

## **District II Advisory Board Minutes**

**September 10, 2007**

[www.wichita.gov](http://www.wichita.gov)

The District II Advisory Board meeting was held at 7:00 p.m. at the Rockwell Branch Library, 5939 E. 9<sup>th</sup> Street North. CM Schlapp, ten board members, 5 staff and approximately 7 citizens were in attendance. Only those individuals who signed in are listed as guests below.

### **Members Present**

Brian Carduff  
Daryl Crotts  
Sarah DeVries  
Larry Frutiger  
Joe Johnson  
Aaron Mayes  
David Mollhagen  
Phil Ryan  
Max Weddle  
Marty Weeks  
Council Member Sue Schlapp

### **Members Absent**

Tim Goodpasture

### **Staff Present**

Sgt. Allen Wolf, Patrol East  
Donna Goltry, Planning Department  
Paul Gunzelman, Public Works  
Jim Armour, Public Works  
LaShonda Porter, Neighborhood Assistant

### **Guests**

Listed on the last page.

## **ORDER OF BUSINESS**

### **CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 7:03 p.m. Board members did introduction. **CM Schlapp** explained how the District II Advisory Board meeting is conducted. She advised that chair Joe Johnson runs the meeting as she likes to get feedback from her board on issues brought before them and feels that this is the best manner to receive that information.

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES AND AGENDA**

The meeting agenda for September 10, 2007 was approved. (**Mollhagen: Weddle, 10-0**)

The meeting minutes for August 6, 2007 were approved with one correction to the spelling of Larry Frutiger's last name. (**Ryan: Mollhagen, 10-0**)

### **PUBLIC AGENDA**

#### **Scheduled items**

No items submitted.

#### **Off-Agenda Items**

No items submitted.

## STAFF REPORT

### **3. Community Police Report**

**Sgt. Allen Wolf, Patrol East Bureau**, provided an update on the activities in District II. The 31 Beat has seen an increase in the number of shed burglaries, lawnmowers, weed eaters, and edgers are been stolen. **Sgt. Wolf** advised that residents should remember to lock up their sheds.

**Sgt. Wolf** also asked Bonnie Brae residents to keep them informed if they noticed any graffiti or illegal dumping at the old K-Mart building on east Kellogg. **Sgt. Wolf** advised that the building is currently being tagged with graffiti and bulky waste and tires are being dumped. **Sgt. Wolf** is continually working with city staff to get this area cleaned up.

Additionally, there are some traffic hiccups between Central and 13<sup>th</sup> close to Greenwich Road. The traffic issues are due to the construction on Greenwich and the hope is that around November 13<sup>th</sup> when one lane is opened this would eliminate some of the problems. **Sgt. Wolf** advised that both Police and the Traffic Engineer have been out to monitor the traffic and right now residents will need to change their driving habits until we get through this first construction phase.

Gas theft is another issue that is occurring in the Douglas & Oliver and Central & Oliver areas. **Sgt. Wolf** advised that residents should store their business vehicles when bringing them home in a better-lighted area to try and prevent this from occurring.

The Board thanked Sgt. Wolf for his updates.

**Action Taken: Received and filed.**

## NEW BUSINESS

### **4. PUD2007-00003**

**Donna Goltry, Planning Department**, presented information on the request to create a mixed-use urban village development including brownstone style housing, flats, high-rise apartments, office and neighborhood retail in the vicinity north of Douglas Avenue, east of Hillside Avenue, south of 1<sup>st</sup> street North and east and west of Rutan Avenue.

The property would be zoned "PUD" Planned Unit Development to replace the current zoning of "GC" General Commercial, "GO" General Office, "B" Multi-family Residential, and "TF-3" Two-family Residential. Use and site development would be defined and limited to the elements contained within the PUD document.

The site lies within the City of Wichita Central & Hillside Redevelopment District approved by Wichita City Council on December 19, 2006. The Douglas & Hillside Redevelopment District (TIF) and the College Hill Urban Village Project Plan were approved by Wichita City Council February 13, 2007.

Proposed uses include all residential and commercial uses permitted by right in the NR zoning district except group residence, broadcast recording studio and pay day loans or similar speedy cash types of businesses, and with the additional NR residential conditional use of neighborhood swimming pool and the additional NR public and civic use of minor utility. The PUD did not request any other public and civic uses or any industrial, manufacturing and extractive uses or any agricultural uses. Restaurants would be allowed up to 6,000 square feet in size, which varies from the NR special development standards for restaurants but still excludes large-scale restaurant operations. Victor Place east of Rutan would become a pedestrian plaza pocket park. The site plan accompanying the TIF review had a roundabout at the intersection of Rutan and Victor Place that may be eliminated due to fire protection turning radius requirements.

