

METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes

February 5, 2015

The regular meeting of the Wichita-Sedgwick County Metropolitan Area Planning Commission was held on Thursday, February 5, 2015 at 1:30 p.m., in the Planning Department Conference Room, 10th floor, City Hall, 455 North Main, Wichita, Kansas. The following members were present: Matt Goolsby, Chair; Carol Neugent, Vice Chair; David Dennis; John Dailey; David Foster; Bill Johnson; Joe Johnson; John McKay Jr.; Bill Ramsey; Lowell E. Richardson; Debra Miller Stevens and Chuck Warren. Don Klausmeyer; and Don Sherman were absent. Staff members present were: John Schlegel, Director; Dale Miller, Current Plans Manager; Bill Longnecker, Senior Planner; Jeff Vanzandt, Assistant City Attorney and Robert Parnacott, Assistant County Counselor.

1. Approval of the prior January 8, 2015 MAPC meeting minutes.

MOTION: To approve the January 8, 2015 meeting minutes.

DENNIS moved, **MCKAY** seconded the motion, and it carried (7-0-5). **DAILEY, FOSTER, J. JOHNSON, RAMSEY** and **RICHARDSON** - Abstained.

-
2. **CONSIDERATION OF SUBDIVISION COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS**

There were no Subdivision items.

-
3. **PUBLIC HEARING – VACATION ITEMS**

3-1. VAC2014-00052: County request to vacate a portion of platted public street right-of-way, generally described as a portion of 3rd Street located between the Railroad right-of-way and North Avenue F in Furley.

APPLICANT/AGENT: Andale Farmers’ Coop, c/o Steve Morris (applicant) Kaw Valley Eng., c/o Tim Austin (agent)

LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Generally described as the north 20 feet of the platted 80 feet of 3rd Street right-of-way that abuts the south sides of Reserve G, Lots 1 & 2, Block 19, the east side of the Andale Farmer’s Coop property and the west side of Avenue F right-of-way, all in the Furley Addition

LOCATION: Generally located south of 109th Street North and west of 111th Street East (BoCC 1)

REASON FOR REQUEST: Expansion of Andale Farmer’s Coop

CURRENT ZONING: The site is a public street right-of-way. The abutting north and west properties are zoned LI Limited Industrial. Platted public right-of-way Avenue F abuts the east side of the site.

The applicant proposes to vacate north 20 feet of the platted, unimproved 80 feet of 3rd Street right-of-way (ROW) that abuts the south sides of Reserve G, Lots 1 & 2, Block 19 (Andale Farmer's Coop property), the east side of the Andale Farmer's Coop (the applicant) property and the west side of Avenue F ROW, all in the Furley Addition. The applicant proposes additional buildings for the Coop. All of Furley's streets have been platted with 80 feet of ROW. The vacation would reduce this portion of 3rd Street to 60 feet of ROW, which is within the Subdivision's standards for a residential street. There is no public sewer located in the right-of-way. There is a power line pole located in the northwest portion of the 3rd Street – Avenue F intersection; the area of the vacation activity. Comments are needed from the owner(s) of the utilities located on the power line pole. The site is located within Sedgwick County Rural Water District #1 and its comments are needed. The Furley's plat's text states that it is to be filed as a map or a plat of a town. Furley is an unincorporated town of approximately (+/-) 3.2-acres. The Furley Addition was recorded May 20, 1887.

Based upon information available prior to the public hearing and reserving the right to make recommendations based on subsequent comments from County Public Works, Water & Sewer, Fire, Sedgwick County Rural Water District #1, franchised utility representatives and other interested parties, Planning Staff has listed the following considerations (but not limited to) associated with the request to vacate the described portion of the platted, unimproved, street right-of-way.

- A. That after being duly and fully informed as to fully understand the true nature of this petition and the propriety of granting the same, the MAPC makes the following findings:
1. That due and legal notice has been given by publication as required by law, in the Wichita Eagle, of notice of this vacation proceeding one time January 15, 2015, which was at least 20 days prior to this public hearing.
 2. That no private rights will be injured or endangered by vacating the described portion of the platted unimproved, street right-of-way and that the public will suffer no loss or inconvenience thereby.
 3. In justice to the petitioner, the prayer of the petition ought to be granted.

