pump station include an approximately 240 square foot prefabricated fiberglass pump house 12 feet high, along with a 75-foot high pole for a telemetry antenna that is required for sending and receiving pump station operational data. The new facility will also include a 6-foot high fence consisting of chain link with a 1-foot high, 3-strand barbed wire atop as a security measure, along with gate on access driveway to deter vehicular traffic from entering the site. Landscape materials will be used in helping screen the facility.

DEVELOPMENT / CASE HISTORY: The subject site is currently vacant. A Planned Unit Development ("North Topeka Townhouses") was approved for the area in 1966, including the subject site, and the PUD was subsequently amended in
The subject site is included within the approved Planned Unit Development within a designated future parking lot area adjacent to future softball fields as will be maintained by the North Topeka YMCA. The YMCA building itself is located immediately to the south of the site within a separate Planned Unit Development. To the north of the subject site, on the north side of Williams Street, are single-family homes, while the area to the east is currently a vacant area planned for future softball fields. To the west of the subject site is the rear yard area of a single-family home. Adjacent zoning districts are as follows:

North: Remainder of PUD, Single-Family Residential
West: R-1 Single-Family Residential
East: Remainder of PUD, Vacant
South: Separate PUD, YMCA, Recreation and Open Space

An associated minor amendment to the North Topeka Townhouses Planned Unit Development Master Plan is currently in process to accommodate the proposed CUP and new Sanitary Sewer Pump Station.

As previously indicated the site is included within a PUD (Planned Unit Development) as an area reserved for a future parking lot and recreational open space included within the R-2 Single-family use group. As such, the required minimum building setbacks are 25' front (Williams Street side), 5' side and 25' rear (YMCA building side).

The proposed facility meets the required building setbacks with the exception of the telemetry antenna to be placed at the southeast corner of the facility. TMC 18.230.050 stipulates that antenna support systems shall be set back from adjacent property lines a minimum distance of 80 percent of the structure's height which, for the 75-foot high telemetry antenna, is 60 feet. Although there is space within the facility site to provide for a 60-foot setback, city staff have concluded that the proposed location with a 8-foot setback is preferred because it allows the large, brick-clad north elevation of the YMCA building to more readily mask and mitigate visual impacts of the telemetry antenna. The concurrent amendment to the PUD Master Plan will note the placement of the telemetry antenna and its 8-foot setback from the property line.

TMC 18.230.050 also stipulates that antenna support systems not exceed 62 feet in height; however, technical requirements related to the receiving and transmitting of operational data and information for the pump station require that the telemetry antenna be 75 feet in height. Pursuant to TMC 18.190.080 for PUDs the Planning
Commission has the authority to approve the height of antennas and other structures in excess of height standards when the strict application of any provision would result in peculiar and exceptional practical difficulties to, or exceptional hardship upon, the owner of such property; provided, that the variance may be granted without substantial detriment to the public good and without substantially impairing the purpose of this chapter. The proposed height of the antenna is necessary due to technical requirements, and the additional 13 feet in height required for the telemetry antenna will comprise neither an aesthetic or safety problem in the location proposed. The location and height of the antenna will be duly noted on the amended PUD Master Plan currently in process.

OFF-STREET PARKING: Although the City of Topeka Zoning Ordinance does not specify a parking standard for public facilities such as Sanitary Sewer System Pump Stations, the existing and proposed access driveway is of sufficient size to provide off-street parking and access as will be required in routine maintenance of the facility.

LANDSCAPING: Landscaping consists of 8 new coniferous trees to be placed along the east and north boundaries of the site to partially screen the facility from adjacent residential uses. The west boundary includes the utility easement for the existing pump station which will be expanded to include the new pump station. (The west boundary also includes an existing wood privacy fence in good condition.) Screening along the south boundary of the site is not mandatory since the YMCA is a non-residential use.

SIGNAGE: There is no signage proposed for the site and the CUP site plan is so notated.

OPERATING CHARACTERISTICS: There have been no reported problems or complaints related to the operation of the existing pump station and potential impacts in the form of noise, vibration, or odors are anticipated to be the same or less with new equipment in the new facility replacing older equipment in the existing facility.

Although new equipment including the telemetry antenna will provide for improved and more reliable remote monitoring, weekly inspection by Utilities Department staff is anticipated as has been the case with the existing pump station.

PUBLIC FACILITIES

TRANSPORTATION: The property is located adjacent to NW Williams Street, a local street, and approximately 185 feet east of Tyler Street which is classified as a Minor Arterial.
UTILITIES: The property is connected to City sanitary sewer and water.

OTHER FACTORS

SUBDIVISION PLAT: The subject site is a part of Lot 13, Block B of Shorey Estates Subdivision but will be defined by way of a utility easement recorded by instrument.

FLOOD HAZARDS, STREAM BUFFERS: N/A

HISTORIC PROPERTIES: N/A

NEIGHBORHOOD INFORMATION MEETING: The applicant conducted a neighborhood meeting on Wednesday, December 6, 2017 at 6:00 p.m. The three persons from the area attending the meeting had questions regarding potential impacts including lighting, noise, and odors, but concluded they had no particular unresolved concerns.

REVIEW COMMENTS BY CITY DEPARTMENTS AND EXTERNAL AGENCIES

Public Works /Engineering: Project Applicant; no problematic issues identified.

Water Pollution Control: No issues identified.

Fire Department: No issues identified.

Development Services: No issues. A building permit is required for a change of occupancy. A plan showing re-striping of the parking lot will be submitted at that time.

KEY DATES

SUBMITTAL: November 3, 2017

NEIGHBORHOOD INFORMATION MEETING: December 6, 2017

LEGAL NOTICE PUBLICATION: November 20, 2017
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)” The Land Use and Growth Management Plan recognizes the need for public facilities, including sanitary sewer system pump stations, in predominantly residential areas to sustain existing residential development and support new residential development. Based on the conditions of approval the proposed development is consistent with the Land Use and Growth Management 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 the presence of the relatively large YMCA building, as well as detached single-family dwellings and recreation open space. The proposed pump station will have minimal impact and is compatible with the character of the neighborhood. The pump station is relatively small with a 240 square foot, 12 foot high, prefabricated structure surrounded with a 6 foot high chain link fence with 3 strands of barbed wire atop. The fence surrounding the pump station is set back 80 feet from the property line along Williams Street. The facility will be mostly screened from view by new coniferous trees. Additionally, the existing pump station to be replaced has proven to not be problematic within the area.

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 development of the pump station, based on its placement and design, is not unusual or intrusive in a residential district and will be harmonious with the existing residential development and adjacent YMCA building.

4. The suitability of the property for the uses to which it has been restricted under the applicable zoning district regulations:
   Current zoning of the property, by way of the North Topeka Townhouses Planned Unit Development Master Plan, provides for construction of ballfields and accessory parking. The proposed pump station will be a relatively small part of the property and, therefore, will not preclude or restrict future development in accordance with the master plan.

5. The length of time the property has remained vacant as zoned:
   The subject property has been vacant for 10 years or more.

6. The extent to which the approval of the application would detrimentally affect nearby properties:
   Inasmuch as an existing pump station has been located within the immediate area without negative effects, it has been demonstrated that installation of a new replacement pump station would not detrimentally affect nearby properties. Although the new telemetry antenna will be substantially higher than the current antenna and exceeds the 62-foot maximum height, its placement in closer proximity to the YMCA building will be less visually intrusive from adjacent residential properties than the existing antenna which will be removed upon completion of the new pump station. Therefore, it can be concluded that although technical requirements of the telemetry antenna require that it exceed by 13 feet the normally applied height limitation there is no detriment to the public.
7. **The extent to which the proposed use would substantially harm the value of nearby properties:** For the aforementioned reasons, the proposed sanitary sewer system pump station will not harm the value of nearby properties.