Parcel 1 (52,348 square feet-1.2 acre) is located east of Rutan between Victor Place and 1st Street North (the Northeast Brownstone Complex on the College Hill TIF project plan). Requested density is 29 dwelling units per acre and requested maximum building height is 60 feet, however, these levels exceed the proposed uses documented on a proposed site plan and the College Hill Urban Village Project Plan that is the basis for the TIF district. The TIF plan was based on a total of 16 brownstone-type row houses with two-car garage within the units plus a small amount (2,100 square feet) of retail space on the corner. 18 dwelling units per acre (MF-18 density) and a height of 45 feet would be ample to allow the development as proposed by the TIF approval.

Parcel 2 (135,649 square feet-3.1 acres) is the largest tract with the most intensive residential component. It was described as the Condo Tower and Brownstone Complex and the West Brownstone Complex on the TIF project plan. Located west of Rutan between 1st Street North and Victor Place, the parcel would have up to a 14-story high-rise (condominium) apartment building with approximately 84 to 87 dwelling units. A two-level 210-space parking garage would be located under the high-rise tower and extending toward Rutan and the west property line. Up to 36 brownstone row-house type dwellings would surround the high rise. On a site plan, the brownstones have a 10-foot setback from the street. Each unit includes a two-car garage within the unit and a guest parking lot is located east of the main entrance to the high-rise tower. On-street parallel parking spaces provide additional parking for guests or for customers to the office and retail uses. Requested density of the parcel of 50 dwelling units per acre, which is a modest increase from the density of 42 dwelling units per acre of the TIF project plan. Requested height is 300 feet to accommodate a 14-story high-rise.

For Parcels 1 and 2, it is recommended that maximum building height be reduced to 45 feet within 70 feet of 1st Street North and a building setback of 10 feet be required to maintain a unified height and setback along 1st Street and to scale back the intensity of street presence along this street that serves as a main gateway to the lower intensity residential character of the College Hill neighborhood. Also, commercial uses are to be prohibited in structures facing (and located within 70 feet of) 1st Street, again to keep the character of 1st Street intact but allow the remaining development fronting onto Victor and Rutan to utilize mixed commercial and residential use.

Parcel 3 (14,009 square feet-0.32 acre) is proposed as a surface 36-space parking lot to serve parking needs primarily of the office and retail components of the development.

Parcel 4 (56,885 square feet-1.3 acre) is proposed as a retail/residential condominium complex (described as the South Project Retail/Residential Complex on the TIF project plan). A two-story mixed-use building with 9,600 square feet of retail on the street level and five loft apartments on the second floor is to be located on the corner of Douglas and Rutan. Five three-story brownstone-type row houses are shown along Rutan and retail space on the street level with apartments above are

located at the corner of Rutan and Victor. The TIF project plan indicates the brownstones could be replaced with retail uses depending on market demand. A four-story mid-rise apartment building of 24 flats with a 31-car parking lot is shown south of Victor Place and west of Rutan. The PUD requests a maximum building height of 200 feet and density of 50 dwelling units per acre. Current configuration is at a height of about 60 feet and density of 28 dwelling units per acre. The applicant's agent indicated the reason for the wide variation in requested and proposed density and height would be if a second high-rise tower were constructed on the property. This could be a substantial change from the current PUD plan/site plan and the TIF project plan, could affect the parking ratios, and should be subject to a review level associated with an amendment to the PUD. The recommended density and heights reflect the mid-rise and retail/residential components as shown in the TIF project plan and a proposed site plan.

Architectural elements are designed to create an urban village character to the development. Signage is to be per the Wichita Sign Code for the NR district. Consistency in parking lot and lighting elements are to be incorporated. Landscaping would be per the Wichita Landscape Ordinance and done with a consistent plant palette. A proposed site plan shows a row of on-street parking interspersed with trees spaced 60 to 75 feet apart within Victor Place, Rutan and 1st Street. Pedestrian connectivity is required between buildings in the PUD.