Conditions (but not limited to) associated with the request:

- (1) Vacate that portion of the unimproved portion of 3rd Street ROW as approved by the Sedgwick County Engineer.
- (2) Dedicate a portion of the described vacated portion of the platted, unimproved, street right-of-way as a utility - drainage easement. This easement (with original signatures) must be provided to Planning prior to the case going to the County Commission for final action.
- (3) Any relocation or reconstruction of all utilities made necessary by this vacation shall be the responsibility of the applicants and at the applicants' expense shall be to County Standards. If needed provide a private project for relocation of utilities. The approved private project number must be provided to Planning prior to the case going to County Commission and subsequent

recording with the Register of Deeds. If these are franchised utilities, provide Planning with approval from the participating franchised utility.

- (4) Provide an original restrictive covenant(s) binding and tying the vacated portion of the vacated subject street right-of-way to applicant's abutting property. This must be provided to Planning prior to the case going to the County Commission and subsequent recording with the Register of Deeds.
- (5) Provide Planning with a legal description of the vacated street on a Word document, via e-mail. This must be provided to Planning prior to the case going to City Council for final action.
- (6) Provide County Fire and Public Works with any needed improvements, per County Standards and at the applicants' expense.
- (7) Per MAPC Policy Statement #7, all conditions are to be completed within one year of approval by the MAPC or the vacation request will be considered null and void. All vacation requests are not complete until the Wichita City Council or the Sedgwick County Board of County Commissioners have taken final action on the request and the vacation order and all required documents have been provided to the City, County and/or franchised utilities and the necessary documents have been recorded with the Register of Deeds.

SUBDIVISION COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDED ACTION

The Subdivision Committee recommends approval subject to the following conditions:

- (1) Vacate that portion of the unimproved portion of 3rd Street ROW as approved by the Sedgwick County Engineer.
- (2) Dedicate a portion of the described vacated portion of the platted, unimproved, street right-of-way as a utility - drainage easement. This easement (with original signatures) must be provided to Planning prior to the case going to the County Commission for final action.
- (3) Any relocation or reconstruction of all utilities made necessary by this vacation shall be the responsibility of the applicants and at the applicants' expense shall be to County Standards. If needed provide a private project for relocation of utilities. The approved private project number must be provided to Planning prior to the case going to County Commission and subsequent recording with the Register of Deeds. If these are franchised utilities, provide Planning with approval from the participating franchised utility.
- (4) Provide an original restrictive covenant(s) binding and tying the vacated portion of the vacated subject street right-of-way to applicant's abutting property. This must be provided to Planning prior to the case going to the County Commission and subsequent recording with the Register of Deeds.
- (5) Provide Planning with a legal description of the vacated street on a Word document, via e-mail. This must be provided to Planning prior to the case going to City Council for final action.

- (6) Provide County Fire and Public Works with any needed improvements, per County Standards and at the applicants' expense.
- (7) Per MAPC Policy Statement #7, all conditions are to be completed within one year of approval by the MAPC or the vacation request will be considered null and void. All vacation requests are not complete until the Wichita City Council or the Sedgwick County Board of County Commissioners have taken final action on the request and the vacation order and all required documents have been provided to the City, County and/or franchised utilities and the necessary documents have been recorded with the Register of Deeds.

MOTION: To approve subject to the recommendation of the Subdivision Committee and staff recommendation.

B. JOHNSON moved, **RAMSEY** seconded the motion, and it carried (12-0).

PUBLIC HEARINGS

4. **Case No.: ZON2014-00033** - BATC, LLC (applicant/owner) Timothy Chadd (agent) request a City Zone change from SF-5 Single-family Residential to TF-3 Two-family Residential on property on property legally described as:

Lots 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 23, 24 and 25, Block E, Country Acres 6th Addition to Wichita, Sedgwick County, Kansas.

BACKGROUND: The applicant is requesting TF-3 Two-Family Residential zoning on the undeveloped, platted 1.77-acre SF-5 Single-Family Residential zoned site; Lots 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 23, 24 and 25, Block E, Country Acres 6th Addition. The applicant proposes to build a duplex on each lot. Each of the eight (8) lots exceeds the Unified Zoning Code's (UZC) minimum standards for lot size for a duplex. The site is located south of Central Avenue, between Ridge Road and the Big Ditch, on the west side of Wayside Lane's intersections of Newell Street and Frazier Lane.