8. **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 pump station will generate few vehicle trips and no more than the existing pump station that has been at adjacent location since 1967.

9. **The extent to which the proposed use would create excessive air pollution, water pollution, noise pollution or other environmental harm:** The proposed pump station will generate no more noise or odors than the existing pump station which has not been found to be the subject of complaint from area residents or property owners. Should the facility become a cause of complaint due to odors, City of Topeka Utilities Department has protocols in place such as the use of chemical additives that eliminate odors.

10. **The economic impact of the proposed use on the community:** Sanitary sewer system pump stations are essential to the effective delivery of sewer services within the community and have a positive economic impact.

11. **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 help to ensure the effective delivery of sewer system services. The design of the facility and conditions of approval help to ensure that the sanitary sewer system pump station maintains public health, safety, and welfare of the community.

**RECOMMENDATION**

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.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Based upon the above findings and analysis, Planning staff recommend **APPROVAL** of this proposal, subject to:

1. Use and development of the site in accordance with the approved Conditional Use Permit plans “Conditional Use Permit Site Plan Pump Station No.12.”

2. Revise General Note #3 to indicate: “A 6’ chainlink fence with 3-strand barbed wire security top will be no higher than a total of 8 feet. A fence permit is required.”

3. Add new General Note #5 indicating designated 8-foot setback from adjacent property line and height of telemetry antenna being 75 feet.

4. Add new General Note #6 indicating: “The minor amendment of the North Topeka Townhouses PUD Master Plan must be completed prior to work commencing on installation of new sanitary sewer system pump station.”

5. Add new General Note #7 indicating: “Ongoing operation of the pump station will generate no sound greater than 55 decibels measured at the property line. The sound limit on ongoing operation does not apply to vehicles for occasional facility and grounds maintenance, use of an emergency generator, temporary station malfunction, or other temporary source of noise.”
PLANNING COMMISSION MOTION: I move to recommend to the Governing Body APPROVAL of the Conditional Use Permit CU17/02 based upon the findings and analysis listed in the staff report and subject to the conditions.

ATTACHMENTS:
- Aerial Map
- Zoning Map
- Future Land Use Map
- CU17/02 – CUP Site Plan (Exhibit)
- Proposed Associated PUD Amendment (Exhibit)
- NIM Summary and Sign-In sheet
CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT SITE PLAN
PUMP STATION NO. 12
A PORTION OF LOT 13, BLOCK B, SHOREY ESTATES SUBDIVISION, IN THE NORTH EAST QUARTER OF SECTION 19, TOWNSHIP 11 SOUTH, RANGE 16 EAST OF THE SIXTH PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, IN THE CITY OF TOPEKA, SHAWNEE COUNTY, KANSAS

GENERAL NOTES:
1. The site is located at the intersection of Aldrich Avenue and 21st Street.
2. All site development is consistent with the approved site plan.
3. The site is zoned for commercial use.
4. The site is subject to local zoning regulations.

EXHIBIT A:
- Site plan showing the location of the pump station.
- Adjacent properties and streets.

EXHIBIT B:
- Detailed view of the pump station building.
- Elevation and cross-section views.

EXHIBIT C:
- Diagram showing the utility connections to the pump station.
- Material and construction details.

EXHIBIT D:
- Details of the foundation and structural elements.
- Plumbing and electrical systems.

EXHIBIT E:
- Site access and parking.
- Stormwater management plan.

EXHIBIT F:
- Construction schedule and timeline.
- Budget allocation.
Subject: Summary of Neighborhood Information Meeting for CU17/02 Sewer Pump Station

Meeting Location: North Topeka YMCA – 1936 NW Tyler Street

Date/Time: 12/06/17; 6:00 P.M.

Attendance: 3 area residents; 2 city staff from Depts. Of Planning and Public Works; and Engineering consultant (Sign-In Sheet attached)

Meeting began at 6:00 p.m. with John Neunuebel, City of Topeka Planning Department, providing an overview of the Conditional Use Permit process including the upcoming public hearing before the Planning Commission. Zach Stueve and Alex Darby provided information on the CUP for construction and operation of replacement sewer pump station including proposed site plan with prefabricated fiberglass pump house, 75-foot high telemetry antenna, fencing, and landscape screening in the form of new trees.

Area residents in attendance, including North Topeka West President NIA Teresa Miller, inquired of how this improvement may be related to upcoming sewer improvements planned along Tyler Street, and engineering consultant Alex Darby indicated that with this being a replacement pump station it was not directly related to other planned improvements. Other questions/concerns were related to odors or noise generated by the facility, with Zach Stueve and Alex Darby responding that although the same or fewer such impacts are expected than with the existing nearby pump station, there are protocols in place for dealing with potential odors in the form of adding various chemical agents if needed in mitigating impacts, while noise generated by the facility will be minimal if any. They also added that there have been no complaints received regarding the existing facility that has been in the area for 50 years. Another question related to the height of the telemetry antenna, with staff responding that although the 75-foot antenna is approximately twice as high as the existing antenna pole in the current facility, additional height is required in accommodating remote monitoring functions, while the location of the new antenna being closer to the YMCA building will provide for the building mass in helping mitigate visual impacts. In regard to question on facility lighting, staff responded that security lighting will utilize cut-off illumination that will provide for no impact beyond facility boundary.

The residents in attendance indicated that they had no particular concerns at this point regarding the sewer pump station, especially since this replaces a nearby facility that they were not aware was present in the area. After some continued general discussion, the meeting adjourned at 6:50 p.m. and attendees were thanked for attending and their interest in the project.
### Neighborhood Information Meeting

**Sign in Sheet**

Proposed Conditional Use Permit for Sanitary Sewer Pump Station

**Date:** December 6, 2017 at 6:00 PM

**Meeting Location:** YMCA located at 1936 NW Tyler Street

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Email (preferred)/Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delane Wilson</td>
<td>2013 NW Eugene Street</td>
<td><a href="mailto:TomPurple@yahoo.com">TomPurple@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel W. Smith</td>
<td>2013 NW Eugene St</td>
<td><a href="mailto:D.Smith43@cox.net">D.Smith43@cox.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Neunuebel</td>
<td>COT Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teresa Miller</td>
<td>1820 NW Polk St</td>
<td><a href="mailto:teresa-miller@att.net">teresa-miller@att.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zach Stuewe</td>
<td>1115 NE Poplar</td>
<td><a href="mailto:z.stuewe@topeka.org">z.stuewe@topeka.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex Darby</td>
<td>1263 SW Topeka Blvd</td>
<td><a href="mailto:alex.darby@me.com">alex.darby@me.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


PUD17/04 Aqua Blast Laundry
by Chamberlin Properties, LLC
(remanded by Governing Body December 5, 2017)
The Planning Commission recommended APPROVAL of application for proposed Planned Unit Development for Aqua Blast Self-Service Laundry (Case PUD17/04) by a vote of 6-0-0 at its September 18, 2017 meeting and associated public hearing. The Governing Body considered the application on December 5, 2017 and remanded the request back to the Planning Commission (8-0-0) for reasons as follows:

- Re-consideration of the 24 hours per day operation;
- Further consideration of potential traffic impact.

Pursuant to city ordinance and state law, the notification as to another public hearing is not required for items remanded back from the Governing Body to the Planning Commission. The Commission is not obligated to entertain public comment from either the applicant or the general public. Should the planning Commission Chair decide to allow comment, comment should be limited to the two remand issues cited above. At the Commission meeting, the options will be:

1. Resubmit its original recommendation and provide reasons for doing so
2. Submit new or amended recommendations.

Staff’s recommended Condition #5 (page 8 of the September 18, 2017, staff report below) limits daily hours of continuous operation to eighteen (18) hours. Staff’s intended recommendation was for a limit of sixteen (16) hours of continuous operation as reflected in the analysis section on Page 7 of the staff report and on Page 5 of the Planning Commission meeting minutes as attached.
STAFF
RECOMMENDATION:
APPROVAL of Aqua Blast Laundry PUD Master Plan subject to conditions included on Pages 8 and 9.
Based on the findings and analysis in the staff report, I move that the Topeka Planning Commission forward to the Governing Body a recommendation of APPROVAL of the proposed PUD Master Plan along with conditions.