Parking appears to be ample, particularly since in an urban village setting, the parking demand would be anticipated to be lower because more patrons would be anticipated to walk to the site than to suburban commercial developments. The developer is providing two public parking lots (Parcel 3 and a lot behind the buildings on Parcel 4) primarily for the retail component. The total amount of parking in these two lots is about 70 spaces, which would almost meet the standard Unified Zoning Code ("UZC") commercial parking requirement if it were developed with up to 20,000 square feet of retail/commercial square footage (although with restaurants, the true parking need would be higher). It is suggested that the parking provision for general retail/office be 1/500 square feet and for restaurants be 1/8 patrons, which is one-half the standard parking rate of the UZC. The PUD requests a parking requirement of 1.25 spaces for multi-family use. This is less parking than shown on a site plan with the high rise having 211 stalls for less than 90 units and the mid-rise with 30 spaces for 19 units. Additional parking is provided by parallel parking stalls on street. And in the TIF project description, the brownstones are to incorporate two-car garages within the units. In order to build some flexibility into the parking component, the option is suggested that the site be developed according to the parking as shown on the site plan or as specified in the general provisions of the PUD.

The surrounding area is College Hill, a traditional neighborhood on a grid pattern with mostly single-family dwellings mixed with duplexes; College Hill Elementary School is the property immediately to the north of Parcel 1 and Plymouth Congregational Church is one block east. The Hillcrest is a premiere apartment tower owned by its residents as a coop. It is ten stories in height and located one block south of this project. The Hillcrest (1927) long has served as the landmark and focal point for the Uptown retail area and edge of College Hill neighborhood. Douglas in this vicinity was known as the "Uptown" area historically and still maintains a strong mix of retail/commercial uses including the Uptown Theater (dinner theater), several furniture stores, offices, dance studio, and restaurants. The Dockum Drug Store building (1927) is significant due to the presence of the Carthalite detailing on the façade. Zoning surrounding the tract includes "SF-5" Single-family Residential, "TF-3" Two-family Residential, "MF-29" Multi-family Residential, "B" Multi-family Residential, "GO" General Office, "LC" Limited Commercial and "GC" General Commercial.

**Goltry** then opened the discussion for questions. **Frutiger** wanted to know what was directly east of this development. **Goltry** explained that the development was adjacent to apartment buildings and a dental office to the east.

**Johnson** expressed that he thought this was a great project and it was very needed. He also wanted to know if the owners in the area agreed to the 10-foot setback. **Goltry** advised that they did.

**Mollhagen** wanted to know if the 14-foot story limitation had any impacts on this project, since the proposed project is requesting to build 14 ½ feet. **Goltry** advised that since the ½ story would not be for dwellings that it would not be an issue.

**Weddle** asked if the urban village concept was defined anywhere and if the Board was being asked to improve the entire package? **Goltry** advised that it was not defined specifically that it is more of a vernacular term, and yes they were looking for approval for the entire package.

**Weddle** then asked for clarification on the PUD item #10 that reads “trash receptacles shall be appropriately screened to hide them from ground view of all parcels and shall be of the same material and color as building.” He also wanted to know if wireless communication has been addressed? **Goltry** advised that the wireless communication would be based on the NR regulations.

**Mayes** asked if the area in which the development was being proposed was an area with poor cell phone coverage? **Goltry** responded that she was not sure.

**Mollhagen** questioned whether it was normal to request a 6-foot wall on the side of Parcel 1. **Goltry** explained that she thought it was fair since it had some single family residential adjacent to the development.

**CM Schlapp** expressed that in conversations with the owner she believes that he would be willing to have discussions later down the road if the need arises and owner **Michael Loveland** agreed.

**Tim Austin, Poe & Associates**, advised the Board that the request has been approved by the MAPC with the following adjustments to the staff report: Item #3 –was changed to 15 stories, Item #9 was deleted, and Item # 11 was increased to 4000 square feet.

**Michael Loveland, Loveland Properties LLC**, advised that the issue of the cell towers would be addressed in the covenants that would be developed with this project. **Loveland** advised that their intention is to try and make the antennas from the outer appear as apart of the project, and to make a conscious effort to not have the antennas just sticking out.

**Austin** also advised that the plat for this area was also approved on Thursday, September 6, 2007.

**Action Taken: Board recommended approval of project with the modifications to items # 3,9, and 11 in the staff report as recommended by the MAPC. (Crotts: Mollhagen, 10-0)**

## **5. Improvement to the Intersection of Douglas and Oliver**

**Paul Gunzelman & Jim Armour, Public Works** provided information on the improvements to the intersection of Douglas and Oliver. **Armour** explained that this area has a lot of historical significance that both staff and the community are trying to preserve. **Armour** explained that meetings have been occurring over the last several years and within the last six weeks they have met with the adjacent property owners and through those meetings have come up with the proposal before the Board tonight.