The SF-5 zoned site is located in a neighborhood of predominately low to high density residential development and zoning. The neighborhood is located south of (and behind) the commercial development and zoning along Central Avenue. A small SF-5 zoned public park abuts the west side of the site. The park separates the site from the adjacent west SF-5 zoned single-family residences (built in the early 1970s). A small GO General Office zoned office is located further west of the site along Ridge Road, marking the end of most of the area's SF-5 zoning. South of the site are SF-5 zoned single-family residences (built in the early 1970s). Further south and east of the site are MF-18 Multi-family Residential and TF-3 zoned duplexes, apartments and townhouses, all part of a residential Community Unit Plan, CUP DP-59. The duplexes appear to be some of the most recent residential development in the area, being built in the mid-2000s. A GC General Commercial zoned self-storage warehouse is also located in this area south of the site. North of the site is the LC Limited Commercial zoned YMCA, retail, a cosmetology school, a bank, restaurants, and other commercial uses. Most of this development is part of the commercial CUP DP-39.

CASE HISTORY: The subject site was platted as, Lots 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 23, 24 and 25, Block E, Country Acres 6th Addition, which was recorded with the Sedgwick County Register of Deeds February 8, 1960.

DAB V considered this request at their January 26, 2015 meeting and recommended approval, 7-0. No one protested the request at the DAB V meeting.

ADJACENT ZONING AND LAND USE:

NORTH: LC	YMCA, retail strips, restaurants, cosmetology school
SOUTH: SF-5, MF-18, LC, GC	Single-family residences, apartments, duplexes, self-storage
WEST: SF-5, GO	Public park, single-family residences, office strip
EAST: MF-18, TF-3	Duplexes, townhouses

PUBLIC SERVICES: Newell Street, Frazier Lane and Wayside Lane are paved residential streets. All utilities are available to the site.

CONFORMANCE TO PLANS/POLICIES: The “2013 Land Use Guide of the Comprehensive Plan” (Plan) identifies the SF-5 zoned site as “urban residential.” The urban residential category encompasses areas that reflect the full diversity of residential development densities and types typically found in large urban municipality. The Plan identifies SF-5 zoning as being compatible with the urban residential category. The SF-5 zoning district allows single-family residences and institutional uses such as a parks, schools and churches, but not duplexes, by right. The site’s requested TF-3 zoning is compatible with the Plan’s urban residential category and allows duplexes as well as single-family residential development and institutional uses such as a parks, schools and churches.

RECOMMENDATION: Based upon information available prior to the public hearings, planning staff recommends that the request be **APPROVED**.

This recommendation is based on the following findings:

- (1) The zoning, uses and character of the neighborhood:** The SF-5 zoned site is located in a neighborhood of predominately low to high density residential development and zoning. The neighborhood is located south of (and behind) the commercial development and zoning along Central Avenue. A small SF-5 zoned public park abuts the west side of the site. The park separates the site from the adjacent west SF-5 zoned single-family residences (built in the early 1970s). A small GO General Office zoned office is located further west of the site along Ridge Road, marking the end of most of the area’s SF-5 zoning. South of the site are SF-5 zoned single-family residences (built in the early 1970s). Further south and east of the site are MF-18 Multi-family Residential and TF-3 zoned duplexes, garden apartment, townhouse and apartments, part of a mixed residential Community Unit Plan, CUP DP-59. The duplexes appear to be some of the most recent residential development in the area, being built in mid-2000. A GC General Commercial zoned self-storage warehouse is also located in this area south of the site. North of the site is the LC Limited Commercial zoned YMCA, retail, a cosmetology school, a bank, restaurants, and other commercial uses. Most of this development is part of the commercial CUP DP-39.
- (2) The suitability of the subject property for the uses to which it has been restricted:** The site is currently zoned SF-5 and is vacant.
- (3) Extent to which removal of the restrictions will detrimentally affect nearby property:** The requested TF-3 zoning allows duplexes as well as single-family residences by right. It also

permits institutional uses such as parks, schools and churches by right. The request would not introduce TF-3 zoning or duplex development into the area, as the most recent development in the area may be some TF-3 zoned duplexes (built in mid-2000) located east of the site.