RECOMMENDED
MOTION:

PROPOSED USE / SUMMARY:
Proposed PUD Master Plan includes use group(s) of “C-1” Commercial restricted to self-service laundry and “O&I -2” Office and Institutional.

DEVELOPMENT / CASE HISTORY:
The 2.46-acre site consists of vacant land. The current zoning of “O&I-2” Office and Institutional District has been in effect on the subject site since May 2014 when it was changed from “M-3” Multiple Family Dwelling District. In 1972 the previous M-3 Multiple Family Dwelling zoning had been changed from “R-1” single family residential and “I-1” Light Industrial when the subject site was adjacent to the former “Allen Air Park” that included light industrial uses.

PHOTOS:
View from driveway serving multi-family residential development on south side of 22nd Terrace looking north toward subject site and office and commercial development along Westport Drive
South side of project area looking east along 22nd Terrace with multi-family residential development on south side of 22nd Terrace

View from intersection of Westport Drive and 22nd Terrace looking northwest into center portion of project area

ZONING AND CHARACTER OF SURROUNDING AREA:

The adjacent land to the north is zoned PUD/C4 use group with an office and recreational use. The adjacent lands to the west across Westport Drive are zoned I-1 with a self-storage facility, and PUD/O&I-1 use group with a professional office use. The adjacent lands to the south and southeast are zoned PUD/M3 use group and include the “Pheasant Run” and “The Woods” residential condominium development(s). Further to the
south is "Whispering Pines" residential apartments, along with single-family residential. An adjacent property located immediately east of the site and adjacent to the I-470 corridor is zoned O&I-2, as is the subject site, and is also currently vacant.

OVERVIEW OF PROPOSED PUD ELEMENTS

UTILITIES: All utilities to be underground, with available sanitary sewer and water service to be provided by City of Topeka.

CIRCULATION, PARKING, AND TRAFFIC: The PUD master plan provides for internal circulation for vehicles and pedestrians, including a single point of vehicular access on SW Westport Drive. (The initial iteration of the PUD Master Plan included a second access onto SW 22nd Terrace, but the applicant removed this second access in response to concerns expressed by nearby residents during the Neighborhood Information Meeting.)

The City's off-street parking regulations do not include a quantity standard specifically for self-service laundries. Based on the general commercial standard of 1 space for 200 square feet of the net floor area 46 parking spaces are required (Gross floor area minus storage rooms, rest rooms, mechanical rooms, and corridors equals a net floor area of approximately 9,186 square feet.). The PUD Master Plan includes 48 parking spaces in compliance with the City's parking requirements.

Due to anticipated, relatively minor traffic impacts associated with a self-service laundry, a traffic impact assessment was not required for analysis of the proposed zone change. The use itself is not a peak-hour traffic generator, with the busiest day of the week for a self-service laundry normally being on Sunday.

BUILDINGS AND HOURS OF OPERATION: The PUD Master Plan provides for a single building of 12,500 square feet in size. The intended use as a self-service laundry will include glass-door entries on all four building facades, with a covered 'drive and drop-off entry' on the east-facing facade. External wall elevations will be brick-clad, along with a pitched roof.

The owner/ applicant proposes that the laundry facility be a 24-hour operation that will also include an attendant being present at all times.

SIGNAGE: The PUD Master Plan provides for a single monument-style sign adjacent to Westport Drive and located to the north of the building, and shall not exceed 6 feet in height and shall not exceed a total of 50 square feet per sign face. Wall signs are restricted to no more than one single wall sign on
each side of the building, with each sign being limited to a maximum area of 30 square feet, and shall be located no higher than 15 feet above grade. Electronic message center (EMC) and portable reader board signs are prohibited.

**LANDSCAPING:**

The PUD Master Plan provides for substantial landscaping including required landscape buffers along 22nd Terrace and a portion of Westport drive, as well as landscape islands located within parking area and adjacent to the northwest, southwest, and southeast corners of the building. The wooded portions of the site to the north and east will remain as undisturbed buffer including drainage channel. A portion of the Westport Drive frontage includes a landscape buffer less than the standard minimum width of 4 feet or is absent altogether. This request for reduced buffer is for an area approximately 75 linear feet south of the access driveway on Westport Drive. (Of affected street frontage, approximately 50 linear feet is without any landscape buffer.)

The applicant proposes that layout and shape of the lot makes it difficult to design the site to allow for access, parking, and parking circulation. The applicant further proposes that a 37 foot landscape buffer at the immediate corner of Westport and 22nd Terrace and a 30 foot wide landscape setback provided along most of the 22nd Terrace frontage, as a buffer to the adjacent residences south of 22nd Terrace, compensates for the substandard or lack of buffer along Westport Drive. It is the opinion of staff that providing a zero-foot landscape setback is not warranted based on the character of the area and a substantial landscape setback should be provided along Westport Drive. The self-service laundry is potentially a more intensive use than the surrounding uses, and the development immediately west of the proposed building is a professional office for which its parking and circulation is set back 16 to 22 feet the Westport Drive right-of-way.

**OTHER:**

A Drainage Plan has been submitted for the PUD, and is undergoing revision pursuant to comments from Department of Public Works.

**COMPLIANCE WITH DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES**

(The PUD Master Plan establishes development standards and guidelines as generally described in the previous section of this report.)

**OTHER FACTORS**

**SUBDIVISION PLAT:** The subject property has been platted as Lot 16 within Block A of John O Allen Subdivision No. 2. (plat recorded in 1978)
FLOOD HAZARDS, STREAM BUFFERS: As noted in the Drainage Plan prepared for the PUD, the site is currently graded open space with grass cover and trees along its eastern edge within an existing drainage channel. The site accepts off-site water from a storm pipe from SW Westport Drive and some limited surface runoff from the commercial development to the north. The site does not contain any FEMA floodplain. Proposed new development will utilize new storm sewers and a grassed, dry detention area in the southeast portion of the site for developed runoff that will also serve as a sedimentation basin for water quality treatment.

HISTORIC PROPERTIES: None

NEIGHBORHOOD MEETING: The project applicant held a Neighborhood Information Meeting on Tuesday, August 29, 2017. Questions and comments from approximately 30 attendees related to: drainage; traffic impacts; lighting; crime concerns; signage; building size and design; and business operations including information from owner such as general business plan and staffing, how particular location was identified, owner’s similar projects in Wichita, hours of operation, etc. Particular concerns were also expressed in regard to proposed access onto SW 22nd Terrace as included in initial iteration of PUD Master Plan.

OTHER: None

REVIEW COMMENTS BY CITY DEPARTMENTS AND EXTERNAL AGENCIES

PUBLIC WORKS/ENGINEERING: City of Topeka Department of Public Works provided particular comments in regard to Stormwater Drainage Plan and revisions and clarifications required therein.

POLICE DEPARTMENT: Continuous staffing/attendant recommended for 24-hour operation.

KEY DATES

SUBMITTAL OF PUD APPLICATION August 3, 2017

SUBMITTAL OF REVISED PUD MASTER PLAN August 31, 2017 (Submittal of revised PUD Master Plan in response to Staff comments dated August 25, 2017, as well as comments received during Neighborhood Information Meeting.)

