

Advance Plans Committee: 2003-4 Comprehensive Plan Update

Summary of Meeting #8

7:30 am, January 8, 2004

Attendance

Committee Members: Kerry Coulter, Morris Dunlap, Bud Hentzen, Ron Marnell, John McKay, M.S. Mitchell

MAPD staff: Dave Barber, Nalini Johnson, Stephen Banks, Scott Wadle

Other: Irene Hart

Discussion Summary

Future Land Use Guide Map and Definitions Review:

The Committee offered the following comments on the latest draft of the Wichita Land Use Guide Map and the proposed definitions for the functional land use categories.

- The definition of Urban Development Mix should state commercial instead of just local serving commercial. The Committee felt that full disclosure would be better achieved through this change.
- All the intersections coming off of the Northwest Bypass should be marked as regional commercial nodes. The area to either side of the Northwest Bypass should be shown as regional commercial. However, it is still difficult to flag the precise areas for regional commercial designation because it is difficult to anticipate marketplace factors.
- The Advanced Plans members would rather show the functional land use classifications as more intense, because it is always easier to go to less intense land use classes.
- The map will be updated every year, so the map can be modified regularly to reflect changes in anticipated land use patterns.

Midtown Plan Review Comments:

The Committee offered the following comments on the latest draft of the Midtown Plan:

- Ron Marnell requested that his name not be included in the finished plan document.
- Some Committee members felt that the plan document is over bloated and too complex, not clear and concise:
 - You have to read forever to see what's going on.
 - A comparison was made to the McAdams Neighborhood Plan regarding size and length.

- One Committee member felt that the Midtown Plan document is easier to implement than other plans because it provides details describing what, where, when, and how much. The details included in the plan make it easier to follow up on.
- The vision statement is too lengthy.
- The appendices give the appearance of “patting ourselves on the back”.
- Before the Midtown Plan is presented before the MAPC as a whole, members of the Advance Plans Committee recommended:
 - Another meeting to discuss the plan and to ask questions;
 - A meeting with the Steering Committee members to ask questions and to make recommendations.
- One specific organization in the Midtown Neighborhood has not heard about the plan.
- What happened to the neighborhood facilitator’s position in the plan? The position is still listed in the plan. Elizabeth Bishop’s position should be listed with a time frame condition disclosing her time of participation as a facilitator to the plan development process.
- The footnote disclaimer does not need to be included at the end of every page.
- The total cost of all projects included in the plan should be identified, specifically those projects that will/would not occur if the plan did not call for them:
 - The projects that benefit the entire City should not be included in this plan because this plan should be focuses on the neighborhood.
 - It might be advisable to include statements of support for citywide projects that the plan encourages but that the plan is not solely responsible for.
- Irene Hart requested that the references to the Sedgwick County Economic Development (SCED) be removed, as the County does not currently have the resources to serve in that capacity.
- A table of maps needs to be included in the document.

The next Advanced Plans meeting will be on February 5th at 7:30 am.