- (4) **Relative gain to the public health, safety and welfare as compared to the loss in value or the hardship imposed upon the applicant:** Approval of the request would limit development by right to single-family residential, duplex, and institutional uses such as a parks, schools and churches. Denial of the request could impose a financial hardship on the owner.
- (5) **Conformance of the requested change to the adopted or recognized Comprehensive Plan and policies:** The “2013 Land Use Guide of the Comprehensive Plan” (Plan) identifies the SF-5 zoned site as “urban residential.” The urban residential category encompasses areas that reflect the full diversity of residential development densities and types, including duplexes, typically found in large urban municipality. The Plan identifies SF-5 zoning as being compatible with the urban residential category. The SF-5 zoning district allows single-family residential uses and parks, but not duplexes, by right. The site’s requested TF-3 zoning and proposed duplex development is compatible with the Plan’s urban residential category.
- (6) **Impact of the proposed development on community facilities:** All services are in place, and any increased demand on community facilities can be handled by current infrastructure.

BILL LONGNECKER, Planning Staff presented the Staff Report.

FOSTER pointed out several typographical errors on the Staff Report regarding “cosmetology”.

MOTION: To approve subject to staff recommendation.

MCKAY moved, **J. JOHNSON** seconded the motion, and it carried (12-0).

NON-PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

5. **Case No.: DER2015-00002** - Proposed Amendments to the "U" University Zoning District.

Background: Wichita State University has developed an Innovation Campus Master Plan (see attached) to redevelop Braeburn Golf Course with:

- An Experiential Engineering Building with engineering laboratories and a maker space
- Partnership Buildings, constructed with private funds by developers who will lease space to companies that want to work with WSU students and faculty
- A new home for the W. Frank Barton School of Business, with an adjacent Innovation Center
- A new residence hall
- Mixed-use buildings, built by private developers along 17th and 21st Streets, near Oliver, that would include retail stores and restaurants on the first level and apartments on upper levels
- A hotel, built by a private developer, on the southwest corner of 21st and Oliver

The current zoning of Wichita State’s main campus and the former Braeburn Golf Course is “SF-5” Single Family with the “U” University Overlay District. The current language of the Unified Zoning Code indicates that the “U” University Overlay District should be applied only to non-university,

residential properties adjacent to campus and that properties on campus should be zoned “U” University Base District.

Since neither the “U” University Overlay District nor “U” University Base District permits the proposed Innovation Campus uses and since other university campuses are zoned “U” University Base District, staff recommends the attached amendments to the “U” University Overlay District to create a section that applies to university-owned property on-campus and a different section that applies to non-university, residential property adjacent to campus. The “U” University Overlay District on campus would permit the proposed uses of the Innovation Campus. Since Wichita State has the only on-campus property zoned “U” University Overlay District, Wichita State would be the only campus permitted the Innovation Campus uses if the proposed amendments are approved. Non-university, residential properties in the “U” University Overlay District would continue with existing permitted uses.

Recommended Action: Based on the information available prior to the public hearing, staff recommends approval of the proposed amendments to the “U” University Overlay District. This recommendation is based on the following findings.

1. The zoning, uses, and character of the neighborhood: The Wichita State University campus is the predominant use in the neighborhood and establishes the character of the neighborhood. The proposed amendments support the expansion of the campus.
2. The suitability of the subject property for the uses to which it has been restricted: The “U” University Overlay District currently restricts the Wichita State University campus to residential uses and uses auxiliary to the university. The proposed amendments permit the typical range of university campus uses as well as proposed innovation campus uses.
3. The extent to which removal of the restrictions will detrimentally affect nearby property: The Wichita State University campus is buffered from nearby property by arterial streets on all four sides. This buffer along with the setback and floor area ratio requirements of the proposed amendments will mitigate detrimental impacts of campus expansion on nearby property.
4. Conformance of the requested change to the adopted or recognized Comprehensive Plan: The 2030 Wichita Functional Land Use Guide identifies the Wichita State University as appropriate for Major Institutional uses. The proposed amendments are consistent with this functional classification.