NEIGHBORHOOD INFORMATION MEETING August 29, 2017

LEGAL NOTICE PUBLICATION August 28, 2017

PROPERTY OWNER NOTICE MAILED August 23, 2017
ANALYSIS

Character of Neighborhood: The proposed PUD Master Plan provides for development of a vacant property with a use that, although commercial, does provide through development standards a discernible transition between the residential area to the south and the commercial uses to the north. Additionally, the architectural design of the associated building including brick-cladding and pitched roof, approximates the design of the medical/dental building on the west side of Westport Drive and the relatively large size of the building footprint (12,500 sq.ft) provides for potential re-use of the building as office use should such a change be warranted in the future. The requested variance eliminating or reducing the landscape buffer adjacent to Westport Drive is not compatible with the character of the residential neighborhood to the south or the office use to the west, nor is it consistent with providing an appropriate transition between the nearby residential neighborhood and more intense commercial and industrial areas to the north. In addition, there are architectural design elements of the proposed building that need be enhanced in further adhering to the character of the nearby residential area. Staff is also recommending the limiting of hours of operation to 18 continuous hours as an additional measure in protecting nearby residential areas from the potentially negative impacts of a round-the-clock commercial use.

Zoning and Use of Nearby Properties: The adjacent land to the north is zoned PUD/C4 use group with an office and recreational use. The adjacent lands to the west across Westport Drive are zoned I-1 with a self-storage facility, and PUD/O&I-1 use group with a professional office use. The adjacent lands to the south and southeast are zoned PUD/M3 use group and include the “Pheasant Run” and “The Wood” residential condominium development(s).

While the proposed development is for a use that C-1 zoning allows, the proposed PUD Master Plan does not allow for other “C” commercial uses and includes restrictive conditions including design and development standards that generally adhere to the intent of the subject property’s current underlying zoning of O&I-2 Office and Institutional in serving as a transitional area between existing residential zoning and development to the south and commercial & industrial zoning and development to the north and west. To further ensure that commercial use is limited to the self-service laundry as proposed, staff is recommending a clarification to the PUD Master Plan in regard to allowable PUD-Use Group of O&I-2 plus self-service laundry use.

Length of time property has remained vacant as zoned or used for its current use under present classification: The property has remained vacant since it was platted in 1978 although intensive residential and commercial development has occurred in adjacent areas.

Conformance to Comprehensive Plan: The proposed PUD Master Plan site comprises an infill development consisting of a self-service laundry, and is categorized within the Future Land Use Map of the Topeka Land Use and Growth Management Plan 2040 (LUGMP) as Regional Commercial and is part of the Wanamaker Commercial Corridor. The LUGMP encourages less intense zoning districts between commercial and residential uses to provide for a stepping down in intensity of land use, and although the existing zoning for the site of “O&I-2” may more readily provide for such a lessening of intensity, the proposed PUD Master Plan through inclusion of standards related to building and site design, signage, and significant landscaped buffer area along 22nd Terrace does provide for a discernible transition between the residential area to the south and more intensive commercial area to the north. (The PUD Master Plan also includes O&1-2 as a designated use group.) Based upon the future land use designation for the subject site and proposed development standards within the Master Plan, along with recommended conditions for approval, the proposed PUD Master Plan is consistent with the Topeka Land Use and Growth Management Plan 2040.

The extent to which removal of the restrictions will detrimentally affect nearby properties: The proposed Planned Unit Development (PUD) zoning provides for development of the property for a self-service laundry and does not allow for other land uses not permitted under the current zoning designation. While there may be concern about use of the property as a self-service laundry, the conditions of approval for the PUD master plan will help ensure that there are no detrimental effects to nearby properties.
The relative gain to the public health, safety and welfare by the destruction of the value of the owner’s property as compared to the hardship imposed upon the individual landowner: The property’s current zoning of O&I-2 provides for a broad range of uses, including some forms of residential use, numerous types of civic, cultural and recreational uses, and limited commercial uses, including office and health services uses. A disapproval of the proposed change in zoning does not deprive the owner of the opportunity for economically viable development.

The proposed planned unit development (PUD) zoning provides for one type of commercial land use, specifically a self-service laundry, not permitted under the current zoning. The PUD master plan ties the self-service laundry use to a site plan with conditions controlling for signage, landscaping, and the size and design of the building. With the appropriate conditions imposed, the proposed self-service laundry is compatible with surrounding land uses and will not pose a hardship to the owners of surrounding property.

Availability of Public Services: All essential public services and utilities are presently available.

Compliance with zoning and subdivision regulations: The PUD Master Plan establishes development standards and guidelines as described in the previous section of this report, and these standards are more restrictive than the standards applicable to O&I zoning without a planned unit development with the exception of the requested elimination or reduction in landscape buffer adjacent to Westport Drive.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based upon the above findings and analysis Planning Staff recommend APPROVAL of the Aqua Blast Self-Service Laundry PUD Master Plan subject to the following conditions:

1.) Re-locate, re-orient, or re-configure self-service laundry building as necessary to provide a landscape setback and buffer adjacent to Westport Drive that retains significant buffer at southwest corner of Westport Drive and 22nd Terrace while tapering down to a landscape setback and buffer that is a minimum of ten (10) feet in width.

2.) Revise “Current Zoning” within General Provisions to indicate: PUD-Use Group of O&I-2 PLUS SELF-SERVICE LAUNDRY USE.

3.) Revise architectural elevations so as to add articulation and visual interest to the 130-foot long rooftop ridgelines on the north and south elevations through the use of elements such as gable-roofed dormers, hip-roof elements, or other design measures that achieve an equivalent result.

4.) Revise General Provisions Note #10 to indicate: LIGHTING WITHIN THIS DEVELOPMENT SHALL BE IN ADHERANCE TO CITY OF TOPEKA ZONING CODE. LIGHTING SHALL BE FULL CUT OFF, SHIELDED & RECESSED WITH CUT-OFF ANGLES TO PREVENT THE CAST OF LIGHTING BEYOND THE PROPERTY.

5.) Add new Note #11 within General Provisions to indicate: HOURS OF DAILY OPERATION FOR SELF-SERVICE LAUNDRY IS LIMITED TO NO MORE THAN EIGHTEEN (18) CONTINUOUS HOURS.

6.) Add new note within Building and Structure Notes to indicate: ALL MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT ON THE EXTERIOR OF BUILDING VISIBLE FROM SW 22ND TERRACE SHALL BE FULLY SHIELDED FROM VIEW.

7.) Add new landscape Note #5 indicating: A 30” HIGH BERM IN SHIELDING PARKING AREA SHALL BE
INCLUDED IN LANDSCAPE BUFFER ADJACENT TO SW 22ND STREET.

8.) Add new landscape Note #6 indicating: UNDEVELOPED PORTION NORTH OF PARKING AREA TO CONSIST OF TURF AND/OR A VARIETY OF LANDSCAPE PLANTINGS.

9.) Inasmuch as additional uses in separate buildings as may be proposed in the future will require a major amendment of the approved PUD Master Plan including public hearing process, delete last sentence in Building and Structures Note #3 indicating that a revised site plan for additional uses to be submitted to Planning Commission for consideration.

ATTACHMENTS

Aerial Map
Zoning Map
Aqua Blast PUD Master Plan, along with Floor Plan and Building Elevations
Neighborhood Information Meeting report and attendance sheet
Applicant's Letter of August 1, 2017 as submitted with Application
Citizen Comments (1 letter)
PUD 17/04
Aqua Blast Self-Service Laundry PUD Master Plan
THIS PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT IS ESTABLISHED TO PROVIDE FOR A LIMITED RANGE OF NON-RESIDENTIAL USES, THE FOLLOWING TYPES OF SIGNS AS PERMITTED IN THE O&I-2 DISTRICT, WITH THE FOLLOWING VARIANCES:

1. **Wall Signs** are restricted to no more than one single wall sign on each side of the building.