**Gunzelman** advised that lanes will be increased from 9ft to 10ft on Oliver and Douglas will have 11ft lanes. Additionally, the project will provide for left turn lanes in all directions. **Gunzelman** then advised that the city will need to purchase the right-of-ways on the west side, which will require a 10 foot by 10 foot corner clip on the south west corner and a 9 foot by 10 foot corner clip on north west corner. Neither of these corner clips will reduce parking for any of adjacent property owners.

**Gunzelman** also explained that the owners have expressed a need to see landscaping on the southeast corner, which staff is looking into. Additionally, the project will include brick cross walks, black signal poles, and they are looking into ornamental street light fixtures, as the community would like to see those added in this area.

**Mollhagen** asked what the corner clips would do to the sidewalks. **Gunzelman** explained this would add a little more area for sidewalks and allow them to provide better access ramps. **Mollhagen** also wanted to know how the 10ft lanes would affect trucks. **Gunzelman** explained that since the lanes were only 9ft today that this would improve safety.

**Armour** also advised that this project would allow us to get the protected left turn lanes and address some of the traffic concerns.

**CM Schlapp** stated this has been an issue for a while and this intersection has the highest number of accidents in the city. She expressed her gratitude to staff and the city, as there has been a lot of give and take throughout this entire process. She went on to express how happy she is with the due diligence from staff and the cooperation and partnerships with the community on this project. She expressed this is how government should work and that she is pleased with the design and really excited about the project. **CM Schlapp** thanked staff for a job well done!

**Armour** expressed that staff has enjoyed working with the property owners on this project and look forward to being able to build this project in the coming months.

**Jay Barrier, 4800 E Douglas**, wanted to know if the city was taking property from the west side of the street. **Armour** responded no we just have to purchase some of the right-of-way. **Barrier** also wanted to know if the cost of moving the clock and streetlights were included in the budget for this project. **Armour** advised that the clock was for sure and that he was checking on the streetlights.

James Smith expressed that they (owners) are happy with the project but would like to see if the speed limits could be reduce and that he too thinks decorative lightning is important for this are as well.

**Johnson** expressed that he is happy to see that businesses have decided to stay here.

**Armour** then advised that they hope to start next year in mid-February or beginning of March with the construction for this project. It is also staffs intention to have the project completed in six-

months, no later than November 1. Part of the timing will be based on how quickly Southwestern Bell can complete their work.

**CM Schlapp** wanted to know how quickly we could get Southwestern Bell out there? **Armour** responded that it depends on what Southwestern Bell really has out there. **CM Schlapp** wanted to know if there was anything we could do to ensure that this is not an issue that delays the project. **CM Schlapp** expressed her concern with the efficiency of this project and the importance of making the completion of this project to be as great as the partnership has been.

**Armour** advised **CM Schlapp** that they would do everything possible and go the extra mile to ensure that this project is completed as efficiently and timely as possible.

**DeVries** wanted to know if there is any possibility to reduce the speed limit. **Armour** advised that the city must follow federal guidelines, which requires them to study the area and determine what the speed limit should be. **Armour** advised that conducted a study that showed that the speed limits should be raised, so as a compromise with the owners, the speed limits will remain the same and not be increased.

**CM Schlapp** then asked staff when could we re-evaluate the speed limits? **Armour** advised at least one year after the project has been completed. **CM Schlapp** then suggested that we revisit the issue at that time and if there is a need to study the area again that we do so.

**Mayes** wanted to know if we were integrating this concept with the ideas that are being prepared for the Design District? **Armour** advised that currently they are not as they have not heard from anyone from the Design District, but would love to hear from them.

**James Smith** advised that is wife is the Vice President of the Design District and would make sure that she got in contact with **Armour**.

**Action Taken: Recommended approval of project as presented by staff. (Frutiger: DeVries, 10-0)**

## **BOARD AGENDA**

### **6. Updates, Issues, and Reports**

No items submitted.

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7:56 p.m.

The next DAB II meeting will be **October 1, 2007** at the Rockwell Branch Library.

Respectfully Submitted,  
LaShonda Porter, Neighborhood Assistant