Attachments: Innovation Campus Master Plan
Proposed Amendments to the “U” University Zoning District

SCOTT KNEBEL, Planning Staff presented the Staff Report.

MCKAY asked about the student housing north of 21st Street.

KNEBEL explained that was one of the reasons staff was suggesting splitting the zoning. He said currently those areas are zoned University Overlay, but added that these proposed amendments would not change that zoning. He added that the proposed amendments were presented to the Advance Plans Committee who recommended approval of the staff recommendation.

FOSTER asked staff to provide a graphic of the current Overlay District at the public hearing. He referred to the future land use map for the updated Comprehensive Plan that shows this area as zoned residential, mixed employment. He asked staff if they are going to recommend that it remain that way.

KNEBEL said yes, he believes that description is accurate including the proposed development for the area. He said there will also be a significant increase in the number of dwelling units within the area.

FOSTER asked about the impact on taxation with regard to leasing the property. He mentioned a previous zoning case at the northwest corner of 21st and Oliver which a Planning Commissioner indicated was excluded from commercial development for a number of reasons. He said the proposed uses will compete with other uses in the area for economic growth. He said he wanted to understand the theory behind the proposal and asked that staff provide that information at the public hearing.

KNEBEL clarified Commissioner Foster wanted to know the theory behind the Innovative Campus itself.

FOSTER said no, just the idea of introducing competing commercial enterprises in an area that has been in decline for quite some time.

KNEBEL said he does not believe the proposed commercial development is intended to compete, but to serve the growth of the campus. He said there will be approximately two million square feet of new development and there is not the restaurant or retail in this area to support that type of development.

FOSTER also asked about clarifying the terminology “adjacent residential” property.

KNEBEL said adjacent residential property is a single term used to describe properties adjacent to the campus. He explained that the reason for the UZC amendment is to split district into two overlay districts; one is an overlay district on campus and the other is an overlay district is for adjacent residential properties.

FOSTER said then this would impact the areas north of 21st Street.

KNEBEL said this does impact those areas in the sense that the amendment would change the nomenclature of the zoning. He said the types of things that are permitted are not significantly impacted but staff did clarify some language.

MOTION: To set a public hearing for March 5, 2015 to consider amendments to the Unified Zoning Code.

J. JOHNSON moved, **WARREN** seconded the motion, and it carried (12-0).

-
- 6. Case No.: DER2015-00003** - The City of Garden Plain seeks Unilateral Annexation of various tracts located adjacent to the City of Garden Plain - Resolution No. 151.

Background: On January 7, 2015, the City of Garden Plain passed Resolution No. 151 authorizing a public hearing on March 11, 2015, for the purposes of considering the unilateral annexation of several

properties eligible under KSA 12-520(a) and located immediately adjacent to the City of Garden Plain.

Prior to unilaterally annexing property, Kansas statutes require that a plan be prepared indicating the means by which city services will be extended to the area proposed for annexation. The City of Garden Plain has not submitted to the MAPD, a copy of the service plan describing the extension of services to the annexation area. All six tracts proposed for annexation are various segments of road right-of-way located adjacent to existing City limits.

Analysis: Kansas statutes governing unilateral annexations provide for official notification to certain local officials, including planning commissions having jurisdiction in the area. Additionally, Kansas statutes require that the planning commission review the proposal and make a finding of compatibility or incompatibility with any adopted land use or comprehensive plans related to the area and the annexing city.

After review by staff, it has been determined that three of the six tracts proposed for unilateral annexation fall within the City of Garden Plain 2030 Urban Growth Area as designated within the Wichita-Sedgwick County Comprehensive Plan *Preparing for Change*, adopted and updated by the Metropolitan Area Planning Commission and the Board of County Commission in May 2005. All six tracts fall within the revised City of Garden Plain 2035 Urban Growth Area as depicted in the Working Draft Community Investments Plan dated January 8, 2015. Staff has concluded that the proposed unilateral annexation by the City of Garden Plain is substantially consistent with the Wichita-Sedgwick County Comprehensive Plan.

Recommended Action: That the Metropolitan Area Planning Commission pass a motion finding the unilateral annexation proposed by Resolution No. 151 of the City of Garden Plain to be substantially consistent with the adopted Wichita-Sedgwick County Comprehensive Plan.