2. **Electronically Message Center (EMC) Signs** are prohibited.

3. **Portable Reader Board Signs**, either manual or electronic, are prohibited.

4. **Lighting within this development** shall be per code.

5. **Sanitary sewer service** shall be by the City of Topeka.

6. **Public Improvements** shall be made to City standards.

7. **Address individual building site locations, off-street parking and internal circulation, fire utilities, storm water, relationship to adjacent lots, etc.**

8. **Landscaping, Circulation, Driveways, Pull off parking, Pedestrian access, Drainage, City's landscape regulations in TMC 18.235**, Existing trees along the east and north footprint, landscaping, circulation, driveways, pull off parking, pedestrian access, drainage, city's landscape regulations in TMC 18.235, existing trees along the east and north footprint.

9. **The operation of the self-service laundry facility is intended to be a 24-hour facility**, and an attendant and/or additional security shall be provided on-site at all times.

10. **The design layout shown on this plan illustrates one development concept.** Modifications to existing trees along the east and north footprint, landscaping, circulation, driveways, pull off parking, pedestrian access, drainage, city's landscape regulations in TMC 18.235.

11. **Red Oak** (3) and **Norway Spruce** (3) are approved, including granting of any necessary storm water management easements.

12. **Feather Reed Grass** (11) is approved, including granting of any necessary storm water management easements.

13. **Kansas Tall Fescue Seed** (25,663 sf) is approved, including granting of any necessary storm water management easements.

**CRIME PREVENTION THROUGH ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN**

Lot 16, Block A, John O. Allen Subdivision No. 2, in the City of Topeka, Shawnee County, Kansas.

Be it remembered that on this ________ day of ________, (Year), ________.

In Testimony Whereof, the Owner(s) of the above described property, have signed these presents this ________ day of ________, (Year) ________.

__________________________
(Notary Public)
My Commission Expires:________

Certification of Master P.U.D. Plan Approval:

Affidavit, No. A000000

Owner(s) Name

On the ______ day of ______, ______, the undersigned, owner(s) of the above described property, have signed an Instrument of Writing, and the same is herewith acknowledged, and declared by the said owner(s) to be a true and correct copy of the Instrument of Writing, signed by said owner(s) and acknowledged by said owner(s), and as much the same as if the same should appear in the records of the County Register of Deeds, as the same is hereby acknowledged.

My Commission Expires:________

Amended Copy of Master P.U.D. Plan:

The undersigned, owner(s) of the above described property, and the owner(s) of the property within a radius of 0.3 mi. (0.5 km) have signed an Instrument of Writing, and the same is herewith acknowledged, and declared by the said owner(s) to be a true and correct copy of the Instrument of Writing, signed by said owner(s) and acknowledged by said owner(s), and as much the same as if the same should appear in the records of the County Register of Deeds, as the same is hereby acknowledged.

My Commission Expires:________
August 31, 2017

Aqua Blast Laundry Neighborhood Meeting

Held at:

6:00 PM Tues. Aug 29, 2016
TrampoLazerRockball Park
2134 SW Westport Dr.

Attendance: 28 Neighbors (not all attending signed in)
2 Topeka Planning Staff
Former Property Owners, Property Developers, Owner’s Agent

The meeting was open at 6:05 by John Neunuebel, from the Topeka Planning Staff, with a brief explanation of the project. Greg Ferris, agent for the owner, described the project in more detail. This explanation included that the building would be brick with a pitched roof to fit a residential character, the increased landscaping, and the exact type of operation that would be in the laundry. Drawings showing the site plan, landscaping, building elevations, and building layout were at the meeting. The floor was then opened for questions and comments. The issues and questions raised by the neighbors were:

1. Traffic on Westport would be increased causing a hazard: Greg Ferris explained that the project had been reviewed by Topeka Traffic Engineering and they did not believe it would increase traffic significantly. This is because the property is zoned O&I1 and would allow office development. The proposed laundry peak traffic is not during any peak traffic hours. Therefore, the traffic issues would very likely be less than an office with some traffic during peak hours.

2. Questions were asked how long the developers had been in the laundry business: The developers described their experience of 9 to 40 years and number of current facilities.

3. Questions were asked of the developers, “Why this location?”: The developer stated that he had another facility in Topeka he wanted to relocate. That is due to two reasons. First, he is leasing the property and would like to own the facility. The second is that the owner of his building did not maintain it to the standards he wanted for his type of facility. He had look for several months for an appropriate location to build or purchase. This property fit the demographics he was interested in.

4. The proposed laundry would attract people from outside the neighborhood that might not be desirable: The developers explained that they hoped
many people use the facility, but they believed that the facility would draw from a 1 to 1 ½ mile area.

5. While people were doing their laundry, they would be bored and may roam the neighborhood: It was explained that the facility will have TVs and an inviting interior that would serve to entice people to stay on site. There may be people going outside but the owners had not seen that as a problem in their other locations.

6. Lighting from the project would be so bright it would keep up neighbors across the street from the project: Greg Ferris answered that the project will be designed to City Code that does not allow light to leave the property. The developers are willing to look into lowering the brightness of the lights.

7. The change to C1 zoning would allow other commercial uses including bars, convenient stores, retail uses and possibly something like the “Suds & Buds Laundry”: Greg Ferris explained that this is not correct. The proposed PUD is to allow uses in O&I plus the laundry. No other commercial uses are allowed. No serving of alcohol would be allowed. If there were to be any other changes in the future they would have to amend the PUD and go through the public process again.

8. The access to SW 22nd Terrace would create major traffic issues for the condos on the south side of SW 22nd Terrace: While the owners & developer disagreed with this premise, they have agreed to close the entrance on SW 22nd Terrace and will submit revised PUD drawings to that effect.

9. Most people in the area had their own washers and dryers and would not use the facility: An audience member pointed out that she had a washer and dryer but often used a laundry facility because she could get her entire laundry done in 1 to 1 ½ hours. The developer said that 40% of all users of a laundry have their own washers and dryers but enjoy the convenience. The developer also believes there are enough apartments in the immediate area to make this the appropriate location.

10. The current site has tall grass that needs mowing: The developer acknowledged this and promised to have it mowed immediately.

11. The development would cause flooding: Greg Ferris explained that the project would be designed to standards acceptable to the City of Topeka and would not be allowed to add to any flooding issues.

12. Question was asked how many washers and dryers would be at the facility: The developers said they would have approximately 70 total washers and 55 total dryers.

13. Questions were asked of the developers why it needed to be open 24 hours: While the developers believe there are a few people who will use the facility during late hours the primary reason is to allow cleaning of all the machines, lint traps, the facility, etc. The developers also believe the reason none of their facilities have had security issues is because they have someone on site 24 hours per day.

14. Concern was raised that the business would not be successful and the developers would leave an empty building: The developers explained that they would be spending $1.8 million on the building, not including land. They have never closed a facility and did the due diligence to believe this
facility would be successful or they would not make that substantial investment.

The formal meeting concluded at 7:20. The developers and Greg Ferris remained to answer any other questions and go through the drawings if needed.