Attachments: Attachment No. 1 - Resolution No. 151 and map.
Attachment No. 2 - 2030 Urban Growth Areas Map, May 2005.

DAVE BARBER, Planning Staff presented the Staff Report.

FOSTER asked what was the purpose of the annexation.

BARBER said staff was never forwarded a copy of the annexation service plan so he did not know the intent; however, he speculated that it may consolidation of boundaries.

FOSTER asked about annexing over a highway. He asked will Garden Plain take over road maintenance.

BARBER referred the question to the County Counselor.

BOB PARNACOTT, ASSISTANT COUNTY COUNSELOR mentioned the term “connecting link” which area roads through small cities that are maintained by the County. He commented that County Public Works determines which roads are the “connecting links”. He said if it is not a link, maintenance would fall to the City because it is within the City Limits.

FOSTER asked since the new Comprehensive Plan has not been adopted or approved, does staff feel comfortable recommending approval of this annexation request.

BARBER said yes because the annexation of these properties does not impact the future growth or development of any other community in this area of Sedgwick County.

MOTION: Finds that the unilateral annexation of the City of Garden Plain to be substantially consistent with the adopted Wichita-Sedgwick County Comprehensive Plan.

MCKAY moved, **NEUGENT** seconded the motion and it carried (12-0)

7. **Conformity of the Project Area 1 Plan for the Union Station Redevelopment District with the Wichita-Sedgwick County Comprehensive Plan.**

Background: A tax increment finance district is a tool available under Kansas Statutes to stimulate economic redevelopment. It allows a city to finance in blighted or deteriorating areas, all or a portion of public infrastructure and redevelopment costs using captured incremental real estate tax revenues or sales tax revenues generated by the redevelopment activity.

In October 2014, the City of Wichita established the Union Station Redevelopment District in order to encourage (using tax increment financing) the redevelopment of a 10 parcel area centered on the historic Union Station Depot in downtown Wichita. This TIF redevelopment district is bounded on the west by the elevated rail corridor, on the east by an irregular line roughly following S. Rock Island Avenue and S. Mead Street, on the north by E. Douglas Avenue and on the south by E. Waterman Street.

On November 20, 2014, the Metropolitan Area Planning Commission passed a resolution finding the proposed Union Station Project Plan for the Union Station Redevelopment District to be substantially consistent with the adopted Wichita-Sedgwick County Comprehensive Plan. The Union Station Project Plan area is identical to the Union Station TIF redevelopment district area. The Project Plan consists of a mixed-use development of approximately 275,000 square feet of retail, restaurants, office space and structured parking. The project will consist of retail, restaurants, and office space (includes 80,000 square feet of new office/retail space) and the construction of a public parking structure (471 spaces) at the south end of the campus.

Over the last month, the developer of the Union Station Project Plan has determined that it would be more appropriate and financially prudent to undertake the redevelopment proposed in the Union Station Project Plan in two distinct phases. At the developer's request, the Union Station Project Plan will be left to expire by the City Council at the hearing scheduled for February 3, 2015. At that time, the developer will request the City Council to amend the Union Station Redevelopment District to create two project areas instead of one.

A new project plan called the Project Area 1 Plan, covering the north and northeast portions of the Union Station Redevelopment District, has been submitted to the MAPC for a determination of consistency with the Wichita-Sedgwick County Comprehensive Plan.

Project Details - The Project Area 1 Plan covers 79,035 square feet on the north end of the Union Station campus. The proposed private and public improvements will consist of the following:

- Improvements to the Grand Hotel (streetscape improvements along Douglas and Mead Streets as well as internal and external improvements to the building structure).
- Improvements to the Rock Island Passenger Depot Building (streetscape and landscaping improvements adjacent to the building structure as well as internal and external improvements to the building structure).
- Union Station Plaza improvements (streetscape, landscape and lighting improvements north and east of the Terminal building)
- Granting of a public access easement to provide pedestrian and vehicular access with the Project Area 1 Plan area.

The Developer will finance the project including various public infrastructure improvements. The City will provide pay-as-you-go financing to reimburse the Developer for TIF-eligible expenditures. It is estimated that construction of public infrastructure improvements will begin in 2015 and be completed before the end of 2019 at a total estimated cost of \$1,223,354. The city access easement will cost \$432,580. Tax increment financing will be used to finance these improvements.

The original total assessed valuation of the Project Area as of January 2014 for taxes payable in 2014-2015 is \$148,493. The projected total assessed valuation as of January 1, 2020 is estimated to be \$1,445,858. Therefore, the captured assessed valuation for the Project Area as of January 1, 2020 is estimated at \$1,297,365. The resulting property tax increment in 2020 has been calculated to be \$124,372. It is the City's intention to use the property tax increment revenues generated by this TIF District to reimburse the Developer on a pay-as-you-go basis. No TIF bonds will be used to finance eligible expenses. The projected tax increment revenue from the District will be sufficient to reimburse the Developer for all eligible project costs.

Analysis: The Project Area 1 Plan for the Union Station Redevelopment District falls within the *Project Downtown Master Plan* which has been adopted as an element of the *Wichita-Sedgwick County Comprehensive Plan*. More specifically, the Project Plan area falls within the Downtown Master Plan's designated 'Old Town South District', one of 15 unique districts that constitute Downtown Wichita.

The Project Area 1 Plan will specifically accomplish certain elements of the following key vision theme identified for the 'Old Town South District':

- *"Revive Union Station, adjacent sites, and Douglas Avenue with office, hotel and/or other uses"*

It is the opinion of staff that the Project Area 1 Plan dated January 28, 2015 is substantially consistent with the Wichita-Sedgwick County Comprehensive Plan.

Legal Considerations: Pursuant to K.S.A. 12-1772, each redevelopment project plan undertaken as part of a tax increment finance district must be prepared in consultation with the planning commission. Accordingly, the MAPC has a responsibility to review the proposed Project Area 1 Plan and make a determination of its consistency with the Wichita-Sedgwick County Comprehensive Plan.

Recommended Action: That the Metropolitan Area Planning Commission pass a resolution finding the proposed Project Area 1 Plan for the Union Station Redevelopment District dated January 28, 2015 to be substantially consistent with the adopted Wichita-Sedgwick County Comprehensive Plan.

Attachment: Project Area 1 Plan for the Union Station Redevelopment District

DAVE BARBER, Planning Staff briefly reviewed background information on the item. He reminded the Commission of their previous approval of the plan back in November of 2014 and said this was an amended Project Plan. He said the Project Area 1 Plan falls within the Downtown Master Plan which was approved as an element of the Wichita-Sedgwick County Comprehensive Plan.

SCOTT KNEBEL, Planning Staff presented the Staff Report.

RICHARDSON asked staff to point out the public access easement and asked why it cost \$432,000.

KNEBEL referred to an aerial map of the area which consisted of a plaza area, two streets and a drive connecting the two streets. He said the \$432,000 is a square foot allocation of the \$1,000,000 acquisition price of the entire site. He said that amount is eligible for reimbursement through TIF.

RICHARDSON clarified that the City was paying the developer \$432,000 for public access to the private properties.

KNEBEL responded that is correct.

DAILEY asked if this adjusted the TIF that has already been approved.

KNEBEL said the overall boundaries of the TIF District are not being changed, just the private areas within the TIF District. He said the City Council took the action to create two project areas within the TIF District. He said in order to expend any TIF monies there has to be a Project Plan adopted. He said this Project Area 1 Plan is the first for the District.

MOTION: To pass a resolution finding the proposed Project Area 1 Plan for the Union Station Redevelopment District dated January 28, 2015 to be substantially consistent with the adopted Wichita-Sedgwick County Comprehensive Plan.

J. JOHNSON moved, **RAMSEY** seconded the motion and it carried (12-0).

The Metropolitan Area Planning Commission adjourned at 2:05 p.m.

State of Kansas)
Sedgwick County) ^{SS}

I, John L. Schlegel, Secretary of the Wichita-Sedgwick County Metropolitan Area Planning Commission, do hereby certify that the foregoing copy of the minutes of the meeting of the Wichita-Sedgwick County Metropolitan Area Planning Commission, held on _____, is a true and correct copy of the minutes officially approved by such Commission.

Given under my hand and official seal this _____ day of _____, 2015.

John L. Schlegel, Secretary
Wichita-Sedgwick County Metropolitan
Area Planning Commission

(SEAL)