Sincerely,

Gregory Ferris
## Neighborhood Information Meeting

**Sign in Sheet**

Proposed Zone Change for Property Located at Northwest Corner of SW Westport Drive and SW 22nd Terrace

**Date:** August 29, 2017 at 6:00 PM  
**Meeting Location:** Trampolazer Rockball Park; 2134 SW Westport Drive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Email (preferred)/Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Debbie Miller</td>
<td>5741 SW 12th Terr</td>
<td>melissadu [at] aol.com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Hawkstadt</td>
<td>5749 SW 10th Terr</td>
<td><a href="mailto:marya.hawkstadt@gmail.com">marya.hawkstadt@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ott &amp; Esther Lane</td>
<td>5839 SW 22nd Terr #2</td>
<td><a href="mailto:605761@gmail.com">605761@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally Lemmon</td>
<td>5707 SW 22 Terr #3</td>
<td>785-271-8312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Walshkine</td>
<td>5807 SW 22nd Terr #2</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lwalshkine@att.net">lwalshkine@att.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas A. Kinneig</td>
<td>5862 SW 27th St.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nick84pro@outlook.com">nick84pro@outlook.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane George</td>
<td>5713 SW 22nd Terrance #3</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rues.george@oath.com">rues.george@oath.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth Madell</td>
<td>5719 SW 22nd Terr #1</td>
<td><a href="mailto:smadell@cox.net">smadell@cox.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rafe Rhodd</td>
<td>5861 SW 22nd Terr #1</td>
<td>985-640-6371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pete Tarnower</td>
<td>5809 SW 22nd Terr #4</td>
<td><a href="mailto:william.tarnower@psych.com">william.tarnower@psych.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Mitchell</td>
<td>5713 SW 22nd Terr</td>
<td><a href="mailto:vamitchell@akh.com">vamitchell@akh.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Stevens</td>
<td>5707 SW 22nd Terr</td>
<td><a href="mailto:estevens1954@att.net">estevens1954@att.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian &amp; Chris Mathews</td>
<td>5755 SW 22nd Terr</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bcmathewsks@att.net">bcmathewsks@att.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Shelton</td>
<td>5851 SW 22nd Terr #1</td>
<td><a href="mailto:yesheltonks@att.net">yesheltonks@att.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joy Barnes</td>
<td>5851 SW 22nd Terr #2</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kephaoone@znet.technical.com">kephaoone@znet.technical.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Coen</td>
<td>2416 SW Borden Rd</td>
<td><a href="mailto:john@tqeka.org">john@tqeka.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuck Benedict</td>
<td>5807 SW 22nd Terr #4</td>
<td><a href="mailto:chuckbendict@gmail.com">chuckbendict@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ned Nystrom</td>
<td>5839 SW 22nd Terr #1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda Hartshorn</td>
<td>5741 SW 22nd Terr</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ahartshorn@in.com">ahartshorn@in.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherie Renag Bye</td>
<td>5440 SW 24th Terr</td>
<td><a href="mailto:j.cherie@att.net">j.cherie@att.net</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
August 1, 2017

Michael Hall, Current Plans Manager
City of Topeka Planning Department
620 SE Madison, 3rd Fl.
Topeka, KS 66607

RE: PUD for Self-Service Laundry located on the NE Corner of SW Westport Dr. and SW 22nd Terrace; Lot 16 Block A, John O Allen Subdivision #2

Dear Mr. Hall:

The application for a PUD seeks the ability to construct a self-service laundry at on SW Westport Dr. The property is currently zoned Office & Institutional-1. The PUD proposes to allow the uses of O&I-1 plus the self-service laundry. The site is currently vacant.

The area is a mix of industrial, commercial, office and high density multifamily. There is single family housing located south on SW Westport Dr. However, it is buffered from the proposed development by the multifamily. The industrial includes storage units to the west. The commercial includes a recreational facility to the north and C-4 zoning north of the recreational facility. The office uses are north and west. The multifamily units are located south, across SW 22nd Terrace.

While the proposed use is considered a retail use its character is a neighborhood service. The use is one that will serve the multifamily to the south. Because of the type of structure proposed it serves as a transition from the industrial and commercial uses to the north to the high density residential to the south. The limitations of the PUD further restrict the uses to make sure it remains transitional in nature. Even though it requires a commercial zoning; the use does not lend itself to typical retail. There are not a large volume of customers coming to the property for short intervals. They will be fewer, come from the neighborhood and stay for a significant amount of time.

The proposed development will increase the required 25-foot setback from SW 22nd Terrace to approximately seventy feet. A landscape buffer, much greater than is required, will separate the multifamily from the proposed site. The landscape buffer along SW 22nd Terrace also includes large and medium trees; thus, increasing the buffering.

The application seeks a waiver from the street-side landscape requirement along SW Westport for a small section south of the entrance. The layout of the lot makes it impossible to design the site to allow for the entrance, parking, and parking movement. The application proposes to significantly increase the size of the
required buffer in other areas along SW Westport to compensate for this waiver. There also will be parking lot landscaping just east of the section where the waiver is requested.

The site has been designed to best utilize the property and its limitations. The drainage easement on the east side of the property greatly restricts the flexibility of the site. The building size has been reduced from its originally desired 15,000 square feet to approximately 12,500 square feet. This was done because of the constraints of the site.

SW Westport is a collector street. The proposed use generates traffic at off-peak times. Most of the traffic will be from the neighborhood. Any traffic not from the neighborhood will access the property from SW 21st St. and will not need to drive through or past the residential uses. Topeka Engineering Department has determined that SW Westport is adequate for the traffic generated by the proposed use.

The proposed structure will fit the character of the area. It is proposed to be a brick structure with a pitched roof. The sides facing the both streets will include windows and doors. This is significantly more in character than the recreational use just north of the property. There is always one employee on site that increases the security of the site.

The proposed development and PUD comply with the factors laid out in the Kansas Supreme Court case of Golden vs. Overland Park. Those factors are:

- **The zoning, uses and character of the neighborhood;** The area is a mix of industrial, commercial, office and high density multifamily. The majority of the property surrounding the site are non-residential uses. The site serves as a buffer from the less restrictive uses to the north to the multifamily to the south. The brick structure with a pitched roof and significant landscaping further allows the site to serve as a buffer.

- **The extent to which removal of the restrictions will detrimentally affect nearby property;** The removal of the restrictions will have no detrimental effect on the nearby properties. The site is setback from the roadways, has significant landscaping and will be an attractive structure. The requirements of the PUD contain many provisions the more restrictive than the current allowed uses.

- **The length of time the subject property has remained vacant as zoned;** The property has remained vacant for many years. It has been platted for a long time but no development has occurred.

- **The relative gain to the public health, safety and welfare as compared to the loss in value or the hardship imposed upon the applicant;** The development will provide needed service to the area; particularly the multifamily development. It will increase the tax base. The construction of sidewalks will be a gain to public safety. Taking vacant property and development takes it from an attractive nuisance to a productive use.
Failure to approve the PUD will result in a great loss of value to the applicant.

- **The conformance of the requested change to the adopted or recognized comprehensive plan or other plans or policies being utilized by the City or County;** The property is planned as medium or high density residential or office. The use is a neighborhood service that will generate less traffic and negative impact than some allowed uses.

- **Impact of the proposed development on community facilities;** Topeka Engineering has determined SW Westport is adequate for the development. There is adequate sewer and water to serve the proposed use. There is no negative impact on community facilities.

- **Opposition or support of neighborhood residents;** A neighborhood meeting will be held to inform the area of the proposal. No support or opposition is known at this time.

The applicant believes the PUD complies with the majority of the elements laid out in Golden vs. Overland Park and there are no elements that would lead to a denial of the PUD.

Please contact me if you have any questions regarding this application. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Gregory Ferris
Dear Mr. Neunuebel,

Since the neighborhood meeting earlier this week I have given the project a lot of thought, and weighed the costs and benefits to the neighborhood. Frankly, the only benefit that I see is that a sidewalk would be installed in an area that currently doesn’t have one. The costs to the neighborhood far outweigh the benefits.

Our immediate neighborhood has little need for a Laundromat; the majority of residents in the close vicinity have their own homes, condos or apartments with laundry facilities. I, personally, can imagine visiting a Laundromat only on extremely rare occasions.

The traffic on Westport in our area is currently an overloaded and dangerous mess, especially during peak hours. Adding any additional traffic will make it more frustrating and dangerous to drive on Westport.

Because of our proximity to the freeway, noise is a big factor in the area, and adding a business that is family- and kid-friendly will certainly add noise. I’m sure that some kids will be happy to play indoors but others will come outside to play in the parking lot and in the 22nd Terrace cul-de-sac. That will be not only noisy but also dangerous for the kids and drivers at The Woods and Pheasant Run.

Opening a business of this type at this location seems like it will increase the potential crime risk in the neighborhood since laundry customers will have idle time, and at all hours of the day and night.

Lighting in the parking lot will leak into the surrounding neighborhood and, for me personally, a view of the Laundromat, its parking lot and its lighting is what I will see from my dining room window and from my balcony. That’s not what I wanted when I bought a condo at The Woods.

The lot is currently a sea of greenery bordered by trees, but it will become a paved area with a building. That change is a loss for the neighborhood.

24/7 operation is a huge problem in a residential and office-oriented area. It’s simply disruptive of residents’ ability to enjoy peace and quiet in their homes.

In the end, it seems that the request for this zoning change will put the lot into a commercial status but with PUD exemptions that allow for an even larger building footprint than the C-1 district, a business that is not economically supported by the nearby population and that definitely does draw more community-wide patronage into the area. I believe that the zone change request should be denied because it only benefits the developer, not the local neighborhood or nearby community.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Stevens
PUD17/04 Aqua Blast Laundry by: Chamberlin Properties, LLC, requesting to amend the District Zoning Classification from “O&I-2” Office and Industrial District to “PUD” Planned Unit Development (O&I-2 Use Group and Laundry) for development of a self-service laundromat on the 2.44-acre property located at the Northeast corner of SW Westport Drive & SW 22nd Terrace (Neunuebel)

Mr. Neunuebel presented the staff report and staff recommendations. Commissioners asked questions about some of the recommendations, including #5 and #1. Mr. Haugh asked what the limitations are for the drainage and utility easements. Mr. Neunuebel stated that there is currently a drainage plan under review with City staff and that the drainage easement must be left undisturbed. Mr. Fiander added that the easement could potentially be altered through a platting process.

Mr. Greg Ferris came forward representing the owner/applicant. Mr. Ferris pointed out that they have removed a driveway/entrance that was originally planned on SW Terrace because neighbors had expressed concern about it. He spoke about the materials and landscaping that are planned and stated that the applicant is asking for a variance in what staff is asking them to do regarding landscaping.

Mr. Ferris stated that the proposed PUD offers a transitional buffer between nearby industrial and commercial development and multi-family uses to the south. He stated that the recreation center just to the north of the PUD site has a much more intensive use than the proposed laundromat.

Regarding conditions recommended by staff, Mr. Ferris stated that the applicant agrees with numbers 2, 4, 6, 8 & 9 and have submitted changes to Mr. Neunuebel to comply with those recommendations. He briefly reviewed those recommendations and changes.

In regard to recommendations 1 and 7, Mr. Ferris stated that the drainage easement limits how the applicant can configure the site. He discussed the proposed landscaping and how it’s more landscaping than is typical for the area, and he stated that the applicant sees no good reason for the requested 30” high berm (#7).
In regard to recommendation #[5] (stated as #3 by Mr. Ferris), Mr. Ferris stated that the applicant is considering what would be allowed in O&I2, the current zoning of the property. He stated that businesses that are allowed in O&I2 include medical offices with pharmacies, funeral homes, radio & TV broadcasting, and fitness clubs which can operate 24 hours/day and have substantial traffic. He stated that the applicant is concerned about the proposed restriction of hours. They have stated they'll have someone onsite 24 hours/day to manage the facility, their business plan includes being open 24 hours, and they feel anything short of that would be discriminatory against people who work 2nd or 3rd shift and need to do laundry at different hours.

In regard to the building itself (#3), he referenced the materials they're planning to use (brick and a gabled roof) and stated that it's not required in O&I-2. He believes that the building they plan to build complies with what O&I-2 allows and goes well beyond that.

Mr. Ferris reviewed the "Golden Rules" and how the applicant feels the project complies with those. He asked the Commission to approve the PUD application with staff recommendations, except for numbers 1, 3, 5 & 7.

Mr. Haugh asked what might be done with the remaining land to the north of the proposed building. Mr. Ferris stated that perhaps a small office building could be placed there, but any proposals would need to be approved through a PUD amendment.

Mr. Haugh inquired as to whether the building could be re-designed to allow for the minimum 10' landscape setback and buffer. Mr. Ferris stated that because of the way the applicant's buildings and layout are configured to allow for the washers and dryers, maintenance, etc., it would hinder the applicant's ability to have the number of machines needed. He stated that they don't believe the trade-off for a small amount of landscaping is warranted. Mr. Haugh asked about the possibility of rotating the building and Mr. Ferris stated that their architects say that would be very difficult. They have three other facilities and this is the same way those facilities are designed.

Ms. Messina asked Mr. Neunuebel about the reason for recommending restricting the hours of operation. Mr. Neunuebel stated that staff feels it would be more in keeping with the nearby residential area, which is just on the other side of 22nd Terrace.

Mr. Fiander asked commissioners if it would be helpful for staff to address the staff recommendations that the applicant expressed concern about and they agreed that it would be.

Regarding #5 / hours of operation - Mr. Fiander explained that staff sees this as a commercial use and since the facility is going into a transition area with homes and offices nearby, a 24 hour operation doesn't fit the character of a transitional area.

Regarding #1 / 10’ landscape buffer - Mr. Fiander explained that while there is a requirement in O&I-2, what's being requested is a PUD, where there are no set requirements other than the requirement to reflect the character of what's around it. Thus there are no variances available.

Regarding #3 / architectural elevations – Mr. Hall explained that due to the size of the proposed building, it can have a longer ridgeline, looking less like a small scale office building and potentially look more like a barn. The purpose of the recommendation is to address that concern.

Regarding #7 / 30” berm along 22nd Terrace – Mr. Fiander stated that the berm was added in response to keeping with the character of the area, wanting to hide or screen the parking lot as much as possible. He
added that requesting a berm is fairly standard when there’s a large parking area that is incompatible with its surroundings or on an image street.

Mr. Armstrong asked for additional information about #3 and what staff is trying to achieve. Mr. Fiander directed the commissioners to Sheet A4 of the plans included in the agenda packet, which deal with elevations. He pointed out that gabled roof is large and blank and that’s what the staff recommendation is trying to address. Mr. Hall added that the length of the building / ridgeline is substantial and that affects the character of the building.

Mr. Kannarr declared the public hearing open.

**Esther Lane**, of 5839 SW 22\(^{nd}\) Terrace #2, stated she’s with the Pheasant Run HOA Board. She expressed concerns about traffic and handed around a sheet of photos. She pointed to two exits from Pheasant Run and spoke of the poor sight lines, ultimately being concerned about issues that would be caused by additional traffic from the proposed laundromat. She also pointed out where buses stop when picking up/dropping off children several times a day. Ms. Lane added that Pheasant Run is individually owned condos, owned by people who have their own laundry facilities and would not be using the proposed Aqua Blast.

Ms. Lane stated that it’s difficult to turn from Westport Drive onto 21\(^{st}\) Street, as well as from 21\(^{st}\) Street onto Westport, due to heavy traffic on 21\(^{st}\) Street. She stated that before anything is done, she believes traffic issues and implications should be assessed.

Ms. Lane stated that she had checked with realtors and they believe that having a laundromat in close proximity would have a negative impact on property values. They could not, however, say how much of an impact it might have. Ms. Lane concluded by stating that she’d prefer to have a doctor’s office or something else built on the property.

Ms. Cavazos asked Ms. Lane to state her address, which she did, and added that she also has concerns about lights coming into bedroom windows.

Ms. Messina asked Ms. Lane if she feels the current traffic issues could be impacted by the construction on Wanamaker. Ms. Lane stated that it’s a possibility.

Mr. Haugh pointed out that a doctor’s office would likely have heavier traffic than a laundromat.

Mr. Fiander passed around to commissioners a letter from **Rosalee Cooper**, along with a petition that was handed to him at this evening’s meeting.

**Joy Barnes**, of 5851 SW 22\(^{nd}\) Terrace, #2, came forward and stated she lives in Pheasant Run. She stated that she was initially against the re-zoning but, having seen that the applicant has responded to most of the concerns put forth both neighbors, she is now for it. She is not concerned about the laundromat being open 24 hours, believing that with the promised attendant, non-customers would not be allowed to hang out. She stated that the neighborhood currently has problems with people driving through too fast and people going through the garbage; she believes it’s that way in most neighborhoods and will not be made worse or better by the existence of a laundromat.

**Ruth Madell**, of 5719 SW 22\(^{nd}\) Terrace, #3, came forward to speak against the proposed project. She stated she lives in The Woods and expressed concerns about the lights from the project. She said her biggest concern is the hours. Ms. Madell stated that everyone in her condos owns their own home and have their own washers; they don’t need a laundromat and this will bring people from another part of town.
She said that at the Neighborhood Information Meeting residents were told that Sunday is the busiest day for laundromats and Ms. Madell stated that it’s nice to have quiet on Sundays.

Ms. Madell stated that when you go to a laundromat you have 40 minutes to wait while your clothes are washing or drying and she expressed concern about where people would go during this time. She feels people will wander out and around 22nd Terrace and the condo complexes.

With nobody else coming forward to speak, Mr. Kannarr declared the public hearing closed.

Mr. Armstrong stated that he is involved in the 21st & Wanamaker street project and noted that there is considerable detour traffic right now that will decrease once the 21st & Wanamaker intersection is fully open. He also noted that there are issues at 21st & Westport at peak hours of the day but he doesn't think the project under consideration would adversely affect it.

Mr. Kannarr stated that he agrees with Mr. Armstrong and added that he drives down Westport on a regular basis coming home from work. He also agrees that this project will not substantially affect traffic and there would be the same issues with any project that went on the property.

Ms. Messina asked Mr. Fiander if there are any road improvements scheduled for 22nd Terrace/Westport Dr. and Mr. Fiander stated there are none scheduled or anticipated.

Ms. Messina asked if the lights on the property would remain on all night regardless of whether the laundromat operated 16 or 24 hours/day. Mr. Fiander pointed out that there is a recommendation in the staff report recommending that light not leave the property. That note does not address the length of time the parking lot / outdoor lights are on.

Mr. Kannarr pointed out that the applicant has objections to 4 of the staff recommendations and asked Commissioners to address those.

Mr. Haugh stated that in regard to number 1, he doesn’t believe the applicant did enough study on the site to realize a 10’ setback. He belies there’s room in the plan to make adjustments to the orientation or other areas to accommodate the requirements. He added that if you correct #1, that could also take care of #3, improving architectural elevations. Mr. Haugh stated that the commission accepting staff recommendations #1 and #3 would be necessary for his approval.

Mr. Kannarr asked staff if, under current zoning, a fitness center would be allowed on this property. Mr. Fiander stated that yes it would, subject to fitting the building on the site. Mr. Kannarr pointed out that the proposed renderings look an awful lot like gymnasiums and he doesn’t think it’s dissimilar to what might go in there without a zoning change. He stated that due to a lack of expertise, he would defer to Mr. Haugh regarding recommendation #1.

Ms. Ringler stated that she agrees with Mr. Haugh on #1 & #3.

Mr. Armstrong referred to a new building going in not too far away that appears to be a concrete block, but he stated that this project is in a transitional area whereas that one is not.

In regard to recommendation #5 / hours of operation:

Ms. Messina stated she is not opposed to 24 hour operation. Mr. Haugh and Mr. Kannarr concurred.

In regard to recommendation #7 / 30” berm:
Mr. Haugh stated that he doesn’t believe it would be hard to achieve and wouldn’t cost that much to install. Mr. Kannarr concurred.

Ms. Cavazos asked staff what their thoughts were behind limiting business hours. Mr. Fiander stated that staff based their recommendation on the fact that a 24 hour facility in a transitional area/going into a neighborhood is atypical; it’s more a commercial character. He also noted that most laundromats are not 24 hours.

Ms. Cavazos stated that she would have concerns about safety issues for 24 hour operation. In regard to a gym, which others had noted might also be a 24 hour business, Ms. Cavazos noted that only gym members come and go when the facility is locked and they have keycards, so there is safety built into that process.

Ms. Messina stated the fact that the laundromat will be staffed 24 hours will help keep non-customers from just hanging out and wandering around the parking lot. She noted that people who work different shifts need the flexibility.

Mr. Kannarr stated he agrees and remembers when he himself had to use laundromats at odd hours. He believes having an attendant will adequately address the vagrancy issue of non-users.

Motion by Mr. Haugh recommending forwarding to the Governing Body a recommendation for approval of the proposed PUD Master Plan, along with the following staff recommendations: 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9. Second by Ms. Messina. Mr. Kannarr noted that he would have left out recommendation #3 but that won’t change his vote on the motion. APPROVAL (6-0-0)

Mr. Ferris went to the podium and thanked staff and Planning Commissioners.
AQUA BLAST SELF-SERVICE LAUNDRY
PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT MASTER PLAN

GENERAL PROVISIONS:

PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT (PUD) is planned to provide for a mixed-use area of commercial, retail and residential uses. The PUD Plan will provide for increased density, walkable streets, landscaping and other urban design elements to create a cohesive neighborhood setting. The proposed PUD is subject to the provisions of the Topeka Zoning Code and the Planned Unit Development Ordinance. A master plan and supporting regulatory documents are required for the PUD to be approved.

OWNERS' CERTIFICATION:

My Commission Expires:________

I hereby set my hand and affix my notarial seal the day and year last written above.

Notary Public
My Commission Expires:_______

CERTIFICATION OF MASTER
P.U.D. PLAN APPROVAL

City Hall, Suite 100, Topeka, KS 66601
(785) 350-4700

Date of Submission: August 2, 2017
Date of Approval: September 15, 2017

AMENDMENT NOTE:

The above amendment was filed with the Shawnee County Register of Deeds on May 16, 2017. The amendment provides for a reduction in the total number of parking spaces from 63 to 49 spaces.

PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT NOTES:

Aqua Blast Self-Service Laundry proposed to provide for a mixed-use area of commercial, retail and residential uses. The PUD Plan will provide for increased density, walkable streets, landscaping and other urban design elements to create a cohesive neighborhood setting. The proposed PUD is subject to the provisions of the Topeka Zoning Code and the Planned Unit Development Ordinance. A master plan and supporting regulatory documents are required for the PUD to be approved.

LEGAL DESCRIPTION:

101 Westport Drive, Topeka, Shawnee County, Kansas
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PLAN:" + 220 + " SELF-SERVICE LAUNDRY" + 220 + " PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT MASTER PLAN" + 220 + " STOCK COMPANY, P.A." + 220 + " Topeka, Kansas 66601" + 220 + " This plan has been filed for recording in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 35, K.S.A. 66-3, of the Comprehensive Zoning Regulations of the City of Topeka, Shawnee County, Kansas, and the plan is subject to the provisions of the Kansas Zoning Act and all amendments thereto. This plan should be filed in the Office of the Clerk of the County and shall be recorded and public notice given. The plan has been filed with the Shawnee County Register of Deeds and is subject to the provisions of the Kansas Zoning Act and all amendments thereto. This plan should be filed in the Office of the Clerk of the County and shall be recorded and public notice given.
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